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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Allegation</th>
<th>Investigation</th>
<th>Allegation Type</th>
<th>Allegation Details</th>
<th>Allegation Source</th>
<th>Investigation Source</th>
<th>Results of Incident</th>
<th>Alleged Incidence of Fraud</th>
<th>Resolution of Incident</th>
<th>Source of Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>BOE Dismissed</td>
<td>Apache, Arizona</td>
<td>31-Aug-04</td>
<td>2002 general</td>
<td>County Attorney alleges some Navajo Nation voters cast multiple ballots. The Election Director dismisses many of the allegations and questioned why the county attorney had waited more than a year and a half to make them.</td>
<td>Arizona Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Eureka Springs, Arkansas</td>
<td>29-Jun-01</td>
<td>county judge</td>
<td>A special judge rules prosecutors must show the mayor intended to vote twice—he says he got confused when he voted early for a city bond election and the voting clerk offered him a primary ballot at the same time. He then voted in the primary at his precinct on election day.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Times</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>riêng</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>La Puente, California</td>
<td>3-Aug-02</td>
<td>municipal</td>
<td>Four family members of a councilman were charged with voting twice because they voted absentee and on election day.</td>
<td>Los Angeles Times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Chronicle</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Press</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>San Francisco, California</td>
<td>1-Mar-04</td>
<td>mayoral run-off</td>
<td>One of the candidates alleged that 400 people who are dead cast votes. The allegation was based on a computer program that cross-referenced voters and the social security death index using first and last names and date of birth. When the Chronicle also used middle initials and other identifying indicators, the list was whittled to five cases. Some were by absentee but a couple were in person.</td>
<td>San Francisco Chronicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Post</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Found</td>
<td>Untrue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>25-Mar-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of State says that RNC allegations that 54 Connecticut voters cast ballots in 2 different states have been investigated and found to be false. 15 voted only in CT, 29 voted only in another state, four names were wrong because they had different birth dates, and three were referred to the FBI and US Attorney because information from the other state could not be obtained.</td>
<td>Denver Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven Register</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Found</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>22-Oct-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Losing candidate alleges some voters were able to vote twice.</td>
<td>New Haven Register</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News 12</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Found</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>23-Sep-03</td>
<td>mayoral primary</td>
<td>Records indicate that 24 voters cast ballots in both DC and Maryland in the September 2002 primary and 90 voters did so in the 2000 election. Voters denied they had done so and election officials said it was possible for precinct workers to make mistakes when recording who voted.</td>
<td>News 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Post</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Found</td>
<td>DC and Maryland</td>
<td>31-Oct-02</td>
<td>presidential election</td>
<td>Voters deny possible mistakes</td>
<td>Washington Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Dead Voters and Multiple Voting**

| Type | Allegation | Source for Allegation | Investigation | Charged (individuals) | Acquitted or guity plea (individuals) | Follow-up possible? (Open investigation and/or pending charges) | City / County | Date | Type of Election | Alleged instance of fraud | Original Source | Resolution of incident | Source of Resolution-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Absentee</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>5-Dec-02</td>
<td>2002 general</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The County State Attorney will be investigating about a dozen people accused of voting twice. Each cast an absentee ballot and voted on Election Day. The Secretary of State says they may have forgotten they voted absentee. They all had to vote by provisional ballots so none of the second votes were counted. This is the first time the Secretary's office has found people who voted twice.</td>
<td>Sun-Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Absentee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>2-Nov-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>One voter returned two absentee ballots – the first one was counted and the second discarded. A woman voted by absentee and then during early voting. Her absentee ballot will be thrown out.</td>
<td>Press Journal (Vero Beach)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Absentee</td>
<td>Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>6-Nov-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Palm Beach Post reports that three voters cast absentee ballots and then filled out provisional ballots on Election Day. Local officials have asked the Attorney General to investigate. The Post reached two of the voters and they said they cast provisional ballots because when they tried to check on their absentee ballots they were unable to confirm they had been received.</td>
<td>Florida Times</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Both</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Votusia</td>
<td>6-Nov-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Volusia officials said Friday they have identified 12 cases of suspected election fraud stemming from Tuesday's presidential election. All involved people trying to vote twice, said County Judge Steven deLaroche, a member of the county canvassing board. In one case, which occurred during early voting, a person was caught trying to feed an absentee ballot into a tabulating machine after casting a traditional ballot, deLaroche said. That person was stopped by a poll worker. In the other 11 cases, people who had voted by absentee ballot or at an early voting site tried to vote a second time on Election Day, he said. In those cases, election workers discovered the attempts when computers showed those voters had already cast ballots. All the cases will be forwarded to the State Attorney's Office for prosecution.</td>
<td>Orlando Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type:</td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>Partisan Allegation</td>
<td>Investigation 7</td>
<td>Other Source for Allegation</td>
<td>Other Official Involvement</td>
<td>Charged (Individuals)</td>
<td>Acquittal (Individuals)</td>
<td>Convicted (Individuals)</td>
<td>Follow-up Possible (Open Investigation and/or Pending Charges)</td>
<td>City/County</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Alleged Instance of Fraud</td>
<td>Original Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Absentee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Officers said in January that a review of records found more than 50 cases in which the same person had cast an absentee and in person ballot. An FBI investigation found that every one of those instances was due to a clerical error, such as someone signing the voter rolls before they were told they had to vote elsewhere.</td>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>31-Jul-05</td>
<td>presidenital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple in person</td>
<td></td>
<td>Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A newspaper analysis shows that five votes cast were attributed to people who were dead well before the election.</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>16-May-04</td>
<td>county primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A woman called a radio talk show Tuesday and admitted casting fraudulent votes in Hancock County. The woman said she voted once using her own name, but after realizing she was not required to show identification, she waited several hours and returned to the polls and used a friend’s name. The county clerks said the incident appears to be isolated and her office has not received evidence of other fraudulent votes elsewhere in the county.</td>
<td>Prairie</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>8-Jan-05</td>
<td>general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Absentee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A voter claims someone forged his signature to vote under his name. He reported the incident to City Hall.</td>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>3-Nov-04</td>
<td>presidenital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The investigation shows there may be more than 300 voters voting twice in different counties. The exact number is impossible to determine because many counties have shredded their poll books data in the past. The state computer files contain many errors that show people voting who did not actually vote. The investigation only flagged people who voted in different counties. After further investigation, it was determined that voting who did not actually vote. The investigation only flagged people who voted in different counties. After further investigation, it was determined that

Two people are registered to vote in more than one county.

A former conservative party candidate for lieutenant governor is arraigned on an indictment for voting twice in the November election.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Absentee/Affirmative</th>
<th>Source of Allegation</th>
<th>Other Official Involved</th>
<th>Charges (Individual)</th>
<th>Other Determination</th>
<th>Open Investigation/Resolution (pending charges)</th>
<th>City/County</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Alleged Instance of Fraud</th>
<th>Original Source of Incident</th>
<th>Resolution of Allegation</th>
<th>Source of Resolution of Allegation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>24-Oct-04</td>
<td>2000 and 2002</td>
<td>The Observer found up to 180 people who were listed as having voted in both Carolinas in either the 2000 or 2002 elections. Reporters found no one who admitted to double voting and discovered plausible explanations for many of the duplications. In one case, an Army captain in North Carolina shared the same name as his father in South Carolina. The father was likely mistakenly recorded under his son's name when he cast his ballot.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>20-Oct-04</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>Four men were charged with voting by absentee and on election day. Three denied the allegations or said they misunderstood the process.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaston</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>16-Dec-04</td>
<td>There are differences in most precincts between the number of ballots cast and the number of people recorded as voting. State investigators have concluded there is no way to rule out double-voting or missing votes because poll workers cannot explain the discrepancies.</td>
<td>Charlotte Observer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chio</td>
<td>2-Nov-04</td>
<td>predial</td>
<td>Republican attorney cites a Plain Dealer report saying more than 27,000 people are registered to vote in both Ohio and Florida and that 100 people cast votes in both places four years ago. A Dispatch investigation of the allegations found little proof of duplicate voting after comparing the Ohio and Florida state databases and conducting further research. After culling the list through those methods, the Dispatch interviewed the people left in question. This failed to turn up anyone who had ever voted twice. Many had never been to Florida; some had never lived in Columbus.</td>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>8-Dec-04</td>
<td>The Director of the Board of Elections says the number of people under investigation for voting twice has decreased from 19 to 10. The board already determined that there were legitimate explanations for about half of the votes. In one case it appeared a man voted absentee and at the polling place but it turned out the absentee ballot had been cast by his son who had the same name.</td>
<td>Akron Beacon Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>9-Dec-04</td>
<td>A couple who admitted voting twice were not indicted -- they voted by absentee ballot and then voted in person because they thought their absentee ballots had been lost.</td>
<td>Akron Beacon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>20-Oct-04</td>
<td>The Board of Elections reviewed at the allegations of double voting and found that of 19 cases, 11 did not vote twice and seven did but did not intend to. All of the double votes were caught by the board but not counted twice. The board forwarded only one case of alleged double voting to the sheriff for further investigation.</td>
<td>Akron Beacon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>Allegation</td>
<td>Other Source for Allegation</td>
<td>Allegation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Logan, Okla. 24-Feb-01, primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Oregon, 11-Apr-02, general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>State BOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Oregon, 16-May-04, general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>State BOE</td>
<td>Found Untrue</td>
<td>Oregon, 1-Nov-04, presidencial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>Found Untrue</td>
<td>Rhode Island, 14-Jan-03, General Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>Hamilton County, 19-Dec-02, county commission</td>
<td>Tennessee, 15-Dec-03, county commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A man is charged with voting twice, once by absentee and once on election day. Although election board officials said they haven't seen a case like this in twenty years, they won't dismiss the charge. The Secretary of State has referred five cases of possible double voting to the Attorney General (Oregon votes entirely by mail). Republicans claimed 1,200 Oregonians had registered in two counties and voted twice. But a state Elections Division investigation found that just a handful of voters were registered to vote in two counties and one had cast more than one ballot. The state Republican Chair claims in a news conference that he has uncovered six cases of people voting twice. The elections division immediately showed that five of the voters had only voted once, and the sixth case had immediately been caught by election workers. The Pawtucket Board of Canvassers determined there was no truth to the allegation that Louis C. Yip, owner of the China Inn restaurant and a well-known developer, had shepherded the same couple to two different polling places, getting them to vote twice. City Registrar of Voters Dawn M. McCormick said that when voting records were checked it turned out that the couple that Yip was accused of getting to vote at Towers East and Kennedy Housing was actually two different couples, both elderly and Chinese. The county election commissioner said she believed people were using other names to vote and that addresses were changed fraudulently. Voters sign fail-safe affidavits when they change their addresses and their voting records have not yet been updated. Oaths of identity are signed when voters have no other form of identification. The commissioner said she questioned the validity of 11 oaths of identity and 68 fail-safe affidavits in the District 4 election. The Pawtucket Island subdivision 03 Bulletin The Oregonian Providence Journal Bulletin Chattanooga Times Free Press.
### 'Dead' Voters and Multiple Voting

| Type       | Absentee? | Party Allegation | Allegation Source | Investigation # | Other Allegation | Accused (Individually) | Convicted Individuals | Other Determination | Follow-up Possible? | Open Investigation in Season or Pending Charges | City/County | State | Date | Type of Election | Absentee, In Person, In Person, Absentee | Source of Allegation | Original Source | Resolution of Allegation | Source of Resolution |
|------------|-----------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------|-------|------|----------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Dead       | Yes       | Press            | Yes              | Tennessee       | 14-Dec-06       | state            | State legislator who lost by 32 votes alleges 32 people voted twice and 101 residents from other districts cast ballots | Dallas               | Press             | Yes                                      | Dead        | Press | Jan-06 | Multiple | Absentee, In Person, In Person, Absentee | Most of the allegations seem to be cases of innocent mistakes that may have been technically illegal but not fraud | Honolulu Chronicle | January 16, 2005 |
| Multiple   | Yes       |        |                  | State/County    | 12-May-05       | county            | The county is investigating three voters suspected of voting early and on election day | San Antonio         | Yes               | Yes                                      | Multiple    | Yes   | Jan-05 | In Person | In Person                          | The Monitor                                          |            |                |                    |                     |
| Both       | Yes       |        |                  | King/State      | 22-Jun-06       | gubernatorial    | Republican officials release the names of 16 people they say voted twice. One person is found to be two people with the same name but different birthdates. Two names were referred to the prosecutors office, files were charged against one. | King                | Yes               | Yes                                      | Both        | Yes   | Jan-06 | Multiple | In Person                          | See Washington Summary                                 | Seattle Times | See Washington summary |
| Multiple   | Yes       |        |                  | King/State      | 13-Oct-05       | gubernatorial    | Republican officials release the names of 16 people they say voted twice. One person is found to be two people with the same name but different birthdates. Two names were referred to the prosecutors office, files were charged against one. | King                | Yes               | Yes                                      | Multiple    | Yes   | Jan-06 | Multiple | In Person                          | See Washington Summary                                 | Seattle Times | See Washington summary |
| Multiple   | Yes       |        |                  | King/State      | 14-Oct-05       | gubernatorial    | Woman on Republican list under investigation for double voting | King                | Yes               | Yes                                      | Multiple    | Yes   | Jan-06 | Multiple | In Person                          | See Washington Summary                                 | Seattle Times | See Washington summary |
| Multiple   | Yes       |        |                  | King/State      | 13-Jan-05       | nonpartisan election | Student who voted by absentee ballot and in person at college sentenced to probation | Appleton            | Yes               | Yes                                      | Multiple    | Yes   | Jan-05 | Absentee | Absentee                          | Post Crescent                                          |                  |                  |                    |                     |
| Multiple   | Yes       |        |                  | King/State      | 14-Oct-05       |                 | Woman on Republican list under investigation for double voting | King                | Yes               | Yes                                      | Multiple    | Yes   | Jan-06 | Multiple | In Person                          | See Washington Summary                                 | Seattle Times | See Washington summary |

A second dead voter cast a ballot in the September special election held to fill the seat vacated by former state senator John Ford. Like a similar case documented earlier this week, this one involves an elderly voter who died weeks before the Sept. 16 election, an investigation by The Commercial Appeal found.

Both of the suspect votes occurred in Precinct 27-1, in the heart of heavily Democratic North Memphis. By law, health officials report deaths once a month to the state Election Commission, which then purges the dead from voter registration rolls. In that window of time - a month or so before the election - there's a good chance dead voters will remain on the rolls on Election Day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th>Partisan Allegation</th>
<th>Source for Allegation</th>
<th>Investigation</th>
<th>Charges (Individually)</th>
<th>Acquittal/Dismissal (Individually)</th>
<th>Conviction and/or Pleas (Individually)</th>
<th>Other Determination</th>
<th>Follow-up Investigation and/or Pending Charges</th>
<th>City/County</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source of Resolution</th>
<th>Source of Allegation</th>
<th>Type of Election</th>
<th>Alleged Instance of Fraud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>US Attorney</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>22-Aug-05</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>clerical errors</td>
<td>Man charged with voting twice said he voted more than once</td>
<td>Milwaukee, Wiscon</td>
<td>Journal Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>21-Sep-05</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>clerical errors</td>
<td>Man charged with voting twice said he voted more than once</td>
<td>Milwaukee, Wiscon</td>
<td>Journal Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>5-Dec-05</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>clerical errors</td>
<td>Four people charged with double voting</td>
<td>Milwaukee, Wiscon</td>
<td>Journal Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Laramie</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>3-Nov-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>clerical errors</td>
<td>Laramie County Clerks says there has never been any intentional double registration or double voting</td>
<td>Laramie, Wyom</td>
<td>Journal Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>23-Oct-02</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>clerical errors</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Motor Vehicles says they will be able to refute the claims.</td>
<td>Milwaukee, Wiscon</td>
<td>USA Today</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOP claims there were nine cases where people voted in Milwaukee and another city. US Attorney says he found no fraud, but rather clerical errors.

Man charged with voting twice said he voted more than once.

Four people charged with double voting, none convicted.

Laramie County Clerks says there has never been any intentional double registration or double voting.

RNC compiles a national database of 3,273 people who voted twice in 2000. In North Carolina, the first name on the list was the chair of the Assembly's election law committee, and the California Secretary of State says they will be able to refute the claims.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/County</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of Election</th>
<th>Alleged Instance of Fraud</th>
<th>Original Source</th>
<th>Source 1</th>
<th>Source 2</th>
<th>Source 3</th>
<th>Resolution of Incident</th>
<th>Source of Resolution 1</th>
<th>Source of Resolution 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>10-Jan-06</td>
<td>sheriff</td>
<td>Former sheriff and an attorney said in a federal criminal trial that they did not conspire to illegally run criminal history checks on absentee voters for the sheriff’s election. Prosecutors say he started doing the check after he lost the election, while the sheriff says he did it to ferret out voter fraud.</td>
<td>Birmingham News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>28-Nov-01</td>
<td>municipal</td>
<td>The Coast Guard found the lids to eight absentee ballot boxes floating in the bay, raising suspicions of tampering.</td>
<td>San Francisco Chronicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>November 15, 2001; 11/16/2001</td>
<td>mayoral</td>
<td>Mayor Bradley accuses opponent of stuffing boxes with counterfeit ballots and having noncitizens vote.</td>
<td>LA Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>27-Jan-03</td>
<td>DNT</td>
<td>Nearly 3000 votes were lost for two days as some were taken home by poll workers, others misplaced. Vote totals failed to add up correctly when the votes were restored.</td>
<td>Brandenton Herald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>12-Nov-05</td>
<td>mayoral</td>
<td>Detroit officials lost track of ballots in nine precincts and did not count them until two days after the polls closed; a poll worker took home two computer data packs containing ballot information and did not return them until the next day, leading to tampering allegations. Judge overseeing the recount orders more security for the ballots.</td>
<td>Detroit Free Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>26-Nov-05</td>
<td>mayoral</td>
<td>Assemblywoman Friscia’s suit alleges that election workers told voters who to vote for: allowed two or three people to enter voting booths at the same time; permitted people to vote even though their home addresses and signatures did not match the elections register; allowed registered Republicans to vote in a Democratic pri-mary; provided faulty voting machines; paid people to vote for Vas; allowed non-citizens to vote; refused to accept absentee ballots, and closed Friscia’s own polling station in Woodbridge.</td>
<td>Home News Tribune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex County</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>19-Jun-03</td>
<td>assembly primary</td>
<td>City council member accused of filing absentee ballot applications for 10 people without their authorization. The Attorney General charges councilman with 10 counts of tampering with public records and one count of hindering or preventing voting.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>11-Nov-05</td>
<td>mayoral and city council</td>
<td>A Cleveland elections board employee is charged with changing the votes on ballots completed by five nursing home residents in favor of Bush.</td>
<td>Yahoo News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton County, Tennessee</td>
<td>18-Jan-03</td>
<td>district primary</td>
<td>The Tennessee Bureau of Investigation searched the home of former Hamilton County Election Commission employee Rita Jones on Friday and seized an undisclosed number of documents. Ms. Jones, a 14-year employee of the Election Commission, was fired two days after the Nov. 5 general election when officials discovered a box of 150 ballots had not been counted on Election Day.</td>
<td>Chattanooga Times Free Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, Texas</td>
<td>10-Dec-02</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>The county election administrator found that ballot counters switched ballots from Republican to Democrat</td>
<td>San Antonio Express News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamo, Texas</td>
<td>15-Dec-03</td>
<td>county commission</td>
<td>A supporter of one of the candidates alleges that he saw the mayor in the city secretary's office going over a list of residents that showed who had voted and who had not and that the 2500 people were open mail-in ballots in front of them</td>
<td>The Monitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ector County, Texas</td>
<td>15-Dec-04</td>
<td>county commission</td>
<td>On Election Day, Republican David Dunn had one more vote than his opponent for an Ector County commission seat. After a recount, he lost by a vote. He filed a lawsuit Tuesday accusing opponent Barbara Graf and elections administrator Sharon Wilson of election fraud. He accused Graf of ballot tampering during the recount, claiming she or her supporters doctored tally sheets. Wilson mishandled the recount, tossing out two duplicate ballots for Dunn, according to the suit.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forney, Texas</td>
<td>13-Dec-05</td>
<td>mayoral</td>
<td>A judge found that votes cast by several people, including City Council member Andy Parker, could not be found in the ballot box. Mr. Parker testified during the seven-day trial that he had used ballot No. 331, but the No. 331 in the box did not match the way he voted. In all, 165 people testified that they had voted early for Mr. Wilson, while just 152 early votes were counted for him - something Judge Kupper called an &quot;irreconcilable discrepancy.&quot; The Sheriff's Department is investigating.</td>
<td>Dallas Morning News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake, Utah</td>
<td>20-Nov-02</td>
<td>County Council</td>
<td>County clerk candidate writes a letter to the Attorney General alleging altering of vote counts</td>
<td>Salt Lake Tribune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>26-May-05</td>
<td>gubernatorial</td>
<td>An election administrator admitted she falsified a report to make it appear that all absentee ballots were accounted for. It later proved inaccurate when workers discovered 95 unopened, uncounted absentee ballots in a warehouse. Republicans say of the 95 ballots, 47 came from Rossi districts and 28 Gregoire. Gregoire won four of the five King County precincts that recorded more votes than voters. Rossi won four of the six King County precincts that recorded more votes than voters. Republicans claim this proves ballot boxes were stuffed in precincts that favored Gregoire and ballots vanished in precincts favoring Rossi.</td>
<td>See Washington summary -- Judge eventually found no fraud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30-May-05</td>
<td>gubernatorial</td>
<td>Republican attorneys allege King County election officials committed fraud by allowing illegal ballots in Democratic districts, ballot box stuffing and thefts of votes from the Republican candidate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>gubernatorial</td>
<td>GOP lawyer contends claim that the Democrats rigged the election by stuffing ballot boxes in the Democrat's two strongest precincts and by &quot;losing&quot; votes in two of the Republican's strongest precincts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>7-Feb-03</td>
<td>council</td>
<td>In the 2002 election two candidates had to be physically removed from the polling place, one for allegedly attempting to steal ballots. Charges of fraud and improprieties included photocopying ballots and stuffing ballot boxes. 135 more ballots than stakeholders were cast. After investigating, the city found no cause to dismiss the election and the League of Women Voters did not find any stuffing of the ballot boxes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>29-Mar-04</td>
<td>city council</td>
<td>There are differences in most precincts between the number of ballots cast and the number of people recorded as voting. State investigators have concluded there is no way to rule out double voting or missing votes because poll workers cannot explain the discrepancies. More than 13,000 votes were omitted from the county's unofficial results, including 1,200 votes from a Dallas precinct and about 12,000 early votes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- The Olympian
- AP
- LA Weekly
- Herald Sun
- Charlotte Observer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th>5/9/2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parties Involved</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phillips Arkan sas 2-Nov 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forgery</strong></td>
<td>South Gate Calif onia 28-Jan 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coercion</strong></td>
<td>Bridgeport Conn ection 6-Sep 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ineligible</strong></td>
<td>Federal 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ineligible</strong></td>
<td>Bridgeport Conn ection 3-Dec 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ineligible</strong></td>
<td>Smyrna Delaw are 3-Aug 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forgery</strong></td>
<td>Winter Garden Flor ida 5-Mar-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forgery</strong></td>
<td>Volusia Flor ida 3-Oct-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ineligible</strong></td>
<td>Winter Haven Flor ida 6-Jan 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Allegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Voters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Allegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery-Dead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishandling/Ineligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>State Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Source for Allegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Federal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forged Voter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County Circuit Court judge ruled the Clerk violated the law; There is an election contest and a federal investigation involving irregularities with absentee ballots. 

Detroit Free Press; November 9, 2005

Detroit Free Press; November 24, 2005

AP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Partisan Source for Allegation</th>
<th>Other Source for Allegation</th>
<th>Investigative Official Involvement</th>
<th>Charge(s)</th>
<th>Accounted for (Individually)</th>
<th>Alleged Conviction(s)</th>
<th>Pending Investigation(s)</th>
<th>Alleged Involvement(s)</th>
<th>Source of Source of Incident</th>
<th>Type of Allegation</th>
<th>Source of Resolution of Incident</th>
<th>Source of Resolution of Incident</th>
<th>Resolution of Incident of Allegation</th>
<th>Source of Resolution of Incident of Allegation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Palisades Park</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>6-Nov-02</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Board of elections requests an inquiry into alleged forged absentee ballots</td>
<td>The Record</td>
<td>October 4, 2004</td>
<td>The Record</td>
<td>276 absentee ballots from the 2002 election in Palisades Park are still impounded in the office of Patricia DiCostanzo, the Bergen County superintendent of elections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forger</td>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>9-Jul-03</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>The FBI is investigating charges that voters targeted by a Democratic campaign had their signatures forged or had been pressured or misled into voting absentee</td>
<td>Atlantic County News</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heral News (Passaic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion/Forgery</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>22-Sep-04</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>In the city of Passaic, three dozen voters claimed they’d been victims of absentee ballot fraud in 2003.</td>
<td>The Record</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forger-Other Voters</td>
<td>Passaic</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>4-Oct-04</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>131 absentee ballots were delivered by a ward leader, leading to vague allegations of coercion. All absentee ballots and machines impounded under a court order</td>
<td>Albany Times Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>Albany County</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>8-Mar-04</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>One person filled in more than 140 signed absentee ballot applications, and there were other administrative errors in absentee ballot distribution and return. The candidates made a deal before the judge ruled on the case to have a special election; the absentee ballots are not counted</td>
<td>Albany Times Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>Albany County</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>10-Mar-04</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>An absentee ballot scandal is being investigated in Haskell County, where one man allegedly admitted notarizing 42 absentee ballots without having the voters present while another man helped him, the District Attorney said.</td>
<td>Daily Oklahoman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>23-Aug-02</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Elderly woman says strangers coerced her into giving them her ballot</td>
<td>Providence Journal-Bulletin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Absentee Fraud Investigation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>10/25/2002</td>
<td>The prosecutor in Fall River County said he will investigate possible multiple absentee ballots were cast by fewer than 10 people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>12/02</td>
<td>A person with connections to the Williams campaign nicknamed 'The Voter Man' convinced elderly voters, some living in residential care facilities, to fill out absentee ballot registration forms. Some say they never received a ballot, even though records indicate a ballot was cast in their names. At least one staff member at a non-communicative Alzheimer's care facility into casting absentee ballots. While not technically illegal, the volume of absentee votes raised state eyebrows within the Norwood Senate campaign. As a result of suspected fraud, the party ordered a new district election and the cases are being criminally investigated. The state is moving forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td>10/25/2002</td>
<td>The prosecutor in Dakota said he will investigate possible multiple absentee ballots were cast by fewer than 10 people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>12/02</td>
<td>A person with connections to the Williams campaign nicknamed 'The Voter Man' convinced elderly voters, some living in residential care facilities, to fill out absentee ballot registration forms. Some say they never received a ballot, even though records indicate a ballot was cast in their names. At least one staff member at a non-communicative Alzheimer's care facility into casting absentee ballots. While not technically illegal, the volume of absentee votes raised state eyebrows within the Norwood Senate campaign. As a result of suspected fraud, the party ordered a new district election and the cases are being criminally investigated. The state is moving forward.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The date 12/02 refers to the date of the investigation or report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Allegation</th>
<th>Other Source for Allegation</th>
<th>Other Official Involved?</th>
<th>Charge Individual?</th>
<th>Convicted or Acquitted Individuals</th>
<th>Other Determination?</th>
<th>Source of Resolution</th>
<th>Resolution of Incident</th>
<th>Alleged Instance of Fraud</th>
<th>Violation of Source</th>
<th>Source of Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dallas Observer</td>
<td></td>
<td>November 4, 2004</td>
<td>Argus Leader</td>
<td>A voter fraud investigation has resulted in the indictment of a Dallas woman who is accused of filling out a mail-in ballot in May without the voter's permission, a Dallas prosecutor said Tuesday.</td>
<td>February 13, 2002, Fort Worth Star Telegram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgergy - Other Voters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dallas Texas</td>
<td>10-May-04</td>
<td>Both candidates accuse the other of manipulating the absentee ballot votes of senior citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dallas Morning News</td>
<td>A voter fraud investigation has resulted in the indictment of a Dallas woman who is accused of filling out a mail-in ballot in May without the voter's permission, a Dallas prosecutor said Tuesday.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgergy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A voter fraud investigation has resulted in the indictment of a Dallas woman who is accused of filling out a mail-in ballot in May without the voter's permission, a Dallas prosecutor said Tuesday.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgergy - Unknown</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A voter fraud investigation has resulted in the indictment of a Dallas woman who is accused of filling out a mail-in ballot in May without the voter's permission, a Dallas prosecutor said Tuesday.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three former Republican notaries pleaded guilty to signing absentee ballots without witnessing the signatures. Three other former GOP workers are charged, as is one Daschle staff person accused of not being present for two notary applications. Officials say none of the incidents affected any votes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Partisan Allegation</th>
<th>Other Source for Allegation</th>
<th>Investigator</th>
<th>Other Official Involved</th>
<th>Charge (Individual)</th>
<th>Convicted or Acquitted (Individual)</th>
<th>Follow-up possible? (Open investigation or pending charges)</th>
<th>City / County</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of Election</th>
<th>Alleged Instance of Fraud</th>
<th>Original Source</th>
<th>Resolution of Allegation</th>
<th>Source of Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forger-y - Other Voters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17, 5</td>
<td>Hearne Texas</td>
<td>18-Oct-03</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Man fined and sentenced to five years probation for voting in the names of three dozen other people by absentee ballot. He is the fifth person to plead guilty to similar charges brought by a grand jury in August 17 were indicted.</td>
<td>Houston Chronicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forger-y - Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30, Yes</td>
<td>Hearne Texas</td>
<td>28-Dec-03</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>Several mail in ballot requests appeared to be filled out by the same person and a few were in the names of dead people. A precinct chairwoman was charged with four counts of tampering with government records</td>
<td>Star Telegram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forger-y - Unknown/Dead/Other Voters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5, El Paso, Texas, 04</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>12-Feb-04</td>
<td>water board</td>
<td>Complaints were made to the Board of Elections against workers for several campaigns of irregularities concerning absentee ballots, including coercion of elderly voters, a complaint that someone requested an absentee ballot for a dead voter; four people said their ballots were already sealed when they received them, and a voter whose absentee ballot that was sent elsewhere</td>
<td>Assoc Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-March-04</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Judge's race</td>
<td>The names of 42 deceased people, most of whom lived on the South Side, appeared on applications for mail-in ballots that were submitted to election officials for the primaries. A computer at the Bexar County elections office flagged the applications and the district attorney's office is investigating. No ballots appear to have been sent to a dead person as a result of the applications, election officials have said. However, the applications were cited by Henry Cuellar - a Democratic candidate for the District 28 congressional seat who lost by 145 votes - as one of several concerns that persuaded him to call for a recount this week. The list of applicants includes next-door neighbors, people who never voted when they were alive, and two who died in 1988.</td>
<td>The Monitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forger-y - Dead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-March-04</td>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Congressional</td>
<td>San Antonio Express-News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All but one bear the deceased's correct voter registration number. Each had the correct address and voting precinct, and all indicated the voter was older than 65, which is one of the reasons individuals may obtain a mail-in ballot. But whoever filled out many of the applications didn't alter his or her handwriting on the forms, all of which supposedly were done by the individual voters. Two batches of the falsified documents show clear similarities.

Elderly voters complain of "vote brokering" whereby "coyotes" pressure them into voting by absentee ballot. Investigators have looked into this in the past, and there has only been one conviction of someone pressuring others to vote absentee.

The District Attorney requested a recount of ballots because of many complaints of people filing mail-in ballots sent to homes of people who have died. One of the candidates says that in one instance a wife mailed in the ballot of her husband who just died, and another was a son's vote being mistaken for the father's because they had the same name.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Resolution Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th>Convict</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Case:</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>5/9/2007</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td></td>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Case:</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convict</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Convict:</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feared</td>
<td></td>
<td>Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Details:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Allegation</td>
<td>Other Source for Allegation</td>
<td>Investigating Agency</td>
<td>Change / Dismissal</td>
<td>Convicted / Acquitted</td>
<td>Other Determination</td>
<td>City / County / State Date</td>
<td>Type of Election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery-Voters/Coeion</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Milwaukee, Wisconsn 5-Mar-03</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>County board recall</td>
<td>A police handwriting expert labeled signatures on 60 absentee ballot envelopes suspicious and elections officials and the DA questioned 36 more. The 96 are among 182 that were distributed to 5th District voters by the African American Coalition for Empowerment. The group had residents agree to ask the city to send absentee ballots to their offices rather than directly to the voters. The group then went to the homes, witnessed the votes and returned the ballots.</td>
<td>Milwaukee Journal Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery-Other Voter</td>
<td>Milwaukee, Wisconsn 15-Jan-04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>County recall</td>
<td>A voting rights activist was convicted of three felony counts stemming from his management of an absentee ballot campaign. Although evidence suggested forgery and other mischief, the case turned on one voter registration card. The voter had his signature forged by his girlfriend, and the activist had signed the form as a deputy registrar.</td>
<td>Milwaukee Journal Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery-Unknown</td>
<td>Milwaukee, Wisconsn 20-Feb-04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>County recall</td>
<td>One person is convicted for forging absentee ballots</td>
<td>Milwaukee Journal Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Absentee**

5/9/2007
### Challenges

- **Type**: Yes
- **Source**: Hansinger
- **Source of Incident/Allegation**: Official Charged
- **Year**: 2004
- **State**: Alabama
- **Resolution**: 23-Aug-03

#### Challenge

About 50 challenged ballots in a Bayou La Batre City Court election have stirred discrimination concerns because they were all demanded from Asian-American voters. Fred Marceaux of COD, an advocate for the Asian community, called the challenged ballots "scare tactics." By all accounts, the voters were challenged to their faces as they walked into the polling place at the Bayou La Batre Community Center. Being publicly confronted on their first trip to the voting booth visibly upset many of those who were challenged. Until this year, Asians here have seemed reluctant to step into local politics, preferring to live as a self-contained community for the most part.

### Polling Place Harassment

- **Polling Place**: Pollworker/th presiders
- **Type**: Yes
- **Source**: Hansinger
- **Resolution**: 1-Oct-04

#### Harassment

In Phoenix (Maricopa County) more than 10,000 people trying to register have been rejected for being unable to prove their citizenship. Yvonne Reed, a spokesman for the Recorder's office, said that most are probably U.S. citizens whose married names differ from the ones on their birth certificates or who have lost documentation. She hopes the number of rejected voters shrinks as election officials explain the new requirements. But, she said, "there will be an amount of people who we will not be able to get on the rolls because of not being able to find the right documents or just losing interest." In Tucson (Pima County), 10 percent of those who tried to register initially could not. Elections chief Chris Reid said that all appeared to be U.S. citizens, but many had moved to Arizona recently and couldn't access their birth certificates or passports. Many of those prospective voters have since been able to register, but Roads said about 1,000 citizens are still unable to vote in this week's election because of Proposition 200 requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Source Allegation</th>
<th>Partisan Allegation</th>
<th>Other Source Allegation</th>
<th>Other Official Allegation</th>
<th>Charged/Individuals Acquitted</th>
<th>Follow-up Allegation</th>
<th>Alleged Instance of Fraud</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Resolution of Incident/Allegation</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poling Place Harassment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arkansas 5-Nov-02</td>
<td>In Arkansas, where voters were allowed to cast their ballots up to two weeks early to lessen the pressure on election day, there were allegations of intimidation in the early voting. Democrats claimed that black voters were photographed as they arrived at polling booths and had their identities subjected to disproportionate scrutiny.</td>
<td>The Guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poling Place Harassment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arkansas 30-Dec-02</td>
<td>Democrats accused Republican poll watchers of driving away voters in predominantly black precincts by taking photos of them and demanding identification during early voting.</td>
<td>The American Prospect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poling Place Harassment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arkansas 17-Nov-04</td>
<td>DNC Chair says black voters in Arkansas were harassed during early voting.</td>
<td>Ethnic News Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poling Place Harassment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California 14-Nov-01</td>
<td>The ousted mayor's lawyer, in a legal challenge to the election, said he intends to show that Perdomo's supporters pulled guns on voters at precincts.</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California 28-Jan-03</td>
<td>Latino community organizer tells city council panel that Latinas have experienced poll workers who intimidate Latinos by illegally asking them to show identification.</td>
<td>Los Angeles Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polworkers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California 5-Nov-03</td>
<td>A group called the People of Color Caucus alleged that some Latinas wearing Gonzalez buttons were told they were not allowed to vote.</td>
<td>Union-Tribune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polworkers/ID</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California 2-Feb-04</td>
<td>Democrats fear what they believe to be a plan by Republicans to challenge new voters, especially students at the University of Colorado at Boulder who may seek to use student IDs as proof of identification at the polls. State GOP brass said they have no such plan.</td>
<td>Los Angeles Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado 28-Oct-04</td>
<td>U.S. Representative tells Republican registrars to request police supervision at the polls if they are concerned about fraud or disturbance.</td>
<td>Denver Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Connecticut 11-Nov-02</td>
<td>Federal observers found poll workers downplay &quot;hostile&quot; to Hispanics, even insisting that voters must speak English to vote.</td>
<td>The Day Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polworkers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Federal Observers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Florida 23-May-02</td>
<td>Citing fears of voter intimidation and a repeat by GOP operatives to &quot;barrage polling places,&quot; local Democrats - including former U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno and U.S. Rep. Carrie Meek - are suing to block Miami-Dade County from allowing a Republican political action committee to put poll watchers inside the county's precincts.</td>
<td>St. Petersburg Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Florida 1-Nov-02</td>
<td>Citing fears of voter intimidation and a repeat by GOP operatives to &quot;barrage polling places,&quot; local Democrats - including former U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno and U.S. Rep. Carrie Meek - are suing to block Miami-Dade County from allowing a Republican political action committee to put poll watchers inside the county's precincts.</td>
<td>Miami Herald</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5/9/2007
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nded
Hearkening back to the 1960s, when Southern
states used poll taxes and In-timidatfon to shut
blacks out of elections, the Rev. Jesse Jackson
on Monday ac-cused Florida Gov. Jeb Bush of
engaging in "disenfranchisement schemes" by
ask-ing counties to purge felons from voter rolls.
"This is a typical South (tactic), denying the right
to vote based on race and class," Jackson said.
"You see classical voter disenfranchisement.
These schemes to deny or suppress voters are
22-Jun- 1pre idenlnotnewSChemes."
hal
Florida 04
The Justice Department is investigating
accusations that Florida law enforcement officers
intimidated elderly black voters during a probe of
voting fraud In the Orlando mayoral election.
Civil rights groups and Democrats contend that
the agents presence and behavior, including
allegedly displaying their guns, intimidated the
19-Sep- presiden minority voters they visited.
Florida 04
tial
Yes
Representatives from People for the American
Way saw poll workers turn back registered
voters who did not have ID, although that is not
required. A spokeswoman from Election
Protection says that several voters report being
presiden asked if they are citizens during early voting.
Florida 1-Oct-04 tial
Democratic election lawyer says Republican
l6-Oct- presides plans to challenge voters at the polls may
tial
intimidate voters.
Florida 04
Two white men were filming voters as they
25-Oct- presiden entered the poll site In a presumed attempt at
Florida 04
tial
intimidation.
The Republican Party distributed to the media
affidavits from anonymous voters claiming to be
harassed at polling sites In Miami, Pembroke
Pines, Boca Raton, Plantation, St. Petersburg,
26-Oct- presiden Jacksonville Apopka and Tallahassee.
tial
Yes
Florida 04
Democratic National Committee (DNC)
Chairman Terry McAuliffe has accused Republicans of engaging in "systematic efforts" to
disenfranchise voters, imposing unlawful
identification requirements on voters, throwing
eligible voters off the rolls and depriving voters of
27-Oct- presiden their right to cast a provisional ballot.
tlal
Florida 04
Democrats have complained that GOP poll
watchers will issue challenges in order fo slow
29-Oct- presiden down the voting process and drive people away
Florida 04
tial
from thepolls.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Allegation</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Allegation</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Ledger, October 31, 2004</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Orlando Sentinel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling Place Harassment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tampa Tribune</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Orlando Sentinel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling Place Harassment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ottawa Citizen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Orlando Sentinel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling Place Harassment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Boston Globe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Boston Globe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>St. Petersburg Times</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Boston Globe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Democrats fear Republicans will systematically challenge black and Hispanic voters and create long lines at the polls. The suspicions were fed by reports that Republicans had a list of 1,666 voters they were planning to challenge in predominantly black areas of Jacksonville.

Based on a 1962 consent decree, The Advancement Project filed a lawsuit asking a federal district court in New Jersey to ban GOP poll watcher activities in heavily minority precincts in Florida. The suit contends that in New Jersey, Louisiana, and North Carolina, the RNC sent mass mailers to thousands of voters registered predominantly in black precincts. When thousands were returned because of incorrect addresses, those names went on lists for challenges. The GOP says it has just done a mass mailer to new voters.

At one polling station, Republicans claimed that Democratic poll watchers were approaching Republican voters and shouting "There's a dirty Bush supporter!" as they waited on line.

Democratic poll workers say Republican poll workers are intimidating Kerry supporters, staring at them and refusing to move away if they decline to accept a Bush-Kerry sticker.

A Republican Party spokesman said elderly voters standing in line at early polling places who refuse to accept Kerry stickers have been harassed with shouts of "Hey, we've got a Bush voter here!" He says Republican poll watchers and volunteers have been "pretty much continually harassed and intimidated."

Democrats say Republicans are disproportionately putting poll watchers in predominantly minority precincts and said it could signal plans to intimidate or slow down voters. In Miami-Dade County, Democrats said 99% of predominately black precincts have at least one Republican poll watcher, while 24% of predominately white precincts have them. In Leon County, 64% of black precincts have at least one Republican poll watcher compared with 24% of majority white precincts. In Alachua, 71% of black precincts have a Republican poll watcher assigned, while 24% of white precincts do.

Democrats have said that poll watchers will enforce a portion of Florida law allowing poll watchers to challenge a voter at the polls.
| Type                  | Allegation | Other Source for Allegation | Other Source for Investigation | Charged Individuals | Acquitted Individuals | Alleged Voter Disenfranchisement | Alleged Vandalism of Ballot Box | Alleged Theft of Ballots | Alleged Vandalism of Precinct | Alleged Theft of Precinct | Alleged Vote Tabulation Error | Alleged Precinct Tampering | Alleged Voter Registration Error | Alleged Use of Force or Threat of Force | Alleged Use of Intimidation or Persuasion | Alleged Use of Corrupt Practices | Alleged Use of Racial Profiling | Alleged Use of Religious Profiling | Alleged Use of Gender Profiling | Alleged Use of Age Profiling | Alleged Use of Sexual Orientation Profiling | Alleged Use of Other Profile Allegations | Alleged Use of Military Status Allegations | Alleged Use of Immigration Status Allegations | Alleged Use of Other Profile Allegations | Alleged Use of Other Profile Allegations |
|----------------------|------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Polling Place Harassment | Yes        | Third-party                  |                               | Florida             | 1-Nov-04              | 1-Nov-04 presidential           | Florida                        | Yes                      | Yes                            | Yes                            | Yes                             | Yes                          | Yes                             | Yes                             | Yes                             | Yes                             |
| Challenges            | Police     | Police                      | Florida                       | 3-Nov-04 presidential | Florida              | 3-Nov-04 presidential           | Florida                        | Yes                      | Yes                            | Yes                            | Yes                             | Yes                          | Yes                             | Yes                             | Yes                             | Yes                             |
| Challenges            | Police     | Police                      | Florida                       | 3-Nov-04 presidential | Florida              | 3-Nov-04 presidential           | Florida                        | Yes                      | Yes                            | Yes                            | Yes                             | Yes                          | Yes                             | Yes                             | Yes                             | Yes                             |
| Police                | Yes        | Yes                         | Florida                       | 3-Nov-04 presidential | Florida              | 3-Nov-04 presidential           | Florida                        | Yes                      | Yes                            | Yes                            | Yes                             | Yes                          | Yes                             | Yes                             | Yes                             | Yes                             |
| Polling Place Harassment | Elections   | Elections                   | Florida                       | 2-Mar-05 presidential | Florida              | 2-Mar-05 presidential           | Florida                        | Yes                      | Yes                            | Yes                            | Yes                             | Yes                          | Yes                             | Yes                             | Yes                             | Yes                             |
| Pollworkers           | Voters      |                            | Florida                       | 3-Nov-04 presidential | Florida              | 3-Nov-04 presidential           | Florida                        | Yes                      | Yes                            | Yes                            | Yes                             | Yes                          | Yes                             | Yes                             | Yes                             | Yes                             |
95 people who make up more than three-quarters of a rural Georgia county's registered Hispanic voters were summoned to a courthouse Thursday to defend their right to vote after a complaint alleged a county commissioner attempted to register non-U.S. citizens. The Atkinson County Board of Registrars, however, dismissed most of the complaint at the beginning of the hearing, saying the case could open the county to charges of violating the Voting Rights Act. Remaining complaints against two voters were dropped when the complainants declined to present any evidence against them. The three men who filed the complaint had said they have evidence a county commissioner attempted to help non-U.S. citizens register so they could vote for him in the July 20 Democratic primary.

Lawyers from the ACLU and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund got involved because the men filed the challenges based on a list they had received from the Board of Registrars of all Hispanics registered in the south Georgia county.

Linda Davis, chief registrar in Atkinson County, said she provided the men with a list of the 121 voters on the rolls who listed their race as Hispanic or Mexican. She said the men decided to challenge 95 of them.

The Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund filed a federal lawsuit last October alleging that election officials conspired to persuade Hispanics to vote by absentee ballot and limit their access to the polls in the 2003 Democratic primary. The U.S. Attorney's Office is investigating similar allegations.

The lawsuit seeks to overturn the election of Mayor Robert Pastick, who defeated challenger George Pabey, who is of Puerto Rican descent.
Persistent warnings about terrorism also have drawn skepticism from some Democratic election officials and civil rights advocates who have accused the Republican White House of creating a climate of fear that, among other things, could suppress voter turnout. Heavy voter turnout historically has favored Democrats in U.S. elections.

Some local officials in Indiana accused Secretary of State Todd Rokita, a Republican, of trying to intimidate voters after he asked election clerks to develop responses to "an immediate and present danger." Engr. Abdelkader, civil rights director for the Council on American-Islamic Relations, says that Arab-Americans and other minorities could choose to stay away from the polls if they believe that federal agents will be questioning people there.

A poll worker, Jeff Farmer, was stationed at Horse Creek Elementary School as a "challenger," someone who observes the process and can ask voters to prove identities or addresses. The sheriff said Farmer was warned after interfering with voters. "I told him to sit his ass down," Jordan said.

When Farmer went outside about 10:30 a.m. and began "pulling voters out of line," according to Jordan, a sheriff's deputy told him to leave or face arrest. Farmer had a different version of county events, saying he went out to smoke and wasn't allowed back in.

A flyer written and distributed by the Republican in charge of recruiting poll workers asserts that in the previous races the NAACP and the Philip Randolph Institute have targeted "poor, black voters" and encouraged them to "commit voter fraud." Civil rights leaders say this shows that the Republican plan to put challengers in predominantly African American polling sites is racially based. The Republican County chair had announced that Republicans would place challengers at 59 precincts that were either chosen at random or because there were too few election workers.
<p>| Challenges | Yes | Third-party | Yes | Kentucky | 2-Nov-03 | guberna- | Republicans plan to deploy &quot;a small army&quot; of challengers in Jefferson County. Critics say the mobilization of mostly white challengers in poorer minority districts is intended to intimidate. Black leaders held a rally decrying the Republican initiative. |
| Challenges | Yes | Third-party | Yes | Kentucky | 4-Nov-03 | guberna- | A group of Republicans called on the county party chair to resign because of plans to use voter challengers in the election. In 2003, the party used Republicans from across the county to watch voting in 18 predominantly Democratic districts – most of them with large numbers of black voters. |
| Police | Police | Louisiana | 7-Oct-03 | sheriff | Tangipahoa Parish Sheriff Ed Layrisson said Monday he has suspended two deputies while his office investigates allegations of public intimidation against them. The deputies were at a polling place Saturday and allegedly asked several people in a group how they planned to vote in the sheriff’s race, authorities said. The deputies &quot;have adamantly denied the allegation,&quot; Layrisson said. He said the deputies were not in uniform, but were carrying their badges and weapons. |
| Networker | third-party | Louisiana | 2-Nov-04 | presiden- | Louisiana Election Protection says it received many complaints of voters being denied the right to vote if they did not have a driver's license. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Allegations</th>
<th>Other Sources of Information</th>
<th>Allegations of Fraud</th>
<th>Resolution of Incident/ Allegation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Washington Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Suppression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>UPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poling Place Harassment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Boston Globe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Suppression/Pol Workers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Boston Globe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollworkers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Boston Globe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Democratic National Committee filed a lawsuit seeking to prevent the Ehrlich campaign from using off-duty police officers as poll workers. The Democrats dropped the action when the campaign agreed the officers would not wear uniforms, badges or sidearms or identify themselves as police officers.

In Maryland, David Paulson, the director of communications for the state Democratic Party, charged that signs saying voters needed photo identification to vote had been "illegally" or "extra-legally" placed by the Board of Elections in Prince George's County, just outside of Washington. Photo identification has never been required for voters there, he said.

In 2002, there were allegations that Russian and Chinese voters were being told how to vote by translators in a Brighton precinct that is home to the Jee-ah Community Housing for the Elderly complex on Wallingford Road. After those allegations, the city changed the rules at the polling place located there: Now, no resident of the building is allowed to work as an election official there.

In a lawsuit filed yesterday, the Justice Department alleges that the city and its poll workers interfered with voters' rights by "improperly influencing, coercing, or ignoring the ballot choices of limited English proficient Hispanic and Asian-American voters" and of generally "abridging" their voting rights by treating Hispanic and Asian voters disrespectfully at the polls and by failing to provide adequate translation services for them.

A survey by the Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund found 10 voters who had been turned away because their names were not on the rolls and who were not offered provisional ballots as required by law.
Trouble was reported at Bowen Recreation Center in Pontiac, where police were called after voters and election workers complained that a Republican Party volunteer was harassing people. Precinct chairwoman Linda Nichols said the woman, who identified herself as Teresa Sayer, came to the poll after leaving another location where voters had complained that she was questioning whether they were eligible to vote. "She would be behind the shoulder of the poll worker telling them what they could and could not do," Nichols said. "She even got behind the voter when they were going into the voting booth, asking them if they had identification."

State election officials say challengers are not allowed to talk directly to voters but can question the veracity of a voter with poll chairpersons. State Republican officials denied that the woman was intimidating voters at the polling place. The precinct, on Bagley near Orchard Lake, is heavily Democratic and black.

Democrats were outraged when Republican state representative John Pappageorge was quoted in July as warning that "if we do not suppress the Detroit vote, we're going to have a tough time in this election." Detroit is 83% black. "The documented incidents of intimidation and harassment that we have in our files are right out of the stories regarding harassment and intimidation in the South in the 1950's and 1960's," Turner said GOP challengers harassed people in line to vote, requesting identification when they had no right to, and had lists of voters "they intended to challenge without any legal basis for such challenges."

The GOP's Paotino said the lists were of newly registered Detroit voters to whom the GOP had sent mailings that came back from the post office as address unknown.
### Intimidation and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alleged Incident of Race</th>
<th>Alleged Incidence of Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NAACP has received more than 100 complaints including ones involving intimidation at the polls. There were many fights between challengers and poll workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alleged Incident of Race</th>
<th>Alleged Incidence of Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A US District judge ordered all political parties to refrain from talking to voters at the polls. The ruling came in response to a suit filed by the Detroit NAACP which said it had received complaints from 19 polling places that state and national GOP poll monitors were harassing voters. Republicans disputed the claim. The suit charged GOP workers were harassing voters in violation of a state law that prohibits challengers from taking to voters. The suit also said the watchers challenged the eligibility of Detroit voters to cast ballots, prompting some to leave without voting. The Detroit NAACP president said it was an attempt to reduce the black vote in next year's state and congressional elections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alleged Incident of Race</th>
<th>Alleged Incidence of Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Republicans systematically challenged a group of voters brought in by a nonprofit group and a group from a shelter. At another site, a minority group advocate accused a Republican challenger of intimidating American Indian and black voters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alleged Incident of Race</th>
<th>Alleged Incidence of Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secretary of State Kiffmeyer said her office received about 140 complaints about MoveOn. Minnesota Republican Party leaders tried and failed to get a restraining order against the MoveOn organization, which they accused of stationing activists too close to polling places Tuesday. The judge disagreed. "The evidence has consisted almost entirely of hearsay," said Hennepin County District Judge Francis Connelly after a two-hour hearing Tuesday afternoon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alleged Incident of Race</th>
<th>Alleged Incidence of Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officials in Beltrami County and throughout the Twin Cities reported seeing poll challengers increasingly focused on polling places with particularly heavy populations of specific groups. Examples of those specific groups were college students, Indians on reservations, minorities or the homeless. In one case, the chairman of a Minnesota Indian tribe accused Republican poll challengers of intimidating legitimate voters by aggressively challenging their residency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alleged Incident of Race</th>
<th>Alleged Incidence of Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Allegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling Place</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Allegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Racial slurs from election workers, missing bilingual ballots and unwarranted demands to check voter identification turned away Asian American voters across the nation, according to reports by the Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund. "There were racist remarks in New York City — poll workers were blaming them for holding up the lines. One of them said, 'You Oriental guys are taking too long to vote,'" she said. Although the legal fund continues to tally its existing poll surveys and has no firm estimate for the number of incidents, Fung said repeated requests from poll workers to check identification hindered the high turnout of Asian American voters. With their patience worn thin by the inadequacy of their voting site, many simply left without voting. In polling sites across Detroit, University of Michigan student volunteers monitoring the polling sites said they not only encountered deficient polling sites, but also challengers from the Republican Party deliberately aiming to drive voters away through tactics of intimidation.

In his first high-profile address since conceding the presidential election, Senator John F. Kerry decried what he called the suppression of thousands of would-be voters last November. "Thousands of people were suppressed in their efforts to vote. Voting machines were distributed in uneven ways," he told an enthusiastic audience of 1,200. "In Democratic districts, it took people four, five, 11 hours to vote, while Republicans [went] through in 10 minutes. Same voting machines, same process, our America," Kerry said. Critics of the election process in Ohio say there were not enough voting machines in urban, Democrat-leaning precincts, leading to long lines that dis-suaded many voters from casting ballots. In some cases, polls were held open after the announced closing time to allow everyone in line to vote, but some left without voting after standing in line for hours. Some blacks in particular have also charged that there were organized efforts to send voters to the wrong voting places, and troubling disparities in the way voting machines counted Democratic votes.

A group called "Concerned Citizens for Fair Elections" filed 1,200 voter challenges, nearly 200 of which were duplicates or triplicates of the same challenge. 220 were improper, several of those who signed the challenges under penalty of perjury said they never inspected the residence they claimed was abandoned or not occupied by a registered voter. District Attorney investigates whether there was perjury.
### Intimidation and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Allegation</th>
<th>Original Source</th>
<th>Resolution of incident/allegation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>Nevada 1-Oct-04</td>
<td>The Progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nevada 29-Oct-04</td>
<td>Washington Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick workers/Intimidation</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>New Jersey 26-Jun-01</td>
<td>New York Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New Jersey 6-Nov-01</td>
<td>The Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New Jersey 4-Dec-01</td>
<td>The Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>New Jersey 27-Oct-04</td>
<td>Newark Advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New Jersey 9-Nov-05</td>
<td>Star Ledger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Allegation</td>
<td>Other Source</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>Nevada 1-Oct-04</td>
<td>president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nevada 29-Oct-04</td>
<td>president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick workers/Intimidation</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>New Jersey 26-Jun-01</td>
<td>municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New Jersey 6-Nov-01</td>
<td>US Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New Jersey 4-Dec-01</td>
<td>sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>New Jersey 27-Oct-04</td>
<td>president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New Jersey 9-Nov-05</td>
<td>statewld</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intimidation and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Allegations</th>
<th>Source of Allegation</th>
<th>Other Source of Allegation</th>
<th>Alleged Intention of Fraud</th>
<th>Alleged Intention of Fraud</th>
<th>Alleged Intention of Fraud</th>
<th>Alleged Intention of Fraud</th>
<th>Alleged Intention of Fraud</th>
<th>Alleged Intention of Fraud</th>
<th>Alleged Intention of Fraud</th>
<th>Alleged Intention of Fraud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suppression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>26-Oct-04</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>26-Oct-04</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>26-Oct-04</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling Place Harassment</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3-Nov-04</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3-Nov-04</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3-Nov-04</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollworkers/ID</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Elections Officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a mass mailing, the Republican National Committee is citing Hispanic voter registration campaigns as proof that "Democrats...will cheat in order to win." Hispanic advocates say this is designed to suppress Hispanic voting.

In New Mexico, a Republican poll watch videorecorded a man as he left a polling station after casting a provisional ballot on Saturday, said Secretary of State Rebecca Vigil-Giron, a Democrat. Vigil-Giron said Republicans argued they wanted to check the voter's face for a possible legal challenge. Federal officials were investigating, she said.

Democratic candidate sends a letter to the Department of Justice complaining of Republican election day plans to man some polls with out-of-curry corrections officials, calling it a bid to intimidate voters.

The head of the Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund says the sheriff gave a list of registered Hispanic voters to immigration authorities to check their status. The sheriff "also threatened to go door-to-door personally with his department to ensure that immigration status was checked and make sure there was no perception of fraud by Latinos."

In southeast Charlotte, Elections Director Michael Dickerson told poll workers at the Morrison Regional Library to stop asking people waiting to cast early votes to get identification cards ready. Richard Friedman, an unaffiliated voter who is volunteering with the Kerry campaign, complained after elections staff told people standing in line to get their driver's license or voter registration card ready. Most N.C. voters are not required to show ID when they vote, and no one asked for it when voters got in to cast ballots, Friedman said.

Democrats believe the Secretary of State's order that people who appear to vote in the wrong precinct should not be allowed a provisional ballot and the unnecessary purging of voter rolls, and the Republicans' checking of new registrants are designed to intimidate voters into staying home.

Republicans filed a challenger list in 191 precincts - many of them in largely black neighborhoods around Dayton. Republicans say it is to prevent vote fraud.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Alleged Allegation</th>
<th>Original Source</th>
<th>Resolution of incident / allegation</th>
<th>Source of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republicans formally challenged the validity of 35,000 voter registrations across the state</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Ohio 23-Oct-04</td>
<td>Cleveland Plain Dealer</td>
<td>After a court fight, scheduled hearings are canceled, but voters still received mail notifying them they were being challenged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans challenges to newly registered voters in Franklin County will be tossed out because they were not properly filed, a local elections official said yesterday.</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>Ohio 24-Oct-04</td>
<td>Columbus Dispatch</td>
<td>Democrats contend Republican challenges to voters around Cleveland and Columbus are designed to keep poor and minority voters from voting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican challenges to voters around Cleveland and Columbus are designed to keep poor and minority voters from voting.</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
<td>Ohio 29-Oct-04</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>In a lawsuit, a voter and Democrats contend Republican challenges to voters around Cleveland and Columbus are designed to keep poor and minority voters from voting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans accused of using challengers to suppress voter turnout</td>
<td>Cour</td>
<td>Ohio 30-Oct-04</td>
<td>Toledo Blade</td>
<td>Republicans accused Republicans of using challengers to suppress voter turnout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans will not allow the press to attend training sessions.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ohio 31-Oct-04</td>
<td>Cleveland Plain Dealer</td>
<td>Republicans accused of using challengers to suppress voter turnout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a lawsuit in Hamilton County, civil rights activists say GOP challenges are discriminatory because they were filed disproportionately in precincts with a majority of black voters. A civil rights group seeks to block challengers in Ohio by arguing they violate a 1981 national order prohibiting the Republican National Committee from trying to intimidate black voters.</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Ohio 1-Nov-04</td>
<td>Columbus Dispatch</td>
<td>District court judges blocked the challenges because they could cause delays, confusion and intimidation. 6th Circuit overturns the lower court rulings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Lucas County, Ohio, Republicans asked a judge to bar poll monitors from wearing &quot;Voter Protection Staff&quot; and &quot;Voting Rights Staff&quot; arm bands from polling spots.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ohio 3-Nov-04</td>
<td>New York Daily News</td>
<td>Republicans asked a judge to bar poll monitors from wearing &quot;Voter Protection Staff&quot; and &quot;Voting Rights Staff&quot; arm bands from polling spots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Allegation</td>
<td>Allegation</td>
<td>Charge</td>
<td>Charge</td>
<td>Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>5-Nov-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Suppression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>11-Dec-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Because blue-collar and lower-income workers tend to vote Democratic, the long lines in Akron and other urban areas fueled suspicion of a deliberate tactic to hold down the turnout — especially in largely African-American precincts — for presidential challenger John Kerry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>23-Jun-05</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Blacks and young voters in Ohio faced widespread voter suppression - mostly because of long lines and improper identification checks - during last year's presidential election, according to a new Democratic Party report. DNC Chairman Howard Dean said that while it's unclear whether the suppression was intentional or whether it influenced the election results, the party's five-month, $250,000 investigation showed that 28 percent of Ohio voters - and twice as many black voters - reported facing challenges on Election Day. &quot;You have a particular ethnic group that has to wait three times as long as other voters, then clearly there is something going on that is aimed at particular precincts,&quot; Dean said blacks waited an average of 52 minutes to vote while white voters waited about 18 minutes. It also found that 37 percent of Ohio voters reported being asked for identification. Ohio law requires only new voters to produce identification, and new registrants accounted for 7 percent of all voters. Blacks and voters under 30 were asked for IDs at higher rates than other voters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Suppression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>23-Jun-05</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Long lines were caused by the scarcity of voting machines in a number of precincts, particularly in minority areas, a report by the DNC on the election in Ohio says.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>Election</td>
<td>Officials</td>
<td>21-Oct-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Officials are concerned about voter intimidation at ballot drop-off sites the evening of the Nov. 2 deadline. A Republican manual instructs GOP volunteers to take video cameras. Party officials say this is to make sure no ballots are collected after the 8 pm cutoff, but Democrats worry that it could frighten away some voters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Allegations</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Resolution of Allegations</td>
<td>Source of Resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UPI</td>
<td>Complaints filed with the police, the district attorney's office, and the Committee of Seventy alleging physical violence, harassment and intimidation were the highest in modern history. The DA's office reported it had received at least 171 complaints, nearly quadruple the 41 complaints of four years ago. Most charged that voters and poll workers had been intimidated or interfered with. Inspector William Catanuto said the Police Department had received at least 110 complaints, most dealing with simple assaults, vandalism and disturbances. In the course of the day, Common Pleas Judge Benjamin Lerner signed two orders directing Republican workers at polling places in Germantown and North Philadelphia to stop demanding identification from people showing up to vote.</td>
<td>Pennsylvania, 6-Nov-02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling Place Harassment/Workers</td>
<td>Police/Local</td>
<td>Philadelphia Daily News</td>
<td>Republican Representative John Perzel, speaker of the state house, told US News and World Report that &quot;The Kerry campaign needs to come out with humongous numbers here in Philadelphia. It's important for me to keep that number down.&quot; At the same time, he said campaign workers are examining voting records to fend off Democrats regathering more than once or otherwise violating election rules. An aide to Perzel said challengers will have lists of questionable registrations at the polls.</td>
<td>Pennsylvania, 26-Oct-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>In Philadelphia, Republicans unsuccessfully sought last week to change locations of 63 polling places, contending that their placement in closed bars or in homes would intimidate voters. Democrats pointed out that most of those locations were in minority neighborhoods and branded the move an effort to suppress black votes.</td>
<td>Pennsylvania, 31-Oct-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polisie Location</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Philadelphia Inquirer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Allegation</td>
<td>Original Source</td>
<td>Resolution of incident/allegation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Vote fraud allegations</td>
<td>Philadelphia Inquirer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morning Call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia Inquirer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lancaster Sunday News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intimidation and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Allegation</th>
<th>Allegation Source</th>
<th>Other Source Investigation</th>
<th>Charged</th>
<th>Convicted</th>
<th>Alleged Incident of Fraud</th>
<th>Source of Allegation</th>
<th>Alleged Incident of Fraud Source</th>
<th>Resolution of Incident / Allegation</th>
<th>Source of Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Carolina 5-Nov-02</td>
<td>Candidate says he plans to have observers at the polls and may call for sheriff's deputies to enforce voting laws when voters try for a third time to nominate a Republican County Council candidate. His opponent alleges he is trying to intimidate black voters from voting.</td>
<td>The Post and Courier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Carolina 12-Aug-04</td>
<td>Greenville News</td>
<td>Dozens of voters, many students, were turned away from a precinct at Benedict College after Republican poll watchers contested the legality of their vote. Challenges slowed voting at the precinct causing waits as long as four hours. The Republican Party executive director said poll watchers were challenging people who did not have proper state identification, such as a driver's license. Alternate forms of identification permit student to vote provisional ballots.</td>
<td>Greenville News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Carolina 2-Nov-04</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Senator Daschle says Republicans have targeted Native American communities in making allegations of vote fraud and launching initiatives in order to suppress the Native American vote</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Dakota 31-Oct-02</td>
<td>US Senate</td>
<td>Washington Times</td>
<td>Senator Daschle says Republicans have targeted Native American communities in making allegations of vote fraud and launching initiatives in order to suppress the Native American vote</td>
<td>Washington Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intimidation and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Allegation</th>
<th>Resolution of Incident/Allegation</th>
<th>Source of Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican attorneys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>across the state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on Election Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to gather affidavits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to show vote buying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The State Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (a Republican)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>says that of the 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affidavits only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three alleged criminal activity, and two of those proved to be false.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person is being investigated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two of the affidavits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were found to have been forged or perjurious.Each affidavit states that the person allegedly signing it claimed to have been picked up by a van driver, offered $10 to vote, taken to the polling place and home again and again offered the $10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the allegations focused on the Rosebud Reservation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican attorneys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fanned out across the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state on Election Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to gather affidavits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to show vote buying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The State Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (a Republican)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>says that of the 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affidavits only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three alleged criminal activity, and two of those proved to be false.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person is being investigated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two of the affidavits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were found to have been forged or perjurious.Each affidavit states that the person allegedly signing it claimed to have been picked up by a van driver, offered $10 to vote, taken to the polling place and home again and again offered the $10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the allegations focused on the Rosebud Reservation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Details

- **Republican attorneys** fanned out across the state on Election Day to gather affidavits to show vote buying. The State Attorney General (a Republican) says that of the 60 affidavits only three alleged criminal activity, and two of those proved to be false. One person is being investigated. Two of the affidavits were found to have been forged or perjurious. Each affidavit states that the person allegedly signing it claimed to have been picked up by a van driver, offered $10 to vote, taken to the polling place and home again and again offered the $10. Most of the allegations focused on the Rosebud Reservation.

- During the June 1 special election, several Native American voters were told they could not vote if they did not have ID and were not told about the affidavit option. Most of the complaints came from across the state, many from reservations and some from Rapid City, where there is a large American Indian population. A Republican poll watcher denied this was the case. He said Indian voting rights workers were intimidating poll workers.

- Some American Indians were not allowed to vote in the primary because they did not have photo ID and some said they were not told they could instead sign an affidavit.

- On Election Day, a district court judge ruled Republican poll watchers in Charles Mix County had to stop following American Indian voters after they cast ballots. The GOP workers were also ordered to stop writing down those people's license plate numbers.

- A GOP memo to its poll watchers said, "There are problems" with the instructions [state election director] Thompson's office provided to local officials, and focuses on whether the would-be voters are legitimately qualified. If the officers at the precinct are not screening voters for their qualifications to vote, including their citizenship, they should be challenged so that the election officials will carry out the law and make sure they are qualified to vote if they are first-time voters," the memo says Thompson said the U.S. Department of Justice, part of President Bush's administration, notified him of the GOP memo last week and expressed concerns about it. After confering with the Justice Department and state Attorney General's office, Thompson sent a four-page memo to local election officials Friday that makes it clear that poll watchers are forbidden by law to question or challenge voters directly and that election officials are not to require would-be voters to provide proof of eligibility, as the GOP memo seeks.
Intimidation and Suppression

The state Democratic Chair said the challenges targeted African American voters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Allegation</th>
<th>Original Source</th>
<th>Resolution of incident / allegation</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>Suppression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Texas 6-Oct-04</td>
<td>Los Angeles Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>16-Jun-04</td>
<td>Deseret Morning News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>County Clerk</td>
<td>6-Nov-04</td>
<td>Salt Lake Tribune</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students at historically black college Prairie View A &amp; M filed several lawsuits against a Texas district attorney for making comments that he would prosecute students that falsely declared the school as their place of residency. In 1979, the US Supreme Court ruled in favor of Prairie View A &amp; M, upholding a student's right to vote.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An immigration-issues group is mounting a last-minute bid to challenge hundreds of foreign-born voters in Utah's Republican primary Tuesday. The effort is the work of ProjectUSA, based in Washington, D.C. The Utah voter challenge would require those singled out in the state's 3rd Congressional District by ProjectUSA to confirm at the polls that they are U.S. citizens and registered voters. State elections director Amy Naccarato is concerned ProjectUSA might scare off some legitimate voters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Republican candidate challenged the legal registration of 1,495 residents of the Holladay-area neighborhoods in the days before the election. 1,494 were Democrats, and one was from the American Party. The County Clerk determined the claims were groundless and said he could be subject to a charge of voter intimidation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedures for validating ballot signatures vary widely from county to county in Washington state, a fact that has become significant given the razor-thin margin of the governor's race. 

A survey by The Seattle Times showed that counties use different procedures for evaluating signatures, the newspaper reported Sunday. 

More than 3,400 absentee and provisional ballots in Washington were rejected in the November election because the signatures didn't match those on file with elections officials. The state Supreme Court last week rejected an argument by the Democratic Party that counties have disenfranchised voters by handling mismatched signatures so differently.

King County election workers were told as early as May that if an absentee ballot came in without a matching signature on file they were required to make a concerted effort to verify that the vote was valid. Before a special election in May, King County election workers routinely violated state law by counting such ballots without making any attempt to verify the signatures. In this November's general election, the county's absentee-ballot staff still didn't make the effort to find matching signatures. But instead of counting the ballots automatically, they rejected them.

A Soap Lake man is challenging the voting credentials of hundreds of Washington voters, saying he thinks they're illegal immigrants who registered and cast ballots illegally. But Martin Ringhofer may have a hard time proving the challenges he has filed in Spokane and 10 other Washington counties. For one thing, there's the methodology of his research. Ringhofer said he obtained a list of people who registered to vote when they obtained or renewed a driver's license, then culled the list for names "that appear to be from outside the United States," particularly those that appeared to be Hispanic or Asian. For another, there's the fact that many of the people on his list are citizens. In fact, The Spokesman-Review contacted a dozen of the 161 people on Ringhofer's Spokane County list, and all of them are citizens.
### Intimidation and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Allegations</th>
<th>Original Source</th>
<th>Resolution of Allegations</th>
<th>Source of Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>A county councilman asks the county prosecutor to investigate whether a Republican challenger committed perjury in filing some of the challenges without justification. The challenger was the head of the county GOP’s Voter Registration Integrity Project which challenged the registrations of 1,044 voters saying they were registered at private mailbox businesses and storage complexes. Many of the challenges turned out to be baseless. Others did not know it was illegal. Those voters had to file a challenge ballot. The validity of those ballots will be determined at a canvassing board hearing. County Democrats claim the challenges were an attempt to intimidate and disenfranchise voters.</td>
<td>Seattle Post-Intelligencer, November 8, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5-Nov-05 county</td>
<td>A county councilman asks the county prosecutor to investigate whether a Republican challenger committed perjury in filing some of the challenges without justification. The challenger was the head of the county GOP’s Voter Registration Integrity Project which challenged the registrations of 1,044 voters saying they were registered at private mailbox businesses and storage complexes. Many of the challenges turned out to be baseless. Others did not know it was illegal. Those voters had to file a challenge ballot. The validity of those ballots will be determined at a canvassing board hearing. County Democrats claim the challenges were an attempt to intimidate and disenfranchise voters.</td>
<td>Seattle Post-Intelligencer, November 8, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agents</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Defendants in a vote buying case allege that federal agents intimidated voters by videotaping and photographing voters as they visited the polls</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Suppression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Milwaukee County Executive Scott Walker, citing vote-fraud concerns, is pub-licly balking at a City of Milwaukee request for almost 260,000 additional ballots in anticipation of high turnout for the Nov. 2 presidential election. Mayor Tom Barrett blasted Walker’s stance, and Common Council President Willie Hines Jr. immediately joined in, saying it was an attempt to suppress the central-city vote.</td>
<td>Milwaukee Journal Sentinel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Suppression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Federation for American Immigration Reform sent Michigan residents to Wisconsin to vote registration stations set up by an immigrant rights groups to see whether an illegal immigrant was registering illegal voters. The group said it refused to register the Michigan voters and if they insisted they discarded their forms. Prosecutors will check to ensure the registrations were not mailed.</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the Board of Elections refused a request by the state Republican Party to have 5,619 names and addresses removed from Milwaukee voting lists, the party plans to challenge anyone who tries to vote from those addresses at the polls. A Journal Sentinel review shows many of the names and addresses confirmed some of the problems cited by the GOP, as well as uncovered additional missing addresses. Some cited by the GOP may be explained by clerical errors, however.

Amid a renewed push Friday by Republicans to get some 6,500 names removed from Milwaukee voting lists, prosecutors began examining 500 new registrants that a city review indicated are from non-existent addresses. The same review by the city attorney's office, however, raised doubts about the quality of the GOP's original list, finding that hundreds of the addresses that the Republicans claim are invalid and want removed do, in fact, exist. Some others, according to City Attorney Grant Langley, can be explained by data entry errors, not attempted fraud.

Late Friday, Langley outlined the review situation in a letter to Lisa Artisan, head of the city Election Commission.

The letter said the review by his staff and the district attorney's office found cases where the database used by the GOP was corrupted, dropping digits on some names so otherwise valid addresses showed up as non-existent. In other cases, a check of the original handwritten registration cards shown digits had been transposed by clerks, something that can be corrected at the polls.

Langley's letter says the review casts "doubt on the overall accuracy" of the GOP list and the way it was compiled. At least some of the addresses will be investigated for possible fraud, however.

Republican and City of Milwaukee leaders reached an agreement Sunday ending a faceoff over thousands of registered voters with questionable addresses.

2) Under an agreement reached, a list of 5,512 prospective city voters whose addresses are questionable will be distributed to polling places. Those on the list who show up to vote will be asked to fill out a change of address card or registration form, and to show proof of residency — a driver's license, utility bill or some other document showing an address — before casting their ballots. Anyone without proof of residency at an address on the list will have to take an oath, and that person's ballot will be marked as being challenged by the poll worker.

Challenges

City Attorney/Dismissed

BOE

Wisconsin, Oct 04

President

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, October 30, 2004
5/9/2007
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Citing a new list of more than 37,000
questionable addresses, the state Republican
Party demanded that city officials require
identification from all of those voters. It the city
doesn't, the party says ills prepared to have
volunteers challenge each individual — including
thousands wt o might be missing an apartment
number on their registration — at the polls.
Democrats say this is a last minute effort to
suppress turnout by creating long delays at the
polls, This is in addition to the 5,619 bad
addresses the party claimed. The state GOP
chair said they had just focussed on Milwaukee
because Its voter list is a mess and cause for
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City / County</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of Election</th>
<th>Alleged Instance of fraud</th>
<th>Original Source</th>
<th>Source 1</th>
<th>Source 2</th>
<th>Source 3</th>
<th>Resolution of incident / allegation</th>
<th>Source of Resolution 1</th>
<th>Source of Resolution 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa County</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5-Nov-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>158 noncitizens were found on the voting rolls. The county recorder said all of the cases involved people who misunderstood voting requirements. The county attorney nonetheless has charged ten of the immigrants with felonies.</td>
<td>LA Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>12-Feb-02</td>
<td>mayor and city council</td>
<td>After an election legal challenge, two incumbents who originally lost were reinstated. In her ruling, the judge said numerous noncitizens voted illegally.</td>
<td>Los Angeles Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>11-Dec-01</td>
<td>mayor</td>
<td>Losing candidate claims there was &quot;suspect&quot; noncitizen voting</td>
<td>Detroit Free Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-Feb-05</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Secretary of State Kiffmeyer said that she has asked several county attorneys across Minnesota to investigate evidence her staff uncovered that suggests some noncitizens illegally registered to vote in the November election. &quot;So far, at least, we have 32 people who have registered to vote and seem to be – allegedly – not U.S. citizens,&quot; Kiffmeyer said. Some of the 32 also voted in the election. Both registering and voting are illegal for noncitizens. Kiffmeyer said her staff discovered the possible criminal offenses by comparing voter registration cards to driver's license records, which now identify noncitizens visiting the United States on visas.</td>
<td>Saint Paul Pioneer Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td>24-Oct-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Washington-based advocacy group for tougher Immigration laws recently said that it believes illegal immigrants may be registered to vote in North Carolina because they were able to sign up when obtaining driver's licenses without Social Security numbers. State elections and Division of Motor Vehicles officials say they've run two checks - one in 2002 and again this year - of people who received driver's licenses without proof of citizenship and found only a handful who had registered to vote. Those cases are being investigated, they said.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>28-Jan-05</td>
<td>state house</td>
<td>Republican representative ousted narrowly by Democratic opponent alleges there was noncitizen voting in the election.</td>
<td>Dallas Morning News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td>30-Aug-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Attorney General will investigate allegations in a legislative audit that found evidence of fourteen people believed to be noncitizens who have voted in a past election. The auditor's office has said that a follow up investigation found that 6 of the 14 were actually citizens, two were confirmed by immigration authorities as having prior deportation orders and the other 6 are still under review. Of the six that were citizens, three had their Social Security numbers mistyped in the database and three were naturalized citizens.</td>
<td>Desert Morning News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City / County</td>
<td>Type of Election</td>
<td>Alleged Instance of fraud</td>
<td>Original Source</td>
<td>Source 1</td>
<td>Source 2</td>
<td>Source 3</td>
<td>Resolution of incident / allegation</td>
<td>Source of Resolution 1</td>
<td>Source of Resolution 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips County</td>
<td>2-Nov-02</td>
<td>The state Republican Party alleges five convicted felons voted, four of them in early voting</td>
<td>Arkansas Democrat-Gazette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>12-Sep-04</td>
<td>For the first time since 1994, a man was charged with three counts of registering to vote while on parole and a fourth count of voting in the recall election.</td>
<td>Sacramento Bee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>25-Mar-05</td>
<td>In a survey of counties, 13 counties had referred 59 cases of possible felon voting to county attorneys. Denver County referred 52 cases of felon voting.</td>
<td>Denver Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>29-Oct-04</td>
<td>Florida's Republican Party says it has a list of 925 felons who have voted illegally or are planning to. The information could be used to challenge voters. The GOP found the allegedly illegal voters by starting with the same flawed set of names the state compiled in order to purge the rolls— that list was scrapped when its inaccuracies were exposed. Democrats and civil rights groups suggested that Republicans wanted to use the list to intimidate black Democrats from going to the polls. The party took the initial state list of voters and compared it to the Florida Parole Commission names of felons rights who had been restored.</td>
<td>Miami Herald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okaloosa</td>
<td>19-Oct-05</td>
<td>Man is accused of registering to vote in Okaloosa County in 1999 and casting a ballot in November 2002, even though he had been convicted of a felony offense of selling illegal drugs in Colorado in 1980, said Michele Nicholson, spokeswoman for the Okaloosa County sheriff's department. It is illegal for felons to vote in Florida unless their rights have been restored.</td>
<td>Miami Herald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Deposit</td>
<td>8-Jun-03</td>
<td>Losing candidate alleges people convicted of crimes were allowed to vote. The chief election official of the town dismissed the allegations.</td>
<td>Baltimore Sun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A death row inmate and a child pornographer are among about 2,500 felons who remained on Oklahoma voting rolls after their convictions, The Oklahoman re-reported on Sunday. Records show some felons have voted, even though it's illegal while they're serving their sentences. "It's a huge problem," said state Rep. Mike Reynolds, who estimates as many as 16,000 felons are on voting rolls. About 1,100 may have voted in last year's general election. An exact count is difficult - in part because voters sometimes sign the wrong lines in poll books. Most significantly, the Oklahoma State Election Board has ignored the notices from U.S. prosecutors in Oklahoma and other states. Thousands are filed away in a back room. The law is unclear whether voting rights can be stripped after a guilty plea or only after sentencing. Some convicts are unsure about their voting status, and judges rarely explain it to them at sentencing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>22-May-05</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>31 provisional voters were found to be felons whose voting rights had not been restored. The county election commission is debating action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>12-Jan-05</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Three indicted on illegal voting charges were ineligible to vote because they were convicted felons who lost voting privileges. One said she has been on probation for two years, and said she did not know that she was ineligible to vote because officials in the local voter registration office approved a replacement voter registration card before the city election.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falfurrias</td>
<td>11-Sep-04</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Man convicted in 1986 for larceny by check votes after being notified he had been taken off the voter rolls. He entered a plea of illegal voting; State Attorney General says he has never prosecuted or seen such a case during his five years on the election board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>14-Jan-04</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>In its case to overturn the election, Republicans allege 736 King County felons illegally cast ballots, and another 220 illegal felons were cast elsewhere. Knowingly casting an illegal vote is a crime, but several felon votes said they were unaware they could not vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>28-Apr-05</td>
<td>Gubernatorial</td>
<td>See summary of Washington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Nexis Articles - Intentional Felon Voting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Evidence/Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>10-May-05</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Investigators say they have evidence of 200 felons voting illegally. Milwaukee Journal Sentinel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>27-Apr-01</td>
<td>mayor</td>
<td>State Division of Criminal Investigation says convicted felons allegedly voted. AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May 5, 2005: Officials say charges will be filed, although officials said these cases are hard to prosecute because it must be established that the felon knew he could not vote – see complete summary of Milwaukee; December 5, 2005: federal prosecutors charge 10 felons with voting illegally – four were convicted, one was acquitted and five cases are still pending; the County DA charged two with felon voting – still pending. See Milwaukee summary. Milwaukee Journal Sentinel Milwaukee Journal Sentinel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City / County</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of Election</th>
<th>Alleged Instance of Fraud</th>
<th>Original Source</th>
<th>Source 1</th>
<th>Source 2</th>
<th>Source 3</th>
<th>Resolution of Incident / allegation</th>
<th>Source of Resolution 1</th>
<th>Source of Resolution 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>16-Apr-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>The US Department of Justice says county officials have violated election law and proposed a consent decree with the county regarding ballot gathering and counting. The Department investigated registration practices that may have disenfranchised numerous voters, including sending voters to multiple poll sites and voters wrongly missing from the registration list. Under the agreement, the county will fix the problems in the database and DOJ lawyers will monitor polling places and the clerk's office.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-Oct-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Democrats are complaining about an attempt to remove up to 6,000 convicted felons from the electoral roll, at the behest of the state's Republican secretary of state, Donetta Davidson, despite a US federal law that prohibits eliminating a voter's rights within 90 days of an election to give time for the voter to protest.</td>
<td>The Observer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>29-Sep-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Secretary of State Hood tried to revive the discredited 2000 statewide purge list of suspected felons and ex-felons for 2004. That list disproportionately removed black voters from the rolls. The state tried to keep the list secret until forced to release it by court order. When it was released, it was found to contain a disproportionate number of black voters, including 2,000 who had had their rights restored and included several people who could show they had not criminal record at all. In addition, the list of 46,000 contained only 61 Hispanic names, way out of line with the strength of both the general Hispanic population and prison population. Hood was forced to drop the list.</td>
<td>The Independent (UK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2-Nov-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>More than 200 voters sought court orders because they were turned away from a polling place, mostly because their names were not on voter lists. In 95% of the cases the judges ruled they could cast ballots.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2-Nov-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Students at SUNY Albany found their names no longer on the voter registration rolls, even though they had voted at the same location in the past.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City / County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type of Election</td>
<td>Alleged Instance of Fraud</td>
<td>Original Source</td>
<td>Source 2</td>
<td>Source 3</td>
<td>Resolution of incident / Source of Resolution 1</td>
<td>Source of Resolution 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>11-Dec-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>A Phoenix resident, a registered Democrat, says he received a call three days before the election that he was supposed to cast a ballot across town, 30 miles away, which was wrong. Legal experts believe thousands of other Arizonans received similar calls and are investigating whether the state Republican Party was the source. The Republican Party denies it.</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>11-Dec-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>A voter found a message on her voting machine telling him to go to the wrong polling place. Using the &quot;last number dial back feature she got the local Republican headquarters.</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>24-Oct-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Voters in Jefferson County have received calls from someone posing as an election official and instructing them to throw away their absentee ballots.</td>
<td>Denver Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>19-Jul-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Election administrators post signs saying &quot;Photo and Signature Identification Required&quot; when those without such ID may vote by affidavit ballot.</td>
<td>St Petersburg Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>31-Oct-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Rumors have been circulated that people can't vote if they have outstanding child-support statements.</td>
<td>New York Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>2-Nov-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>The Chair of the Election Assistance Commission was given a flyer distributed in a block neighborhood directing voters to the wrong address for polling stations, giving the contact information for the local NAACP.</td>
<td>The New York Sun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>3-Nov-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>From throughout the state, election officials said there were reports of voters receiving phone calls incorrectly telling them their polling places had been moved, or that they weren't allowed to vote. In Osceola County, voting-rights attorney Fatimah Gilliam said some voters received automated phone calls saying that their polling place was closed. The precinct, at the Robert Guevara Community Center in Buenaventura Lakes, is located in a predominantly Hispanic and highly Democratic neighborhood. In rural Lafayette County, Election Supervisor Lana B. Morgan said some voters reported people going door-to-door to tell them they needed to go to another county to vote — information that Morgan said was both wrong and dangerous.</td>
<td>Orlando Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>17-Nov-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>DNC Chair says phone calls were received by Democratic Party-aligned voters in Florida telling them to send their absentee ballots in only after Election Day was over.</td>
<td>Ethnic Newswatch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>11-Dec-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Some voters reported they were told they could vote by phone</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>12-Dec-02</td>
<td>US Senate</td>
<td>The Landrieu campaign said a pamphlet was circulated in New Orleans public housing complexes just before the runoff. The document said: &quot;VOTE!!! Bad Weather? No problem!!! If the weather is uncomfortable on election day (Saturday December 7th) Remember you can wait and cast your ballot on Tuesday December 10th.&quot; Anyone who waited past Saturday, however, missed the chance to vote.</td>
<td>Times-Picayune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Election Type</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>4-Nov-02</td>
<td>gubernatorial</td>
<td>Democrats produced fliers they said was circulating in some neighborhoods that reminded people to vote on Wednesday -- the day after election day -- and advised them to pay any parking tickets and overdue rent before they could vote</td>
<td>Washington Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>2-Nov-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>The Secretary of State had to put out a statement about where to send absentee ballots after voters in Ann Arbor received calls telling them to mail the ballots to the wrong address</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-20 Democrats received calls claiming to be from the Board of Elections in which voters were told their polling place had moved. One woman contacted the party Monday and said a group of people visited her home over the weekend and told her that if she filled out her sample ballot, they would deliver it to the election division and save her a trip to the polls today. Hispanic residents have complained of phone calls from Republican representatives who said they can register them to vote over the phone.</td>
<td>Nevada Democratic Party Review Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2-Nov-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Federal monitor reports that voters in Passaic City and Patterson received phone calls reminding them, falsely, that they would need identification such as a driver's license to vote. He said it seemed aimed at minority voters.</td>
<td>Las Vegas Review Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>4-Dec-01</td>
<td>sheriff</td>
<td>In a mass mailing, the Republican National Committee is citing Hispanic voter registration campaigns in New Mexico as proof that &quot;Democrats...will cheat in order to win.&quot;</td>
<td>The Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>25-Oct-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>In Ohio, within little more than a week, the Board of Elections in Cuyahoga County received complaints of voters being contacted by people they said claimed to be from the election board: One Cleveland woman said her mother got a call from such a man telling her, falsely, that the location of her polling station had changed. Another woman said two men posing as election officials knocked on her door and said they had come to pick up her absentee ballot. An elderly woman in a suburban senior center complained about a call telling her the Nov. 2 election had been postponed until Nov. 3. The deputy director of the Board of Elections in Franklin County, which includes the capital Columbus, said his office was getting similar calls. At first they were &quot;sporadic,&quot; he said, but now there are &quot;a lot of them.&quot;</td>
<td>Washington Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td>28-Oct-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>State officials say people have been impersonating party and elections officials on the phone directing people to go to the wrong polling place or to vote on November 3. Tricks appeared targeted at African Americans, senior citizens and new voters. Democrats say Republican plans to engage in mass challenges is an effort to deny minorities access to the polls.</td>
<td>Los Angeles Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td>28-Oct-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>State officials say people have been impersonating party and elections officials on the phone directing people to go to the wrong polling place or to vote on November 3. Tricks appeared targeted at African Americans, senior citizens and new voters. Democrats say Republican plans to engage in mass challenges is an effort to deny minorities access to the polls.</td>
<td>UPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County, Ohio</td>
<td>29-Oct-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>A memo with a Lake County Board of Elections letterhead tells residents not to vote if registered by certain Democratic or progressive groups. Many voters received an &quot;urgent advisory&quot; claiming voters registered by the NAACP, the Democratic presidential campaign, their local congressional campaign, or America Coming Together are not eligible to vote.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>31-Oct-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>In Franklin, both Democrats and Republicans have been receiving phone calls from phony Board of Elections workers telling them that their polling places have been changed. A Republican spokesman says that Ohio Republicans have received calls telling them their absentee ballots will be picked up by election workers, which is illegal. In West Dayton, Democrats received calls reminding them to vote on November 5, three days after the election.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>3-Nov-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>In a suburb of Cleveland, some voters reported being told that &quot;if they went in to vote and had any traffic violations, they would be arrested or fined,&quot; said Chellie Pingree, president of Common Cause.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>10-Nov-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>There are more than a dozen allegations of that voters' registration cards were destroyed, altered or thrown away by canvassers. The cases are under investigation by the AG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>25-Oct-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>An official said at a meeting of the city election board that he had received calls from about 30 longtime voters who said that they had received calls from someone telling them not to bother going to the polls because their registrations had expired. They had not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny, PA</td>
<td>28-Oct-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>At the Ross Park Mall, people are distributing leaflets printed on bogus, but official-looking, county stationery telling Republicans to vote Tuesday, Nov. 2, and Democrats to wait a day. The election will be over on Nov. 3. The fliers have succeeded in spreading confusion, and county officials spent parts of Wednesday fielding phone calls from residents. Officials say the fliers also turned up in mailboxes of homes in the North Hills. The letter reads in part: &quot;Due to the immense voter turnout that is expected on Tuesday November 2 the state of Pennsylvania has requested and extended the voting period ... Voters will be able to vote on both November 2 and November 3.&quot; The letter is signed by &quot;Anne Ryan,&quot; and a phone number on the flier rings in Tampa, Fla. Workers there reached by telephone denied any knowledge of the flier. Police are investigating.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland, PA</td>
<td>3-Nov-04</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>Lawyers working for the Election Protection program got a call that in Westmoreland a radio station told listeners that people who had outstanding warrants against them would not be allowed to vote.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>3-Nov-04</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Dorm residents at Temple University and the University of Pennsylvania reported that a doctored version of an Associated Press news article left the impression that out-of-state students voting in Pennsylvania could be forced to repay state grants because of a residency controversy. It was unclear which group was orchestrating the false information, but both of the targeted universities are in heavily Democratic areas.</td>
<td>Knight-Ridder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1-Nov-04</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Election Protection reports on a faked letter using NAACP letterhead that claims that those with an outstanding parking ticket or unpaid child support will be arrested if they vote.</td>
<td>Cox News Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2-Nov-04</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>AP reported on a letter that falsely purported to be from the South Carolina NAACP to black voters, saying they couldn't vote if they owed more than $50 in parking tickets.</td>
<td>The New York Sun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3-Nov-04</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>A leaflet claiming to be issued by the NAACP warned residents that if they had outstanding traffic violations or had not submitted credit reports one week prior to the election, they would be barred from voting and could be arrested.</td>
<td>The New York Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>31-Oct-04</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Rumors have been circulated that police are setting up sting operations at polls to find any voters who are also on the outstanding warrants list.</td>
<td>New York Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericksburg, Virginia</td>
<td>9-Nov-05</td>
<td>Gubernatorial</td>
<td>Elections registrars receive many complaints of voters getting phone calls telling them falsely that their polling precinct had changed.</td>
<td>Free Lance Star</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>8-Nov-05</td>
<td>Gubernatorial</td>
<td>Residents report door-hangers with false precinct information on them.</td>
<td>Free Lance Star</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>31-Oct-04</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>In Wisconsin, a flier is circulating in Milwaukee's black neighborhoods that purports to be from the &quot;Milwaukee Black Voters League.&quot; &quot;If you've already voted in any election this year, you can't vote in the presidential election,&quot; the flier reads. &quot;If you violate any of these laws, you can get ten years in prison and your children will get taken away from you.&quot;</td>
<td>Washington Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>27-Oct-05</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Republicans ask the US attorney to investigate a letter a voter received claiming to be from the Republican National Committee and urging a vote for John Kerry.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City / County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type of Election</td>
<td>Alleged Instance of Fraud</td>
<td>Original Source</td>
<td>Source 1</td>
<td>Source 2</td>
<td>Source 3</td>
<td>Resolution of incident / allegation</td>
<td>Resolution of Resolution 1</td>
<td>Resolution of Resolution 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenix City</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>31-Aug</td>
<td>municipal</td>
<td>The Attorney General and DA are investigating allegations of buying of absentee ballot votes</td>
<td>Columbus Ledger-Enquirer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>29-Aug-02</td>
<td>US House</td>
<td>Candidate says opposing campaign's consultant was paying residents of black nursing homes to cast absentee ballots and trying to skew the vote of black voting precincts in some cases.</td>
<td>Arkansas Democrat-Gazette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Park</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>17-May-01</td>
<td>village</td>
<td>Candidate alleges that one voter was paid not to vote after being paid to vote absentee and two other people, possibly noncitizens, were paid for absentee ballots.</td>
<td>Belleville News-Democrat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>30-Jun-05</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>5 convicted of conspiring to buy votes with cash, cigarettes and liquor.</td>
<td>Chicago Sun Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berrien County</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>18-Apr-05</td>
<td>city commission</td>
<td>A Berrien County judge Friday overturned the recall of Glenn Yarbrough in a civil trial against the city of Benton Harbor and Clerk Jean Nesbitt. In his ruling, Judge Paul Maloney said the true will of the people was violated by gross voter fraud in February's recall election. He cited bought votes, forged ballots, and jobs promised in return for &quot;yes&quot; votes, crimes allegedly committed by someone other than Yarbrough.</td>
<td>South Bend Tribune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>24-Oct-02</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>Federal prosecutors are investigating absentee vote buying</td>
<td>Courier Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>6-Nov-02</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>In Knott County, there were nearly a dozen complaints in the primary alleging vote-selling for drugs, said assistant commonwealth's attorney Lori Daniel, but no one has admitted it. She said the attorney general's office has a pending investigation in Knott County. Reports of vote-buying also were reported in Magoffin, Pike and Floyd counties during the primary.</td>
<td>Courier Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>16-Sep-04</td>
<td>judicial</td>
<td>Man found guilty of paying $10 each to a group in a church parking lot after voting</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnfield</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>12-Apr-02</td>
<td>police chief and mayor</td>
<td>Losing candidate accuses opponent of paying ten people to vote</td>
<td>Daily Town Talk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marksville</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>15-May-02</td>
<td>mayoral</td>
<td>Two men accused of buying votes for small amounts of money</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberville</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>13-Dec-02</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>Iberville Parish Councilman Howard Oubre Jr. and three other Plaquemine residents were arrested Thursday for allegedly paying people to vote absentee in a recent election. Oubre went into the community and solicited people to vote absentee in the Oct. 5 primary election. Oubre allegedly paid these people between $3 and $10</td>
<td>The Advocate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Election Type</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Rouge, MI</td>
<td>4-Apr-04</td>
<td>Mayoral</td>
<td>Yahoo News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham, MI</td>
<td>6-Oct-04</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Lansing State Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>15-Dec-05</td>
<td>Mayoral</td>
<td>Detroit Free Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippah, MS</td>
<td>27-Mar-04</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>2-Jun-05</td>
<td>Mayoral</td>
<td>St. Louis Post-Dispatch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenoir, NC</td>
<td>9-Mar-03</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>Belgrove News Democrat (July 3, 2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Action Description</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebud</td>
<td>23-Dec-02</td>
<td>US Senate</td>
<td>Republicans investigating Election Day irregularities in South Dakota based on allegations of vote buying, and rumors discussed on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, New Jersey lawyer who presided over the search for fraud. Republicans collected statements on a wide range of events, including accusations of people offering multiple names to vote and improper use of polling places by Democratic workers. The most serious claims, however, were three affidavits signed by Native Americans from the Mission area who said they offered $10 to vote by the driver of a van with a Tim Johnson for Senate sign in the window. Attorney General Mark Barnett has said that two of those statements were false and the third was suspect, but not before the allegations became the basis of reports in several national media outlets.</td>
<td>Argus Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Ridge</td>
<td>2-Nov-04</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>On the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, investigators are looking into Republican allegations of vote buying.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg</td>
<td>9-Sep-03</td>
<td>Constitutional</td>
<td>DA is investigating an employer for allegedly giving concert tickets to workers who cast early balloting.</td>
<td>Tyler Morning Telegraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAllen</td>
<td>20-Aug-05</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Grand jury is investigating whether &quot;politiqueras&quot; tried to buy absentee ballots.</td>
<td>The Monitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>22-Dec-05</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Ten people were indicted on allegations of telling people to vote for and unlawful solicitation of ballots for money.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falfurrias</td>
<td>11-Sep-04</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Candidate alleges the opposing campaign bribed some voters with money, beer and cigarettes in exchange for their votes, according to his lawsuit contesting the election.</td>
<td>Corpus Christie Caller Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachia</td>
<td>11-May-05</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>State police are looking at claims that supporters of a candidate offered food, cigarettes and liquor to residents in a public housing complex for letting the supporter fill out absentee ballots for them.</td>
<td>The Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>19-Jul-04</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>County sheriff pleads guilty to conspiring to buy votes in elections he was running in.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>31-May-05</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>12 people are indicted for selling their votes for $20 or $40.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>29-Nov-05</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Logan County Clerk plans to plead guilty to conspiring to bribe voters between 1992 and 2002. Prosecutors already have guilty pleas from the county sheriff and the police chief.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>2-Dec-05</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>FBI operates a sting operation by putting up a phony candidate to catch a man engaging in buying votes. Man is being tried for conspiracy to buy votes.</td>
<td>Washington Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thirteen people have been convicted of vote buying in the southern part of West Virginia over the last several years, including the 2004 primaries. However, the federal investigation is ongoing. In terms of cooperating witnesses, prosecutors may also continue to rely on Thomas Esposito. In an apparently unprecedented move, the FBI briefly planted the former longtime Logan mayor as a candidate in a 2004 legislative race. Evidence supplied by Esposito and his 75-day candidacy yielded December guilty pleas from two Logan County residents.

| West Virginia | 1-Jan-06 | Thirteen people have been convicted of vote buying in the southern part of West Virginia over the last several years, including the 2004 primaries. However, the federal investigation is ongoing. In terms of cooperating witnesses, prosecutors may also continue to rely on Thomas Esposito. In an apparently unprecedented move, the FBI briefly planted the former longtime Logan mayor as a candidate in a 2004 legislative race. Evidence supplied by Esposito and his 75-day candidacy yielded December guilty pleas from two Logan County residents. | AP |
| Hanna | Wyoming | 27-Apr-01 | State Division of Criminal Investigation said gratuities, such as alcoholic beverages, were allegedly offered in exchange for votes. | AP |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Alleged Incident of Fraud</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of Fraud</th>
<th>Other Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>At least six dead people tried to register to vote, including one helped by a person also listed on campaign-spendng reports as having received $100 from the state Democratic party, said Marty Ryall, Republican Party chairman. Michael Cook, executive director of the Arkansas Democratic Party, said a former staffer had hired two teenagers to register voters and that they took names directly from the phone book. He said the incident happened seven months ago and that party officials are cooperating with the U.S. Attorney's Office.</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-Oct-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>A Lafayette man has been charged with voter fraud after registering his toy poodle, Bamabas, to vote, a move he says was meant to show lax registration oversight. Donald Miller, 78, has been charged with misdemeanor voter fraud. The Contra Costa County district attorney's office found out about the stunt after reports about Bamabas being called for jury duty in March.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>03-May-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Several voters have said they were tricked into registering to vote as Republicans when they were told they were signing a petition to lower taxes or applying for a rebate from the power company or some other falsehood.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>02-Jun-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roll Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>A Stockton man hired to register Republican voters pleaded guilty to forging someone's name on a voter registration card. The conviction is the first arising from a Republican-funded voter registration drive that Democrats allege involved fraud.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>13-Jul-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modesto Bee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Eight family members of a councilman are charged with registering at nonexistent addresses</td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>16-Oct-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>A Lafayette man has been charged with voter fraud after registering his toy poodle, Bamabas, to vote, a move he says was meant to show lax registration oversight. Donald Miller, 78, has been charged with misdemeanor voter fraud. The Contra Costa County district attorney's office found out about the stunt after reports about Bamabas being called for jury duty in March.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>16-Oct-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Several voters have said they were tricked into registering to vote as Republicans when they were told they were signing a petition to lower taxes or applying for a rebate from the power company or some other falsehood.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>02-Jun-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roll Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Eight family members of a councilman are charged with registering at nonexistent addresses</td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>16-Oct-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Alleged Incident</td>
<td>City/County</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type of Incident</td>
<td>Alleged Residence of Fraud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>16-Oct 04</td>
<td>Presid</td>
<td>A worker at the Election Commission found a registration form with her own name on it. When another form was cross-referenced with Vital Records, it was found to be from a dead person. Denver workers have forwarded 200 suspicious registrants to the DA. The voter outreach coordinator says the computer immediately flags names of voters who have registered more than once. Several other counties have found suspect voter registration forms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>17-Oct 04</td>
<td>Presid</td>
<td>The Secretary of State accused the Attorney General of not doing enough to prosecute potential ballot crimes. The Secretary confirmed that 6,000 felons are registered to vote. A Denver woman told a TV station she had registered to vote 25 times and signed up several friends up to 40 times to help her boyfriend, a paid staffer for a community group registering voters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>18-Oct 04</td>
<td>Presid</td>
<td>With just two weeks before the Nov. 2 election, the state has been rocked by evidence that some voter-registration drives have submitted applications with forged signatures. In other cases, would-be voters have applied to vote as many as 40 times. At the same time, some registration drives have collected applications and then failed to submit them by the Oct. 4 deadline, prompting Secretary of State Donetta Davidson to announce the use of provisional ballots last week. At yesterday's meeting with county clerks and district attorneys, Mrs. Davidson announced procedures for accepting provisional ballots, which are issued to people who say they have registered but whose names fail to appear on the voter roll. Such ballots would be marked &quot;VRD,&quot; for &quot;Voter Registration Drive.&quot; The would-be voter would have to produce identification and tell when and where they registered. The ballot later would be checked against the state's voter data-bases. The clerks are referring cases that appear to be blatant fraud, such as forged signatures, to the county attorneys. Bill Ritter, the Denver County prosecutor, charged two people Wednesday with falsely filling out multiple voter forms to boost their pay in a paid registration drive. Criminal cases are pending against four people for questionable registrations in the metro area, and there may be more before investigations are completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>31-Oct 02</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>The State Attorney is investigating charges of illegal changes to party affiliations on voter registration cards for a primary. The scheme seems to have been targeted at Hispanics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Voter Registration Fraud

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Alleged</th>
<th>Type of</th>
<th>Alleged Instance of Fraud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Elections officials asked prosecutors to investigate possible voter fraud involving 25 registration forms with apparently bogus addresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>Students at Florida State and Florida A&amp;M universities, some of whom signed petitions to legalize medical marijuana or impose stiffer penalties for child molesters, unknowingly had their party registration switched to Republican and their addresses changed. Officials say students at the University of Florida in Alachua County have made similar complaints and that about 4,000 potential voters in all have been affected. Local papers have traced some of the problems to a group hired by the Florida Republican Party, which has denounced the shenanigans. Switching voters’ party affiliations does not affect their ability to vote, but changing addresses does, because when voters shows up at their proper polling places, they will not be registered there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Fourteen months after a campaign to increase Florida’s minimum wage drew allegations of voter fraud, a federal judge in South Florida has ruled at least some of those accusations against grass roots political group ACORN were so baseless they amount to defamation. Stuart alleged that ACORN improperly handled registration forms when it conducted voter registration drives, including not submitting Republican registrations to election officials. The judge upheld ACORN’s counterclaim that Stuart’s lack of evidence made his allegations libel and slander. An investigation by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement also found no evidence of criminal activity at ACORN, department officials confirmed Wednesday.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>23-Oct-04</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>29-Oct-04</td>
<td>Telegraph Herald (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>31-Oct-04</td>
<td>Washington Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton County</td>
<td>15-Dec-06</td>
<td>St. Petersburg Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton County</td>
<td>4-Nov-06</td>
<td>Fulton County Daily Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Source</td>
<td>Source of Resolution</td>
<td>Allegation/Investigation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Post Dispatch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WashTV</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Advertiser</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The Advocate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washingt on Post</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing Free Press</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing State Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Free Press</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleged Instance of Fraud</td>
<td>Source of Resolution</td>
<td>Resolution of Incident/ Allegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A former ACORN official arrested for running a stop sign and 300 voter registration forms, some of them months old, in his trunk. State law requires they be submitted to the secretary of state within 10 days</td>
<td>Atlanta Journal Constitution</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Prosecutor Jennifer Joyce convened a grand jury that is investigating 3,800 suspect voter registration cards, including several for dead aldermen. The cards were turned in Feb. 7, the deadline to register voters. Joyce said there have been no indictments.</td>
<td>St. Louis Post Dispatch</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI subpoenas election board records on all people who registered to vote, cast ballots, was turned away at the polls, or whose voter registration was rejected from October 1 [2000] through March 6 [2001]; Senator Bond calls for further investigations because his office learned from state election officials that 24,000 registered voters in the city and 33,000 voters in the county were registered to vote somewhere else</td>
<td>St. Louis Post Dispatch</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six guilty to dozens of crimes involving falsifying voter registration forms (&quot;6 plead guilty in vote fraud case&quot;)</td>
<td>St. Louis Post Dispatch</td>
<td>Three workers are charged with turning in fraudulent voter registration applications a few weeks before the mayoral primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats said Voters Outreach of America, a Republican-funded registration group run by Sprouts &amp; Associates, destroyed Democratic voter registration forms. A former employee of the group told a Nevada TV station that registrations collected from Democrats had been destroyed instead of filed with the elections office.</td>
<td>Atlanta Journal Constitution</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Alleged Source of Allegation</td>
<td>Alleged Incident of Fraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>31-Oct 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-Sep 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernalillo</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>15-Sep 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOE finding</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>19-Sep 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx Local</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>23-Jun 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>15-Sep 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>6-Dec-01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOE and DMV find small # of questionable registrations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24-Oct-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg County commission and North Carolina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28-Sep-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirtifed on 2-8-04</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2-8-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>15-Oct-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials are investigating ACORN because an ACORN organizer found that one of its workers had faked about 70 registrations. The worker was fired and the information turned over to the state board. A similar problem with a consumer interest group in Wake County has also been turned over to state officials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Charlotte Observer found more than 60,000 people who appear to be registered in both Carolinas. Alamance County Sheriff says illegal immigrants are registering to vote using false documents at drivers license offices. North Carolina is investigating two groups that may have falsely registered new voters. Some are worried that noncitizens could vote because in North Carolina you can get a driver's license without a social security number. The Elections division and the DMV ran two checks of people who received driver's licenses without proof of citizenship and found only a handful who had registered to vote.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg County commission and North Carolina formally challenged the registration of more than 400 homeless voters Tuesday, saying they had improperly registered using commercial addresses. James and Guignard said the 446 voters challenged in their complaint incorrectly used the addresses of the Urban Ministries at 905 N. College St., the Charlotte Rescue Mission at 900 W. First St. or the Salvation Army at 524 Spratt St. to register, even though those are commercial addresses where the voters could not permanently live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 70 people have claimed a Walnut Hills tailoring shop as their home address while registering to vote, leading the Hamilton County Board of Elections to subpoena the tailor, who is a candidate for Cincinnati Board of Elections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A part-time worker for ACORN was indicted for falsely filling out and signing a voter registration card.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Hamilton County, the Board of Elections has subpoenaed 19 registered voters who elections officials don't believe exist. The Summit County Board of Elections in Akron has asked Ohio Attorney General Jim Petro to Investigate 803 allegedly fraudulent voter-registration cards, many of which appeared to be in the same handwriting. In Lake County, east of Cleveland, several voter-registration cards seem to have forged signatures, elections officials say.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Akron woman was charged with filling out false registration cards. She may be the only person to face criminal charges after a yearlong state and federal investigation. A task force of state, federal and local investigators was launched last year after hundreds of false registrations were apparently filled throughout Ohio. The investigation resulted in no federal indictments. The two fake registration cards traced to the woman were turned in by Project Vote and not submitted to the Board because the organization thought they were suspicious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person(s) Allegedly Involved in Incident</td>
<td>Alleged Source of Partisan Target</td>
<td>Source of Original Resolution/Incident Allegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint State Republican party</td>
<td>Official or paid canvasser</td>
<td>Materials submitted to the Akron Beacon Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State GOP Chair</td>
<td>State GOP Chair</td>
<td>State GOP Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three police officers</td>
<td>State law enforcement</td>
<td>State law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>State law enforcement</td>
<td>State law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students at Mt. Hood and Chemeketa community colleges</td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>State law enforcement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State GOP Chair says that the party tried to contact 231,834 new registrants in the five largest counties and had 5.7% returned as undeliverable.

An Akron woman was charged with filing out false registration cards. She may be the only person to face criminal charges after a yearlong state and federal investigation. A task force of state, federal and local investigators was launched last year after hundreds of fake registrations were apparently filed throughout Ohio. The investigation resulted in no federal indictments. The two fake registration cards traced to the woman were turned in by Project Vote and not submitted to the Board because the organization thought they were suspicious.

State GOP Chair says that the party tried to contact 231,834 new registrants in the five largest counties and had 5.7% returned as undeliverable.

An Akron woman was charged with filing out false registration cards. She may be the only person to face criminal charges after a yearlong state and federal investigation. A task force of state, federal and local investigators was launched last year after hundreds of fake registrations were apparently filed throughout Ohio. The investigation resulted in no federal indictments. The two fake registration cards traced to the woman were turned in by Project Vote and not submitted to the Board because the organization thought they were suspicious.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partial Allegation</th>
<th>Allegation's Involvement</th>
<th>Charged Party</th>
<th>Alleged Guilt</th>
<th>Alleged Involvement</th>
<th>Alleged Violation</th>
<th>Type of Election</th>
<th>Alleged Instance of Fraud</th>
<th>Alleged Party</th>
<th>Source of Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Republicans mailed letters to 130,000 people who had registered to vote in the last 6 months. 10,000 came back as undeliverable. The legal counsel to the state party said Republicans had looked at a sample of the letters and found 15 of 100 of the registrants were dead. The director of a nonpartisan organization says in a transient city many people may have moved over a six month period, and many letters might not have reached people living in shelters or substandard housing.</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Philadelphia Inquirer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allegheny County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County investigators have launched an investigation into a scam in which University of Pittsburgh and Community College of Allegheny County students believed they were signing petitions to legalize marijuana for medical use, only to find themselves registered as Republicans.</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Tribune Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Providence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four people charged with using business addresses to register to vote</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Pawtucket Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Several counties, almost all of them adjoining an American Indian reservation, submit questionable registration forms to law enforcement</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Argus Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual reaches plea agreement for falsifying registration cards</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Argus Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harris County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Tax Assessor-Collector alleges 157 registered had false addresses. County officials are investigating</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Houston Chronicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prince William County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate charged with lying on a registration card and voting in a district where he did not reside</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Washington Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Alleged</td>
<td>Source of</td>
<td>Alleged Instance of Fraud</td>
<td>Origin of Source</td>
<td>Resolution of Allegation</td>
<td>Source of Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>31-Oct-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukee Journal Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>10-May-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin State Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>11-May-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukee Journal Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>8-Dec-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vast majority of voters alleged to have been phantoms because their verification forms were returned as undeliverable really exist and their cards were returned because of innocent mistakes in filling out voter registration forms. Of 1,194 verification cards returned, 16 are still being examined. Arrest warrants issued and felony charges filed against two workers for Project Vote who admitted to filling out multiple registration cards using fictitious information to earn money. County DA charges two people affiliated with ACORN for filling false voter registrations.
Interview with Commissioner Harry Van Sickle and Deputy Chief Counsel to the Secretary of State Larry Boyle, State of Pennsylvania

March 1, 2006

As Commissioner Van Sickle has only been in office for about a year, Mr. Boyle answered most of our questions.

Fraud and Intimidation
Neither Van Sickle nor Boyle was aware of any fraud of any kind in the state of Pennsylvania over the last five years. They are not aware of the commission of any deceptive practices, such as flyers that intentionally misinform as to voting procedures. They also have never heard of any incidents of voter intimidation. With respect to the mayoral election of 2003, the local commission would know about that.

Since the Berks County case of 2003, where the Department of Justice found poll workers who treated Latino voters with hostility among other voting rights violations, the Secretary's office has brought together Eastern Pennsylvania election administrators and voting advocates to discuss the problems. As a result, other counties have voluntarily chosen to follow the guidance of the Berks County federal court order.

Regarding the allegations of fraud that surrounded the voter identification debate, Mr. Boyle said he was not aware of any instances of fraud involving identity. He believes this is because Pennsylvania has laws in place to prevent this. For example, in 2002 the state legislature passed an ID law that is stricter than HAVA's – it requires all first time voters to present identification. In addition, the SURE System – the state's statewide voter registration database – is a great anti-fraud mechanism. The system will be in place statewide in the May 2006 election.

In addition, the state took many steps before the 2004 election to make sure it would be smooth. They had attorneys in the counties to consult on problems as well as staff at the central office to take calls regarding problems. In addition, in 2004 the state used provisional ballots for the first time. This resolved many of the problems that used to occur on Election Day.

Mr. Boyle is not aware of any voter registration fraud. This is because when someone registers to vote, the administrator does a duplicate check. In addition, under new laws a person registering to vote must provide their driver's license or Social Security number which are verified through the Department of Motor Vehicles and the Social Security Administration. Therefore, it would be unlikely that someone would be able to register to vote falsely.

Process

Most problems are dealt with at the local level and do not come within the review of the Secretary of State's office. For instance, if there is a complaint of intimidation, this is generally dealt with by the county courts which are specially designated solely to election cases on
Election Day. The Secretary does not keep track of these cases. Since the passage of NVRA and HAVA counties will increasingly call the office when problems arise.

Recommendations
Mr. Boyle suggested we review the recommendations of the Pennsylvania Election Reform Task Force which is on the Secretary’s website. Many of those recommendations have been introduced in the legislature.

Interview with Craig Donsanto, Director, Public Integrity Section, U.S. Department of Justice
January 13, 2006

Questions

How are Prosecution Decisions Made?

Craig Donsanto must approve all investigations that go beyond a preliminary stage, all charges, search warrant applications and subpoenas and all prosecutions. The decision to investigate is very sensitive because of the public officials involved. If a charge seems political, Donsanto will reject it. Donsanto gives possible theories for investigation. Donsanto and Noel Hillman will decide whether to farm out the case to an AUSA. Donsanto uses a concept called predication. In-other-words, there must be enough evidence to suggest a crime has been committed. The method of evaluation of this evidence depends on the type of evidence and its source. There are two types of evidence---factual (antisocial behavior) and legal (antisocial behavior leading to statutory violations). Whether an indictment will be brought depends on the likelihood of success before a jury. Much depends on the type of evidence and the source. Donsanto said he “knows it when he sees it.” Donsanto will only indict if he is confident of a conviction assuming the worst case scenario – a jury trial.

A person under investigation will first receive a target letter. Often, a defendant who gets a target letter will ask for a departmental hearing. The defendant’s case will be heard by Donsanto and Hillman. On occasion, the assistant attorney general will review the case. The department grants such hearings easily because such defendants are likely to provide information about others involved.

The Civil Rights Division, Voting Rights Section makes its own decisions on prosecution. The head of that division is John Tanner. There is a lot of cooperation between

Does the Decision to Prosecute Incorporate Particular Political Considerations within a State Such as a One Party System or a System in which the Party in Power Controls the Means of Prosecution and Suppresses Opposition Complaints?

Yes. Before, the department would leave it to the states. Now, if there is racial animus involved in the case, there is political bias involved, or the prosecutor is not impartial, the department will take it over.
Does it Matter if the Complaint Comes from a Member of a Racial Minority?

No. But if the question involves racial animus, that has also always been an aggravating factor, making it more likely the Department will take it over.

What Kinds of Complaints Would Routinely Override Principles of Federalism?

Federalism is no longer a big issue. DOJ is permitted to prosecute whenever there is a candidate for federal office.

Are There Too Few Prosecutions?

DOJ can't prosecute everything.

What Should Be Done to Improve the System?

The problem is asserting federal jurisdiction in non-federal elections. It is preferable for the federal government to pursue these cases for the following reasons: federal districts draw from a bigger and more diverse jury pool; the DOJ is politically detached; local district attorneys are hamstrung by the need to be re-elected; DOJ has more resources - local prosecutors need to focus on personal and property crimes - fraud cases are too big and too complex for them; DOJ can use the grand jury process as a discovery technique and to test the strength of the case.

In *U.S. v. McNally*, the court ruled that the mail fraud statute does not apply to election fraud. It was through the mail fraud statute that the department had routinely gotten federal jurisdiction over election fraud cases. 18 USC 1346, the congressional effort to "fix" *McNally*, did not include voter fraud.

As a result, the department needs a new federal law that allows federal prosecution whenever a federal instrumentality is used, e.g. the mail, federal funding, interstate commerce. The department has drafted such legislation, which was introduced but not passed in the early 1990s. A federal law is needed that permits prosecution in any election where any federal instrumentality is used.

Other Information

The Department has held four symposia for DEOs and FBI agents since the initiation of the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative. In 2003, civil rights leaders were invited to make speeches, but were not permitted to take part in the rest of the symposium. All other symposia have been closed to the public. (Peg will be sending us the complete training materials used at those sessions. These are confidential and are the subject of FOIA litigation).

There are two types of attorneys in the division: prosecutors, who take on cases when the jurisdiction of the section requires it; the US Attorney has recused him or herself; or when the
US Attorney is unable to handle the case (most frequent reason) and braintrust attorneys who analyze the facts, formulate theories, and draft legal documents.

Cases:

Donsanto provided us with three case lists: Open cases (still being investigated) as of January 13, 2006 – confidential; election fraud prosecutions and convictions as a result of the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative October 2002-January 13, 2006 and cases closed for lack of evidence as of January 13, 2006

If we want more documents related to any case, we must get those documents from the states. The department will not release them to us.

Although the number of election fraud related complaints have not gone up since 2002, nor has the proportion of legitimate to illegitimate complaints of fraud, the number of cases that the department is investigating and the number of indictments the department is pursuing are both up dramatically.

Since 2002, the department has brought more cases against alien voters, felon voters, and double voters than ever before. Previously, cases were only brought when there was a pattern or scheme to corrupt the process. Charges were not brought against individuals – those cases went unprosecuted. This change in direction, focus, and level of aggression was by the decision of the Attorney General. The reason for the change was for deterrence purposes.

The department is currently undertaking three pilot projects to determine what works in developing the cases and obtaining convictions and what works with juries in such matters to gain convictions:

Felon voters in Milwaukee.
Alien voters in the Southern District of Florida. FYI – under 18 USC 611, to prosecute for “alien voting” there is no intent requirement. Conviction can lead to deportation. Nonetheless, the department feels compelled to look at mitigating factors such as was the alien told it was OK to vote, does the alien have a spouse that is a citizen.
Double voters in a variety of jurisdictions.

The department does not maintain records of the complaints that come in from DEOs, U.S attorneys and others during the election that are not pursued by the department. Donsanto asserted that U.S. attorneys never initiate frivolous investigations.

According to the new handbook, the department can take on a case whenever there is a federal candidate on the ballot
Interview with Douglas Webber, Assistant Attorney General, Indiana

February 15, 2006

Background
Mr. Webber was an attorney for the Marion County Election Board and was also part of the Indianapolis Ballot Security Team (sometimes called the Goon Squad). This Team was a group of attorneys well trained in election law whose mission was to enforce ballot security.

Litigation
Status of litigation in Indiana: On January 12 the briefing was completed. The parties are waiting for a decision from the U.S. district judge. The judge understood that one of the parties would seek a stay from the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals. The parties anticipate a decision in late March or early April. Mr. Webber did the discovery and depositions for the litigation. Mr. Webber feared the plaintiffs were going to state in their reply brief that HAVA’s statewide database requirement would resolve the problems alleged by the state. However, the plaintiffs failed to do so, relying on a Motor Voter Act argument instead. Mr. Webber believes that the voter ID at issue will make the system much more user-friendly for the poll workers. The Legislature passed the ID legislation, and the state is defending it, on the basis of the problem of the perception of fraud.

Incidents of fraud and intimidation
Mr. Webber thinks that no one can put his or her thumb on whether there has been voter fraud in Indiana. For instance, if someone votes in place of another, no one knows about it. There have been no prosecuted cases of polling place fraud in Indiana. There is no recorded history of documented cases, but it does happen. In the litigation, he used articles from around the country about instances of voter fraud, but even in those examples there were ultimately no prosecutions, for example the case of Milwaukee. He also stated in the litigation that there are all kinds of examples of dead people voting—totaling in the hundreds of thousands of votes across the country.

One interesting example of actual fraud in Indiana occurred when a poll worker, in a poll using punch cards, glued the chads back and then punched out other chads for his candidate. But this would not be something that would be addressed by an ID requirement.

He also believes that the perception that the polls are loose can be addressed by the legislature. The legislature does not need to wait to see if the statewide database solve the problems and therefore affect the determination of whether an ID requirement is necessary. When he took the deposition of the Republican Co-Director, he said he thought Indiana was getting ahead of the curve. That is, there have been problems around the country, and confidence in elections is low. Therefore Indiana is now in front of getting that confidence back.

Mr. Webber stated that the largest vote problem in Indiana is absentee ballots. Absentee ballot fraud and vote buying are the most documented cases. It used to be the law that applications for absentee ballots could be sent anywhere. In one case absentee votes were exchanged for “a job on election day”—meaning one vote for a certain price. The election was contested and the trial
judge found that although there was vote fraud, the incidents of such were less than the margin of victory and so he refused to overturn the election. Mr. Webber appealed the case for the state and argued the judge used the wrong statute. The Indiana Supreme Court agreed and reversed. Several people were prosecuted as a result – those cases are still pending.

Process
In Indiana, voter complaints first come to the attorney for the county election board who can recommend that a hearing be held. If criminal activity was found, the case could be referred to the county prosecutor or in certain instances to the Indiana Attorney General’s Office. In practice, the Attorney General almost never handles such cases.

Mr. Webber has had experience training county of election boards in preserving the integrity and security of the polling place from political or party officials. Mr. Webber stated that the Indiana voter rolls need to be culled. He also stated that in Southern Indiana a large problem was vote buying while in Northern Indiana a large problem was based on government workers feeling compelled to vote for the party that gave them their jobs.

Recommendations
- Mr. Webber believes that all election fraud and intimidation complaints should be referred to the Attorney General’s Office to circumvent the problem of local political prosecutions. The Attorney General should take more responsibility for complaints of fraud because at the local level, politics interferes. At the local level, everyone knows each other, making it harder prosecute.
- Indiana currently votes 6 am to 6 pm on a weekday. Government workers and retirees are the only people who are available to work the polls. Mr. Webber suggested that the biggest change should be to move elections to weekends. This would involve more people acting as poll workers who would be much more careful about what was going on.
- Early voting at the clerk’s office is good because the people there know what they are doing. People would be unlikely to commit fraud at the clerk’s office. This should be expanded to other polling places in addition to that of the county clerk.
- Finally, Mr. Webber believes polling places should be open longer, run more professionally but that there needs to be fewer of them so that they are staffed by only the best, most professional people.

Interview Sharon Priest, former Secretary of State, Arkansas
January 24, 2006

Process:

When there is an allegation of election fraud or intimidation, the county clerk refers it to the local district attorney. Most often, the DA does not pursue the claim. There is little that state administrators can do about this because in Arkansas, county clerks are partisanly elected and completely autonomous. Indeed, county clerks have total authority to determine who is an eligible voter.
EAC SUMMARY OF EXPERT INTERVIEWS FOR
VOTING FRAUD-VOTER INTIMIDATION RESEARCH

Data:

There is very little data collected in Arkansas on fraud and intimidation cases. Any information there might be stays at the county level. This again is largely because the clerks have so much control and authority, and will not release information. Any statewide data that does exist might be gotten from Susie Storms from the State Board of Elections.

Most Common Problems

The perception of fraud is much greater than the actual incidence of fraud.

- The DMV does not implement NVRA in that it does not take the necessary steps when providing the voter registration forms and does not process them properly. This leads to both ineligible voters potentially getting on the voting rolls (e.g. noncitizens, who have come to get a drivers license, fill out a voter registration form having no intention of actually voting) and voter thinking they are registered to vote to find they are not on the list on Election Day. Also, some people think they are automatically registered if they have applied for a drivers license.
- Absentee ballot fraud is the most frequent form of election fraud.
- In Arkansas, it is suspected that politicians pay ministers to tell their congregations to vote for them
- In 2003, the State Board documented 400 complaints against the Pulaski County Clerk for engaging in what was at least borderline fraud, e.g. certain people not receiving their absentee ballots. The case went to a grand jury but no indictment was brought.
- Transportation of ballot boxes is often insecure making it very easy for insiders to tamper with the ballots or stuff the ballot boxes. Priest has not actually witnessed this happen, but believes it may have.
- Intimidation at the poll sites in court houses. Many voters are afraid of the county judges or county employees and therefore will not vote. They justifiably believe their ballots will be opened by these employees to see who they voted for, and if they voted against the county people, retribution might ensue.
- Undue challenges to minority language voters at the poll sites
- Paid registration collectors fill out phony names, but these individuals are caught before anyone is able to cast an ineligible ballot.

Suggested Reforms for Improvement:

- Nonpartisan election administration
- Increased prosecution of election crimes through greater resources to district attorneys. In addition, during election time, there should be an attorney in the DA’s office who is designated to handle election prosecution.
- There should be greater centralization of the process, especially with respect to the statewide database. Arkansas has a “bottom up” system. This means the counties still control the list and there is insufficient information sharing. For example, if someone
lives in one county but dies in another, the county in which the voter lived – and was registered to vote – will not be notified of the death.

Interview with Heather Dawn Thompson, Director of Government Relations, National Congress of American Indians

March 22, 2006

Background

Thompson is a member of the Cheyenne River Sioux tribe in South Dakota. For many years she worked locally on elections doing poll monitoring and legal work, from a nonpartisan perspective. In 2004, she headed the Native Vote Election Protection, a project run by the National Congress of American Indians, and was in charge of monitoring all Native American voting sites around the country, focusing on 10 or 15 states with the biggest Native populations. She is now permanently on staff of the National Congress of American Indians as the Director of Government relations. NCAI works jointly with NARF as well as the Election Protection Coalition.

Recent trends

Native election protection operations have intensified recently for several reasons. While election protection efforts in Native areas have been ongoing, leaders realized that they were failing to develop internal infrastructure or cultivate locally any of the knowledge and expertise which would arrive and leave with external protection groups.

Moreover, in recent years partisan groups have become more aware of the power of the native vote, and have become more active in native communities. This has partly resulted in an extreme increase in voter intimidation tactics. As native communities are easy to identify, easy to target, and generally dominated by a single party, they are especially vulnerable to such tactics.

Initially, reports of intimidation were only passed along by word of mouth. But it became such a problem in the past 5 to 6 years that tribal leaders decided to raise the issue to the national level. Thompson points to the Cantwell election in 2000 and the Johnson election in South Dakota in 2002 as tipping points where many began to realize the Indian vote could matter in Senate and national elections.

Thompson stressed that Native Vote places a great deal of importance on being nonpartisan. While a majority of native communities vote Democratic, there are notable exceptions, including communities in Oklahoma and Alaska, and they have both parties engaging in aggressive tactics. However, she believes the most recent increase in suppression and intimidation tactics have come from Republican Party organizations.
EAC SUMMARY OF EXPERT INTERVIEWS FOR
VOTING FRAUD-VOTER INTIMIDATION RESEARCH

Nature of Suppression/Intimidation of Native Voters

Thompson categorizes suppression into judge related and poll-watcher related incidents, both of which may be purposeful or inadvertent, as well as longstanding legal-structural constraints.

Structural problems

One example of inadvertent suppression built into the system stems from the fact that many Indian communities also include significant numbers of non-Indians due to allotment. Non-Indians tend to be most active in the state and local government while Indians tend to be more involved in the tribal government. Thus, the individuals running elections end up being non-Indian. Having Indians vote at polling places staffed by non-Indians often results in incidents of disrespect towards Native voters (Thompson emphasized the considerable racism which persists against Indians in these areas). Also, judges aren’t familiar with Indian last names and are more dismissive of solving discrepancies with native voters.

Structural problems also arise from laws which mandate that the tribal government cannot run state or local elections. In places like South Dakota, political leaders used to make it intentionally difficult for Native Americans to participate in elections. For example, state, local and federal elections could not be held in the same location as tribal elections, leading to confusion when tribal and other elections are held in different locations. Also, it is common to have native communities with few suitable sites, meaning that a state election held in a secondary location can suddenly impose transportation obstacles.

Photo ID Issues

Thompson believes both state level and HAVA photo ID requirements have a considerable negative impact. For a number of reasons, many Indian voters don’t have photo ID. Poor health care and poverty on reservations means that many children are born at home, leading to a lack of birth certificates necessary to obtain ID. Also, election workers and others may assume they are Hispanic, causing additional skepticism due to citizenship questions. There is a cultural issue as well—historically, whenever Indians register with the federal government it has been associated with a taking of land or removal of children. Thus many Indians avoid registering for anything with the government, even for tribal ID.

Thompson also offered examples of how the impact of ID requirements had been worsened by certain rules and the discriminatory way they have been carried out. In the South Dakota special election of 2003, poll workers told Native American voters that if they did not have ID with them and they lived within sixty miles of the precinct, the voter had to come back with ID. The poll workers did not tell the voters that they could vote by affidavit ballot and not need to return, as required by law. This was exacerbated by the fact that the poll workers didn’t know the voters—as would be the case with non-Indian poll workers and Indian voters. Many left the poll site without voting and did not return.

In Minnesota, the state tried to prohibit the use of tribal ID’s for voting outside of a reservation, even though Minnesota has a large urban Native population. Thompson believes this move was...
very purposeful, and despite any reasonable arguments from the Secretary of State, they had to file a lawsuit to stop the rule. They were very surprised to find national party representatives in the courtroom when they went to deal with lawsuit, representatives who could only have been alerted through a discussion with the Secretary of State.

Partisan Poll-Monitoring

Thompson believes the most purposeful suppression has been perpetrated by the party structures on an individual basis, of which South Dakota is a great example.

Some negative instances of poll monitoring are not purposeful. Both parties send in non-Indian, non-Western lawyers, largely from the East Coast, which can lead to uncomfortable cultural clashes. These efforts display a keen lack of understanding of these communities and the best way to negotiate within in them. But while it may be intimidating, it is not purposeful.

Yet there are also many instances of purposeful abuse of poll monitoring. While there were indeed problems during the 2002 Johnson election, it was small compared to the Janklow special election. Thompson says Republican workers shunned cultural understanding outreach, and had an extensive pamphlet of what to say at polls and were very aggressive about it. In one tactic, every time a voter would come up with no ID, poll monitors would repeat “You can’t vote” over and over again, causing many voters to leave. This same tactic appeared across reservations, and eventually they looked to the Secretary of State to intervene.

In another example, the head of poll watchers drove from poll to poll and told voters without IDs to go home, to the point where the chief of police was going to evict him from the reservation. In Minnesota, on the Red Lake reservation, police actually did evict an aggressive poll watcher—the fact that the same strategies are employed several hundred miles apart points to standardized instructions.

None of these incidents ever went to court. Thompson argues this is due to few avenues for legal recourse. In addition, it is inherently difficult to settle these things, as they are he said-she said incidents and take place amidst the confusion of Election Day. Furthermore, poll watchers know what the outline of the law is, and they are careful to work within those parameters, leaving little room for legal action.

Other seeming instances of intimidation may be purely inadvertent, such as when, in 2002, the U.S. Attorney chose Election Day to give out subpoenas, and native voters stayed in their homes. In all fairness, she believes this was a misunderstanding.

The effect of intimidation on small communities is especially strong and is impossible to ultimately measure, as the ripple effect of rumors in insular communities can’t be traced. In some communities, they try to combat this by using the Native radio to encourage people to vote and dispel myths.

She has suggestions for people who can describe incidents at a greater level of detail if interested.
Vote Buying and Fraud

They haven't found a great deal of evidence on vote-buying and fraud. When cash is offered to register voters, individuals may abuse this, although Thompson believes this is not necessarily unique to the Native community, but a reflection of high rates of poverty. This doesn't amount to a concerted effort at conspiracy, but instead represents isolated incidents of people not observing the rules. While Thompson believes looking into such isolated incidents is a completely fair inquiry, she also believes it has been exploited for political purposes and to intimidate. For example, large law enforcement contingents were sent to investigate these incidents. As Native voters tend not to draw distinctions between law enforcement and other officials, this made them unlikely to help with elections.

Remedies

As far as voter suppression is concerned, Native Vote has been asking the Department of Justice to look into what might be done, and to place more emphasis on law enforcement and combating intimidation. They have been urging the Department to focus on this at least much as it is focusing on enforcement of Section 203. Native groups have complained to DOJ repeatedly and DOJ has the entire log of handwritten incident reports they have collected. Therefore, Thompson recommends more DOJ enforcement of voting rights laws with respect to intimidation. People who would seek to abuse the process need to believe a penalty will be paid for doing so. Right now, there is no recourse and DOJ does not care, so both parties do it because they can.

Certain states should rescind bars on nonpartisan poll watchers on Election Day; Thompson believes this is contrary to the nonpartisan, pro-Indian presence which would best facilitate voting in Native communities.

As discussed above, Thompson believes ID requirements are a huge impediment to native voters. At a minimum, Thompson believes all states should be explicit about accepting tribal ID on Election Day.

Liberalized absentee ballot rules would also be helpful to Native communities. As many Indian voters are disabled and elderly, live far away from their precinct, and don't have transportation, tribes encourage members to vote by absentee ballot. Yet obstacles remain. Some voters are denied a chance to vote if they have requested a ballot and then show up at the polls. Thompson believes South Dakota's practice of tossing absentee ballots if a voter shows up at the ED would serve as an effective built-in protection. In addition, she believes there should be greater scrutiny of GOTV groups requesting absentee ballots without permission. Precinct location is a longstanding issue, but Thompson recognizes that states have limited resources. In the absence of those resources, better absentee ballot procedures are needed.

Basic voter registration issues and access are also important in native communities and need to be addressed.
Thompson is mixed on what restrictions should be placed on poll watcher behavior, as she believes open elections and third party helpers are both important. However, she would be willing to explore some sort of stronger recourse and set of rules concerning poll watchers’ behavior. Currently, the parties are aware that no recourse exists, and try to get away with what they will. This is not unique to a single party—both try to stay within law while shaking people up. The existing VRA provision is ‘fluffy’—unless you have a consent decree, you have very little power. Thompson thinks a general voter intimidation law that is left a bit broad but that nonetheless makes people aware of some sort of kickback could be helpful.

Interview with Jason Torchinsky, former attorney with the Civil Rights Section of the Department of Justice, assistant general counsel for the American Center for Voting Rights (ACVR) and Robin DeJarnette, political consultant for C4 and C5 organizations and executive director for the ACVR.

February 16, 2006

ACVR Generally

Other officers of the ACVR-Thor Hearne II-general counsel and Brian Lunde, former executive director of the Democratic National Committee.

Board of Directors of ACVR-Brian Lunde, Thor Hearne II, and Cameron Quinn

ACVR works with a network of attorneys around the country and has been recently involved with lobbying in PA and MO.

Regarding the August 2005 Report

ACVR has not followed up on any of the cases it cited in the 2005 report to see if the allegations had been resolved in some manner. Mr. Torchinsky stated that there are problems with allegations of fraud in the report and prosecution---just because there was no prosecution, does not mean there was no vote fraud. He believes that it is very hard to come up with a measure of voter fraud short of prosecution. Mr. Torchinsky does not have a good answer to resolve this problem.

P. 35 of the Report indicates that there were coordinated efforts by groups to coordinate fraudulent voter registrations. P. 12 of the Ohio Report references a RICO suit filed against organizations regarding fraudulent voter registrations. Mr. Torchinsky does not know what happened in that case. He stated that there was a drive to increase voter registration numbers regardless of whether there was an actual person to register. He stated that when you have an organization like ACORN involved all over the place, there is reason to believe it is national in scope. When it is the same groups in multiple states, this leads to the belief that it is a concerted effort.
EAC SUMMARY OF EXPERT INTERVIEWS FOR
VOTING FRAUD-VOTER INTIMIDATION RESEARCH

Voting Problems

Mr. Torchinsky stated there were incidents of double voting---ex. a double voter in Kansas City, MO. If the statewide voter registration database requirement of HAVA is properly implemented, he believes it will stop multiple voting in the same state. He supports the HAVA requirement, if implemented correctly. Since Washington State implemented its statewide database, the Secretary of State has initiated investigations into felons who voted. In Philadelphia the major problem is permitting polling places in private homes and bars – even the homes of party chairs.

Mr. Torchinsky believes that voter ID would help, especially in cities in places like Ohio and Philadelphia, PA. The ACVR legislative fund supports the Real ID requirements suggested by the Carter-Baker Commission. Since federal real ID requirements will be in place in 2010, any objection to a voter ID requirement should be moot.

Mr. Torchinsky stated that there are two major poll and absentee voting problems---(1) fraudulent votes-ex. dead people voting in St. Louis and (2) people voting who are not legally eligible-ex. felons in most places. He also believes that problems could arise in places that still transport paper ballots from the voting location to a counting room. However, he does not believe this is as widespread a problem now as it once was.

Suggestions

Implement the Carter-Baker Commission recommendations because they represent a reasonable compromise between the political parties.

Interview with Joe Rich, former Chief of the Voting Section,
US Department of Justice
February 7, 2006

Background

Mr. Rich went to Yale undergraduate and received his law degree from the University of Michigan. He served as Chief of the Voting Section from 1999-2005. Prior to that he served in other leadership roles in the Civil Rights Division and litigated several civil rights cases.

Data Collection and Monitoring

The section developed a new database before the 2004 election to log complaint calls and what was done to follow up on them. They opened many investigations as a result of these complaints, including one on the long lines in Ohio (see DOJ letter on website, as well as critical commentary on the DOJ letter’s analysis). DOJ found no Section 2 violation in Ohio. John Tanner should be able to give us this data. However, the database does not include complaints that were received by monitors and observers in the field.

All attorney observers in the field are required to submit reports after Election Day to the Department. These reports would give us a very good sense of the scope and type of problems that arose on that day and whether they were resolved on the spot or required further action.
The monitoring in 2004 was the biggest operation ever. Prior to 2000, only certain jurisdictions could be observed – a VRA covered jurisdiction that was certified or a jurisdiction that had been certified by a court, e.g. through a consent decree. Since that time, and especially in 2004, the Department has engaged in more informal “monitoring.” In those cases, monitors assigned to certain jurisdictions, as opposed to observers, can only watch in the polling place with permission from the jurisdiction. The Department picked locations based on whether they had been monitored in the past, there had been problems before, or there had been allegations in the past. Many problems that arose were resolved by monitors on the spot.

Processes for Cases not Resolved at the Polling Site

If the monitor or observer believes that a criminal act has taken place, he refers it to the Public Integrity Section (PIN). If it is an instance of racial intimidation, it is referred to the Civil Rights Criminal Division. However, very few such cases are prosecuted because they are very hard to prove. The statutes covering such crimes require actual violence or the threat of violence in order to make a case. As a result, most matters are referred to PIN because they operate under statutes that make these cases easier to prove. In general, there are not a high number of prosecutions for intimidation and suppression.

If the act is not criminal, it may be brought as a civil matter, but only if it violated the Voting Rights Act – in other words, only if there is a racial aspect to the case. Otherwise the only recourse is to refer it to PIN.

However, PIN tends not to focus on intimidation and suppression cases, but rather cases such as alleged noncitizen voting, etc. Public Integrity used to only go after systematic efforts to corrupt the system. Now they focus on scattered individuals, which is a questionable resource choice. Criminal prosecutors over the past 5 years have been given more resources and more leeway because of a shift in focus and policy toward noncitizens and double voting, etc.

There have been very few cases brought involving African American voters. There have been 7 Section 2 cases brought since 2001 – only one was brought on behalf of African American voters. That case was initiated under the Clinton administration. The others have included Latinos and discrimination against whites.

Types of Fraud and Intimidation Occurring

There is no evidence that polling place fraud is a problem. There is also no evidence that the NVRA has increased the opportunity for fraud. Moreover, regardless of NVRA’s provisions, an election official can always look into a voter’s registration if he or she believes that person should no longer be on the list. The Department is now suing Missouri because of its poor registration list.

The biggest problem is with absentee ballots. The photo ID movement is a vote suppression strategy. This type of suppression is a bigger problem than intimidation. There has been an increase in vote suppression over the last five years, but it has been indirect, often in the way that
laws are interpreted and implemented. Unequal implementation of ID requirements at the polls based on race would be a VRA violation.

The most common type of intimidation occurring is open hostility by poll workers toward minorities. It is a judgment call whether this is a crime or not -- Craig Donsanto of PIN decides if it rises to a criminal matter.

Election Day challenges at the polls could be a VRA violation but such a case has never been formally pursued. Such cases are often resolved on the spot. Development of a pre-election challenge list targeted at minorities would be a VRA violation but this also has never been pursued. These are choices of current enforcement policy.

Long lines due to unequal distribution of voting machines based on race, list purges based on race and refusal to offer a provisional ballot on the basis of race would also be VRA violations.

**Recommendations**

Congress should pass a new law that allows the Department to bring civil actions for suppression that is NOT race based, for example, deceptive practices or wholesale challenges to voters in jurisdictions that tend to vote heavily for one party.

Given the additional resources and latitude given to the enforcement of acts such as double voting and noncitizen voting, there should be an equal commitment to enforcement of acts of intimidation and suppression cases.

There should also be increased resources dedicated to expanded monitoring efforts. This might be the best use of resources since monitors and observers act as a deterrent to fraud and intimidation.

**Interview with Joe Sandler, Counsel to the DNC**

February 24, 2006

**Background**

Sandler is an election attorney. He worked for the DNC in 1986, was in-house counsel from 1993-1998, and currently is outside counsel to the DNC and most state Democratic Parties. Sandler was part of the recount team in Florida in both 2002 and 2004. He recruited and trained attorneys in voting issues---starting in 2002 Sandler recruited in excess of 15,000 attorneys in twenty-two states. He is now putting together a national lawyers council in each state.

**2004-Administrative Incompetence v. Fraud**

Sandler believes the 2004 election was a combination of administrative incompetence and fraud. Sandler stated there was a deliberate effort by the Republicans to disenfranchise voters across the
country. This was accomplished by mailing out cards to registered voters and then moving to purge from the voters list those whose cards were returned. Sandler indicated that in New Mexico there was a deliberate attempt by Republicans to purge people registered by third parties. He stated that there were intentional efforts to disenfranchise voters by election officials like Ken Blackwell in Ohio.

The problems with machine distribution in 2004 were not deliberate. However, Sandler believes that a large problem exists in the states because there are no laws that spell out a formula to allocate so many voting machines per voter.

Sandler was asked how often names were intentionally purged from the voter lists. He responded that there will be a lot of names purged as a result of the creation of the voter lists under HAVA. However, Sandler stated most wrongful purging results from incompetence. Sandler also said there was not much intimidation at the polls because most such efforts are deterred and that the last systematic effort was in Philadelphia in 2003 where Republicans had official looking cars and people with badges and uniforms, etc.

Sandler stated that deliberate dissemination of misinformation was more incidental, with individuals misinforming and not a political party. Disinformation did occur in small Spanish speaking communities.

Republicans point to instances of voter registration fraud but Sandler believes it did not occur, except for once in a blue moon. Sandler did not believe non-citizen voting was a problem. He also does not believe that there is voter impersonation at the polls and that Republicans allege this as a way of disenfranchising voters through restrictive voter identification rules.

Fraud and Intimidation Trends

Sandler stated that over the years there has been a shift from organized efforts to intimidate minority voters through voter identification requirements, improper purging, failure to properly register voters, not allocating enough voting machines, failure to properly use the provisional ballot, etc., by voter officials as well as systematic efforts by Republicans to deregister voters.

At the federal level, Sandler said, the voting division has become so politicized that it is basically useless now on intimidation claims. At the local level, Sandler does not believe politics prevents or hinders prosecution for vote fraud.

Sandler’s Recommendations

Moving the voter lists to the state level is a good idea where carefully done
Provisional ballots rules should follow the law and not be over-used
No voter ID
Partisanship should be taken out of election administration, perhaps by giving that responsibility by someone other than the Secretary of State. There should at least be conflict of interest rules
Enact laws that allow private citizens to bring suit under state law
All suggestions from the DNC Ohio Report:

1. The Democratic Party must continue its efforts to monitor election law reform in all fifty states, the District of Columbia and territories.
2. States should be encouraged to codify into law all required election practices, including requirements for the adequate training of official poll workers.
3. States should adopt uniform and clear published standards for the distribution of voting equipment and the assignment of official poll workers among precincts, to ensure adequate and nondiscriminatory access. These standards should be based on set ratios of numbers of machines and poll workers per number of voters expected to turn out, and should be made available for public comment before being adopted.
4. States should adopt legislation to make clear and uniform the rules on voter registration.
5. The Democratic Party should monitor the processing of voter registrations by local election authorities on an ongoing basis to ensure the timely processing of registrations and changes, including both newly registered voters and voters who move within a jurisdiction or the state, and the Party should ask state Attorneys General to take action where necessary to force the timely updating of voter lists.
6. States should be urged to implement statewide voter lists in accordance with the Help America Vote Act ("HAVA"), the election reform law enacted by Congress in 2002 following the Florida debacle.
7. State and local jurisdictions should adopt clear and uniform rules on the use of, and the counting of, provisional ballots, and distribute them for public comment well in advance of each election day.
8. The Democratic Party should monitor the purging and updating of registered voter lists by local officials, and the Party should challenge, and ask state Attorneys General to challenge, unlawful purges and other improper list maintenance practices.
9. States should not adopt requirements that voters show identification at the polls, beyond those already required by federal law (requiring that identification be shown only by first time voters who did not show identification when registering.)
10. State Attorneys General and local authorities should vigorously enforce, to the full extent permitted by state law, a voter's right to vote without showing identification.
11. Jurisdictions should be encouraged to use precinct-tabulated optical scan systems with a computer assisted device at each precinct, in preference to touchscreen ("direct recording equipment" or "DRE") machines.
12. Touchscreen (DRE) machines should not be used until a reliable voter verifiable audit feature can be uniformly incorporated into these systems. In the event of a recount, the paper or other auditable record should be considered the official record.
13. Remaining punchcard systems should be discontinued.
14. States should ask state Attorneys General to challenge unfair or discriminatory distribution of equipment and resources where necessary, and the Democratic Party should bring litigation as necessary.
15. Voting equipment vendors should be required to disclose their source code so that it can be examined by third parties. No voting machine should have wireless connections or be able to connect to the Internet.
16. Any equipment used by voters to vote or by officials to tabulate the votes should be used
exclusively for that purpose. That is particularly important for tabulating/aggregating computers.
17. States should adopt “no excuse required” standards for absentee voting.
18. States should make it easier for college students to vote in the jurisdiction in which their school is located.
19. States should develop procedures to ensure that voting is facilitated, without compromising security or privacy, for all eligible voters living overseas.
20. States should make voter suppression a criminal offense at the state level, in all states.
21. States should improve the training of pollworkers.
22. States should expend significantly more resources in educating voters on where, when and how to vote.
23. Partisan officials who volunteer to work for a candidate should not oversee or administer any elections.

Interview with John Ravitz, Executive Director, New York City Board of Elections
February 16, 2006

Process
If there is an allegation of fraud or intimidation, the commissioners can rule to act on it. For example, in 2004 there were allegations in Queens that people had registered to vote using the addresses of warehouses and stores. The Board sent out teams of investigators to look into this. The Board then developed a challenge list that was to be used at the polls if any of the suspect voters showed up to vote.

If the allegation rises to a criminal level, the Board will refer it to the county district attorney. If a poll worker or election official is involved, the Board may conduct an internal investigation. That individual would be interviewed, and if there is validity to the claim, the Board would take action.

Incidences of Fraud and Intimidation
Mr. Ravitz says there have been no complaints about voter intimidation since he has been at the Board. There have been instances of over-aggressive poll workers, but nothing threatening. Voter fraud has also generally not been a problem.

In 2004, the problem was monitors from the Department of Justice intimidating voters. They were not properly trained, and were doing things like going into the booth with voters. The Board had to contact their Department supervisors to put a stop to it.

Charges regarding “ballot security teams” have generally just been political posturing.

The problem of people entering false information on voter registration forms is a problem. However, sometimes a name people allege is false actually turns out to be the voter’s real name. Moreover, these types of acts do not involve anyone actually casting a fraudulent ballot.
With respect to the issue of voters being registered in both New York and Florida, the Board now compares its list with that of Florida and other places to address the problem. This will be less of an issue with the use of statewide voter registration databases, as information becomes easier to share. Despite the number of people who were on the voter registration lists of both jurisdictions, there was no one from those lists who voted twice.

Most of the problems at the polls have to do with poll workers not doing what they are supposed to do, not any sort of malfeasance. This indicates that improved training is the most important measure we can take.

There have been instances in which poll workers ask voters for identification when they shouldn’t. However, the poll workers seem to do it when they cannot understand the name when the voter tells it to them. The Board has tried to train them that no matter what, the poll worker cannot ask for identification in order to get the person’s name.

Absentee ballot fraud has also not been a problem in New York City. This is likely because absentee ballots are counted last – eight days after election day. This is so that they can be checked thoroughly and verified. This is a practice other jurisdictions might consider.

New York City has not had a problem with ex-felons voting or with ex-felons not knowing their voting rights. The City has not had any problems in recent years with deceptive practices, such as flyers providing misinformation about voting procedures.

**Recommendations**
- Better poll worker training
- Thorough inspection of absentee ballots subsequent to the election

**Interview with John Tanner, Director, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice**

February 24, 2006

Note: Mr. Tanner’s reluctance to share data, information and his perspective on solving the problems presented an obstacle to conducting the type of interview that would help inform this project as much as we would have hoped. Mr. Tanner would not give us any information about or data from the section’s election complaint in-take phone logs; data or even general information from the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system-its formal process for tracking and managing work activities in pursuing complaints and potential violations of the voting laws; and would give us only a selected few samples of attorney-observer reports, reports that every Voting Section attorney who is observing elections at poll sites on Election Day is required to submit. He would not discuss in any manner any current investigations or cases the section is involved in. He also did not believe it was his position to offer us recommendations as to how his office, elections, or the voting process might be improved.

**Authority and Process**
The Voting Section, in contrast to the Public Integrity section as Craig Donsanto described it, typically looks only at systemic problems, not problems caused by individuals. Indeed, the section never goes after individuals because it does not have the statutory authority to do so.
situations in which individuals are causing problems at the polls and interfering with voting rights, the section calls the local election officials to resolve it.

Federal voting laws only apply to state action, so the section only sues local governments – it does not have any enforcement power over individuals. Most often, the section enters into consent agreements with governments that focus on poll worker training, takes steps to restructure how polls are run, and deals with problems on Election Day on the spot. Doing it this way has been most effective – for example, while the section used to have the most observers in the South, systematic changes forced upon those jurisdictions have made it so now the section does not get complaints from the South.

The section can get involved even where there is no federal candidate on the ballot if there is a racial issue under the 14th and 15th Amendments.

When the section receives a complaint, attorneys first determine whether it is a matter of individuals or systemic. When deciding what to do with the complaint, the section errs on the side of referring it criminally because they do not want civil litigation to complicate a possible criminal case.

When a complaint comes in, the attorneys ask questions to see if there are even problems there that the complainant is not aware are violations of the law. For example, in the Boston case, the attorney did not just look at Spanish language cases under section 203, but also brought a Section 2 case for violations regarding Chinese and Vietnamese voters. When looking into a case, the attorneys look for specificity, witnesses and supporting evidence.

Often, lawsuits bring voluntary compliance.

Voter Intimidation

Many instances of what some people refer to as voter intimidation are more unclear now. For example, photographing voters at the polls has been called intimidating, but now everyone is at the polls with a camera. It is hard to know when something is intimidation and it is difficult to show that it was an act of intimidation.

The fact that both parties are engaging in these tactics now makes it more complicated. It makes it difficult to point the finger at any one side.

The inappropriate use of challengers on the basis of race would be a violation of the law. Mr. Tanner was unaware that such allegations were made in Ohio in 2004. He said there had never been an investigation into the abusive use of challengers.

Mr. Tanner said a lot of the challenges are legitimate because you have a lot of voter registration fraud as a result of groups paying people to register voters by the form. They turn in bogus registration forms. Then the parties examine the registration forms and challenge them because 200 of them, for example, have addresses of a vacant lot.
However, Mr. Tanner said the Department was able to informally intervene in challenger situations in Florida, Atkinson County, Georgia and in Alabama, as was referenced in a February 23 Op-Ed in USA Today. Mr. Tanner reiterated the section takes racial targeting very seriously.

Refusal to provide provisional ballots would be a violation of the law that the section would investigate.

Deceptive practices are committed by individuals and would be a matter for the Public Integrity Section. Local government would have to be involved for the voting section to become involved.

Unequal implementation of ID rules, or asking minority voters only for ID would be something the section would go after. Mr. Tanner was unaware of allegations of this in 2004. He said this is usually a problem where you have language minorities and the poll workers cannot understand the voters when they say their names. The section has never formally investigated or solely focused a case based on abuse of ID provisions. However, implementation of ID rules was part of the Section 2 case in San Diego. Mr. Tanner reiterated that the section is doing more than ever before.

When asked about the section’s references to incidents of vote fraud in the documents related to the new state photo identification requirements, Mr. Tanner said the section only looks at retrogression, not at the wisdom of what a legislature does. In Georgia, for example, everyone statistically has identification, and more blacks have ID than whites. With respect to the letter to Senator Kit Bond regarding voter ID, the section did refer to the perception of concern about dead voters because of reporting by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution. It is understandable that when you have thousands of bogus registrations that there would be concerns about polling place fraud. Very close elections make this even more of an understandable concern. Putting control of registration lists in the hands of the states will be helpful because at this higher level of government you find a higher level of professionalism.

It is hard to know how much vote suppression and intimidation is taking place because it depends on one’s definition of the terms – they are used very loosely by some people. However, the enforcement of federal law over the years has made an astounding difference so that the level of discrimination has plummeted. Registration of minorities has soared, as can be seen on the section’s website. Mr. Tanner was unsure if the same was true with respect to turnout, but the gap is less. That information is not on the section’s website.

The section is not filing as many Section 2 cases as compared to Section 203 cases because many of the jurisdictions sued under Section 2 in the past do not have issues anymore. Mr. Tanner said that race based problems are rare now.

NVRA has been effective in opening up the registration process. In terms of enforcement, Mr. Tanner said they do what they can when they have credible allegations. There is a big gap between complaints and what can be substantiated. Mr. Tanner stated that given the high quality of the attorneys now in the section, if they do not investigate it or bring action, that act complained of did not happen.
EAC SUMMARY OF EXPERT INTERVIEWS FOR
VOTING FRAUD-VOTER INTIMIDATION RESEARCH

Recommendations
Mr. Tanner did not feel it was appropriate to make recommendations.

Interview with Kevin Kennedy, State Elections Director, State of Wisconsin

April 11, 2006

Background

Kennedy is a nonpartisan, appointed official. He has been in this position since 1983.

Complaints of fraud and intimidation do not usually come to Kennedy’s office. Kennedy says that complainants usually take their allegations to the media first because they are trying to make a political point.

2004 Election Incidents of Fraud

The investigations into the 2004 election uncovered some cases of double voting and voting by felons who did not know they were not eligible to vote, but found no concerted effort to commit fraud. There have been a couple of guilty pleas as a result, although not a number in the double digits. The task force and news reports initially referred to 100 cases of double voting and 200 cases of felon voting, but there were not nearly that many prosecutions. Further investigation since the task force investigation uncovered that in some instances there were mis-marks by poll workers, fathers and sons mistaken for the same voter, and even a husband and wife marked as the same voter. The double votes that are believed to have occurred were a mixture of absentee and polling place votes. It is unclear how many of these cases were instances of voting in two different locations.

In discussing the case from 2000 in which a student claimed – falsely – that he had voted several times, Kennedy said that double voting can be done. The deterrent is that it’s a felony, and that one person voting twice is not an effective way to influence an election. One would need to get a lot of people involved for it to work.

The task force set up to investigate the 2004 election found a small number of illegal votes but given the 7,000 alleged, it was a relatively small number. There was no pattern of fraud.

The one case Kennedy could recall of an organized effort to commit fraud was in the spring of 2003 or 2004. A community service agency had voters request that absentee ballots be sent to the agency instead of to the voters and some of those ballots were signed without the voters’ knowledge. One person was convicted, the leader of the enterprise.

In Milwaukee, the main contention was that there were more ballots than voters. However, it was found that the 7,000 vote disparity was tied to poll worker error. The task force found that there was no concerted effort involved. Kennedy explained that there are many ways a ballot
can get into a machine without a voter getting a number. These include a poll worker forgetting to give the voter one; someone does Election Day registration and fills out a registration form but does not get a number because the transaction all takes place at one table; and in Milwaukee, 20,000 voters who registered were not put on the list in time and as a short term solution the department sent the original registration forms to the polling places to be used instead of the list to provide proof of registration. This added another element of confusion that might have led to someone not getting a voter number.

The Republican Party used this original list and contracted with a private vendor to do a comparison with the U.S. postal list. They found initially that there were 5,000 bad addresses, and then later said there were 35,000 illegitimate addresses. When the party filed a complaint, the department told them they could force the voters on their list to cast a challenge ballot. On Election Day, the party used the list but found no actually voting from those addresses. Kennedy suspects that the private vendor made significant errors when doing the comparison.

In terms of noncitizen voting, Kennedy said that there is a Russian community in Milwaukee that the Republican Party singles out every year but it doesn’t go very far. Kennedy has not seen much in the way of allegations of noncitizen voting.

However, when applying for a drivers license, a noncitizen could register to vote. There is no process for checking citizenship at this point, and the statewide registration database will not address this. Kennedy is not aware of any cases of noncitizen voting as a result, but it might have happened.

Kennedy said that the biggest concern seemed to be suspicions raised when groups of people are brought into the polling site from group homes, usually homes for the disabled. There are allegations that these voters are being told how to vote.

Incidents of Voter Intimidation

In 2004, there was a lot of hype about challenges, but in Wisconsin, a challenger must articulate a basis under oath. This acts as a deterrent, but at the same time it creates the potential that someone might challenge everyone and create long lines, keeping people from voting. In 2004, the Republican Party could use its list of suspect addresses as a legitimate basis for challenges, so there is the potential for abuse. It is also hard to train poll workers on that process. In 2004, there were isolated cases of problems with challengers.

In 2002, a flyer was circulated only in Milwaukee claiming that you had vote by noon. This was taken as an intimidation tactic by the Democrats.

Reforms

Wisconsin has had difficulty with its database because 1) they have had a hard time getting a good product out of the vendor and 2) until now there was no registration record for one-quarter of the voters. Any jurisdiction with fewer than 5000 voters was not required to have a registration list.
In any case, once these performance issues are worked out, Kennedy does believe the statewide voter registration database will be very valuable. In particular, it will mean that people who move will not be on more than one list anymore. It should also address the double voting issue by identifying who is doing it, catching people who do it, and identifying where it could occur.

Recommendations

Better trained poll workers
Ensure good security procedures for the tabulation process and more transparency in the vote counting process
Conduct post-election audits

Interview with Lori Minnite, Barnard College

February 22, 2006

Background

Ms. Minnite is an assistant professor of political science at Barnard College. She has done substantial research on voter fraud and wrote the report “Securing the Vote.” Ms. Minnite also did work related to an election lawsuit. The main question that she was asked to address in the lawsuit was---did election-day registration increase the possibility of fraud?

Securing the Vote

In Securing the Vote, Ms. Minnite found very little evidence of voter fraud because the historical conditions giving rise to fraud have weakened over the past twenty years. She stated that for fraud to take root a conspiracy was needed with a strong local political party and a complicit voter administration system. Since parties have weakened and there has been much improvement in the administration of elections and voting technology, the conditions no longer exist for large scale incidents of polling place fraud.

Ms. Minnite concentrates on fraud committed by voters not fraud committed by voting officials. She has looked at this issue on the national level and also concentrated on analyzing certain specific states. Ms. Minnite stressed that it is important to keep clear who the perpetrators of the fraud are and where the fraud occurs because that effects what the remedy should be. Often, voters are punished for fraud committed by voting officials.

Other Fraud Issues

Ms. Minnite found no evidence that NVRA was leading to more voter fraud. She supports non-partisan election administration. Ms. Minnite has found evidence that there is absentee ballot fraud. She can’t establish that there is a certain amount of absentee ballot fraud or that it is the major kind of voter fraud.
EAC SUMMARY OF EXPERT INTERVIEWS FOR VOTING FRAUD-VOTER INTIMIDATION RESEARCH

Recommendations

Assure there are accurate voter records and centralize voter databases

Reduce partisanship in electoral administration.

Interview with Nina Perales, Counsel, Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund

March 7, 2006

Background

Ms. Perales is an attorney with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund (MALDEF). MALDEF’s mission is to foster sound public policies, laws and programs to safeguard the civil rights of the 40 million Latinos living in the United States and to empower the Latino community to fully participate in our society. One of the areas MALDEF works in is electoral issues, predominately centered on the Voting Rights Act. Ms. Perales did not seem to have a sense of the overall electoral issues in her working region (the southwest) effecting Hispanic voters and did not seem to want to offer her individual experiences and work activities as necessarily a perfect reflection of the challenges Hispanic voters face.

Largest Election Problems Since 2000

Santa Anna County, New Mexico-2004-intimidated voters by video taping them.

San Antonio-One African American voter subjected to a racial slur.

San Antonio-Relocated polling places at the last minute without Section 5 pre-clearance.

San Antonio-Closed polls while voters were still in line.

San Antonio-2003-only left open early voting polls in predominantly white districts.

San Antonio-2005-racially contested mayoral run-off election switched from touch screen voting to paper ballots.

Voter Fraud and Intimidation

In Texas, the counties are refusing to open their records with respect to Section 203 compliance (bilingual voting assistance), and those that did respond to MALDEF’s request submitted incomplete information. Ms. Perales believes this in itself is a form of voter intimidation.

Ms. Perales said it is hard to say if the obstacles minorities confront in voting are a result of intentional acts or not because the county commission is totally incompetent. There have
continuously been problems with too few ballots, causing long lines, especially in places that had historically lower turnout. There is no formula in Texas for allocating ballots – each county makes these determinations.

When there is not enough language assistance at the polls, forcing a non-English speaker to rely on a family member to vote, that can suppress voter turnout.

Ms. Perales is not aware of deceptive practices or dirty tricks targeted at the Latino community.

There have been no allegations of illegal noncitizen voting in Texas. Indeed, the sponsor of a bill that would require proof of citizenship to vote could not provide any documentation of noncitizen voting in support of the bill. The bill was defeated in part because of the racist comments of the sponsor. In Arizona, such a measure was passed. Ms. Perales was only aware of one case of noncitizen voting in Arizona, involving a man of limited mental capacity who said he was told he was allowed to register and vote. Ms. Perales believes proof of citizenship requirements discriminate against Latinos.

Recommendations

Ms. Perales feels the laws are adequate, but that her organization does not have enough staff to do the monitoring necessary. This could be done by the federal government. However, even though the Department of Justice is focusing on Section 203 cases now, they have not even begun to scratch the surface. Moreover, the choices DOJ has made with respect to where they have brought claims do not seem to be based on any systematic analysis of where the biggest problems are. This may be because the administration is so ideological and partisan.

Ms. Perales does not believe making election administration nonpartisan would have a big impact. In Texas, administrators are appointed in a nonpartisan manner, but they still do not always have a nonpartisan approach. Each administrator tends to promote his or her personal view regardless of party.

Interview with Pat Rogers, private attorney

March 3, 2006

Background

In addition to his legal practice with Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris & Sisk, Rogers also does some state-level lobbying for Verizon Wireless, GM, Dumont and other companies. His experience in election law goes back to 1988, where his first elections case was a defense against Bill Richardson, who had sued to get another candidate tossed off a ballot because of petition fraud. Since 1988, he has been involved in election cases at least once every two years.

2004 Litigation
In a case that ended before the New Mexico Supreme Court, Rogers represented the Green Party and other plaintiffs against the New Mexico Secretary of State for sending a directive telling local boards not to require ID for first time voters registering by mail. He argued that this watered-down ID check conflicted with what seemed fairly clear statutory requirements for first time voters. In 2004 these requirements were especially important due to the large presence of 3rd party organizations registering voters such as a 527 funded by Governor Richardson, ACORN, and others.

Plaintiffs were seeking a temporary restraining order requiring Secretary of State to follow the law. Yet the Supreme Court ultimately decided that, whether the directive was right or wrong, it was too late to require ID lest Bush v. Gore issues be raised.

Today, the issue is moot as the state legislature has changed the law, and the Secretary of State will no longer be in office. It seems unlikely they will send any policy directives to county clerks lest they violate due process/public notice.

Major issues in NM w/ regard to vote fraud

Registration fraud seems to be the major issue, and while the legislature has taken some steps, Rogers is skeptical of the effect they will have, considering the history of unequal application of election laws. He also believes there are holes in the 3rd party registration requirement deadlines.

Rogers views a national law requiring ID as the best solution to registration problems. Rather than imposing a burden he contends it will enhance public confidence in the simplest way possible.

Registration Fraud in 2004 election

It came to light that ACORN had registered a 13 year old. The father was an APD officer and received the confirmation, but it was sent to the next door address, a vacant house. They traced this to an ACORN employee and it was established that this employee had been registering others under 18.

Two weeks later, in a crack cocaine bust of Cuban nationals, one of those raided said his job was registering voters for ACORN, and the police found signatures in his possession for fictitious persons.

In a suspicious break-in at an entity that advertised itself as nonpartisan, only GOP registrations were stolen.

In another instance, a college student was allegedly fired for registering too many Republicans.

Rogers said he believed these workers were paid by the registration rather than hourly.

There have been no prosecution or convictions related to these incidents. In fact, there have been no prosecutions for election fraud in New Mexico in recent history. However, Rogers is
skeptical that much action can be expected considering the positions of Attorney General, Governor, and Secretary of State are all held by Democrats. Nor has there been any interest from the U.S. attorney—Rogers heard that U.S. attorneys were given instruction to hold off until after the election in 2004 because it would seem too political.

As part of the case against the Secretary of State regarding the identification requirement, the parties also sued ACORN. At a hearing, the head of ACORN, and others aligned with the Democratic Party called as witnesses, took the 5th on the stand as to their registration practices.

Other incidents

Very recently, there have been reports of vote buying in the town of Espanola. Originally reported by the *Rio Grande Sun*, a resident of a low-income housing project is quoted as saying it has been going on for 10-12 years. The *Albuquerque Journal* is now reporting this as well. So far the investigation has been extremely limited.

In 1996, there were some prosecutions in Espanola, where a state district judge found registration fraud.

In 1991, the chair of Democratic Party of Bertolino County was convicted on fraud. Yet she was pardoned by Clinton on same day as Marc Rich.

Intimidation/Suppression

Rogers believes the most notable example of intimidation in the 2004 election was the discovery of a DNC Handbook from Colorado advising Democratic operatives to widely report intimidation regardless of confirmation in order to gain media attention.

In-person polling place fraud

There have only been isolated instances of people reporting that someone had voted in their name, and Rogers doesn’t believe there is any large scale conspiracy. Yet he contends that perspective misses the larger point of voter confidence. Although there has been a large public outcry for voter ID in New Mexico, it has been deflected and avoided by Democrats.

In 2004, there were more Democratic lawyers at the polls than there are lawyers in New Mexico. Rogers believes these lawyers had a positive impact because they deterred people from committing bad acts.

Counting Procedures

The Secretary of State has also taken the position that canvassing of the vote should be done in private. In NM, they have a ‘county canvas’ where they review and certify, after which all materials—machine tapes, etc.,—are centralized with the Secretary of State who does a final canvass for final certification. Conducting this in private is a serious issue, especially considering the margin in the 2000 presidential vote in New Mexico was only 366 votes. They wouldn’t be
changing machine numbers, but paper numbers are vulnerable.

On a related note, NM has adopted state procedures that will ensure their reports are slower and very late, considering the 2000 late discovery of ballots. In a close race, potential for fraud and mischief goes up astronomically in the period between poll closing and reporting. Rogers believes these changes are going to cause national embarrassment in the future.

Rogers attributes other harmful effects to what he terms the Secretary of State's incompetence and inability to discern a nonpartisan application of the law. In the 2004 election, no standards were issued for counting provisional ballots. Furthermore, the Secretary of State spent over $1 million of HAVA money for 'voter education' in blatant self-promotional ads.

Recommendations

Rogers believes it would be unfeasible to have nonpartisan election administration and favors transparency instead. To make sure people have confidence in the election, there must be transparency in the whole process. Then you don't have the 1960 vote coming down to Illinois, or the Espanola ballot or Dona Anna County (ballots found there in the 2000 election). HAVA funds should also be restricted when you have an incompetent, partisan Secretary of State.

There should be national standards for reporting voting results so there is less opportunity for fraud in a close race. Although he is not generally an advocate of national laws, he does agree there should be more national uniformity into how votes are counted and recorded.

Interview with Rebecca Vigil-Giron, Secretary of State, New Mexico

March 24, 2006

Background

Vigil-Giron has been Secretary of State for twelve years and was the President of the National Association of Secretaries of State in 2004. Complaints of election fraud and intimidation are filed with the SOS office. She then decides whether to refer it to the local district attorney or the attorney general. Because the complaints are few and far between, the office does not keep a log of complaints; however, they do have all of the written complaints on file in the office.

Incidents of Fraud and Intimidation

During the 2004 election, there were a couple of complaints of polling place observers telling people outside the polling place who had just voted, and then the people outside were following the voters to their cars and videotaping them. This happened in areas that are mostly second and third generation Latinos. The Secretary sent out the sheriff in one instance of this. The perpetrators moved to a different polling place. This was the only incident of fraud or intimidation Vigil-Giron was aware of in New Mexico.
There have not been many problems on Native reservations because, unlike in many other states, in New Mexico the polling place is on the reservation and is run by local Native Americans. Vigil-Giron said that it does not make sense to have non-Natives running those polls because it is necessary to have people there who can translate. Because most of the languages are unwritten, the HAVA requirement of accessibility through an audio device will be very helpful in this regard. Vigil-Giron said she was surprised to learn while testifying at the Voting Rights Act commission hearings of the lack of sensitivity to these issues and the common failure to provide assistance in language minority areas.

In 2004 the U.S. Attorney, a Republican, suddenly announced he was launching an investigation into voter fraud without consulting the Secretary of State’s office. After all of that, there was maybe one prosecution. Even the allegations involving third party groups and voter registration are often misleading. People doing voter registration drives encourage voters to register if they are unsure if they are already registered, and the voter does not even realize that his or her name will then appear on the voter list twice. The bigger problem is where registrations do not get forwarded to election administrators and the voter does not end up on the voting list on Election Day. This is voter intimidation in itself, Vigil-Giron believes. It is very discouraging for that voter and she wonders whether he or she will try again.

Under the bill passed in 2004, third parties are required to turn around voter registration forms very quickly between the time they get them and when they must be returned. If they fail to return them within 48 hours of getting them, they are penalized. This, Vigil-Giron believes, is unfair. She has tried to get the Legislature to look at this issue again.

Regarding allegations of vote buying in Espanola, Vigil-Giron said that the Attorney General is investigating. The problem in that area of New Mexico is that they are still using rural routes, so they have not been able to properly district. There has, as a result, been manipulation of where people vote. Now they seem to have pushed the envelope too far on this. The investigation is not just about vote buying, however. There have also been allegations of voters being denied translators as well as assistance at the polls.

Vigil-Giron believes there was voter suppression in Ohio in 2004. County officials knew thirty days out how many people had registered to vote, they knew how many voters there would be. Administrators are supposed to use a formula for allocation of voting machines based on registered voters. Administrators in Ohio ignored this. As a result, people were turned away at the polls or left because of the huge lines. This, she believes, was a case of intentional vote suppression.

A few years ago, Vigil-Giron heard that there may have been people voting in New Mexico and a bordering town in Colorado. She exchanged information with Colorado administrators and it turned out that there were no cases of double voting.

**Recommendations**

Vigil-Giron believes that linking voter registration databases across states may be a way to see if people who are registered twice are in fact voting twice.
The key to improving the process is better trained poll workers, who are certified, and know what to look for on Election Day. These poll workers should then work with law enforcement to ensure there are no transgressions.

There should be stronger teeth in the voter fraud laws. For example, it should be more than a fourth degree felony, as is currently the case.

Interview with Sarah Bell Johnson

April 19, 2006

Procedures for Handling Fraud

Fraud complaints are directed first to the state Board of Elections. Unlike boards in other states, Kentucky's has no investigative powers. Instead, they work closely with both the Attorney General and the U.S. Attorney. Especially since the current administration took office, they have found the U.S. Attorney an excellent partner in pursuing fraud cases, and have seen many prosecutions in the last six years. She believes that there has been no increase in the incidence of fraud, but rather the increase in prosecutions is related to increased scrutiny and more resources.

Major Types of Fraud and Intimidation

Johnson says that vote buying and voter intimidation go hand in hand in Kentucky. While historically fraud activity focused on election day, in the last 20 years it has moved into absentee voting. In part, this is because new voting machines aren't easy to manipulate in the way that paper ballots were open to manipulation in the past, especially in distant rural counties. For this reason, she is troubled by the proliferation of states with early voting, but notes that there is a difference between absentee ballot and early voting on machines, which is far more difficult to manipulate.

Among the cases of absentee ballot fraud they have seen, common practice involves a group of candidates conspiring together to elect their specific slate. Nursing homes are an especially frequent target. Elderly residents request absentee ballots, and then workers show up and 'help' them vote their ballots. Though there have been some cases in the Eastern district of election day fraud, most have been absentee.

Johnson argues that it is hard to distinguish between intimidation and vote buying. They have also seen instances where civic groups and church groups intimidate members to vote in a specific manner, not for reward, but under threat of being ostracized or even telling them they will go to hell.

While she is aware of allegations of intimidation by the parties regarding minority precincts in Louisville, the board hasn't received calls about it and there haven't been any prosecutions.
Challengers

Challengers are permitted at the polls in Kentucky. Each party is allowed two per location, and they must file proper paperwork. There is a set list of defined reasons for which they can challenge a voter, such as residency, and the challengers must also fill out paperwork to conduct a challenge.

As for allegations of challengers engaging in intimidation in minority districts, Johnson notes that challengers did indeed register in Jefferson County, and filed the proper paperwork, although they ultimately did not show up on election day.

She finds that relatively few challengers end up being officially registered, and that the practice has grown less common in recent years. This is due more to a change of fashion than anything. And after all, those wishing to affect election outcomes have little need for challengers in the precinct when they can target absentee voting instead.

In the event that intimidation is taking place, Kentucky has provisions to remove disruptive challengers, but this hasn’t been used to her knowledge.

Prosecutions

Election fraud prosecutions in Kentucky have only involved vote buying. This may be because that it is easier to investigate, by virtue of a cash and paper trail which investigators can follow. It is difficult to quantify any average numbers about the practice from this, due in part to the five year statute of limitations on vote buying charges. However, she does not believe that vote-buying is pervasive across the state, but rather confined to certain pockets.

Vote-hauling Legislation

Vote hauling is a common form of vote buying by another name. Individuals are legally paid to drive others to the polls, and then divide that cash in order to purchase votes. Prosecutions have confirmed that vote hauling is used for this purpose. While the Secretary of State has been committed to legislation which would ban the practice, it has failed to pass in the past two sessions.

Paying Voter Registration Workers Legislation

A law forbidding people to pay workers by the voter registration card or for obtaining cards with registrations for a specific party was passed this session. Individuals working as part of a registration campaign may still be paid by hour. Kentucky’s experience in the last presidential election illustrates the problems arising from paying individuals by the card. That contest included a constitutional amendment to ban gay marriage on the ballot, which naturally attracted the attention of many national groups. One group paying people by the card resulted in the registrar being inundated with cards, including many duplicates in the same bundle, variants on names, and variants on addresses. As this practice threatens to overwhelm the voter registration process, Kentucky views it as constituting malicious fraud.
Deceptive practices

Other than general reports in the news, Johnson hasn’t received any separate confirmation or reports of deceptive practices, i.e., false and misleading information being distributed to confuse voters.

Effect of Kentucky’s Database

Johnson believes Kentucky’s widely praised voter registration database is a key reason why the state doesn’t have as much fraud as it might, especially the types alleged elsewhere like double and felon voting. While no database is going to be perfect, the connections with other state databases such as the DMV and vital statistics have been invaluable in allowing them to aggressively purge dead weight and create a cleaner list. When parties use their database list they are notably more successful. Johnson wonders how other states are able to conduct elections without a similar system.

Some factors have made especially important to their success. When the database was instituted in 1973, they were able to make everyone in the state re-register and thus start with a clean database. However, it is unlikely any state could get away with this today.

She is also a big supporter of a full Social Security number standard, as practiced in Kentucky. The full Social Security, which is compared to date of birth and letters in the first and last name, automatically makes matching far more accurate. The huge benefits Kentucky has reaped make Johnson skeptical of privacy concerns arguing for an abbreviated Social Security number. Individuals are willing to submit their Social Security number for many lesser purposes, so why not voting? And in any event, they don’t require a Social Security number to register (unlike others such as Georgia). Less than a percent of voters in Kentucky are registered under unique identifiers, which the Board of Elections then works to fill in the number through cross referencing with the DMV.

Recommendations

Johnson believes the backbone of effective elections administration must be standardized procedures, strong record keeping, and detailed statutes. In Kentucky, all counties use the same database and the same pre election day forms. Rather than seeing that as oppressive, county officials report that the uniformity makes their jobs easier.

This philosophy extends to the provisional ballot question. While they did not have a standard in place like HAVA’s at the time of enactment, they worked quickly to put a uniform standard in place.

They have also modified forms and procedures based on feedback from prosecutors. Johnson believes a key to enforcing voting laws is working with investigators and prosecutors and ensuring that they have the information they need to mount cases.
She also believes public education is important, and that the media could do more to provide information about what is legal and what is illegal. Kentucky tries to fulfill this role by information in polling places, press releases, and high profile press conferences before elections. She notes that they deliberately use language focusing on fraud and intimidation.

Johnson is somewhat pessimistic about reducing absentee ballot fraud. Absentee ballots do have a useful function for the military and others who cannot get to the polling place, and motivated individuals will always find a way to abuse the system if possible. At a minimum, however, she recommends that absentee ballots should require an excuse. She believes this has helped reduce abuse in Kentucky, and is wary of no-excuse practices in other states.

Interview with Steve Ansolobohere and Chandler Davidson
February 17, 2006

Methodology suggestions

In analyzing instances of alleged fraud and intimidation, we should look to criminology as a model. In criminology, experts use two sources: the Uniform Crime Reports, which are all reports made to the police, and the Victimization Survey, which asks the general public whether a particular incident has happened to them. After surveying what the most common allegations are, we should conduct a survey of the general public that asks whether they have committed certain acts or been subjected to any incidents of fraud or intimidation. This would require using a very large sample, and we would need to employ the services of an expert in survey data collection. Mr. Ansolobohere recommended Jonathan Krosnick, Doug Rivers, and Paul Sniderman at Stanford; Donald Kinder and Arthur Lupia at Michigan; Edward Carmines at Indiana; and Phil Tetlock at Berkeley. In the alternative, Mr. Ansolobohere suggested that the EAC might work with the Census Bureau to have them ask different, additional questions in their Voter Population Surveys.

Mr. Chandler further suggested it is important to talk to private election lawyers, such as Randall Wood, who represented Ciro Rodriguez in his congressional election in Texas. Mr. Ansolobohere also recommended looking at experiments conducted by the British Election Commission.

Incidents of Fraud and Intimidation

Mr. Davidson’s study for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights on the Voting Rights Act documented evidence of widespread difficulty in the voting process. However, he did not attempt to quantify whether this was due to intentional, malevolent acts. In his 2005 report on ballot security programs, he found that there were many allegations of fraud made, but not very many prosecutions or convictions. He saw many cases that did go to trial and the prosecutors lost on the merits.

In terms of voter intimidation and vote suppression, Mr. Davidson said he believes the following types of activities do occur: videotaping of voters’ license plates; poll workers asking
intimidating questions; groups of officious-looking poll watchers at the poll sites who seem to be some sort of authority looking for wrongdoing; spreading of false information, such as phone calls, flyers, and radio ads that intentionally mislead as to voting procedures.

Mr. Ansolobehere believes the biggest problem is absentee ballot fraud. However, many of these cases involve people who do not realize what they are doing is illegal, for example, telling someone else how to vote. Sometimes there is real illegality occurring however. For example, vote selling involving absentee ballots, the filling out of absentee ballots en masse, people at nursing homes filling out the ballots of residents, and there are stories about union leaders getting members to vote a certain way by absentee ballot. This problem will only get bigger as more states liberalize their absentee ballot rules. Mr. Chandler agreed that absentee ballot fraud was a major problem.

Recommendations

Go back to “for cause” absentee ballot rules, because it is truly impossible to ever ensure the security of a mail ballot. Even in Oregon, there was a study showing fraud in their vote by mail system.

False information campaigns should be combated with greater voter education. Los Angeles County’s voter education program should be used as a model.

Interview with Tracy Campbell, author

March 3, 2006

Background

Campbell’s first book on election fraud looked at Ed Pritchard, a New Deal figure who went to jail for stuffing ballot boxes. While his initial goal in writing that book was to find out why Pritchard had engaged in vote stealing, his growing understanding of a pervasive culture of electoral corruption led him to consider instead how it was that Pritchard was ever caught. In 1998, he started working on a book regarding fraud in Kentucky, which quickly became a national study. He hoped to convey the ‘real politics’ which he feels readers, not to mention academics, have little sense about. While less blatant than in previous eras, fraud certainly still occurs, and he mentions some examples in his book. The major trend of the past 60-70 years has been that these tactics have grown more subtle.

While he hasn’t conducted any scientific study of the current state of fraud, his sense as a historian is that it is seems naive, after generations of watching the same patterns and practices influence elections, to view suspect election results today as merely attributable to simple error.

Vote-buying and absentee fraud
Campbell sees fraud by absentee ballot and vote buying as the greatest threats to fair elections today. He says vote fraud is like real estate: location, location, location—the closer you can keep the ballots to the courthouse the better. Absentee ballots create a much easier target for vote brokers who can manage voting away from the polling place, or even mark a ballot directly, in exchange for, say, $50—or even more if an individual can bring their entire family. He has noted some small counties where absentee ballots outnumber in-person ballots.

However, few people engaged in this activity would call it 'purchasing' a vote. Instead, it is candidate Jones' way of 'thanking' you for a vote you would have cast in any event. The issue is what happens if candidate Smith offers you more. Likewise, the politicians who engage in vote fraud don't see it as a threat to the republic but rather as a game they have to play in order to get elected.

Regional patterns

Campbell suggests such practices are more prevalent in the South than the Northern states, and even more so compared to the West. The South has long been characterized as particularly dangerous in intimidation and suppression practices—throughout history, one can find routine stories of deaths at the polls each year. While he maintains that fraud seems less likely in the Western states, he sees the explosion of mail in and absentee ballots there as asking for trouble.

Poll site closings as a means to suppress votes

Campbell points to a long historical record of moving poll sites in order to suppress votes. Polling places in the 1800s were frequently set-up on rail cars and moved further down the line to suppress black votes.

He would include door-to-door canvassing practices here, as well as voting in homes, which was in use in Kentucky until only a few years ago. All of these practices have been justified as making polling places 'more accessible' while their real purpose has been to suppress votes.

Purge lists

Purge lists are, of course, needed in theory, yet Campbell believes the authority to mark names off the voter rolls presents extensive opportunity for abuse. For this reason, purging must be done in a manner that uses the best databases, and looks at only the most relevant information. When voters discover their names aren’t on the list when they go to vote, for example, because they are “dead,” it has a considerable demoralizing effect. Wrongful purging takes place both because of incompetence and as a tool to intentionally disenfranchise.

Campbell believes transparency is the real issue here. An hour after the polls close, we tend to just throw up our hands and look the other way, denying voters the chance to see that discrepancies are being rectified. He believes the cost in not immediately knowing election outcomes is a small price to pay for getting results rights and showing the public a transparent process.
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Deceptive practices

Today's deceptive practices have are solidly rooted in Reconstruction-era practices—i.e. phony ballots, the Texas 'elimination' ballot. The ability to confuse voters is a powerful tool for those looking to sway elections.

Language minorities

Campbell argues there is a fine line between offering help to non-English speakers and using that help against them. A related issue, particularly in the South, is taking advantage of the illiterate.

Current intimidation

Another tactic Campbell considers an issue today is polling place layout: the further vote suppressers can keep people away from the polls, the better. Practices such as photographing people leaving a polling place may also tie into vote-buying, where photos are used to intimidate and validate purchased votes. A good way to combat such practices is by keeping electioneering as far from the polls as possible.

Recommendations

Specific voting administration recommendations Campbell advocates would include reducing the use of absentee ballots and improving the protective zone around polling places.

Campbell would also like to see enforcement against fraud stepped up and stiffer penalties enacted, as current penalties make the risk of committing fraud relatively low. He compares the risk in election fraud similar to steroid use in professional sports—the potential value of the outcome is far higher than the risk of being caught or penalized for the infraction, so it is hard to prevent people from doing it. People need to believe they will pay a price for engaging in fraud or intimidation. Moreover, we need to have the will to kick people out of office if necessary.

He is skeptical of the feasibility of nonpartisan election administration, as he believes it would be difficult to find people who care about politics yet won't lean one way or the other—such an attempt would be unlikely to get very far before accusations of partisanship emerged. He considers the judiciary the only legitimate check on election fraud.

Interview with Wade Henderson, Executive Director, Leadership Conference for Civil Rights

February 14, 2006

Data Collection

Mr. Henderson had several recommendations as to how to better gather additional information and data on election fraud and intimidation in recent years. He suggested interviewing the
following individuals who have been actively involved in Election Protection and other similar efforts:

- Jon Greenbaum, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights
- Tanya Clay, People for the American Way
- Melanie Campbell, National Coalition for Black Political Participation
- Larry Gonzalez, National Association of Latino Election Officers
- Jacqueline Johnson, National Congress of American Indians
- Chellie Pingree, Common Cause
- Jim Dickson, disability rights advocate
- Mary Berry, former Chair of the US Commission on Civil Rights, currently at the University of Pennsylvania
- Judith Browne and Eddie Hailes, Advancement Project (former counsel to the US Commission on Civil Rights)
- Robert Rubin, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights – San Francisco Office
- Former Senator Tom Daschle (currently a fellow at The Center for American Progress)

He also recommended we review the following documents and reports:

- The 2004 litigation brought by the Advancement Project and SEIU under the 1981 New Jersey Consent Decree
- Forthcoming LCCR state-by-state report on violations of the Voting Rights Act
- Forthcoming Lawyers Committee report on violations of the Voting Rights Act (February 21)

Types of Fraud and Intimidation Occurring

Mr. Henderson said he believed that the kinds of voter intimidation and suppression tactics employed over the last five years are ones that have evolved over many years. They are sometimes racially based, sometimes based on partisan motives. He believes the following types of activity have actually occurred, and are not just a matter of anecdote and innuendo, and rise to the level of either voter intimidation or vote suppression:

- Flyers with intentional misinformation, such as ones claiming that if you do not have identification, you cannot vote, and providing false dates for the election
- Observers with cameras, which people associate with potential political retribution or even violence
- Intimidating police presence at the polls
- Especially in jurisdictions that authorize challenges, the use of challenge lists and challengers goes beyond partisanship to racial suppression and intimidation
- Unequal deployment of voting equipment, such as occurred in Ohio. Also, he has seen situations in which historically Black colleges will have one voting machine while other schools will have more.

Mr. Henderson believes that these matters are not pursued formally because often they involve activities that current law does not reach. For example, there is no law prohibiting a Secretary of State from being the head of a political campaign, and then deploying voting machines in an uneven manner. There is no way to pursue that. Also, once the election is over, civil litigation
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becomes moot. Finally, sometimes upon reflection after the campaign, some of the activities are not as sinister as believed at the time.

Mr. Henderson believes government does not engage in a sustained investigation of these matters or pursue any kind of resolution to them. LCCR has filed a FOIA request with both the Civil Rights Division and the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice to examine this issue.

Election Protection activities will be intensified for the 2006 elections, although the focus may shift somewhat given the implementation of new HAVA requirements.

Recommendations for Reform

There was tremendous concern after the 2004 election about conflicts of interest – the “Blackwell problem” – whereby a campaign chair is also in charge of the voting system. We need to get away from that.

He also supports Senator Barak Obama’s bill regarding deceptive practices, and is opposed to the voter identification laws passing many state legislatures.

- States should adopt election-day registration, in order to boost turnout as well as to allow eligible voters to immediately rectify erroneous or improperly purged registration records
- Expansion of early voting & no-excuse absentee voting, to boost turnout and reduce the strain on election-day resources.
- Provisional ballot reforms:
  - Should be counted statewide – if cast in the wrong polling place, votes should still be counted in races for which the voter was eligible to vote (governor, etc.)
  - Provisional ballots should also function as voter registration applications, to increase the likelihood that voters will be properly registered in future elections
- Voter ID requirements: states should allow voters to use signature attestation to establish their identity
- The Department of Justice should increase enforcement of Americans with Disabilities Act and the accessibility requirements of the Help America Vote Act
- Statewide registration databases should be linked to social service agency databases
- Prohibit chief state election officials from simultaneously participating in partisan electoral campaigns within their states
- Create and enforce strong penalties for deceptive or misleading voting practices

Interview with Wendy Weiser, Deputy Director, Democracy Program, The Brennan Center

Brennan Center findings on fraud

The Brennan Center’s primary work on fraud is their report for the Carter Baker Commission with commissioner Spencer Overton, written in response to the Commission’s ID
recommendations. Brennan reviewed all existing reports and election contests related to voter fraud. They believe the contests serve as an especially good record of whether or not fraud exists, as the parties involved in contested elections have a large incentive to root out fraudulent voters. Yet despite this, the incidence of voter impersonation fraud discovered is extremely low—something on the order 1/10000th of a percentage of voters. See also the brief Brennan filed on 11th circuit in Georgia photo ID case which cites sources in Carter Baker report and argues the incidence of voter fraud too low to justify countermeasures.

Among types of fraud, they found impersonation, or polling place fraud, is probably the least frequent type, although other types, such as absentee ballot fraud are also very infrequent. Weiser believes this is because impersonation fraud is more likely to be caught and is therefore not worth the risk. Unlike in an absentee situation, actual poll workers are present to disrupt impersonation fraud, for instance, by catching the same individual voting twice. She believes perhaps one half to one quarter of the time the person will be caught. Also, there is a chance the pollworker will have personal knowledge of the person. Georgia Secretary of State Cathy Cox has mentioned that there are many opportunities for discovery of in person fraud as well. For example, if one votes in the name of another voter, and that voter shows up at the polls, the fraud will be discovered.

Weiser believes court proceedings in election contests are especially useful. Some are very extensive, with hundreds of voters brought up by each side and litigated. In both pre-election challenges and post-election contests, parties have devoted extraordinary resources into 'smoking out' fraudulent voters. Justin Leavitt at Brennan scoured such proceedings for the Carter Baker report, which includes these citations. Contact him for answers to particular questions.

Countermeasures/statewide databases

Brennan has also considered what states are doing to combat impersonation fraud besides photo ID laws, although again, it seems to be the rarest kind of fraud, beyond statistically insignificant. In the brief Brennan filed in the Georgia case, the Center detailed what states are already doing to effectively address fraud. In another on the web site includes measures that can be taken that no states have adopted yet. Weiser adds that an effort to look at strategies states have to prevent fraud, state variations, effectiveness, ease of enforcement would be very useful.

Weiser believes the best defense against fraud will be better voter lists—she argues the fraud debate is actually premature because states have yet to fully implement the HAVA database requirement. This should eliminate a great deal of 'deadwood' on voter rolls and undermine the common argument that fraud is made possible by this deadwood. This was the experience for Michigan, which was able to remove 600,000 names initially, and later removed almost 1 million names from their rolls. It is fairly easy to cull deadwood from lists due to consolidation at the state level—most deadwood is due to individuals moving within the state and poor communication between jurisdictions. (Also discuss with Chris Thomas, who masterminded the Michigan database for more information and a historical perspective.)
Regarding the question of whether the effect of this maintenance on fraud in Michigan can be quantified, Weiser would caution against drawing direct lines between list problems and fraud. Brennan has found various groups abusing the existence of list deadwood to make claims about fraudulent voting. This is analyzed in greater detail in the Brennan Center’s critique of a purge list produced by the NJ Republican party, and was illustrated by the purge list produced by the state of Florida. When compiling such lists and doing comparisons, sound statistical methods must be utilized, and often are not.

The NJ GOP created a list and asked NJ election officials to purge names of ineligible voters on it. Their list assumed that people appearing on the list twice had voted twice. Brennan found their assumptions shoddy and based on incorrect statistical practices, such as treating individuals with the same name and birthdays as duplicates, although this is highly unlikely according to proper statistical methods. Simply running algorithms on voter lists creates a number of false positives, does not provide an accurate basis for purging, and should not be taken as an indicator of fraud.

Regarding the Florida purge list, faulty assumptions caused the list to systematically exclude Hispanics while overestimating African Americans. Matching protocols required that race fields match exactly, despite inconsistent fields across databases.

The kinds of list comparisons that are frequently done to allege fraud are unreliable. Moreover, even if someone is on a voter list twice, that does not mean that voter has voted twice. That, in fact, is almost never the case.

Ultimately, even matching protocols without faulty assumptions will have a 4 percent to 35 percent error rate—that’s simply the nature of database work. Private industry has been working on improving this for years. Now that HAVA has introduced a matching requirement, even greater skepticism is called for in judging the accuracy of list maintenance.

Intimidation and Suppression

Brennan does not have a specific focus here, although they do come across it and have provided assistance on bills to prevent suppression and intimidation. They happen to have an extensive paper file of intimidating fliers and related stories from before the 2004 election. (They can supply copies after this week).

Challengers

Brennan has analyzed cases where challenger laws have been beneficial and where they have been abused. See the decision and record from the 1982 NJ vs. RNC case for some of the history of these laws. Brennan is currently working on developing a model challenger law.

Weiser believes challenge laws with no requirement that the challenger have any specific basis for the challenge or showing of ineligibility are an invitation to blanket harassing challenges and have a range of pitfalls. State laws are vague and broad and often involve arcane processes such as where voters are required to meet a challenge within 5 days. There are incentives for political abuse, potential for delaying votes and disrupting the polls, and they are not necessarily directed.
toward the best result. Furthermore, when a voter receives a mailer alleging vote fraud with no basis, even the mere fact of a challenge can be chilling. A voter does not want to have to go through a quasi-court proceeding in order to vote.

Brennan recommends challenge processes that get results before election, minimize the burden for voters, and are restricted at polling place to challenges by poll workers and election officials, not voters. They believe limitless challenges can lead to pandemonium—that once the floodgates are open they won’t stop.

Recommendations

Intimidation— Weiser believes Sen. Barak Obama’s bill is a good one for combating voter harassment and deceptive practices. Many jurisdictions do not currently have laws prohibiting voter harassment and deceptive practices.

Fraud— Current state and federal codes seem sufficient for prosecuting fraud. Weiser doesn’t consider them under-enforced, and sees no need for additional laws.

Voter lists— New legislation or regulations are needed to provide clear guidance and standards for generating voter lists and purging voters, otherwise states could wrongfully disenfranchise eligible voters.

Challengers—Challenge laws need to be reformed, especially ones that allow for pre-election mass challenges with no real basis. There is no one size fits all model for challenger legislation, but some bad models involving hurdles for voters lead to abuse and should be reformed. There should be room for poll workers to challenge fraudulent voters, but not for abuse.

Also useful would be recommendations for prosecutors investigating fraudulent activity, How should they approach these cases? How should they approach cases of large scale fraud/intimidation? While there is sufficient legislative cover to get at any election fraud activity, questions remain about what proper approaches and enforcement strategies should be.

Interview with Bill Groth, Attorney for the Plaintiffs in Indiana Identification Litigation
February 22, 2006

Fraud in Indiana

Indiana has never charged or prosecuted anyone for polling place fraud. Nor has any empirical evidence of voter impersonation fraud or dead voter fraud been presented. In addition, there is no record of any credible complaint about voter impersonation fraud in Indiana. State legislators signed an affidavit that said there had never been impostor voting in Indiana. At the same time, the Indiana Supreme Court has not necessarily required evidence of voter fraud before approving legislative attempts to address fraud.
The state attorney general has conceded that there is no concrete fraud in Indiana, but has instead referred to instances of fraud in other states. Groth filed a detailed motion to strike evidence such as John Fund's book relating to other states, arguing that none of that evidence was presented to the legislature and that it should have been in the form of sworn affidavits, so that it would have some indicia of verifiability.

**Photo ID law**

By imposing restrictive ID measures, Groth contends you will discourage 1,000 times more legitimate voters than illegitimate voters you might protect against. He feels the implementation of a REAL ID requirement is an inadequate justification for the law, as it will not affect the upcoming 2006 election where thousands of registered voters will be left without proper ID. In addition, he questions whether REAL ID will be implemented as planned in 2008 considering the backlash against the law so far. He also feels ID laws are unconstitutional because of inconsistent application.

**Statewide database as remedy**

Groth believes many problems will be addressed by the statewide database required under HAVA. To the extent that the rolls in Indiana are bloated, it is because state officials have not complied with NVRA list maintenance requirements. Thus, it is somewhat disingenuous for them to use bloated voter rolls as a reason for imposing additional measures such as the photo ID law. Furthermore, the state has ceded to the counties the obligation to do maintenance programs, which results in a hit or miss process (see discussion in reply brief, p 26 through p. 28).

**Absentee fraud**

To the extent that there has been an incidence of fraud, these have all been confined to absentee balloting. Most notably the East Chicago mayoral election case where courts found absentee voting fraud had occurred. See: Pabey vs. Pastrick 816 NE 2nd 1138 Decision by the Indiana Supreme Court in 2004.

**Intimidation and vote suppression**

Groth is only aware of anecdotal evidence supporting intimidation and suppression activities. While he considers the sources of this evidence credible, it is still decidedly anecdotal. Instances he is aware of include police cars parked in front of African American polling places. However, most incidents of suppression which are discussed occurred well in the past. Trevor Davidson claims a fairly large scale intimidation program in Louisville.

**Challengers**

There was widespread information that the state Republican Party had planned a large scale challenger operation in Democratic precincts for 2004, but abandoned the plan at the last minute.
Last year the legislature made a crucial change to election laws which will allow partisan challengers to be physically inside the polling area next to members of the precinct board. Previously, challengers at the polling place have been restricted to the ‘chute,’ which provides a buffer zone between voting and people engaging in political activity. That change will make it much easier to challenge voters. As there is no recorded legislative history in Indiana, it is difficult to determine the justification behind this change. As both chambers and the governorship are under single-party control, the challenger statute was passed under the radar screen.

Photo ID and Challengers

Observers are especially concerned about how this change will work in conjunction with the photo ID provision. Under the law, there are at least two reasons why a member of the precinct board or a challenger can raise object to an ID: whether a presented ID conforms to ID standards, and whether the photo on an ID is actually a picture of the voter presenting it. The law does not require bipartisan agreement that a challenge is valid. All it takes is one challenge to raise a challenge to that voter, and that will lead to the voter voting by provisional ballot.

Provisional ballot voting means that voter must make a second trip to the election board (located at the county seat) within 13 days to produce the conforming ID or to swear out an affidavit that they are who they claim to be. This may pose a considerable burden to voters. For example, Indianapolis and Marion County are coterminous—anyone challenged under the law will be required to make second trip to seat of government in downtown Indianapolis. If the voter in question did not have a driver’s license in the first place, they will likely need to arrange transportation. Furthermore, in most cases the election result will already be known.

The law is vague about acceptable cause for challenging a voter’s ID. Some requirements for valid photo ID include being issued by state or fed gov’t, w/ expiration date, and the names must conform exactly. The League of Women Voters is concerned about voters with hyphenated names, as the Indiana DMV fails to put hyphens on driver’s licenses potentially leading to a basis for challenge. Misspelling of names would also be a problem. The other primary mode of challenge is saying the photo doesn’t look like the voter, which could be happen in a range of instances. Essentially, the law gives unbridled discretion to challengers to decide what conforms and what does not.

Furthermore, there is no way to determine whether a challenge is in good or bad faith, and there is little penalty for making a bad faith challenge. The fact that there are no checks on the challenges at the precinct level, or even a requirement of concurrence from an opposing party challenger leads to the concern that challenge process will be abused. The voter on the other hand, will need to get majority approval of county election board members to defeat the challenge.

Groth suggests the political situation in Indianapolis also presents a temptation to abuse this process, as electoral margins are growing increasingly close due to shifting political calculus.

Other cases
Groth’s other election law work has included a redistricting dispute, a dispute over ballot format, NVRA issues, and a case related to improper list purging, but nothing else related to fraud or intimidation. The purging case involved the election board attempting to refine its voter list by sending registration postcards to everyone on the list. When postcards didn’t come back they wanted to purge those voters. Groth blames this error more on incompetence, than malevolence, however, as the county board is bipartisan. (The Indiana Election Commission and the Indiana election division are both bipartisan, but the 92 county election boards which will be administering photo id are controlled by one political party or the other—they are always an odd number, with the partisan majority determined by who controls the clerk of circuit court office.)

**Recommendations**

Supports nonpartisan administration of elections. Indiana specific recommendations including a longer voting day, time off for workers to vote, and an extended registration period.

He views the central problem of the Indiana photo ID law is that the list of acceptable forms of ID is too narrow and provides no fallback to voters without ID. At the least, he believes the state needs to expand the list so that most people will have at least one. If not, they should be allowed to swear an affidavit regarding their identity, under penalty of perjury/felony prosecution. This would provide sufficient deterrence for anyone considering impersonation fraud. He believes absentee ballot fraud should be addressed by requiring those voters to produce ID as well, as under HAVA.

His personal preference would be signature comparison. Indiana has never encountered an instance of someone trying to forge a name in the poll book, and while this leaves open the prospect of dead voters, that danger will be substantially diminished by the statewide database. But if we are going to have some form of ID, he believes we should apply it to everyone and avoid disenfranchisement, provided they swear an affidavit.

**Interview with Neil Bradley, February 21, 2004**

**Voter Impersonation Cases (issue the Georgia ID litigation revolves around)**

Mr. Bradley asserted that Georgia Secretary of State Cox stated in the case at issue: that she clearly would know if there had been any instances of voter impersonation at the polls; that she works very closely with the county and local officials and she would have heard about voter impersonation from them if she did not learn about it directly; and that she said that she had not heard of “any incident”---which includes acts that did not rise to the level of an official investigation or charges.

Mr. Bradley said that it is also possible to establish if someone has impersonated another voter at the polls. Officials must check off the type of voter identification the voter used. Voters without ID may vote by affidavit ballot. One could conduct a survey of those voters to see if they in fact voted or not.
The type of voter fraud that involves impersonating someone else is very unlikely to occur. If someone wants to steal an election, it is much more effective to do so using absentee ballots. In order to change an election outcome, one must steal many votes. Therefore, one would have to have lots of people involved in the enterprise, meaning there would be many people who know you committed a felony. It's simply not an efficient way to steal an election.

Mr. Bradley is not aware of any instance of voter impersonation anywhere in the country except in local races. He does not believe it occurs in statewide elections.

**Voter fraud and intimidation in Georgia**

Georgia’s process for preventing ineligible ex-felons from casting ballots has been improved since the Secretary of State now has the power to create the felon purge list. When this was the responsibility of the counties, there were many difficulties in purging felons because local officials did not want to have to call someone and ask if he or she was a criminal.

The State Board of Elections has a docket of irregularity complaints. The most common involve an ineligible person mailing in absentee ballots on behalf of another voter.

In general, Mr. Bradley does not think voter fraud and intimidation is a huge problem in Georgia and that people have confidence in the vote. The biggest problems are the new ID law; misinformation put out by elections officials; and advertisements that remind people that vote fraud is a felony, which are really meant to be intimidating. Most fraud that does occur involves an insider, and that’s where you find the most prosecutions. Any large scale fraud involves someone who knows the system or is in the courthouse.

**Prosecution of Fraud and Intimidation**

Mr. Bradley stated that fraud and intimidation are hard to prosecute. However, Mr. Bradley made contradictory statements. When asked whether the decision to prosecute on the county level was politically motivated, he first said "no." Later, Mr. Bradley reversed himself stating the opposite.

Mr. Bradley also stated that with respect to US Attorneys, the message to them from the top is that this is not a priority. The Georgia ACLU has turned over information about violations of the Voting Rights Act that were felonies, and the US Attorney has done nothing with the information. The Department of Justice has never been very aggressive in pursuing cases of vote suppression, intimidation and fraud. But, the Georgia ACLU has not contacted Craig Donsanto in DC with information of voter fraud.

Mr. Bradley believes that voter fraud and intimidation is difficult to prove. It is very hard to collect the necessary factual evidence to make a case, and doing so is very labor-intensive.

**Recommendations**

In Georgia, the Secretary of State puts a lot of work into training local officials and poll workers,
and much of her budget is put into that work. Increased and improved training of poll workers, including training on how to respectfully treat voters, is the most important reform that could be made.

Mr. Bradley also suggested that increased election monitoring would be helpful.

**Interview with Justice Evelyn Stratton, Supreme Court of Ohio**

February 17, 2006

**The 2004 Election**

Justice Stratton stated that usually in the period right before an election filings die down due to the Ohio expedited procedures for electoral challenges. However, the 2004 election was unusual because there were motions and cases decided up to the day of the election. Justice Stratton believed that most of the allegations were knee-jerk reactions without any substance. For example, without any factual claims, suit was brought alleging that all voter challengers posed a threat to voters. Thematically, allegations were either everyday voting problems or “conspiracies” depending on where the complaint came from. The major election cases in 2004 revolved around Secretary of State Blackwell.

Justice Stratton made a point that the Ohio Supreme Court bent over backwards in the 2004 election to be fair to both sides. There was never any discussion about a ruling helping one political party more than the other.

Justice Stratton cited two cases that summarize and refute the 2004 complaints---819 NE 2d 1125 (Ohio 2004) and 105 Ohio St. 3d 458 (2004).

**General Election Fraud Issues**

Justice Stratton has seen very few fraud cases in Ohio. Most challenges are for technical statutory reasons. She remembered one instance where a man who assisted handicapped voters marked the ballot differently than the voter wanted. Criminal charges were brought against this man and the question that the Ohio Supreme Court had to decide was whether ballots could be opened and inspected to see how votes were cast.

Justice Stratton claimed she knew of isolated incidences of fictitious voter registration but these were not prosecuted. She has not seen any evidence of ballots being stuffed, dead people voting, etc.

**Suggestions for Changes in Voting Procedures**

The Ohio Supreme Court is very strict about latches---if a person sits on their rights too long, they lose the right to file suit. The Ohio expedited procedures make election challenges run very smooth. Justice Stratton does not remember any suits brought on the day of the election. She supports a non-partisan head of state elections. Justice Stratton believes that last minute
challenges should not be permitted and that lower courts need to follow the rules for the expedited procedures. Even given the anomalies with lower courts permitting late election challenges in 2004, the Ohio Supreme Court does not want to make a new rule unless this pattern repeats itself in 2008.

Interview with Tony Sirvello, Executive Director, IACREOT

April 12, 2006

Biographical

Sirvello is currently the executive director of the International Association of Clerks, Recorders, Election Officials and Treasurers, an organization of 1700 members. Formerly, he ran elections in Harris County, Texas for 29 years.

Incidents of Election Fraud

Sirvello stated that one problem with election crimes is that they are not high on the priority list of either district attorneys or grand juries. Therefore, complaints of election crime very rarely are prosecuted or are indicted by the grand jury. In 1996 in Harris County, 14 people voted twice but the grand jury refused to indict. One woman voted twice, once during early voting and once on Election Day. She said she thought there were two elections. The jury believed her. Sirvello believes none of the people intentionally voted more than once. He said that he believes double voting is not as big of an issue as people make it out to be.

In 1986, it was found that there were 300 more ballots than voter signatures. It was clear that the elections officials stuffed the ballot boxes. The case was brought before a grand jury, but there was no indictment because all of the defendants were friends and relatives of each other and none would admit what had been done.

Sirvello stated that there have been isolated circumstances where a voter would show up at the poll and his name had already been signed and he had voted.

Finally, Sirvello indicated that some people who worked in Houston but did not live in Harris County were permitted to vote.

Specific Absentee Ballot/Vote By Mail Issues

Sirvello said that mail voting presents the largest problem. With mail voting there is too much opportunity to influence voters or to fraudulently request a ballot.

If one applied for an absentee ballot, their name and address was made available to candidates and political consultants who would often send people to collect the ballot. Many did not want to give up the ballot but wanted to mail it personally. The result was to discourage voting.
In Texas, a person could only apply for an absentee ballot if over 65 years of age. Parties, candidates and consultants would get the list of voters over 65 and send them a professional mail piece telling them they could vote by mail and a ballot with everything filled out except the signature. Problems ensued -- for example, voters would print their names rather than sign them, and the ballot was rejected. In other cases, the elderly would give their absentee ballot to someone else.

If a person applied for an absentee ballot but then decided not to cast it but to vote in person, that person had to bring the non-voted absentee ballot to the poll and surrender it. If they did not they would not be permitted to vote at the polling place.

Incidents of Voter Intimidation

Sirvello only reported isolated cases of intimidation or suppression in Harris County. These mostly occurred in Presidential elections. Some people perceived intimidation when being told they were not eligible to vote under the law. Sirvello stated that the big issue in elections now is whether there should be a paper trail for touch screen voting.

Recommendations

District attorneys need to put more emphasis on election crime so people will not believe that it goes unpunished.

There should be either a national holiday for Election Day or a day should be given off of work without counting as a vacation day so that better poll workers are available and there can be more public education on election administration procedures.
The Department of Justice's (DOJ) Election Crimes Branch is responsible for supervising federal criminal investigations and prosecutions of election crimes.

Questions

How are Prosecution Decisions Made?

Craig Donsanto must approve all investigations that go beyond a preliminary stage, all charges, search warrant applications and subpoenas and all prosecutions. The decision to investigate is very sensitive because of the public officials involved. If a charge seems political, Donsanto will reject it. Donsanto gives possible theories for investigation. Donsanto and Noel Hillman will decide whether to farm out the case to an Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA). Donsanto uses a concept called predication. In other words, there must be enough evidence to suggest a crime has been committed. The method of evaluation of this evidence depends on the type of evidence and its source. There are two types of evidence---factual (antisocial behavior) and legal (antisocial behavior leading to statutory violations). Whether an indictment will be brought depends on the likelihood of success before a jury. Much depends on the type of evidence and the source. Donsanto said he “knows it when he sees it.” Donsanto will only indict if he is confident of a conviction assuming the worst case scenario—a jury trial.

A person under investigation will first receive a target letter. Often, a defendant who gets a target letter will ask for a departmental hearing. The defendant’s case will be heard by Donsanto and Hillman. On occasion, the assistant attorney general will review the case.

The Civil Rights Division, Voting Rights Section makes its own decisions on prosecution. The head of that division is John Tanner. There is a lot of cooperation between the Voting Section and the Election Crimes Branch.

Does the Decision to Prosecute Incorporate Particular Political Considerations within a State Such as a One Party System or a System in which the Party in Power Controls the Means of Prosecution and Suppresses Opposition Complaints?

Yes. Before, the department would leave it to the states. Now, if there is racial animus involved in the case, there is political bias involved, or the prosecutor is not impartial, the department will take it over.

Does it Matter if the Complaint Comes from a Member of a Racial Minority?

No. But if the question involves racial animus, that has also always been an aggravating factor, making it more likely the department will take it over.
What Kinds of Complaints Would Routinely Override Principles of Federalism?

Federalism is no longer big issue. DOJ is permitted to prosecute whenever there is a candidate for federal office on the ballot.

Are There Too Few Prosecutions?

DOJ can't prosecute everything.

What Should Be Done to Improve the System?

The problem is asserting federal jurisdiction in non-federal elections. It is preferable for the federal government to pursue these cases for the following reasons: federal districts draw from a bigger and more diverse jury pool; the DOJ is politically detached; local district attorneys are hamstrung by the need to be re-elected; DOJ has more resources – local prosecutors need to focus on personal and property crimes—fraud cases are too big and too complex for them; DOJ can use the grand jury process as a discovery technique and to test the strength of the case.

In U.S. v. McNally, the court ruled that the mail fraud statute does not apply to election fraud. It was through the mail fraud statute that the department had routinely gotten federal jurisdiction over election fraud cases. 18 USC 1346, the congressional effort to "fix" McNally, did not include voter fraud.

As a result, the department needs a new federal law that allows federal prosecution whenever a federal instrumentality is used, e.g. the mail, federal funding, interstate commerce. The department has drafted such legislation, which was introduced but not passed in the early 1990s. A federal law is needed that permits prosecution in any election where any federal instrumentality is used.

Other Information

The Department has held four symposia for District Election Officers (DEOs) and FBI agents since the initiation of the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative. In 2003, civil rights leaders were invited to make speeches, but were not permitted to take part in the rest of the symposium. All other symposia have been closed to the public.

There are two types of attorneys in the division: prosecutors, who take on cases when the jurisdiction of the section requires it; the US Attorney has recused him or herself; or when the US Attorney is unable to handle the case (most frequent reason) and braintrust attorneys who analyze the facts, formulate theories, and draft legal documents.

Donsanto provided us with three case lists: cases still being investigated as of January 2000.
Although the number of election fraud related complaints have not gone up since 2002, nor has the proportion of legitimate to illegitimate complaints of fraud, the number of cases that the department is investigating and the number of indictments the department is pursuing are both up dramatically.

Since 2002, the department has brought more cases against alien voters, felon voters, and double voters than ever before. Previously, cases were only brought against conspiracies to corrupt the process rather than individual offenders acting alone. For deterrence purposes, the Attorney General decided to add the pursuit of individuals who vote when not eligible to vote (noncitizens, felons) or who vote more than once. The department is currently undertaking three pilot projects to determine what works in developing the cases and obtaining convictions and what works with juries in such matters to gain convictions:

1. Felon voters in Milwaukee.

2. Alien voters in the Southern District of Florida. FYI — under 18 USC 611, to prosecute for “alien voting” there is no intent requirement. Conviction can lead to deportation. Nonetheless, the department feels compelled to look at mitigating factors such as was the alien told it was OK to vote, does the alien have a spouse that is a citizen.

3. Double voters in a variety of jurisdictions.

The department does not maintain records of the complaints that come in from DEOs, U.S attorneys and others during the election that are not pursued by the department. Donsanto asserted that U.S. attorneys never initiate frivolous investigations.
Interview with John Tanner, Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

February 24, 2006

The Department of Justice’s (DOJ) Voting Section is charged with the civil enforcement of the Voting Rights Act, the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA), the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA), and Title III of the Help America Vote Act (HAVA).

Authority and Process
The Voting Section, in contrast to the Public Integrity Section as Craig Donsanto described it, typically focuses only on systemic problems resulting from government action or inaction, not problems caused by individuals. Indeed, the section never goes after individuals because it does not have the statutory authority to do so. In situations in which individuals are causing problems at the polls and interfering with voting rights, the section calls the local election officials to resolve it.

Federal voting laws enforced by the section only apply to state action, so the section only sues state and local governments — it does not have any enforcement power over individuals. Most often, the section enters into consent agreements with governments that focus on poll worker training, takes steps to restructure how polls are run, and deals with problems on Election Day on the spot. Doing it this way has been most effective — for example, while the section used to have the most observers in the South, with systematic changes forced upon those jurisdictions, the section now does not get complaints from the South.

The section can get involved even where there is no federal candidate on the ballot if there is a racial issue under the 14th and 15th Amendments.

When the section receives a complaint, attorneys first determine whether it is a matter that involves individual offenders or a systemic problem. When deciding what to do with the complaint, the section errs on the side of referring it criminally to avoid having any civil litigation complicate a possible criminal case.

When a complaint comes in, the attorneys ask questions to see if there are even problems there that the complainant is not aware are violations of the law. For example, in the Boston case, the attorney did not just look at Spanish language cases under section 203, but also brought a Section 2 case for violations regarding Chinese and Vietnamese voters. When looking into a case, the attorneys look for specificity, witnesses and supporting evidence.

Often, lawsuits bring voluntary compliance.

Voter Intimidation

Note: Mr. Tanner's reluctance to share data, information and his perspective on solving the problems presented an obstacle to conducting the type of interview that would help inform this project as much as we would have hoped. Mr. Tanner would not give us any information about or data from the section's election complaint intake system; data or even general information from the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system — its formal process for tracking and managing work activities in pursuing complaints and potential violations of the voting laws; and would give us only a selected few samples of attorney-observer reports, reports that every Voting Section attorney who is observing elections at polling places on Election Day is required to submit. He would not discuss in any manner any current investigations or cases the section is involved in. He also did not believe it was his position to offer us recommendations as to how his office, elections, or the voting process might be improved.
Many instances of what some people refer to as voter intimidation are more unclear now. For example, photographing voters at the polls has been called intimidating, but now everyone is at the polls with a camera. It is hard to know when something is intimidation and it is difficult to show that it was an act of intimidation.

The fact that both parties are engaging in these tactics now makes it more complicated. It makes it difficult to point the finger at any one side.

The inappropriate use of challengers on the basis of race would be a violation of the law. Mr. Tanner was unaware that such allegations were made in Ohio in 2004. He said there had never been a formal investigation into the abusive use of challengers. Mr. Tanner said a lot of the challenges are legitimate because you have a lot of voter registration fraud as a result of groups paying people to register voters by the form. They turn in bogus registration forms. Then the parties examine the registration forms and challenge them because 200 of them, for example, have addresses of a vacant lot. However, Mr. Tanner said the department was able to informally intervene in challenger situations in Florida, Atkinson County, Georgia and in Alabama, as was referenced in a February 23 Op-Ed in USA Today. Mr. Tanner reiterated the section takes racial targeting very seriously.

Refusal to provide provisional ballots would be a violation of the law that the section would investigate.

Deceptive practices are committed by individuals and would be a matter for the Public Integrity Section. Local government would have to be involved for the Voting Section to become involved.

Unequal implementation of ID rules, or asking minority voters only for ID would be something the section would go after. Mr. Tanner was unaware of allegations of this in 2004. He said this is usually a problem where you have language minorities and the poll workers cannot understand the voters when they say their names. The section has never formally investigated or solely focused a case based on abuse of ID provisions. However, implementation of ID rules was part of the Section 2 case in San Diego. Mr. Tanner reiterated that the section is doing more than ever before.

When asked about the section’s references to incidents of vote fraud in the documents related to the new state photo identification requirements, Mr. Tanner said the section only looks at retrogression, not at the wisdom of what a legislature does. In Georgia, for example, everyone statistically has identification, and more blacks have ID than whites. With respect to the letter to Senator Kit Bond regarding voter ID, the section did refer to the perception of concern about dead voters because of reporting by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution. It is understandable that when you have thousands of bogus registrations that there would be concerns about polling place fraud. Very close elections make this even more of an understandable concern. Putting control of registration lists in the hands...
of the states will be helpful because at this higher level of government you find a higher level of professionalism.

It is hard to know how much vote suppression and intimidation is taking place because it depends on one's definition of the terms — they are used very loosely by some people. However, the enforcement of federal law over the years has made an astounding difference so that the level of discrimination has plummeted. Registration of minorities has soared, as can be seen on the section's website. Mr. Tanner was unsure if the same was true with respect to turnout, but the gap is less. That information is not on the section's website.

The section is not filing as many Section 2 cases as compared to Section 203 cases because many of the jurisdictions sued under Section 2 in the past do not have issues anymore. Mr. Tanner said that race based problems are rare now.

NVRA has been effective in opening up the registration process. In terms of enforcement, Mr. Tanner said they do what they can when they have credible allegations. There is a big gap between complaints and what can be substantiated. Mr. Tanner stated that given the high quality of the attorneys now in the section, if they do not investigate it or bring action, that act complained of did not happen.

Recommendations

Mr. Tanner did not feel it was appropriate to make recommendations.

---

Note: We contend that Mr. Tanner's reluctance to share data/information and his perspective on solving the problems presented an obstacle to conducting the type of interviews that would help inform this report as much as we would have hoped. We did not have access to any information about or data from the section's complaint intake, phone logs, or data on even general information from the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system, its formal process for tracking and managing work activities in pursuing complaints and potential violations of the voting laws. Only a selected few samples of attorney-observer reports were provided, reports that every Voting Section attorney who is observing elections at polling sites on Election Day is required to submit. Mr. Tanner would not discuss any current investigations or cases the section is involved in.
Rough Summary of Department of Justice, Public Integrity Section
Activities, October 2002-January 2006*

Prosecutions and Convictions—Individuals
Noncitizen voting: 20
Vote buying: 49
Double voting: 12
Registration fraud: 13
Civil Rights: 4
Voter Intimidation: 2
Unclear: 1

Open Investigations (note: a few cases overlap with prosecutions and convictions)
Noncitizen voting: 3
Vote buying: 25
Double voting: 15
Registration fraud: 29
Absentee ballot fraud: 9
Official: 8
Ineligible: 4
Deceptive Practices: 1
Civil Rights: 14
Intimidation: 6
Other: 2

Cases and Investigations Closed for Lack of Evidence
Civil Rights: 8
Official: 12
Registration Fraud: 12
Absentee Ballot Fraud: 14
Ineligible Voting: 3
Intimidation: 8
Double Voting: 5
Ballot Box Stuffing: 1
Vote Buying: 14
Ballot/machine tampering: 2
Other: 8
Unclear: 3

*Based upon information available as of January 2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Case</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Facts</th>
<th>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
<th>Should the Case be Researched Further</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Rogelio Mejorada-Lopez</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>05-CR-074</td>
<td>December 5, 2005</td>
<td>Mejorada-Lopez, a Mexican citizen, completed several voter registration applications to register to vote in Alaska and voted in the 2000, 2002, and 2004 general elections. He was charged with three counts of voting by a non-citizen in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 611 and pled guilty. Mejorada-Lopez was sentenced to probation for one year.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Shah</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1:04-CR-00458</td>
<td>March 1, 2005</td>
<td>Shah was indicted on two counts of providing false information concerning United States citizenship in order to register to vote in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 911 and 1015(f). Shah was convicted on both counts.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Mohsin Ali</td>
<td>Northern Florida</td>
<td>4:05-CR-47</td>
<td>January 17, 2006</td>
<td>A misdemeanor was filed against Ali charging him with voting by a non-citizen of 18 U.S.C. section</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes-need information on the outcome of the trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Chaudhary</td>
<td>Northern Florida</td>
<td>4:04-CR-00059</td>
<td>May 18, 2005</td>
<td>Chaudhary was indicted for misuse of a social security number in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 408 and for making a false claim of United States citizenship on a 2002 driver's license application in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 911. A superceding indictment was returned, charging Chaudhary with falsely claiming United States citizenship on a driver's license application and on the accompanying voter registration application. He was convicted of the false citizenship claim on his voter registration application.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Velasquez</td>
<td>Southern Florida</td>
<td>1:03-CR-20233</td>
<td>September 9, 2003</td>
<td>Velasquez, a former 1996 and 1998 candidate for the Florida legislature, was indicted on charges of</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. McKenzie; United States v. Francois; United States v. Exavier; United States v. Lloyd Palmer; United States v. Velrine Palmer; United States v. Shivdayal;</td>
<td>Southern Florida</td>
<td>0:04-CR-60160; 1:04-CR-20488; 0:04-CR-60161; 0:04-CR-60159; 0:04-CR-60162; 0:04-CR-60164; 1:04-CR-20491; 1:04-CR-20490;</td>
<td>July 15, 2004</td>
<td>misrepresenting United States citizenship in connection with voting and for making false statements to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 911, 1015(f) and 1001. Velasquez was convicted on two counts of making false statements on his naturalization application to the INS concerning his voting history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Scott; United States v. Nichols; United States v. Terrance Stith; United States v. Sandra Stith; United States v. Powell, et al.</td>
<td>Southern Illinois</td>
<td>3:05-CR-30040; 3:05-CR-30041; 3:05-CR-30042; 3:05-CR-30043; 3:05-CR-30044</td>
<td>June 29, 2005</td>
<td>Four Democrat precinct committeemen in East St. Louis were charged with vote buying on the 2004 general election in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(c). All four pled guilty. Also indicted were four additional Democrat committeemen, Charles Powell, Jr., Jesse Lewis, Sheila Thomas, Kelvin Ellis, and one precinct worker, Yvette Johnson, on conspiracy and vote buying charges in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 371 and 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(c). All five defendants were convicted. Kelvin Ellis also pled guilty to one count of 18 U.S.C. section 1512(c)(2) relative to a scheme to kill one of the trial witnesses and two counts of 18</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. McIntosh</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2:04-CR-20142</td>
<td>December 20, 2004</td>
<td>A felony information was filed against lawyer Leslie McIntosh for voting in both Wyandotte County, Kansas and Jackson County, Missouri, in the general elections of 2000 and 2002 in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(e). A superseding misdemeanor information was filed, charging McIntosh with causing the deprivation of constitutional rights in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 242, to which the defendant pled guilty.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Conley; United States v. Slone; United States v. Madden</td>
<td>Eastern Kentucky</td>
<td>7:03-CR-00013; 7:03-CR-00014; 7:03-CR-00015; 7:03-CR-00016</td>
<td>March 28, 2003 and April 24, 2003</td>
<td>Ten people were indicted on vote buying charges in connection with the 1998 primary election in Knott County, Kentucky, in</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Hays, et al.</td>
<td>Eastern Kentucky</td>
<td>7:03-CR-00011</td>
<td>March 7, 2003</td>
<td>Ten defendants were indicted for conspiracy and vote buying for a local judge in Pike County, Kentucky, in the 2002 general election, in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(c) and 18 U.S.C. section 371. Five defendants were convicted, one defendant was acquitted, and charges against four defendants were dismissed upon motion of the government.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Turner, et al.</td>
<td>Eastern Kentucky</td>
<td>3:05-CR-00002</td>
<td>May 5, 2005</td>
<td>Three defendants were indicted for vote buying and mail fraud in connection with the 2000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes-need update on case status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v.</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3:03-CR-00019</td>
<td>May 2, 2003</td>
<td>Tyrrell Mathews Braud was indicted on three counts of making false declarations to a grand jury in connection with his 2002 fabrication of eleven voter registration applications, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 1623. Braud pled guilty on all counts.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v.</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>6:03-CR-60055</td>
<td>April 12, 2005</td>
<td>St. Martinsville City Councilwoman Pamela C. Thibodeaux was indicted on two counts of conspiring to submit false voter registration information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 371 and 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(c). She pled guilty to both charges.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thibodeaux</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Scherzer; United States v. Goodrich; United States v. Jones; United States v. Martin</td>
<td>Western Missouri</td>
<td>4:04-CR-00401; 4:04-CR-00402; 4:05-CR-00257; 4:05-CR-00258</td>
<td>January 7, 2005; March 28, 2005; September 8, 2005; October 13, 2005</td>
<td>Two misdemeanor informations were filed charging Lorraine Goodrich and James Scherzer, Kansas residents who voted in the 2000 and 2002 general elections on both Johnson County, Kansas and in Kansas City, Missouri. The informations charged deprivation of a constitutional right by causing spurious ballots, in violation of 18 U.S.C. sections 242 and 2. Both pled guilty. Additionally, similar misdemeanor informations were filed against Tammy J. Martin, who voted in both Independence and Kansas City, Missouri in the 2004 general election and Brandon E. Jones, who voted both in Raytown and Kansas City, Missouri in the 2004 general election.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the Republican National Committee, was indicted on charges of conspiring to commit telephone harassment using an interstate phone facility in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 371 and 47 U.S.C. section 223. An information was filed charging Shaun Hansen, the principal of an Idaho telemarketing firm called MILO Enterprises which placed the harassing calls, with conspiracy and aiding and abetting telephone harassment, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 371 and 2 and 47 U.S.C. section 223. The information against Hansen was dismissed upon motion of the government. A superseding indictment was returned against Tobin charging conspiracy to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**DOJ Cases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Case</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Facts</th>
<th>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
<th>Should the Case be Researched Further</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Workman</td>
<td>Western North Carolina</td>
<td>1:03-CR-00038</td>
<td>June 30, 2003</td>
<td>A ten-count indictment was returned charging Joshua Workman, a Canadian citizen, with voting and related offenses in the 200 and 2002 primary and general elections in Avery County, North Carolina, in violation of 18 U.S.C. sections 611, 911, 1001, and 1015(f). Workman pled guilty to providing false information to</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v.</td>
<td>Western North</td>
<td>5:03-CR-00035</td>
<td>May 14, 2004</td>
<td>A nine-count indictment was returned charging Wayne Shatley, Anita Moore, Valerie Moore, Carlos &quot;Sunshine&quot; Hood and Ross &quot;Toogie&quot; Banner with conspiracy and vote buying in the Caldwell County 2002 general election, in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(c) and 18 U.S.C. section 371. Anita and Valerie Moore pled guilty. Shatley, Hood, and Banner were all convicted.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shatley, et al.</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v.</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>05-CR-50085</td>
<td>December 22, 2005</td>
<td>An indictment was filed against Rudolph Vargas, for voting more than once at Pine Ridge in the 2002 general election in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(e). Vargas pled guilty.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vargas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v.</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>02-CR-</td>
<td>July 22,</td>
<td>Danny Ray Wells, Logan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnest Stapleton, commander of the local VFW, was charged by information with mail fraud. He pled guilty. An information was filed charging Thomas E. Esposito, a former mayor of the City of Logan, with concealing the commission of a felony, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 4. Esposito pled guilty. John Wesley Nagy, Logan County Court marshall, pled guilty to making false statements to a federal agent, a violation of 18 U.S.C. section 1001. An information charging Glen Dale Adkins, county clerk of Logan County, with accepting payment for voting, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 1973i(c). Adkins pled guilty. Perry French Harvey, Jr., a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v.</td>
<td>Southern West</td>
<td>2:04-CR-</td>
<td>December 28 &amp; 30,</td>
<td>retired UMW official, pled guilty to involvement in a conspiracy to buy votes. Jackie Adkins was indicted for vote buying in Lincoln County, West Virginia, in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(c). A superceding indictment added Wandell “Rocky” Adkins to the indictment and charged both defendants with conspiracy to buy votes in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 371 and vote buying. A second superseding indictment was returned which added three additional defendants, Gegory Brent Stowers, Clifford Odell “Groundhog” Vance, and Toney “Zeke” Dingess, to the conspiracy and vote buying indictment. Charges were later dismissed against Jackie Adkins. A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adkins, et al.</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>00162</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>third superseding indictment was returned adding two additional defendants, Jerry Allen Weaver and Ralph Dale Adkins. A superseding information was filed charging Vance with expenditures to influence voting, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 597. Vance pled guilty. Superseding informations were filed against Stowers and Dingess for expenditures to influence voting, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 597. Both defendants pled guilty. Weaver also pled guilty. Superseding informations were filed against Ralph and Wandell Adkins for expenditures to influence voting, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 597. Both defendants pled guilty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Davis; United States v. Byas;</td>
<td>Eastern Wisconsin</td>
<td>2:05-MJ-00454; 2:05-MJ-00455;</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>Criminal complaints were issued against Brian L. Davis and Theresa J. Byas charging them with double voting, in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(e). Indictments were filed against convicted felons Milo R. Ocasio and Kimberly Prude, charging them with falsely certifying that they were eligible to vote, in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973gg-10(2)(B), and against Enrique C. Sanders, charging him with multiple voting, in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(e). Five more indictments were later returned charging Cynthia C. Alicea with multiple voting in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(e) and convicted felons Deshawn B. Brooks, Alexander T.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Need updated status on Gooden and the Anderson, Cox, Edwards, and Little cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, Derek G. Little, and Eric L. Swift with falsely certifying that they were eligible to vote in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973gg-10(2)(B). Indictments were filed against Davis and Byas charging them with double voting. Four more indictments were returned charging convicted felons Ethel M. Anderson, Jiyto L. Cox, Correan F. Edwards, and Joseph J. Gooden with falsely certifying that they were eligible to vote. Ocasio and Hamilton pled guilty. Prude was found guilty. A mistrial was declared in the Sanders case. Brooks was acquitted. Byas signed a plea agreement agreeing to plead to a misdemeanor 18 U.S.C. section 242 charge. Swift moved to change his</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Case</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Statutory Basis (if of Note)</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td>Should the Case be Researched Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>plea. Davis was found incompetent to stand trial so the government dismissed the case. Gooden is a fugitive. Alicea was acquitted. Four cases are pending ---Anderson, Cox, Edwards, and Little.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation

Report to the
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
on
Preliminary Research & Recommendations

By
Job Serebrov and Tova Wang
Table of Contents

1. Introduction
   a. Charge Under HAVA
   b. Scope of the Project

2. Working Definition of Fraud and Intimidation

3. Summaries of Research Conducted
   a. Interviews
   b. Nexis Research
   c. Existing Literature
   d. Cases
   e. Methodology

4. Recommendations for Further EAC Action
   a. Consultants' Recommendations
   b. Working Group Recommendations

5. Key Working Group Observations and Concerns

6. Nexis Charts

7. Case Charts

Appendix 1: List of Individuals Interviewed

Appendix 2: List of Literature Reviewed

Appendix 3: Excerpt from "Machinery of Democracy," a Brennan Center Report

Appendix 4: Members of the Working Group
**Introduction**

**Charge Under HAVA**


**Scope of Project**

The Commission employed a bipartisan team of legal consultants, Tova Wang and Job Serebrov to develop a preliminary overview work product to determine the quantity and quality of vote fraud and voter intimidation that is present on a national scale. The consultants’ work is neither comprehensive nor conclusive. This first phase of an envisioned two-phase project was constrained by both time and funding. The consultants’ conclusions and recommendations for phase II will be contained in this report.

The consultants, working without the aid of a support staff, divided most of the work. However, the final work product was mutually checked and approved. They agreed upon the steps that were taken needed and the method employed. For all of the documentary sources, the consultants limited the time period under review from January 1, 2001 to January 1, 2006. The research performed by the consultants included interviews, an extensive Nexis search, a review of existing literature, and case research.

**Interviews:** The consultants chose the interviewees by first coming up with a list of the categories of types of people they wanted to interview. Then the consultants separately, equally filled those categories with a certain number of people. Due to time and resource constraints, the consultants had to pare down this list substantially – for instance, they had to rule out interviewing prosecutors altogether – but still got a good range of people to talk to. The ultimate categories were academics, advocates, elections officials, lawyers and judges. Although the consultants were able to talk to most of the people they wanted to, some were unavailable and a few were not comfortable speaking to them, particularly judges. The consultants together conducted all of the interviews, either by phone or in person. Then the consultants split up drafting the summaries. All summaries were reviewed and mutually approved. Most of the interviews were extremely informative and the consultants found the interviewees to be extremely knowledgeable and insightful for the most part.

**Nexis:** Initially, the consultants developed an enormous list of possible Nexis search terms. It soon became obvious that it would be impossible to conduct the research that way. As a result, consultant Wang performed the Nexis search by finding search term combinations that would yield virtually every article on a particular subject from the last
five years. Consultant Serebrov approved the search terms. Then Wang created an excel spreadsheet in order to break down the articles in way in which they could be effectively analyzed for patterns. Each type of fraud is broken down in a separate chart according to where it took place, the date, the type of election it occurred in, what the allegation was, the publication it came from. Where there was a follow up article, any information that that suggested there had been some further action taken or some resolution to the allegation was also included. For four very complicated and long drawn out situations – Washington State, Wisconsin, South Dakota in 2004, and the vote buying cases in a couple of particular jurisdictions over the last several years – written summaries with news citations are provided.

Existing Literature: Part of the selections made by the consultants resulted from consultant Wang’s long-term familiarity with the material while part was the result of a joint web search for articles and books on vote fraud and voter intimidation and suggestions from those interviewed by the consultants. The consultants reviewed a wide range of materials from government reports and investigations, to academic literature, to reports published by advocacy groups. The consultants believe that they covered the landscape of available sources.

Cases: In order to properly identify all applicable cases, the consultants first developed an extensive word search term list. A WestLaw search was performed and the first one hundred cases under each word search term were then gathered in individual files. This resulted in a total of approximately 44,000 cases. Most of these cases were federal as opposed to state and appellate as opposed to trial. Consultant Serebrov analyzed the cases in each file to determine if they were on point. If he found that the first twenty cases were inapplicable, Serebrov would sample forty to fifty other file cases at random to determine applicability. If the entire file did not yield any cases, the file would be discarded. All discarded word search terms were recorded in a separate file. Likewise, if the file only yielded a few applicable cases, it would also be discarded. However, if a small but significant number of cases were on point, the file was later charted. The results of the case search were stark because relatively few applicable cases were found.
Working Definition of Fraud and Intimidation

Note: The definition provided below is for the purposes of this EAC project. Most of the acts described come within the federal criminal definition of fraud, but some may not.

Election fraud is any intentional action, or intentional failure to act when there is a duty to do so, that corrupts the election process in a manner that can impact on election outcomes. This includes interfering in the process by which persons register to vote; the way in which ballots are obtained, marked, or tabulated; and the process by which election results are canvassed and certified.

Examples include the following:

- falsifying voter registration information pertinent to eligibility to cast a vote, (e.g. residence, criminal status, etc.);
- altering completed voter registration applications by entering false information;
- knowingly destroying completed voter registration applications (other than spoiled applications) before they can be submitted to the proper election authority;
- knowingly removing eligible voters from voter registration lists, in violation of HAVA, NVRA, or state election laws;
- intentional destruction by election officials of voter registration records or balloting records, in violation of records retention laws, to remove evidence of election fraud;
- vote buying;
- voting in the name of another;
- voting more than once;
- coercing a voter's choice on an absentee ballot;
- using a false name and/or signature on an absentee ballot;
- destroying or misappropriating an absentee ballot;
- felons, or in some states ex-felons, who vote when they know they are ineligible to do so;
- misleading an ex-felon about his or her right to vote;
- voting by non-citizens who know they are ineligible to do so;
- intimidating practices aimed at vote suppression or deterrence, including the abuse of challenge laws;
- deceiving voters with false information (e.g.; deliberately directing voters to the wrong polling place or providing false information on polling hours and dates);
- knowingly failing to accept voter registration applications, to provide ballots, or to accept and count voted ballots in accordance with the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act;
- intentional miscounting of ballots by election officials;
- intentional misrepresentation of vote tallies by election officials;
- acting in any other manner with the intention of suppressing voter registration or voting, or interfering with vote counting and the certification of the vote.
Voting fraud does not include mistakes made in the course of voter registration, balloting, or tabulating ballots and certifying results. For purposes of the EAC study, it also does not include violations of campaign finance laws.
Summaries of Research Conducted

Interviews

Common Themes

- There is virtually universal agreement that absentee ballot fraud is the biggest problem, with vote buying and registration fraud coming in after that. The vote buying often comes in the form of payment for absentee ballots, although not always. Some absentee ballot fraud is part of an organized effort; some is by individuals, who sometimes are not even aware that what they are doing is illegal. Voter registration fraud seems to take the form of people signing up with false names. Registration fraud seems to be most common where people doing the registration were paid by the signature.

- There is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud, or at least much less than is claimed, including voter impersonation, “dead” voters, noncitizen voting and felon voters. Those few who believe it occurs often enough to be a concern say that it is impossible to show the extent to which it happens, but do point to instances in the press of such incidents. Most people believe that false registration forms have not resulted in polling place fraud, although it may create the perception that vote fraud is possible. Those who believe there is more polling place fraud than reported/investigated/prosecuted believe that registration fraud does lead to fraudulent votes. Jason Torchinsky from the American Center for Voting Rights is the only interviewee who believes that polling place fraud is widespread and among the most significant problems in the system.

- Abuse of challenger laws and abusive challengers seem to be the biggest intimidation/suppression concerns, and many of those interviewed assert that the new identification requirements are the modern version of voter intimidation and suppression. However, there is evidence of some continued outright intimidation and suppression, especially in some Native American communities. A number of people also raise the problem of poll workers engaging in harassment of minority voters. Other activities commonly raised were the issue of polling places being moved at the last moment, unequal distribution of voting machines, videotaping of voters at the polls, and targeted misinformation campaigns.

- Several people indicate — including representatives from DOJ — that for various reasons, the Department of Justice is bringing fewer voter intimidation and suppression cases now and is focusing on matters such as noncitizen voting, double voting and felon voting. While the civil rights section continues to focus on systemic patterns of malfeasance, the public integrity section is focusing now on individuals, on isolated instances of fraud.

- The problem of badly kept voter registration lists, with both ineligible voters remaining on the rolls and eligible voters being taken off, remains a common concern. A few people are also troubled by voters being on registration lists in two states. They said that there was no evidence that this had led to double voting, but it opens the door to the possibility. There is great hope that full
implementation of the new requirements of HAVA – done well, a major caveat – will reduce this problem dramatically.

**Common Recommendations:**

- Many of those interviewed recommend better poll worker training as the best way to improve the process; a few also recommended longer voting times or voting on days other than election day (such as weekends) but fewer polling places so only the best poll workers would be employed.

- Many interviewed support stronger criminal laws and increased enforcement of existing laws with respect to both fraud and intimidation. Advocates from across the spectrum expressed frustration with the failure of the Department of Justice to pursue complaints.
  - With respect to the civil rights section, John Tanner indicated that fewer cases are being brought because fewer are warranted – it has become increasingly difficult to know when allegations of intimidation and suppression are credible since it depends on one’s definition of intimidation, and because both parties are doing it. Moreover, prior enforcement of the laws has now changed the entire landscape – race based problems are rare now. Although challenges based on race and unequal implementation of identification rules would be actionable, Mr. Tanner was unaware of such situations actually occurring and the section has not pursued any such cases.
  - Craig Donsanto of the public integrity section says that while the number of election fraud related complaints have not gone up since 2002, nor has the proportion of legitimate to illegitimate claims of fraud, the number of cases the department is investigating and the number of indictments the section is pursuing are both up dramatically. Since 2002, the department has brought more cases against alien voters, felon voters and double voters than ever before. Mr. Donsanto would like more resources so it can do more and would like to have laws that make it easier for the federal government to assume jurisdiction over voter fraud cases.

- A couple of interviewees recommend a new law that would make it easier to criminally prosecute people for intimidation even when there is not racial animus.

- Almost everyone hopes that administrators will maximize the potential of statewide voter registration databases to prevent fraud. Of particular note, Sarah Ball Johnson, Executive Director of Elections for Kentucky, emphasized that having had an effective statewide voter registration database for more than thirty years has helped that state avoid most of the fraud problems that have been alleged elsewhere, such as double voting and felon voting.

- Several advocate expanded monitoring of the polls, including some associated with the Department of Justice.

- Challenge laws, both with respect to pre-election day challenges and challengers at the polls, need to be revised by all states to ensure they are not used for purposes of wrongful disenfranchisement and harassment.
Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation – Preliminary Research & Recommendations

• Several people advocate passage of Senator Barak Obama's “deceptive practices” bill
• There is a split on whether it would be helpful to have nonpartisan election officials – some indicated they thought even if elections officials are elected nonpartisanly they will carry out their duties in biased ways nonetheless. However, most agree that elections officials pursuing partisan agendas is a problem that must be addressed in some fashion. Suggestions included moving election responsibilities out of the secretary of states’ office; increasing transparency in the process; and enacting conflict of interest rules.
• A few recommend returning to allowing use of absentee ballots “for cause” only if it were politically feasible.
• A few recommend enacting a national identification card, including Pat Rogers, an attorney in New Mexico, and Jason Torchinsky from ACVR, who advocates the scheme contemplated in the Carter-Baker Commission Report.
• A couple of interviewees indicated the need for clear standards for the distribution of voting machines

Nexis Research

Absentee Ballot Fraud

According to press reports, absentee ballots are abused in a variety of ways:

• Campaign workers, candidates and others coerce the voting choices of vulnerable populations, usually elderly voters
• Workers for groups and individuals have attempted to vote absentee in the names of the deceased
• Workers for groups, campaign workers and individuals have attempted to forge the names of other voters on absentee ballot requests and absentee ballots and thus vote multiple times

It is unclear how often actual convictions result from these activities (a handful of articles indicate convictions and guilty pleas), but this is an area in which there have been a substantial number of official investigations and actual charges filed, according to news reports where such information is available. A few of the allegations became part of civil court proceedings contesting the outcome of the election.

While absentee fraud allegations turn up throughout the country, a few states have had several such cases. Especially of note are Indiana, New Jersey, South Dakota, and most particularly, Texas. Interestingly, there were no articles regarding Oregon, where the entire system is vote by mail.

Voter Registration Fraud
Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation – Preliminary Research & Recommendations

According to press reports, the following types of allegations of voter registration fraud are most common:

- Registering in the name of dead people
- Fake names and other information on voter registration forms
- Illegitimate addresses used on voter registration forms
- Voters being tricked into registering for a particular party under false pretenses
- Destruction of voter registration forms depending on the party the voter registered with

There was only one self evident instance of a noncitizen registering to vote. Many of the instances reported on included official investigations and charges filed, but few actual convictions, at least from the news reporting. There have been multiple reports of registration fraud in California, Colorado, Florida, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, South Dakota and Wisconsin.

Voter Intimidation and Suppression

This is the area which had the most articles in part because there were so many allegations of intimidation and suppression during the 2004 election. Most of these remained allegations and no criminal investigation or prosecution ensued. Some of the cases did end up in civil litigation.

This is not to say that these alleged activities were confined to 2004 – there were several allegations made during every year studied. Most notable were the high number of allegations of voter intimidation and harassment reported during the 2003 Philadelphia mayoral race.

A very high number of the articles were about the issue of challenges to voters’ registration status and challengers at the polling places. There were many allegations that planned challenge activities were targeted at minority communities. Some of the challenges were concentrated in immigrant communities.

However, the tactics alleged varied greatly. The types of activities discussed also include the following:

- Photographing or videotaping voters coming out of polling places.
- Improper demands for identification
- Poll watchers harassing voters
- Poll workers being hostile to or aggressively challenging voters
- Disproportionate police presence
- Poll watchers wearing clothes with messages that seemed intended to intimidate
- Insufficient voting machines and unmanageably long lines
Although the incidents reported occurred everywhere, not surprisingly, many came from "battleground" states. There were several such reports out of Florida, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

"Dead Voters and Multiple Voting"

There were a high number of articles about people voting in the names of the dead and voting more than once. Many of these articles were marked by allegations of big numbers of people committing these frauds, and relatively few of these allegations turning out to be accurate according to investigations by the newspapers themselves, elections officials and criminal investigators. Often the problem turned out to be a result of administrative error, poll workers mis-marking of voter lists, a flawed registration list and/or errors made in the attempt to match names of voters on the list with the names of the people who voted. In a good number of cases, there were allegations that charges of double voting by political leaders were an effort to scare people away from the voting process.

Nonetheless there were a few cases of people actually being charged and/or convicted for these kinds of activities. Most of the cases involved a person voting both by absentee ballot and in person. A few instances involved people voting both during early voting and on Election Day, which calls into question the proper marking and maintenance of the voting lists. In many instances, the person charged claimed not to have voted twice on purpose. A very small handful of cases involved a voter voting in more than one county and there was one substantiated case involving a person voting in more than one state. Other instances in which such efforts were alleged were disproved by officials.

In the case of voting in the name of a dead person, the problem lay in the voter registration list not being properly maintained, i.e. the person was still on the registration list as eligible to vote, and a person taking criminal advantage of that. In total, the San Francisco Chronicle found 5 such cases in March 2004; the AP cited a newspaper analysis of five such persons in an Indiana primary in May 2004; and a senate committee found two people to have voted in the names of the dead in 2005.

As usual, there were a disproportionate number of such articles coming out of Florida. Notably, there were three articles out of Oregon, which has one hundred percent vote-by-mail.

Vote Buying

There were a surprising number of articles about vote buying cases. A few of these instances involved long-time investigations in three particular jurisdictions as detailed in the vote buying summary. There were more official investigations, indictments and convictions/pleas in this area. All of these cases are concentrated in the Midwest and South.

Deceptive Practices
In 2004 there were numerous reports of intentional disinformation about voting eligibility and the voting process meant to confuse voters about their rights and when and where to vote. Misinformation came in the form of flyers, phone calls, letters, and even people going door to door. Many of the efforts were reportedly targeted at minority communities. A disproportionate number of them came from key battleground states, particularly Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. From the news reports found, only one of these instances was officially investigated, the case in Oregon involving the destruction of voter registration forms. There were no reports of prosecutions or any other legal proceeding.

**Non-citizen Voting**

There were surprisingly few articles regarding noncitizen registration and voting – just seven all together, in seven different states across the country. They were also evenly split between allegations of noncitizens registering and noncitizens voting. In one case charges were filed against ten individuals. In one case a judge in a civil suit found there was illegal noncitizen voting. Three instances prompted official investigations. Two cases, from this nexis search, remained just allegations of noncitizen voting.

**Felon Voting**

Although there were only thirteen cases of felon voting, some of them involved large numbers of voters. Most notably, of course, are the cases that came to light in the Washington gubernatorial election contest (see Washington summary) and in Wisconsin (see Wisconsin summary). In several states, the main problem has been the large number of ineligible felons that remained on the voting list.

**Election Official Fraud**

In most of the cases in which fraud by elections officials is suspected or alleged, it is difficult to determine whether it is incompetence or a crime. There are several cases of ballots gone missing, ballots unaccounted for and ballots ending up in a worker’s possession. In two cases workers were said to have changed peoples’ votes. The one instance in which widespread ballot box stuffing by elections workers was alleged was in Washington State. The judge in the civil trial of that election contest did not find that elections workers had committed fraud. Four of the cases are from Texas.

**Existing Research**

There are many reports and books that describe anecdotes and draw broad conclusions from a large array of incidents. There is little research that is truly systematic or scientific. The most systematic look at fraud is the report written by Lori Minnite. The most systematic look at voter intimidation is the report by Laughlin McDonald. Books
written about this subject seem to all have a political bias and a pre-existing agenda that makes them somewhat less valuable.

Researchers agree that measuring something like the incidence of fraud and intimidation in a scientifically legitimate way is extremely difficult from a methodological perspective and would require resources beyond the means of most social and political scientists. As a result, there is much more written on this topic by advocacy groups than social scientists. It is hoped that this gap will be filled in the “second phase” of this EAC project.

Moreover, reports and books make allegations but, perhaps by their nature, have little follow up. As a result, it is difficult to know when something has remained in the stage of being an allegation and gone no further, or progressed to the point of being investigated or prosecuted or in any other way proven to be valid by an independent, neutral entity. This is true, for example, with respect to allegations of voter intimidation by civil rights organizations, and, with respect to fraud, John Fund’s frequently cited book. Again, this is something that it is hoped will be addressed in the “second phase” of this EAC project by doing follow up research on allegations made in reports, books and newspaper articles.

Other items of note:

- There is as much evidence, and as much concern, about structural forms of disenfranchisement as about intentional abuse of the system. These include felon disenfranchisement, poor maintenance of databases and identification requirements.

- There is tremendous disagreement about the extent to which polling place fraud, e.g. double voting, intentional felon voting, noncitizen voting, is a serious problem. On balance, more researchers find it to be less of a problem than is commonly described in the political debate, but some reports say it is a major problem, albeit hard to identify.

- There is substantial concern across the board about absentee balloting and the opportunity it presents for fraud.

- Federal law governing election fraud and intimidation is varied and complex and yet may nonetheless be insufficient or subject to too many limitations to be as effective as it might be.

- Deceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004.

- Voter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities, although the American Center for Voting Rights uniquely alleges it is focused on Republicans.
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Cases

After reviewing over 40,000 cases, the majority of which came from appeals courts, I have found comparatively very few which are applicable to this study. Of those that are applicable, no apparent thematic pattern emerges. However, it seems that the greatest areas of fraud and intimidation have shifted from past patterns of stealing votes to present problems with voter registration, voter identification, the proper delivery and counting of absentee and overseas ballots, provisional voting, vote buying, and challenges to felon eligibility. But because so few cases provided a picture of these current problems, I suggest that case research for the second phase of this project concentrate on state trial-level decisions.

Methodology

The following is a summary of interviews conducted with a number of political scientists and experts in the field as to how one might undertake a comprehensive examination of voter fraud and intimidation. A list of the individuals interviewed and their ideas are available, and all of the individuals welcome any further questions or explanations of their recommended procedures.

- In analyzing instances of alleged fraud and intimidation, we should look to criminology as a model. In criminology, experts use two sources: the Uniform Crime Reports, which are all reports made to the police, and the Victimization Survey, which asks the general public whether a particular incident has happened to them. After surveying what the most common allegations are, we should conduct a survey of the general public that ask whether they have committed certain acts or been subjected to any incidents of fraud or intimidation. This would require using a very large sample, and we would need to employ the services of an expert in survey data collection. (Stephen Ansolobohere, MIT)

- Several political scientists with expertise in these types of studies recommended a methodology that includes interviews, focus groups, and a limited survey. In determining who to interview and where the focus groups should be drawn from, they recommend the following procedure:
  - Pick a number of places that have historically had many reports of fraud and/or intimidation; from that pool pick 10 that are geographically and demographically diverse, and have had a diversity of problems
  - Pick a number of places that have not had many reports of fraud and/or intimidation; from that pool pick 10 places that match the geographic and demographic make-up of the previous ten above (and, if possible, have comparable elections practices)
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- Assess the resulting overall reports and impressions resulting from these interviews and focus groups, and examine comparisons and differences among the states and what may give rise to them.

In conducting a survey of elections officials, district attorneys, district election officers, they recommend that:

- The survey sample be large in order to be able to get the necessary subsets
- The survey must include a random set of counties where there have and have not been a large number of allegations

(Allan Lichtman, American University; Thad Hall, University of Utah; Bernard Grofman, UC – Irvine)

- Another political scientist recommended employing a methodology that relies on qualitative data drawn from in-depth interviews with key critics and experts on all sides of the debate on fraud; quantitative data collected through a survey of state and local elections and law enforcement officials; and case studies. Case studies should focus on the five or ten states, regions or cities where there has been a history of election fraud to examine past and present problems. The survey should be mailed to each state's attorney general and secretary of state, each county district attorney's office and each county board of elections in the 50 states. (Lorraine Minnite, Barnard College)

- The research should be a two-step process. Using LexisNexis and other research tools, a search should be conducted of news media accounts over the past decade. Second, interviews with a systematic sample of election officials nationwide and in selected states should be conducted. (Chandler Davidson, Rice University)

- One expert in the field posits that we can never come up with a number that accurately represents either the incidence of fraud or the incidence of voter intimidation. Therefore, the better approach is to do an assessment of what is most likely to happen, what election violations are most likely to be committed – in other words, a risk analysis. This would include an analysis of what it would actually take to commit various acts, e.g. the cost/benefit of each kind of violation. From there we could rank the likely prevalence of each type of activity and examine what measures are or could be effective in combating them. (Wendy Weiser, Brennan Center of New York University)

- Replicate a study in the United States done abroad by Susan Hyde of the University of California- San Diego examining the impact of impartial poll site observers on the incidence of election fraud. Doing this retrospectively would require the following steps:
  - Find out where there were federal observers
  - Get precinct level voting information for those places
Analyze whether there was any difference in election outcomes in those places with and without observers, and whether any of these results seem anomalous.

Despite the tremendous differences in the political landscapes of the countries examined by Hyde in previous studies and the U.S., Hyde believes this study could be effectively replicated in this country by sending observers to a random sample of precincts. Rather than compare the incumbent’s vote share, such factors such as voter complaints, voter turnout, number of provisional ballots used, composition of the electorate, as well as any anomalous voting results could be compared between sites with and without monitors.

For example, if intimidation is occurring, and if reputable monitors make intimidation less likely or voters more confident, then turnout should be higher on average in monitored precincts than in unmonitored precincts. If polling station officials are intentionally refusing to issue provisional ballots, and the polling station officials are more likely to adhere to regulations while being monitored, the average number of provisional ballots should be higher in monitored precincts than in unmonitored precincts. If monitors cause polling station officials to adhere more closely to regulations, then there should be fewer complaints (in general) about monitored than unmonitored precincts (this could also be reversed if monitors made voters more likely to complain).

Again, random assignment controls for all of the other factors that otherwise influence these variables.

One of the downsides of this approach is it does not get at some forms of fraud, e.g. absentee ballot fraud, those would have to be analyzed separately.

Another political scientist recommends conducting an analysis of vote fraud claims and purging of registration rolls by list matching. Allegations of illegal voting often are based on matching of names and birth dates. Alleged instances of double voting are based on matching the names and birth dates of persons found on voting records. Allegations of ineligible felon (depending on state law), deceased, and of non-citizen voting are based on matching lists of names, birth dates, and sometimes addresses of such people against a voting records. Anyone with basic relational database skills can perform such matching in a matter of minutes.

However, there are a number of pitfalls for the unwary that can lead to grossly over-estimating the number of fraudulent votes, such as missing or ignored middle names and suffixes or matching on missing birth dates. Furthermore, there is a surprising statistical fact that a group of about three hundred people with the same first and last name are almost assured to share the exact same birth date, including year. In a large state, it is not uncommon for hundreds of Robert Smiths (and other common names) to have voted. Thus, allegations of vote fraud
or purging of voter registration rolls by list matching almost assuredly will find a large proportion of false positives: people who voted legally or are registered to vote legally.

Statistics can be rigorously applied to determine how many names would be expected to be matched by chance. A simulation approach is best applied here: randomly assign a birth date to an arbitrary number of people and observe how many match within the list or across lists. The simulation is repeated many times to average out the variation due to chance. The results can then be matched back to actual voting records and purge lists, for example, in the hotly contested states of Ohio or Florida, or in states with Election Day registration where there are concerns that easy access to voting permits double voting. This analysis will rigorously identify the magnitude alleged voter fraud, and may very well find instances of alleged fraud that exceed what might have otherwise happened by chance.

This same political scientist also recommends another way to examine the problem: look at statistics on provisional voting: the number cast might provide indications of intimidation (people being challenged at the polls) and the number of those not counted would be indications of "vote fraud." One could look at those jurisdictions in the Election Day Survey with a disproportionate number of provisional ballots cast and cross reference it with demographics and number of provisional ballots discarded. (Michael McDonald, George Mason University)

- Spencer Overton, in a forthcoming law review article entitled *Voter Identification*, suggests a methodology that employs three approaches—investigations of voter fraud, random surveys of voters who purported to vote, and an examination of death rolls provide a better understanding of the frequency of fraud. He says all three approaches have strengths and weaknesses, and thus the best studies would employ all three to assess the extent of voter fraud. An excerpt follows:

## 1. Investigations and Prosecutions of Voter Fraud

Policymakers should develop databases that record all investigations, allegations, charges, trials, convictions; acquittals, and plea bargains regarding voter fraud. Existing studies are incomplete but provide some insight. For example, a statewide survey of each of Ohio's 88 county boards of elections found only four instances of ineligible persons attempting to vote out of a total of 9,078,728 votes cast in the state’s 2002 and 2004 general elections. This is a fraud rate of 0.00000045 percent. The Carter-Baker Commission’s Report noted that since October 2002, federal officials had charged 89 individuals with casting multiple votes, providing false information about their felon status, buying votes, submitting false voter registration information, and voting improperly as a non-citizen. Examined in the context of the 196,139,871 ballots cast between October 2002 and
August 2005, this represents a fraud rate of 0.0000005 percent (note also that not all of the activities charged would have been prevented by a photo identification requirement).

A more comprehensive study should distinguish voter fraud that could be prevented by a photo identification requirement from other types of fraud — such as absentee voting and stuffing ballot boxes — and obtain statistics on the factors that led law enforcement to prosecute fraud. The study would demand significant resources because it would require that researchers interview and pour over the records of local district attorneys and election boards.

Hard data on investigations, allegations, charges, pleas, and prosecutions is important because it quantifies the amount of fraud officials detect. Even if prosecutors vigorously pursue voter fraud, however, the number of fraud cases charged probably does not capture the total amount of voter fraud. Information on official investigations, charges, and prosecutions should be supplemented by surveys of voters and a comparison of voting rolls to death rolls.

2. Random Surveys of Voters

Random surveys could give insight about the percentage of votes cast fraudulently. For example, political scientists could contact a statistically representative sampling of 1,000 people who purportedly voted at the polls in the last election, ask them if they actually voted, and confirm the percentage who are valid voters. Researchers should conduct the survey soon after an election to locate as many legitimate voters as possible with fresh memories.

Because many respondents would perceive voting as a social good, some who did not vote might claim that they did, which may underestimate the extent of fraud. A surveyor might mitigate this skew through the framing of the question (“I’ve got a record that you voted. Is that true?”).

Further, some voters will not be located by researchers and others will refuse to talk to researchers. Photo identification proponents might construe these non-respondents as improper registrations that were used to commit voter fraud.

Instead of surveying all voters to determine the amount of fraud, researchers might reduce the margin of error by focusing on a random sampling of voters who signed affidavits in the three states that request photo identification but also allow voters to establish their identity through affidavit—Florida, Louisiana, and South Dakota. In
South Dakota, for example, only two percent of voters signed affidavits to establish their identity. If the survey indicates that 95 percent of those who signed affidavits are legitimate voters (and the other 5 percent were shown to be either fraudulent or were non-responsive), this suggests that voter fraud accounts for, at the maximum, 0.1 percent of ballots cast.

The affidavit study, however, is limited to three states, and it is unclear whether this sample is representative of other states (the difficulty may be magnified in Louisiana in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina’s displacement of hundreds of thousands of voters). Further, the affidavit study reveals information about the amount of fraud in a photo identification state with an affidavit exception—more voter fraud may exist in a state that does not request photo identification.

3. Examining Death Rolls

A comparison of death rolls to voting rolls might also provide an estimate of fraud.

Imagine that one million people live in state A, which has no documentary identification requirement. Death records show that 20,000 people passed away in state A in 2003. A cross-referencing of this list to the voter rolls shows that 10,000 of those who died were registered voters, and these names remained on the voter rolls during the November 2004 election. Researchers would look at what percentage of the 10,000 dead-but-registered people who “voted” in the November 2004 election. A researcher should distinguish the votes cast in the name of the dead at the polls from those cast absentee (which a photo identification requirement would not prevent). This number would be extrapolated to the electorate as a whole.

This methodology also has its strengths and weaknesses. If fraudulent voters target the dead, the study might overestimate the fraud that exists among living voters (although a low incidence of fraud among deceased voters might suggest that fraud among all voters is low). The appearance of fraud also might be inflated by false positives produced by a computer match of different people with the same name. Photo identification advocates would likely assert that the rate of voter fraud could be higher among fictitious names registered, and that the death record survey would not capture that type of fraud because fictitious names registered would not show up in the death records. Nevertheless, this study, combined with the other two, would provide important insight into the magnitude of fraud likely to exist in the absence of a photo identification requirement.
Consultants’ Recommendations

**Recommendation 1: Conduct More Interviews**

Time and resource constraints prevented the consultants from interviewing the full range of participants in the process. As a result, we recommend that any future activity in this area include conducting further interviews.

In particular, we recommend that more election officials from all levels of government, parts of the country, and parties be interviewed. These individuals have the most direct inside information on how the system works -- and at times does not work. They are often the first people voters go to when something goes wrong and are often responsible for fixing it. They are the ones who must carry out the measures that are designed to both prevent fraud and voter intimidation and suppression. They will most likely know what, therefore, is and is not working.

It would also be especially beneficial to talk to people in law enforcement, specifically federal District Election Officers (“DEOs”) and local district attorneys, as well as civil and criminal defense attorneys.

The Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice has all of the 93 U.S. Attorneys appoint Assistant U.S. Attorneys to serve as DEOs for two years. DEOs are required to

- screen and conduct preliminary investigations of complaints, in conjunction with the FBI and PIN, to determine whether they constitute potential election crimes and should become matters for investigation;
- oversee the investigation and prosecution of election fraud and other election crimes in their districts;
- coordinate their district’s (investigative and prosecutorial) efforts with DOJ headquarters prosecutors;
- coordinate election matters with state and local election and law enforcement officials and make them aware of their availability to assist with election-related matters;
- issue press releases to the public announcing the names and telephone numbers of DOJ and FBI officials to contact on election day with complaints about voting or election irregularities and answer telephones on election day to receive these complaints; and
- supervise a team of Assistant U.S. Attorneys and FBI special agents who are appointed to handle election-related allegations while the polls are open on election day.
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Given the great responsibilities of the DEOs, and the breadth of issues they must deal with, they undoubtedly are great resources for information and insight as to what types of fraud and intimidation/suppression are occurring in their districts.

In many situations, however, it is the local district attorneys who will investigate election fraud and suppression tactics, especially in local elections. They will be able to provide information on what has gone on in their jurisdictions, as well as which matters get pursued and why.

Finally, those who defend people accused of election related crimes would also be useful to speak to. They may have a different perspective on how well 'the system is working to detect, prevent, and prosecute election fraud.'

Recommendation 2: Follow Up on Nexis Research

The Nexis search conducted for this phase of the research was based on a list of search terms agreed upon by both consultants. Thousands of articles were reviewed and hundreds analyzed. Many of the articles contain allegations of fraud or intimidation. Similarly, many of the articles contain information about investigations into such activities or even charges brought. However, without being able to go beyond the agreed search terms, it could not be determined whether there was any later determination regarding the allegations, investigation or charges brought. This leaves a gaping hole: it is impossible to know if the article is just reporting on “talk” or what turns out to be a serious affront to the system.

As a result, we recommend that follow up Nexis research be conducted to determine what, if any, resolutions or further activity there was in each case. This would provide a much more accurate picture of what types of activities are actually taking place.

Recommendation 3: Follow Up on Allegations Found in Literature Review

Similarly, many allegations are made in the reports and books that we analyzed and summarized. Those allegations are often not substantiated in any way and are inherently time limited by the date of the writing. Despite this, such reports and books are frequently cited by various interested parties as evidence of fraud or intimidation.

Therefore, we recommend follow up to the literature review: for those reports and books that make or cite specific instances of fraud or intimidation, a research effort should be made to follow up on those references to see if and how they were resolved.

Recommendation 4: Review Complaints File With MyVote1 Project Voter Hotline

During the 2004 election and the statewide elections of 2005, the University of Pennsylvania led a consortium of groups and researchers in conducting the MyVote1 Project. This project involved using a 1-800 voter hotline where voters could call for poll location, be transferred to a local hotline, or leave a recorded message with a complaint.
In 2004, this resulted in over 200,000 calls received and over 56,000 recorded complaints. The researchers in charge of this project have done a great deal of work to parse and analyze the data collected through this process, including going through the audio messages and categorizing them by the nature of the complaint. These categories include registration, absentee ballot, poll access, ballot/screen, coercion/intimidation, identification, mechanical, provisional (ballot).

We recommend that further research include making full use of this data with the cooperation of the project leaders. While perhaps not a fully scientific survey given the self-selection of the callers, the information regarding 200,000 complaints should provide a good deal of insight into the problems voters experienced, especially those in the nature of intimidation or suppression.

**Recommendation 5: Further Review of Complaints Filed With U.S. Department of Justice**

Although according to a recent GAO report the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice has a variety in ways it tracks complaints of voter intimidation, the Section was extremely reluctant to provide the consultants with useful information. Further attempts should be made to obtain relevant data. This includes the telephone logs of complaints the Section keeps and information from the database – the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system – the Section maintains on complaints received and the corresponding action taken. We also recommend that further research include a review and analysis of the observer and monitor field reports from Election Day that must be filed with the Section.

**Recommendation 6: Review Reports Filed By District Election Officers**

Similarly, the consultants believe it would be useful for any further research to include a review of the reports that must be filed by every District Election Officer to the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. As noted above, the DEOs play a central role in receiving reports of voter fraud and investigating and pursuing them. Their reports back to the Department would likely provide tremendous insight into what actually transpired during the last several elections. Where necessary, information could be redacted or made confidential.

**Recommendation 7: Attend Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium**

The consultants also believe it would be useful for any further activity in this area to include attendance at the next Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium. According to the Department,

Prosecutors serving as District Election Officers in the 94 U.S. Attorneys' Offices are required to attend annual training conferences on fighting election fraud and voting rights abuses… These conferences are sponsored by the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division and the Public Integrity
Section of the Criminal Division, and feature presentations by Civil Rights officials and senior prosecutors from the Public Integrity Section and the U.S. Attorneys’ Offices. As a result of these conferences, there is a nationwide increase in Department expertise relating to the prosecution of election crimes and the enforcement of voting rights.

By attending the symposium researchers could learn more about the following:

- How District Election Officers are trained, e.g. what they are taught to focus their resources on, how they are instructed to respond to various types of complaints
- How information about previous election and voting issues is presented
- How the Voting Rights Act, the criminal laws governing election fraud and intimidation, the National Voter Registration Act, and the Help America Vote Act are described and explained to participants

**Recommendation 8: Employ Academic or Individual to Conduct Statistical Research**

Included in this report is a summary of various methodologies political scientists and others suggested to measure voter fraud and intimidation. While we note the skepticism of the Working Group in this regard, we nonetheless recommend that in order to further the mission of providing unbiased data, further activity in this area include an academic institution and/or individual that focuses on sound, statistical methods for political science research.

**Recommendation 9: Explore Improvements to Federal Law**

Finally, consultant Tova Wang recommends that future researchers review federal law to explore ways to make it easier to impose either civil or criminal penalties for acts of intimidation that do not necessarily involve racial animus and/or a physical or economic threat.

According to Craig Donsanto, long-time Director of the Election Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice:

> As with other statutes addressing voter intimidation, in the absence of any jurisprudence to the contrary, it is the Criminal Division’s position that section 1973gg-10(1) applies only to intimidation which is accomplished through the use of threats of physical or economic duress. Voter “intimidation” accomplished through less drastic means may present violations of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1973i(b), which are enforced by the Civil Rights Division through noncriminal remedies.

Mr. Donsanto reiterated these points to us on several occasions, including at the working group meeting.
As a result, researchers should examine if there is some way in which current law might be revised or new laws passed that would reach voter intimidation that does not threaten the voter physically or financially, but rather threatens the voter's right to vote as a tangible value in itself. Such an amendment or law would reach all forms of voter intimidation, no matter if it is motivated by race, party, ethnicity or any other criteria. The law would then potentially cover, for example, letters and postcards with language meant to deter voters from voting and both pre-election and Election Day challengers that are clearly mounting challenges solely on illegitimate bases.

In the alternative to finding a way to criminalize such behavior, researchers might examine ways to invigorate measures to deter and punish voter intimidation under the civil law. For example, there might be a private right of action created for voters or groups who have been subjected to intimidation tactics in the voting process. Such an action could be brought against individual offenders; any state or local actor where there is a pattern of repeated abuse in the jurisdiction that such officials did not take sufficient action against; and organizations that intentionally engage in intimidating practices. As a penalty upon finding liability, civil damages could be available plus perhaps attorney's fees.

Another, more modest measure would be, as has been suggested by Ana Henderson and Christopher Edley, to bring parity to fines for violations under the Voting Rights Act. Currently the penalty for fraud is $10,000 while the penalty for acts to deprive the right to vote is $5,000.

**Working Group Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1: Employ Observers To Collect Data in the 2006 and/or 2008 Elections**

At the working group meeting, there was much discussion about using observers to collect data regarding fraud and intimidation at the polls in the upcoming elections. Mr. Ginsberg recommended using representatives of both parties for the task. Mr. Bauer and others objected to this, believing that using partisans as observers would be unworkable and would not be credible to the public.

There was even greater concern about the difficulties in getting access to poll sites for the purposes of observation. Most states strictly limit who can be in the polling place. In addition, there are already so many groups doing observation and monitoring at the polls, administrators might object. There was further concern that observers would introduce a variable into the process that would impact the outcome. The very fact that observers were present would influence behavior and skew the results.

Moreover, it was pointed out, many of the problems we see now with respect to fraud and intimidation does not take place at the polling place, e.g. absentee ballot fraud and deceptive practices. Poll site monitoring would not capture this activity. Moreover, with
increased use of early voting, poll site monitoring might have to go on for weeks to be effective, which would require tremendous resources.

Mr. Weinberg suggested using observers in the way they are utilized in international elections. Such observers come into a jurisdiction prior to the election, and use standardized forms at the polling sites to collect data.

**Recommendation 2: Do a Study on Absentee Ballot Fraud**

The working group agreed that since absentee ballot fraud is the main form of fraud occurring, and is a practice that is great expanding throughout the country, it would make sense to do a stand-alone study of absentee ballot fraud. Such a study would be facilitated by the fact that there already is a great deal of information on how, when, where and why such practices are carried out based on cases successfully prosecuted. Researchers could look at actual cases to see how absentee ballot fraud schemes are conducted in an effort to provide recommendations on more effective measures for preventing them.

**Recommendation 3: Use Risk Analysis Methodology to Study Fraud**

Working group members were supportive of one of the methodologies recommended for studying this issue, risk analysis. As Mr. Bauer put it, based on the assumption that people act rationally, do an examination of what types of fraud people are most likely to commit, given the relative costs and benefits. In that way, researchers can rank the types of fraud that are the easiest to commit at the least cost with the greatest effect, from most to least likely to occur. This might prove a more practical way of measuring the problems than trying to actually get a number of acts of fraud and/or intimidation occurring. Mr. Greenbaum added that one would want to examine what conditions surrounding an election would be most likely to lead to an increase in fraud. Mr. Rokita objected based on his belief that the passions of partisanship lead people to not act rationally in an election.

**Recommendation 4: Conduct Research Using Database Comparisons**

Picking up on a suggestion made by Spencer Overton and explained in the suggested methodology section, Mr. Hearne recommended studying the issue using statistical database matching. Researchers should compare the voter roll and the list of people who actually voted to see if there are “dead” and felon voters. Because of the inconsistent quality of the databases, however, a political scientist would need to work in an appropriate margin of error when using such a methodology.

**Recommendation 5: Conduct a Study of Deceptive Practices**

The working group discussed the increasing use of deceptive practices, such as flyers with false and/or intimidating information, to suppress voter participation. A number of
groups, including the Department of Justice, the EAC, and organizations such as the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, keep phone logs regarding complaints of such practices, which may be available for review and analysis. This is also an area in which there is often tangible evidence, such as copies of the flyers and postcards themselves. All of this information should be reviewed and analyzed to see how such practices are being conducted and what can be done about them.

**Recommendation 6: Study Use of HAVA Administrative Complaint Procedure As Vehicle for Measuring Fraud and Intimidation**

The EAC should study the extent to which states are actually utilizing the administrative complaint procedure mandated by HAVA. In addition, the EAC should study whether data collected through the administrative complaint procedure can be used as another source of information for measuring fraud and intimidation.

**Recommendation 7: Examine the Use of Special Election Courts**

Given that many state and local judges are elected, it may be worth exploring whether special election courts that are running before, during and after election day would be an effective means of disposing with complaints and violations in an expeditious manner. Pennsylvania employs such a system, and the EAC should consider investigating how well it is working to deal with fraud and intimidation problems.
Key Working Group Observations and Concerns

Working Group Observations

1. The main problems today are structural barriers to voting and administrative error. Mr. Perez observed that, in accordance with the research, the biggest issues today are structural barriers to voting, not stealing votes. Election administrators share this view. Election fraud is negligible, and to the extent it occurs, it needs to be prosecuted with stronger criminal laws. The biggest problem is properly preparing people, which is the responsibility of election administrators.

2. Most fraud and intimidation is happening outside of the polling place. Mr. Greenbaum observed that with respect to both voter fraud and voter suppression, such as deceptive practices and tearing up voter registration forms, most of that is taking place outside of the polling place.

3. This issue cannot be addressed through one study or one methodology alone. Mr. Weinberg observed that since there is such a variety in types of fraud and intimidation, one solution will not fit all. It will be impossible to obtain data or resolve any of these problems through a single method.

4. The preliminary research conducted for this project is extremely valuable. Several of the working group members complimented the quality of the research done and although it is only preliminary, thought it would be useful and informative in the immediate future.

5. The Department of Justice is exploring expanding its reach over voter suppression activities. In the context of the conversation about defining voter intimidation, Mr. Donsanto pointed out that while voter intimidation was strictly defined by the criminal law, his section is beginning to explore the slightly different concept of vote suppression, and how to pursue it. He mentioned the phone-jamming case in New Hampshire as an initial success in this effort. He noted that he believes that vote suppression in the form of deceptive practices ought to be a crime and the section is exploring ways to go after it within the existing statutory construct. Mr. Bauer raised the example of a party sending people dressed in paramilitary outfits to yell at people as they go to the polls, telling them they have to show identification. Mr. Donsanto said that under the laws he has to work with today, such activity is not considered corrupt. He said that his lawyers are trying to “bend” the current laws to address aggravated cases of vote suppression, and the phone-jamming case is an example of that. Mr. Donsanto said that within the Department, the term vote “suppression” and translating it into a crime is a “work in progress.”
6. **Registration fraud does not translate into vote fraud.** Ms. Rogers, Mr. Donsanto and others stated that although phony voter registration applications turned in by people being paid by the form was a problem, it has not been found in their experience to lead to fraudulent voters at the polls. Ms. Rogers said such people were motivated by money, not defrauding the election.

7. **Handling of voter fraud and intimidation complaints varies widely across states and localities.** Ms. Rogers and others observed that every state has its own process for intake and review of complaints of fraud and intimidation, and that procedures often vary within states. The amount of authority secretaries of state have to address such problems also is different in every state. Mr. Weinberg stated he believed that most secretaries of state did not have authority to do anything about these matters. Participants discussed whether secretaries ought to be given greater authority so as to centralize the process, as HAVA has mandated in other areas.

**Working Group Concerns**

1. Mr. Rokita questioned whether the purpose of the present project ought to be on assessing the level of fraud and where it is, rather than on developing methods for making such measurements. He believed that methodology should be the focus, “rather than opinions of interviewees.” He was concerned that the EAC would be in a position of “adding to the universe of opinions.”

2. Mr. Rokita questioned whether the “opinions” accumulated in the research “is a fair sampling of what’s out there.” Ms. Wang responded that one of the purposes of the research was to explore whether there is a method available to actually quantify in some way how much fraud there is and where it is occurring in the electoral process. Mr. Rokita replied that “Maybe at the end of the day we stop spending taxpayer money or it’s going to be too much to spend to find that kind of data. Otherwise, we will stop it here and recognize there is a huge difference of opinion on that issue of fraud, when it occurs is obtainable, and that would possibly be a conclusion of the EAC.” Ms. Sims responded that she thought it would be possible to get better statistics on fraud and there might be a way of “identifying at this point certain parts in the election process that are more vulnerable, that we should be addressing.”

3. Mr. Rokita stated that, “We’re not sure that fraud at the polling place doesn’t exist. We can’t conclude that.”

4. Mr. Rokita expressed concern about working with a political scientist. He believes that the “EAC needs to be very careful in who they select, because all the time and effort and money that’s been spent up to date and would be spent in the future could be invalidated by a wrong selection in the eyes of some group.”
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BRENNAN CENTER TASK FORCE ON VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY, LAWRENCE NORDEN, CHAIR

Excerpted from pp. 8-19

METHODOLOGY

The Task Force concluded, and the peer review team at NIST agreed, that the best approach for comprehensively evaluating voting system threats was to: (1) identify and categorize the potential threats against voting systems, (2) prioritize these threats based upon an agreed upon metric (which would tell us how difficult each threat is to accomplish from the attacker’s point of view), and (3) determine, utilizing the same metric employed to prioritize threats, how much more difficult each of the catalogued attacks would become after various sets of countermeasures are implemented.

This model allows us to identify the attacks we should be most concerned about (i.e., the most practical and least difficult attacks). Furthermore, it allows us to quantify the potential effectiveness of various sets of countermeasures (i.e., how difficult the least difficult attack is after the countermeasure has been implemented). Other potential models considered, but ultimately rejected by the Task Force, are detailed in Appendix B.

IDENTIFICATION OF THREATS

The first step in creating a threat model for voting systems was to identify as many potential attacks as possible. To that end, the Task Force, together with the participating election officials, spent several months identifying voting system vulnerabilities. Following this work, NIST held a Voting Systems Threat Analysis Workshop on October 7, 2005. Members of the public were invited to write up and post additional potential attacks. Taken together, this work produced over 120 potential attacks on the three voting systems. They are detailed in the catalogs annexed. Many of the attacks are described in more detail at http://vote.nist.gov/threats/papers.htm.

The types of threats detailed in the catalogs can be broken down into nine categories: (1) the insertion of corrupt software into machines prior to Election Day; (2) wireless and other remote control attacks on voting machines on Election Day; (3) attacks on tally servers; (4) miscalibration of voting machines; (5) shut off of voting machine features intended to assist voters; (6) denial of service attacks; (7) actions by corrupt poll workers or others at the polling place to affect votes cast; (8) vote buying schemes; (9) attacks on ballots or VVPT. Often, the actual attacks...
involves some combination of these categories. We provide a discussion of each type of attack in “Categories of Attacks,” infra at pp. 24–27.

PRIORITIZING THREATS: NUMBER OF INFORMED PARTICIPANTS AS METRIC

Without some form of prioritization, a compilation of the threats is of limited value. Only by prioritizing these various threats could we help election officials identify which attacks they should be most concerned about, and what steps could be taken to make such attacks as difficult as possible. As discussed below, we have determined the level of difficulty for each attack where the attacker is attempting to affect the outcome of a close statewide election.

There is no perfect way to determine which attacks are the least difficult, because each attack requires a different mix of resources – well-placed insiders, money, programming skills, security expertise, etc. Different attackers would find certain resources easier to acquire than others. For example, election fraud committed by local election officials would always involve well-placed insiders and a thorough understanding of election procedures; at the same time, there is no reason to expect such officials to have highly skilled hackers or first-rate programmers working with them. By contrast, election fraud carried out by a foreign government would likely start with plenty of money and technically skilled attackers, but probably without many conveniently placed insiders or detailed knowledge of election procedures.

Ultimately, we decided to use the “number of informed participants” as the metric for determining attack difficulty. An attack which uses fewer participants is deemed the easier attack.

We have defined “informed participant” as someone whose participation is needed to make the attack work, and who knows enough about the attack to foil or expose it. This is to be distinguished from a participant who unknowingly assists the attack by performing a task that is integral to the attack’s successful execution without understanding that the task is part of an attack on voting systems.

The reason for using the security metric “number of informed participants” is relatively straightforward: the larger a conspiracy is, the more difficult it would be to keep it secret. Where an attacker can carry out an attack by herself, she need only trust herself. On the other hand, a conspiracy that requires thousands of people to take part (like a vote-buying scheme) also requires thousands of people to keep quiet. The larger the number of people involved, the greater the likelihood that one of them (or one who was approached, but declined to take part) would either inform the public or authorities about the attack, or commit some kind of error that causes the attack to fail or become known.

Moreover, recruiting a large number of people who are willing to undermine the integrity of a statewide election is also presumably difficult. It is not hard to imagine two or three people agreeing to work to change the outcome of an election. It seems far less likely that an attacker could identify and employ hundreds or thousands of similarly corrupt people without being discovered.
We can get an idea of how this metric works by looking at one of the threats listed in our catalogs: the vote-buying threat, where an attacker or attackers pay individuals to vote for a particular candidate. This is Attack Number 26 in the PCOS Attack Catalog (though this attack would not be substantially different against DREs or DREs w/ VVPT). In order to work under our current types of voting systems, this attack requires (1) at least one person to purchase votes, (2) many people to agree to sell their votes, and (3) some way for the purchaser to confirm that the voters she pays actually voted for the candidate she supported. Ultimately, we determined that, while practical in smaller contests, a vote-buying attack would be an exceptionally difficult way to affect the outcome of a statewide election. This is because, even in a typically close statewide election, an attacker would need to involve thousands of voters to ensure that she could affect the outcome of a statewide race.

For a discussion of other metrics we considered, but ultimately rejected, see Appendix C.

**DETERMINING NUMBER OF INFORMED PARTICIPANTS**

**DETERMINING THE STEPS AND VALUES FOR EACH ATTACK**

The Task Force members broke down each of the catalogued attacks into its necessary steps. For instance, Attack 12 in the PCOS Attack Catalog is “Stuffing Ballot Box with Additional Marked Ballots.” We determined that, at a minimum, there were three component parts to this attack: (1) stealing or creating the ballots and then marking them, (2) scanning marked ballots through the PCOS scanners, probably before the polls opened, and (3) modifying the poll books in each location to ensure that the total number of votes in the ballot boxes was not greater than the number of voters who signed in at the polling place.

Task Force members then assigned a value representing the minimum number of persons they believed would be necessary to accomplish each goal. For PCOS Attack 12, the following values were assigned:

- **Minimum number required to steal or create ballots:** 5 persons total.
- **Minimum number required to scan marked ballots:** 1 per polling place attacked.
- **Minimum number required to modify poll books:** 1 per polling place attacked.

After these values were assigned, the Brennan Center interviewed several election officials to see whether they agreed with the steps and values assigned to each attack. When necessary, the values and steps were modified. The new catalogs, including attack steps and values, were then reviewed by Task Force members. The purpose of this review was to ensure, among other things, that the steps and values were sound.

These steps and values tell us how difficult it would be to accomplish a single attack in a single polling place. They do not tell us how many people it would take to change the outcome of an election successfully – that depends, of course, on specific facts about the jurisdiction: how many votes are generally recorded in each polling
place, how many polling places are there in the jurisdiction, and how close is the race? For this reason, we determined that it was necessary to construct a hypothetical jurisdiction, to which we now turn.

**NUMBER OF INFORMED PARTICIPANTS NEEDED TO CHANGE STATEWIDE ELECTION**

We have decided to examine the difficulty of each attack in the context of changing the outcome of a reasonably close statewide election. While we are concerned by potential attacks on voting systems in any type of election, we are most troubled by attacks that have the potential to affect large numbers of votes. These are the attacks that could actually change the outcome of a statewide election with just a handful of attack participants.

We are less troubled by attacks on voting systems that can only affect a small number of votes (and might therefore be more useful in local elections). This is because there are many non-system attacks that can also affect a small number of votes (*i.e.*, sending out misleading information about polling places, physically intimidating voters, submitting multiple absentee ballots, etc.). Given the fact that these non-system attacks are likely to be less difficult in terms of number of participants, financial cost, risk of detection, and time commitment, we are uncertain that an attacker would target *voting machines* to alter a small number of votes.

In order to evaluate how difficult it would be for an attacker to change the outcome of a statewide election, we created a composite jurisdiction. The composite jurisdiction was created to be representative of a relatively close statewide election. We did not want to examine a statewide election where results were so skewed toward one candidate (for instance, the re-election of Senator Edward M. Kennedy in 2000, where he won 73% of the vote), that reversing the election results would be impossible without causing extreme public suspicion. Nor did we want to look at races where changing only a relative handful of votes (for instance, the Governor's race in Washington State in 2004, which was decided by a mere 129 votes) could affect the outcome of an election; under this scenario, many of the potential attacks would involve few people, and therefore look equally difficult.

We have named our composite jurisdiction “the State of Pennasota.” The State of Pennasota is a composite of ten states: Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Ohio, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Nevada, Wisconsin and Minnesota. These states were chosen because they were the ten “battleground” states that Zogby International consistently polled in the spring, summer, and fall 2004. These are statewide elections that an attacker would have expected, ahead of time, to be fairly close.

We have also created a composite election, which we label the “Governor’s Race” in Pennasota. The results of this election are a composite of the actual results in the same ten states in the 2004 Presidential Election.

We have used these composites as the framework by which to evaluate the difficulty of the various catalogued attacks. For instance, we know a ballot-box stuffing attack would require roughly five people to create and mark fake ballots, as
well as one person per polling place to stuff the boxes, and one person per polling place to modify the poll books. But, in order to determine how many informed participants would be needed to affect a statewide race, we need to know how many polling places would need to be attacked.

The composite jurisdiction and composite election provide us with information needed to answer these questions: i.e., how many extra votes our attackers would need to add to their favored candidate’s total for him to win, how many ballots our attackers can stuff into a particular polling place’s ballot box without arousing suspicion (and related to this, how many votes are generally cast in the average polling place), how many polling places are there in the state, etc. We provide details about both the composite jurisdiction and election in the section entitled “Governor’s Race, State of Pennsylvania, 2007,” infra at pp 20–27.

**LIMITS OF INFORMED PARTICIPANTS AS METRIC**

Of the possible metrics we considered, we believe that measuring the number of people who know they are involved in an attack (and thus could provide evidence of the attack to the authorities and/or the media), is the best single measure of attack difficulty; as already discussed, we have concluded that the more people an attacker is forced to involve in his attack, the more likely it is that one of the participants would reveal the attack’s existence and foil the attack, perhaps sending attackers to jail. However, we are aware of a number of places where the methodology could provide us with questionable results.

By deciding to concentrate on size of attack team, we mostly ignore the need for other resources when planning an attack. Thus, a software attack on DREs which makes use of steganography to hide attack instruction files (see “DRE w/ VVPT Attack No.1a”, discussed in greater detail, infra at pp. 62–65) is considered easier than an attack program delivered over a wireless network at the polling place (see discussion of wireless networks, infra at pp. 85–91). However, the former attack probably requires a much more technologically sophisticated attacker.

Another imperfection with this metric is that we do not have an easy way to represent how much choice the attacker has in finding members of his attack team. Thus, with PCOS voting, we conclude that the cost of subverting a routine audit of ballots is roughly equal to the cost of intercepting ballot boxes in transit and substituting altered ballots (see discussion of PCOS attacks, infra at pp. 77–83). However, subverting the audit team requires getting a specific set of trusted people to cooperate with the attacker. By contrast, the attacker may be able to decide which precincts to tamper with based on which people he has already recruited for his attack.

In an attempt to address this concern, we considered looking at the number of “insiders” necessary to take part in each attack. Under this theory, getting five people to take part in a conspiracy to attack a voting system might not be particularly difficult. But getting five well-placed county election officials to take part in the attack would be (and should be labeled) the more difficult of the two attacks. Because, for the most part, the low-cost attacks we have identified do not necessarily involve well placed insiders (but could, for instance, involve one of many people with access to commercial off the shelf software (“COTS”) during development.
or at the vendor), we do not believe that using this metric would have substantially changed our analysis.

Finally, these attack team sizes do not always capture the logistical complexity of an attack. For example, an attack on VVPT machines involving tampering with the voting machine software and also replacing the paper records in transit requires the attacker to determine what votes were falsely produced by the voting machine and print replacement records in time to substitute them. While this is clearly possible, it raises a lot of operational difficulties—a single failed substitution leaves the possibility that the attack would be detected during the audit of ballots.

We have tried to keep these imperfections in mind when analyzing and discussing our least difficult attacks.

We suspect that much of the disagreement between voting officials and computer security experts in the last several years stems from a difference of opinion in prioritizing the difficulty of attacks. Election officials, with extensive experience in the logistics of handling tons of paper ballots, have little faith in paper and understand the kind of breakdowns in procedures that lead to traditional attacks like ballot box stuffing; in contrast, sophisticated attacks on computer voting systems appear very difficult to many of them. Computer security experts understand sophisticated attacks on computer systems, and recognize the availability of tools and expertise that makes these attacks practical to launch, but have no clear idea how they would manage the logistics of attacking a paper-based system. Looking at attack team size is one way to bridge this difference in perspective.

**EFFECTS OF IMPLEMENTING COUNTERMEASURE SETS**

The final step of our threat analysis is to measure the effect of certain countermeasures against the catalogued attacks. How much more difficult would the attacks become once the countermeasures are put into effect? How many more informed participants (if any) would be needed to counter or defeat these countermeasures?

Our process for examining the effectiveness of a countermeasure mirrors the process for determining the difficulty of an attack: we first asked whether the countermeasure would allow us to detect an attack with near certainty. If we agreed that the countermeasure would expose the attack, we identified the steps that would be necessary to circumvent or defeat the countermeasure. For each step to defeat the countermeasure, we determined the number of additional informed participants (if any) that an attacker would need to add to his team.

As with the process for determining attack difficulty, the Brennan Center interviewed numerous election officials to see whether they agreed with the steps and values assigned. When necessary, the values and steps for defeating the countermeasures were altered to reflect the input of election officials.

**COUNTERMEASURES EXAMINED**

**BASIC SET OF COUNTERMEASURES**

The first set of countermeasures we looked at is the “Basic Set” of countermeasures. This Basic Set was derived from security survey responses we received.
from county election officials around the country, as well as additional interviews with more than a dozen current and former election officials. Within the Basic Set of countermeasures are the following procedures:

**Inspection**

The jurisdiction is not knowingly using any uncertified software that is subject to inspection by the Independent Testing Authority (often referred to as the “ITA”).

**Physical Security for Machines**

- Ballot boxes (to the extent they exist) are examined (to ensure they are empty) and locked by poll workers immediately before the polls are opened.

- Before and after being brought to the polls for Election Day, voting systems for each county are locked in a single room in a county warehouse.

- The warehouse has perimeter alarms, secure locks, video surveillance and regular visits by security guards.

- Access to the warehouse is controlled by sign-in, possibly with card keys or similar automatic logging of entry and exit for regular staff.

- Some form of “tamper evident” seals are placed on machines before and after each election.

- The machines are transported to polling locations five to fifteen days before Election Day.

**Chain of Custody/Physical Security of Election Day Records**

- At close of the polls, vote tallies for each machine are totaled and compared with number of persons that have signed the poll books.

- A copy of totals for each machine is posted at each polling place on Election Night and taken home by poll workers to check against what is posted publicly at election headquarters, on the web, in the papers, or elsewhere.

- All audit information (i.e., Event Logs, VVPT records, paper ballots, machine printouts of totals) that is not electronically transmitted as part of the unofficial upload to the central election office, is delivered in official, sealed and hand-delivered information packets or boxes. All seals are numbered and tamper-evident.

- Transportation of information packets is completed by two election officials representing opposing parties who have been instructed to remain in joint custody of the information packets or boxes from the moment it leaves the precinct to the moment it arrives at the county election center.
Each polling place sends its information packets or boxes to the county election center separately, rather than having one truck or person pick up this data from multiple polling locations.

Once the sealed information packets or boxes have reached the county election center, they are logged. Numbers on the seals are checked to ensure that they have not been replaced. Any broken or replaced seals are logged. Intact seals are left intact.

After the packets and/or boxes have been logged, they are provided with physical security precautions at least as great as those listed for voting machines, above. Specifically, for Pennsylvania, we have assumed the room in which the packets are stored have perimeter alarms, secure locks, video surveillance and regular visits by security guards and county police officers; and access to the room is controlled by sign-in, possibly with card keys or similar automatic logging of entry and exit for regular staff.

Testing

- An Independent Testing Authority has certified the model of voting machine used in the polling place.

- Acceptance Testing is performed on machines at time, or soon after they are received by County.

- Pre-election Logic and Accuracy testing is performed by the relevant election official.

- Prior to opening the polls, every voting machine and vote tabulation system is checked to see that it is still configured for the correct election, including the correct precinct, ballot style, and other applicable details.

REGIMEN FOR AUTOMATIC ROUTINE AUDIT PLUS BASIC SET OF COUNTERMEASURES.

The second set of countermeasures is the Regimen for an Automatic Routine Audit Plus Basic Set of Countermeasures.

Some form of routine auditing of voter-verified paper records occurs in 12 states, to test the accuracy of electronic voting machines. They generally require between 1 and 10% of all precinct voting machines to be audited after each election.

Jurisdictions can implement this set of countermeasures only if their voting systems produce some sort of voter-verified paper record of each vote. This could be in the form of a paper ballot, in the case of PCOS, or a voter-verified paper trail ("VVPT"), in the case of DREs.

We have assumed that jurisdictions take the following steps when conducting an Automatic Routine Audit (when referring to this set of assumptions "Regimen for an Automatic Routine Audit"):
The Audit

- Leaders of the major parties in each county are responsible for selecting a sufficient number of audit-team members to be used in that county.43

- Using a highly transparent random selection mechanism (see point ii, below), the voter-verified paper records for between a small percentage of all voting machines in the State are selected for auditing.

- Using a transparent random selection method, auditors are assigned to the selected machines (two or three people, with representatives of each major political party, would comprise each audit team).

- The selection of voting machines, and the assignment of auditors to machines, occurs immediately before the audits take place. The audits take place as soon after polls close as possible – for example, at 9 a.m. the morning after polls close.

- Using a transparent random selection method, county police officers, security personnel and the video monitor assigned to guard the voter-verified records are chosen from a large pool of on-duty officers and employees on election night.

- The auditors are provided the machine tallies and are able to see that the county tally reflects the sums of the machine tallies before the start of the inspection of the paper.

- The audit would include a tally of spoiled ballots (in the case of VVPT, the number of cancellations recorded), overvotes, and undervotes.

Transparent Random Selection Process

In this report, we have assumed that random auditing procedures are in place for both the Regimen for an Automatic Routine Audit and Regimen for Parallel Testing. We have further assumed procedures to prevent a single, corrupt person from being able to fix the results. This implies a kind of transparent and public random procedure.

For the Regimen for an Automatic Routine Audit there are at least two places where transparent, random selection processes are important: in the selection of precincts to audit, and in the assignment of auditors to the precincts they will be auditing.

Good election security can employ Transparent Random Selection in other places with good effect:

- the selection of parallel testers from a pool of qualified individuals.

- the assignment of police and other security professionals from on-duty lists, to monitor key materials, for example, the VVPT records between the time that they arrive at election central and the time of the completion of the ARA.
If a selection process for auditing is to be trustworthy and trusted, ideally:

- The whole process will be publicly observable or videotaped;  
- The random selection will be publicly verifiable, i.e., anyone observing will be able to verify that the sample was chosen randomly (or at least that the number selected is not under the control of any small number of people); and
- The process will be simple and practical within the context of current election practice so as to avoid imposing unnecessary burdens on election officials.

There are a number of ways that election officials can ensure some kind of transparent randomness. One way would be to use a state lottery machine to select precincts or polling places for auditing. We have included two potential examples of transparent random selection processes in Appendix F. These apply to the Regimen for Parallel Testing as well.

**REGIMEN FOR PARALLEL TESTING PLUS BASIC SET OF COUNTERMEASURES**

The final set of countermeasures we have examined is “Parallel Testing” plus the Basic Set of countermeasures. Parallel Testing, also known as election-day testing, involves selecting voting machines at random and testing them as realistically as possible during the period that votes are being cast.

**Parallel Testing**

In developing our set of assumptions for Parallel Testing, we relied heavily upon interviews with Jocelyn Whitney, Project Manager for Parallel Testing in the State of California, and conclusions drawn from this Report.\textsuperscript{45} In our analysis, we assume that the following procedures would be included in the Parallel Testing regimen (when referring to this regimen “Regimen for Parallel Testing”) that we evaluate:

- At least two of each DRE model (meaning both vendor and model) would be selected for Parallel Testing;
- At least two DREs from each of the three largest counties would be parallel tested;
- Counties to be parallel tested would be chosen by the Secretary of State in a transparent and random manner.
- Counties would be notified as late as possible that machines from one of their precincts would be selected for Parallel Testing;\textsuperscript{46}
- Precincts would be selected through a transparent random mechanism;
- A video camera would record testing;
- For each test, there would be one tester and one observer;
• Parallel Testing would occur at the polling place;

• The script for Parallel Testing would be generated in a way that mimics voter behavior and voting patterns for the polling place;

• At the end of the Parallel Testing, the tester and observer would reconcile vote totals in the script with vote totals reported on the machine.

Transparent Random Selection Process

We further assume that the same type of transparent random selection process that would be used for the Regimen for Automatic Routine Audit would also be employed for the Regimen for Parallel Testing to determine which machines would be subjected to testing on Election Day.

APPENDIX C

ALTERNATIVE SECURITY METRICS CONSIDERED

Dollars Spent

The decision to use the number of informed participants as the metric for attack level difficulty came after considering several other potential metrics. One of the first metrics we considered was the dollar cost of attacks. This metric makes sense when looking at attacks that seek financial gain — for instance, misappropriating corporate funds. It is not rational to spend $100,000 on the misappropriation of corporate funds if the total value of those funds is $90,000. Ultimately, we rejected this metric as the basis for our analysis because the dollar cost of the attacks we considered were dwarfed by both (1) current federal and state budgets, and (2) the amounts currently spent legally in state and federal political campaigns.

Time of Attack

The relative security of safes and other safety measures are often rated in terms of “time to defeat.” This was rejected as metric of difficulty because it did not seem relevant to voting systems. Attackers breaking into a house are concerned with the amount of time it might take to complete their robbery because the homeowners or police might show up. With regard to election fraud, many attackers may be willing to start months or years before an election if they believe they can control the outcome. As discussed supra at pp. 35–48, attackers may be confident that they can circumvent the independent testing authorities and other measures meant to identify attacks, so that the amount of time an attack takes becomes less relevant.
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Ana Henderson and Christopher Edley, Jr., Voting Rights Act Reauthorization: Research-Based Recommendations to Improve Voting Access, Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Race, Ethnicity and Diversity, University of California at Berkeley, School of Law, 2006, p. 29
Existing Research Analysis

There are many reports and books that describe anecdotes and draw broad conclusions from a large array of incidents. There is little research that is truly systematic or scientific. The most systematic look at fraud is the report written by Lori Minnite. The most systematic look at voter intimidation is the report by Laughlin McDonald. Books written about this subject seem to all have a political bias and a pre-existing agenda that makes them somewhat less valuable.

Researchers agree that measuring something like the incidence of fraud and intimidation in a scientifically legitimate way is extremely difficult from a methodological perspective and would require resources beyond the means of most social and political scientists. As a result, there is much more written on this topic by advocacy groups than social scientists. It is hoped that this gap will be filled in the “second phase” of this EAC project.

Moreover, reports and books make allegations but, perhaps by their nature, have little follow up. As a result, it is difficult to know when something has remained in the stage of being an allegation and gone no further, or progressed to the point of being investigated or prosecuted or in any other way proven to be valid by an independent, neutral entity. This is true, for example, with respect to allegations of voter intimidation by civil rights organizations, and, with respect to fraud, John Fund’s frequently cited book. Again, this is something that it is hoped will be addressed in the “second phase” of this EAC project by doing follow up research on allegations made in reports, books and newspaper articles.

Other items of note:

- There is as much evidence, and as much concern, about structural forms of disenfranchisement as about intentional abuse of the system. These include felon disenfranchisement, poor maintenance of databases and identification requirements.

- There is tremendous disagreement about the extent to which polling place fraud, e.g. double voting, intentional felon voting, noncitizen voting, is a serious problem. On balance, more researchers find it to be less of a problem than is commonly described in the political debate, but some reports say it is a major problem, albeit hard to identify.

- There is substantial concern across the board about absentee balloting and the opportunity it presents for fraud.

- Federal law governing election fraud and intimidation is varied and complex and yet may nonetheless be insufficient or subject to too many limitations to be as effective as it might be.
• Deceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004.

• Voter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities, although the American Center for Voting Rights uniquely alleges it is focused on Republicans.
Existing Literature Reviewed

Reports

The Long Shadow of Jim Crow, People for the American Way and the NAACP

The New Poll Tax, Laughlin McDonald

Wisconsin Audit Report, Voter Registration Elections Board

Preliminary Findings, Milwaukee Joint Task Force Investigating Possible Election Fraud

Building Confidence in U.S. Elections, National Commission on Federal Election Reform (Carter/Baker Report)

Response to the Report of the 2005 Commission on Federal Election Reform (Carter/Baker Report), The Brennan Center and Professor Spencer Overton

Republican Ballot Security Programs: Vote Protection or Minority Vote Suppression – or Both?, Chandler Davidson

A Crazy Quilt of Tiny Pieces: State and Local Administration of American Criminal Disenfranchisement Law, Alec Ewald

Vote Fraud, Intimidation and Suppression in the 2004 Presidential Election, American Center for Voting Rights

America’s Modern Poll Tax, The Advancement Project

Analysis of the September 15, 2005 Voter Fraud Report Submitted to the New Jersey Attorney General, The Brennan Center and Professor Michael McDonald

Democracy at Risk: The November 2004 Election in Ohio, Democratic National Committee

Department of Justice Public Integrity Reports 2002, 2003, 2004

 Prosecution of Election Fraud under United States Federal Law, Craig Donsanto

Election Protection 2004, Election Protection Coalition

The Federal Crime of Election Fraud, Craig Donsanto

Views of Selected Local Election Officials on Managing Voter Registration and Ensuring Eligible Citizens Can Vote, General Accounting Office
Securing the Vote: An Analysis of Election Fraud, Lori Minnite

Shattering the Myth: An Initial Snapshot of Voter Disenfranchisement in the 2004 Elections, People for the American Way, NAACP, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights

Books

Stealing Elections, John Fund

Steal this Vote: Dirty Elections and the Rotten History of Democracy in American, Andrew Gumbel

Deliver the Vote: A History of Election Fraud, An American Political Tradition – 1742-2004, Tracey Campbell

A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the White House, David E. Johnson and Jonny R. Johnson

Fooled Again, Mark Crispin Miller

Legal

Indiana Democratic Party vs. Rokita

Common Cause of Georgia vs. Billup

U.S. Department of Justice Section 5 Recommendation Memorandum (Georgia voter identification)
APPENDIX C

BRENNAN CENTER TASK FORCE ON VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY, LAWRENCE NORDEN, CHAIR

Excerpted from p.p. 8-19

METHODOLOGY

The Task Force concluded, and the peer review team at NIST agreed, that the best approach for comprehensively evaluating voting system threats was to: (1) identify and categorize the potential threats against voting systems, (2) prioritize these threats based upon an agreed upon metric (which would tell us how difficult each threat is to accomplish from the attacker's point of view), and (3) determine, utilizing the same metric employed to prioritize threats, how much more difficult each of the catalogued attacks would become after various sets of countermeasures are implemented.

This model allows us to identify the attacks we should be most concerned about (i.e., the most practical and least difficult attacks). Furthermore, it allows us to quantify the potential effectiveness of various sets of countermeasures (i.e., how difficult the least difficult attack is after the countermeasure has been implemented). Other potential models considered, but ultimately rejected by the Task Force, are detailed in Appendix B.

IDENTIFICATION OF THREATS

The first step in creating a threat model for voting systems was to identify as many potential attacks as possible. To that end, the Task Force, together with the participating election officials, spent several months identifying voting system vulnerabilities. Following this work, NIST held a Voting Systems Threat Analysis Workshop on October 7, 2005. Members of the public were invited to write up and post additional potential attacks. Taken together, this work produced over 120 potential attacks on the three voting systems. They are detailed in the catalogs annexed.20 Many of the attacks are described in more detail at http://vote.nist.gov/threats/papers.htm.

The types of threats detailed in the catalogs can be broken down into nine categories: (1) the insertion of corrupt software into machines prior to Election Day; (2) wireless and other remote control attacks on voting machines on Election Day; (3) attacks on tally servers; (4) miscalibration of voting machines; (5) shut off of voting machine features intended to assist voters; (6) denial of service attacks; (7) actions by corrupt poll workers or others at the polling place to affect votes cast; (8) vote buying schemes; (9) attacks on ballots or VVPT. Often, the actual attacks involve some combination of these categories. We provide a discussion of each type of attack in "Categories of Attacks," infra at pp. 24-27.

PRIORITIZING THREATS:
NUMBER OF INFORMED PARTICIPANTS AS METRIC
Without some form of prioritization, a compilation of the threats is of limited value. Only by prioritizing these various threats could we help election officials identify which attacks they should be most concerned about, and what steps could be taken to make such attacks as difficult as possible. As discussed below, we have determined the level of difficulty for each attack where the attacker is attempting to affect the outcome of a close statewide election.21

There is no perfect way to determine which attacks are the least difficult, because each attack requires a different mix of resources – well-placed insiders, money, programming skills, security expertise, etc. Different attackers would find certain resources easier to acquire than others. For example, election fraud committed by local election officials would always involve well-placed insiders and a thorough understanding of election procedures; at the same time, there is no reason to expect such officials to have highly skilled hackers or first-rate programmers working with them. By contrast, election fraud carried out by a foreign government would likely start with plenty of money and technically skilled attackers, but probably without many conveniently placed insiders or detailed knowledge of election procedures.

Ultimately, we decided to use the “number of informed participants” as the metric for determining attack difficulty. An attack which uses fewer participants is deemed the easier attack.

We have defined “informed participant” as someone whose participation is needed to make the attack work, and who knows enough about the attack to foil or expose it. This is to be distinguished from a participant who unknowingly assists the attack by performing a task that is integral to the attack’s successful execution without understanding that the task is part of an attack on voting systems.

The reason for using the security metric “number of informed participants” is relatively straightforward: the larger a conspiracy is, the more difficult it would be to keep it secret. Where an attacker can carry out an attack by herself, she need only trust herself. On the other hand, a conspiracy that requires thousands of people to take part (like a vote-buying scheme) also requires thousands of people to keep quiet. The larger the number of people involved, the greater the likelihood that one of them (or one who was approached, but declined to take part) would either inform the public or authorities about the attack, or commit some kind of error that causes the attack to fail or become known.

Moreover, recruiting a large number of people who are willing to undermine the integrity of a statewide election is also presumably difficult. It is not hard to imagine two or three people agreeing to work to change the outcome of an election. It seems far less likely that an attacker could identify and employ hundreds or thousands of similarly corrupt people without being discovered.

We can get an idea of how this metric works by looking at one of the threats listed in our catalogs: the vote-buying threat, where an attacker or attackers pay individuals to vote for a particular candidate. This is Attack Number 26 in the PCOS Attack Catalog (though this attack would not be substantially different against DREs or DREs w/ VVPT).23 In order to work under our current types of voting
systems, this attack requires (1) at least one person to purchase votes, (2) many people to agree to sell their votes, and (3) some way for the purchaser to confirm that the voters she pays actually voted for the candidate she supported. Ultimately, we determined that, while practical in smaller contests, a vote-buying attack would be an exceptionally difficult way to affect the outcome of a statewide election. This is because, even in a typically close statewide election, an attacker would need to involve thousands of voters to ensure that she could affect the outcome of a statewide race.24

For a discussion of other metrics we considered, but ultimately rejected, see Appendix C.

DETERMINING NUMBER OF INFORMED PARTICIPANTS

DETERMINING THE STEPS AND VALUES FOR EACH ATTACK

The Task Force members broke down each of the catalogued attacks into its necessary steps. For instance, Attack 12 in the PCOS Attack Catalog is “Stuffing Ballot Box with Additional Marked Ballots.”25 We determined that, at a minimum, there were three component parts to this attack: (1) stealing or creating the ballots and then marking them, (2) scanning marked ballots through the PCOS scanners, probably before the polls opened, and (3) modifying the poll books in each location to ensure that the total number of votes in the ballot boxes was not greater than the number of voters who signed in at the polling place.

Task Force members then assigned a value representing the minimum number of persons they believed would be necessary to accomplish each goal. For PCOS Attack 12, the following values were assigned:26

Minimum number required to steal or create ballots: 5 persons total.27

Minimum number required to scan marked ballots: 1 per polling place attacked.

Minimum number required to modify poll books: 1 per polling place attacked.28

After these values were assigned, the Brennan Center interviewed several election officials to see whether they agreed with the steps and values assigned to each attack.29 When necessary, the values and steps were modified. The new catalogs, including attack steps and values, were then reviewed by Task Force members. The purpose of this review was to ensure, among other things, that the steps and values were sound.

These steps and values tell us how difficult it would be to accomplish a single attack in a single polling place. They do not tell us how many people it would take to change the outcome of an election successfully – that depends, of course, on specific facts about the jurisdiction: how many votes are generally recorded in each polling place, how many polling places are there in the jurisdiction, and how close is the race? For this reason, we determined that it was necessary to construct a hypothetical jurisdiction, to which we now turn.

NUMBER OF INFORMED PARTICIPANTS NEEDED TO CHANGE STATEWIDE ELECTION
We have decided to examine the difficulty of each attack in the context of changing the outcome of a reasonably close statewide election. While we are concerned by potential attacks on voting systems in any type of election, we are most troubled by attacks that have the potential to affect large numbers of votes. These are the attacks that could actually change the outcome of a statewide election with just a handful of attack participants.

We are less troubled by attacks on voting systems that can only affect a small number of votes (and might therefore be more useful in local elections). This is because there are many non-system attacks that can also affect a small number of votes (i.e., sending out misleading information about polling places, physically intimidating voters, submitting multiple absentee ballots, etc.). Given the fact that these non-system attacks are likely to be less difficult in terms of number of participants, financial cost, risk of detection, and time commitment, we are uncertain that an attacker would target voting machines to alter a small number of votes.

In order to evaluate how difficult it would be for an attacker to change the outcome of a statewide election, we created a composite jurisdiction. The composite jurisdiction was created to be representative of a relatively close statewide election. We did not want to examine a statewide election where results were so skewed toward one candidate (for instance, the re-election of Senator Edward M. Kennedy in 2000, where he won 73% of the votes30), that reversing the election results would be impossible without causing extreme public suspicion. Nor did we want to look at races where changing only a relative handful of votes (for instance, the Governor's race in Washington State in 2004, which was decided by a mere 129 votes31) could affect the outcome of an election; under this scenario, many of the potential attacks would involve few people, and therefore look equally difficult.

We have named our composite jurisdiction "the State of Pennasota." The State of Pennasota is a composite of ten states: Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Ohio, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Nevada, Wisconsin and Minnesota. These states were chosen because they were the ten "battleground" states that Zogby International consistently polled in the spring, summer, and fall 2004.32 These are statewide elections that an attacker would have expected, ahead of time, to be fairly close.

We have also created a composite election, which we label the "Governor's Race" in Pennasota. The results of this election are a composite of the actual results in the same ten states in the 2004 Presidential Election.

We have used these composites as the framework by which to evaluate the difficulty of the various catalogued attacks.33 For instance, we know a ballot-box stuffing attack would require roughly five people to create and mark fake ballots, as well as one person per polling place to stuff the boxes, and one person per polling place to modify the poll books. But, in order to determine how many informed participants would be needed to affect a statewide race, we need to know how many polling places would need to be attacked.

The composite jurisdiction and composite election provide us with information needed to answer these questions: i.e., how many extra votes our attackers would
need to add to their favored candidate’s total for him to win, how many ballots
our attackers can stuff into a particular polling place’s ballot box without arousing
suspicion (and related to this, how many votes are generally cast in the average
polling place), how many polling places are there in the state, etc. We provide
details about both the composite jurisdiction and election in the section entitled
“Governor’s Race, State of Pennasota, 2007,” infra at pp 20–27.

LIMITS OF INFORMED PARTICIPANTS AS METRIC

Of the possible metrics we considered, we believe that measuring the number of
people who know they are involved in an attack (and thus could provide evidence
of the attack to the authorities and/or the media), is the best single measure of
attack difficulty; as already discussed, we have concluded that the more people an
attacker is forced to involve in his attack, the more likely it is that one of the participants
would reveal the attack’s existence and foil the attack, perhaps sending
attackers to jail. However, we are aware of a number of places where the
methodology could provide us with questionable results.

By deciding to concentrate on size of attack team, we mostly ignore the need for
other resources when planning an attack. Thus, a software attack on DREs which
makes use of steganography to hide attack instruction files (see “DRE w/ VVPT
Attack No.1a”, discussed in greater detail, infra at pp. 62–65) is considered easier
than an attack program delivered over a wireless network at the polling place (see
discussion of wireless networks, infra at pp. 85–91). However, the former attack
probably requires a much more technologically sophisticated attacker.

Another imperfection with this metric is that we do not have an easy way to represent
how much choice the attacker has in finding members of his attack team.
Thus, with PCOS voting, we conclude that the cost of subverting a routine audit
of ballots is roughly equal to the cost of intercepting ballot boxes in transit and
substituting altered ballots (see discussion of PCOS attacks, infra at pp. 77–83).
However, subverting the audit team requires getting a specific set of trusted people
to cooperate with the attacker. By contrast, the attacker may be able to decide
which precincts to tamper with based on which people he has already recruited
for his attack.

In an attempt to address this concern, we considered looking at the number of
“insiders” necessary to take part in each attack. Under this theory, getting five
people to take part in a conspiracy to attack a voting system might not be particularly
difficult. But getting five well-placed county election officials to take part in
the attack would be (and should be labeled) the more difficult of the two attacks.
Because, for the most part, the low-cost attacks we have identified do not necessarily
involve well placed insiders (but could, for instance, involve one of many
people with access to commercial off the shelf software (“COTS”) during development
or at the vendor), we do not believe that using this metric would have
substantially changed our analysis.35

Finally, these attack team sizes do not always capture the logistical complexity of
an attack. For example, an attack on VVPT machines involving tampering with
the voting machine software and also replacing the paper records in transit
requires the attacker to determine what votes were falsely produced by the voting
machine and print replacement records in time to substitute them. While this is clearly possible, it raises a lot of operational difficulties – a single failed substitution leaves the possibility that the attack would be detected during the audit of ballots.

We have tried to keep these imperfections in mind when analyzing and discussing our least difficult attacks.

We suspect that much of the disagreement between voting officials and computer security experts in the last several years stems from a difference of opinion in prioritizing the difficulty of attacks. Election officials, with extensive experience in the logistics of handling tons of paper ballots, have little faith in paper and understand the kind of breakdowns in procedures that lead to traditional attacks like ballot box stuffing; in contrast, sophisticated attacks on computer voting systems appear very difficult to many of them. Computer security experts understand sophisticated attacks on computer systems, and recognize the availability of tools and expertise that makes these attacks practical to launch, but have no clear idea how they would manage the logistics of attacking a paper-based system. Looking at attack team size is one way to bridge this difference in perspective.

EFFECTS OF IMPLEMENTING COUNTERMEASURE SETS

The final step of our threat analysis is to measure the effect of certain countermeasures against the catalogued attacks. How much more difficult would the attacks become once the countermeasures are put into effect? How many more informed participants (if any) would be needed to counter or defeat these countermeasures? Our process for examining the effectiveness of a countermeasure mirrors the process for determining the difficulty of an attack: we first asked whether the countermeasure would allow us to detect an attack with near certainty. If we agreed that the countermeasure would expose the attack, we identified the steps that would be necessary to circumvent or defeat the countermeasure. For each step to defeat the countermeasure, we determined the number of additional informed participants (if any) that an attacker would need to add to his team. As with the process for determining attack difficulty, the Brennan Center interviewed numerous election officials to see whether they agreed with the steps and values assigned. When necessary, the values and steps for defeating the countermeasures were altered to reflect the input of election officials.

COUNTERMEASURES EXAMINED

BASIC SET OF COUNTERMEASURES

The first set of countermeasures we looked at is the “Basic Set” of countermeasures. This Basic Set was derived from security survey responses we received from county election officials around the country, as well as additional interviews with more than a dozen current and former election officials. Within the Basic Set of countermeasures are the following procedures:

Inspection

The jurisdiction is not knowingly using any uncertified software that is subject
to inspection by the Independent Testing Authority (often referred to as the “ITA”).

Physical Security for Machines

Ballot boxes (to the extent they exist) are examined (to ensure they are empty) and locked by poll workers immediately before the polls are opened.

Before and after being brought to the polls for Election Day, voting systems for each county are locked in a single room, in a county warehouse.

The warehouse has perimeter alarms, secure locks, video surveillance and regular visits by security guards.

Access to the warehouse is controlled by sign-in, possibly with card keys or similar automatic logging of entry and exit for regular staff.

Some form of “tamper evident” seals are placed on machines before and after each election.

The machines are transported to polling locations five to fifteen days before Election Day.

Chain of Custody/Physical Security of Election Day Records

At close of the polls, vote tallies for each machine are totaled and compared with number of persons that have signed the poll books.

A copy of totals for each machine is posted at each polling place on Election Night and taken home by poll workers to check against what is posted publicly at election headquarters, on the web, in the papers, or elsewhere.

All audit information (i.e., Event Logs, VVPT records, paper ballots, machine printouts of totals) that is not electronically transmitted as part of the unofficial upload to the central election office, is delivered in official, sealed and hand-delivered information packets or boxes. All seals are numbered and tamper-evident.

Transportation of information packets is completed by two election officials representing opposing parties who have been instructed to remain in joint custody of the information packets or boxes from the moment it leaves the precinct to the moment it arrives at the county election center.

Each polling place sends its information packets or boxes to the county election center separately, rather than having one truck or person pick up this data from multiple polling locations.

Once the sealed information packets or boxes have reached the county election center, they are logged. Numbers on the seals are checked to ensure that they have not been replaced. Any broken or replaced seals are logged. Intact seals are left intact.
After the packets and/or boxes have been logged, they are provided with physical security precautions at least as great as those listed for voting machines, above. Specifically, for Pennasota, we have assumed the room in which the packets are stored have perimeter alarms, secure locks, video surveillance and regular visits by security guards and county police officers; and access to the room is controlled by sign-in, possibly with card keys or similar automatic logging of entry and exit for regular staff.

**Testing**

An Independent Testing Authority has certified the model of voting machine used in the polling place.

Acceptance Testing is performed on machines at time, or soon after they are received by County.

Pre-election Logic and Accuracy testing is performed by the relevant election official.

Prior to opening the polls, every voting machine and vote tabulation system is checked to see that it is still configured for the correct election, including the correct precinct, ballot style, and other applicable details.

**REGIMEN FOR AUTOMATIC ROUTINE AUDIT**

The second set of countermeasures is the Regimen for an Automatic Routine Audit Plus Basic Set of Countermeasures.

Some form of routine auditing of voter-verified paper records occurs in 12 states, to test the accuracy of electronic voting machines. They generally require between 1 and 10% of all precinct voting machines to be audited after each election. Jurisdictions can implement this set of countermeasures only if their voting systems produce some sort of voter-verified paper record of each vote. This could be in the form of a paper ballot, in the case of PCOS, or a voter-verified paper trail ("VVPT"), in the case of DREs.

We have assumed that jurisdictions take the following steps when conducting an Automatic Routine Audit (when referring to this set of assumptions "Regimen for an Automatic Routine Audit"):  

**The Audit**

Leaders of the major parties in each county are responsible for selecting a sufficient number of audit-team members to be used in that county.

Using a highly transparent random selection mechanism (see point ii, below), the voter-verified paper records for between a small percentage of all voting machines in the State are selected for auditing.

Using a transparent random selection method, auditors are assigned to the selected machines (two or three people, with representatives of each major
political party, would comprise each audit team).

The selection of voting machines, and the assignment of auditors to machines, occurs immediately before the audits take place. The audits take place as soon after polls close as possible – for example, at 9 a.m. the morning after polls close.

Using a transparent random selection method, county police officers, security personnel and the video monitor assigned to guard the voter-verified records are chosen from a large pool of on-duty officers and employees on election night.

The auditors are provided the machine tallies and are able to see that the county tally reflects the sums of the machine tallies before the start of the inspection of the paper.

The audit would include a tally of spoiled ballots (in the case of VVPT, the number of cancellations recorded), overvotes, and undervotes.

**Transparent Random Selection Process**

In this report, we have assumed that random auditing procedures are in place for both the Regimen for an Automatic Routine Audit and Regimen for Parallel Testing. We have further assumed procedures to prevent a single, corrupt person from being able to fix the results. This implies a kind of transparent and public random procedure.

For the Regimen for an Automatic Routine Audit there are at least two places where transparent, random selection processes are important: in the selection of precincts to audit, and in the assignment of auditors to the precincts they will be auditing.

Good election security can employ Transparent Random Selection in other places with good effect:

- the selection of parallel testers from a pool of qualified individuals.
- the assignment of police and other security professionals from on-duty lists, to monitor key materials, for example, the VVPT records between the time that they arrive at election central and the time of the completion of the ARA.

If a selection process for auditing is to be trustworthy and trusted, ideally:

- The whole process will be publicly observable or videotaped;
- The random selection will be publicly verifiable, *i.e.*, anyone observing will be able to verify that the sample was chosen randomly (or at least that the number selected is not under the control of any small number of people); and
- The process will be simple and practical within the context of current election
practice so as to avoid imposing unnecessary burdens on election officials. There are a number of ways that election officials can ensure some kind of transparent randomness. One way would be to use a state lottery machine to select precincts or polling places for auditing. We have included two potential examples of transparent random selection processes in Appendix F. These apply to the Regimen for Parallel Testing as well.

**REGIMEN FOR PARALLEL TESTING PLUS BASIC SET OF COUNTERMEASURES**

The final set of countermeasures we have examined is “Parallel Testing” plus the Basic Set of countermeasures. Parallel Testing, also known as election-day testing, involves selecting voting machines at random and testing them as realistically as possible during the period that votes are being cast.

**Parallel Testing**

In developing our set of assumptions for Parallel Testing, we relied heavily upon interviews with Jocelyn Whitney, Project Manager for Parallel Testing in the State of California, and conclusions drawn from this Report. In our analysis, we assume that the following procedures would be included in the Parallel Testing regimen (when referring to this regimen “Regimen for Parallel Testing”) that we evaluate:

- At least two of each DRE model (meaning both vendor and model) would be selected for Parallel Testing;
- At least two DREs from each of the three largest counties would be parallel tested;
- Counties to be parallel tested would be chosen by the Secretary of State in a transparent and random manner.
- Counties would be notified as late as possible that machines from one of their precincts would be selected for Parallel Testing;
- Precincts would be selected through a transparent random mechanism;
- A video camera would record testing;
- For each test, there would be one tester and one observer;
- Parallel Testing would occur at the polling place;
- The script for Parallel Testing would be generated in a way that mimics voter behavior and voting patterns for the polling place;
- At the end of the Parallel Testing, the tester and observer would reconcile vote totals in the script with vote totals reported on the machine.

**Transparent Random Selection Process**
We further assume that the same type of transparent random selection process that would be used for the Regimen for Automatic Routine Audit would also be employed for the Regimen for Parallel Testing to determine which machines would be subjected to testing on Election Day.

APPENDIX C

ALTERNATIVE SECURITY METRICS CONSIDERED

Dollars Spent

The decision to use the number of informed participants as the metric for attack level difficulty came after considering several other potential metrics. One of the first metrics we considered was the dollar cost of attacks. This metric makes sense when looking at attacks that seek financial gain — for instance, misappropriating corporate funds. It is not rational to spend $100,000 on the misappropriation of corporate funds if the total value of those funds is $90,000. Ultimately, we rejected this metric as the basis for our analysis because the dollar cost of the attacks we considered were dwarfed by both (1) current federal and state budgets, and (2) the amounts currently spent legally in state and federal political campaigns.

Time of Attack

The relative security of safes and other safety measures are often rated in terms of “time to defeat.” This was rejected as metric of difficulty because it did not seem relevant to voting systems. Attackers breaking into a house are concerned with the amount of time it might take to complete their robbery because the homeowners or police might show up. With regard to election fraud, many attackers may be willing to start months or years before an election if they believe they can control the outcome. As discussed supra at pp. 35–48, attackers may be confident that they can circumvent the independent testing authorities and other measures meant to identify attacks, so that the amount of time an attack takes becomes less relevant.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER EAC ACTIVITY ON VOTER FRAUD AND INTIMIDATION

- Time and resource constraints prevented the consultants from interviewing the full range of participants in the process. As a result, we recommend that any future activity in this area include conducting further interviews.

In particular, we recommend that more election officials from all levels of government, parts of the country, and parties be interviewed. These individuals have the most direct inside information on how the system works -- and at times does not work. They are often the first people voters go to when something goes wrong and are often responsible for fixing it. They are the ones who must carry out the measures that are designed to both prevent fraud and voter intimidation and suppression. They will most likely know what, therefore, is and is not working.

It would also be especially beneficial to talk to people in law enforcement, specifically federal District Election Officers ("DEOs") and local district attorneys, as well as civil and criminal defense attorneys.

The Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice has all of the 93 U.S. Attorneys appoint Assistant U.S. Attorneys to serve as DEOs for two years. DEOs are required to

- screen and conduct preliminary investigations of complaints, in conjunction with the FBI and PIN, to determine whether they constitute potential election crimes and should become matters for investigation;
- oversee the investigation and prosecution of election fraud and other election crimes in their districts;
- coordinate their district’s (investigative and prosecutorial) efforts with DOJ headquarters prosecutors;
- coordinate election matters with state and local election and law enforcement officials and make them aware of their availability to assist with election-related matters;
- issue press releases to the public announcing the names and telephone numbers of DOJ and FBI officials to contact on election day with complaints about voting or election irregularities and answer telephones on election day to receive these complaints; and
- supervise a team of Assistant U.S. Attorneys and FBI special agents who are appointed to handle election-related allegations while the polls are open on election day.¹

Given the great responsibilities of the DEOs, and the breadth of issues they must deal with, they undoubtedly are great resources for information and insight as to what types of fraud and intimidation/suppression are occurring in their districts.
In many situations, however, it is the local district attorneys who will investigate election fraud and suppression tactics, especially in local elections. They will be able to provide information on what has gone on in their jurisdictions, as well as which matters get pursued and why.

Finally, those who defend people accused of election related crimes would also be useful to speak to. They may have a different perspective on how well the system is working to detect, prevent, and prosecute election fraud.

- The Nexis search conducted for this phase of the research was based on a list of search terms agreed upon by both consultants. Thousands of articles were reviewed and hundreds analyzed. Many of the articles contain allegations of fraud or intimidation. Similarly, many of the articles contain information about investigations into such activities or even charges brought. However, without being able to go beyond the agreed search terms, it could not be determined whether there was any later determination regarding the allegations, investigation or charges brought. This leaves a gaping hole: it is impossible to know if the article is just reporting on “talk” or what turns out to be a serious affront to the system.

As a result, we recommend that follow up Nexis research be conducted to determine what, if any, resolutions or further activity there was in each case. This would provide a much more accurate picture of what types of activities are actually taking place.

- Similarly, many allegations are made in the reports and books that we analyzed and summarized. Those allegations are often not substantiated in any way and are inherently time limited by the date of the writing. Despite this, such reports and books are frequently cited by various interested parties as evidence of fraud or intimidation.

Therefore, we recommend follow up to the literature review: for those reports and books that make or cite specific instances of fraud or intimidation, a research effort should be made to follow up on those references to see if and how they were resolved.

- During the 2004 election and the statewide elections of 2005, the University of Pennsylvania led a consortium of groups and researchers in conducting the MyVotel Project. This project involved using a 1-800 voter hotline where voters could call for poll location, be transferred to a local hotline, or leave a recorded message with a complaint. In 2004, this resulted in over 200,000 calls received and over 56,000 recorded complaints. The researchers in charge of this project have done a great deal of work to parse and analyze the data collected through this process, including going through the audio messages and categorizing them by the nature of the complaint. These categories include registration, absentee
ballot, poll access, ballot/screen, coercion/intimidation, identification, mechanical, provisional (ballot).

We recommend that further research include making full use of this data with the cooperation of the project leaders. While perhaps not a fully scientific survey given the self-selection of the callers, the information regarding 200,000 complaints should provide a good deal of insight into the problems voters experienced, especially those in the nature of intimidation or suppression.

- Although according to a recent GAO report the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice has a variety in ways it tracks complaints of voter intimidation,iii the Section was extremely reluctant to provide the consultants with useful information. Further attempts should be made to obtain relevant data. This includes the telephone logs of complaints the Section keeps and information from the database – the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system – the Section maintains on complaints received and the corresponding action taken. We also recommend that further research include a review and analysis of the observer and monitor field reports from Election Day that must be filed with the Section.

- Similarly, the consults believe it would be useful for any further research to include a review of the reports that must be filed by every District Election Officer to the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. As noted above, the DEOs play a central role in receiving reports of voter fraud and investigating and pursuing them. Their reports back to the Department would likely provide tremendous insight into what actually transpired during the last several elections. Where necessary, information could be redacted or made confidential.

- The consultants also believe it would be useful for any further activity in this area to include attendance at the next Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium. According to the Department,iv

Prosecutors serving as District Election Officers in the 94 U.S. Attorneys’ Offices are required to attend annual training conferences on fighting election fraud and voting rights abuses... These conferences are sponsored by the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division and the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division, and feature presentations by Civil Rights officials and senior prosecutors from the Public Integrity Section and the U.S. Attorneys’ Offices. As a result of these conferences, there is a nationwide increase in Department expertise relating to the prosecution of election crimes and the enforcement of voting rights.

By attending the symposium researchers could learn more about the following:
- How District Election Officers are trained, e.g. what they are taught to focus their resources on, how they are instructed to respond to various types of complaints
- How information about previous election and voting issues is presented
- How the Voting Rights Act, the criminal laws governing election fraud and intimidation, the National Voter Registration Act, and the Help America Vote Act are described and explained to participants

- Included in this report is a summary of various methodologies political scientists and others suggested to measure voter fraud and intimidation. While we note the skepticism of the Working Group in this regard, we nonetheless recommend that in order to further the mission of providing unbiased data, further activity in this area include an academic institution and/or individual that focuses on sound, statistical methods for political science research.
- Finally, consultant Tova Wang recommends that future researchers review federal law to explore ways to make it easier to impose either civil or criminal penalties for acts of intimidation that do not necessarily involve racial animus and/or a physical or economic threat.

According to Craig Donsanto, long-time director of the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice,  

As with other statutes addressing voter intimidation, in the absence of any jurisprudence to the contrary, it is the Criminal Division’s position that section 1973gg-10(1) applies only to intimidation which is accomplished through the use of threats of physical or economic duress. Voter “intimidation” accomplished through less drastic means may present violations of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1973i(b), which are enforced by the Civil Rights Division through noncriminal remedies."

Mr. Donsanto reiterated these points to us on several occasions, including at the working group meeting.

As a result, researchers should examine if there is some way in which current law might be revised or new laws passed that would reach voter intimidation that does not threaten the voter physically or financially, but rather threatens the voter’s right to vote as a tangible value in itself. Such an amendment or law would reach all forms of voter intimidation, no matter if it is motivated by race, party, ethnicity or any other criteria. The law would then potentially cover, for example, letters and postcards with language meant to deter voters from voting and both pre-election and Election Day challengers that are clearly mounting challenges solely on illegitimate bases.

In the alternative to finding a way to criminalize such behavior, researchers might examine ways to invigorate measures to deter and punish voter intimidation under the civil law. For example, there might be a private right of action created for
voters or groups who have been subjected to intimidation tactics in the voting process. Such an action could be brought against individual offenders; any state or local actor where there is a pattern of repeated abuse in the jurisdiction that such officials did not take sufficient action against; and organizations that intentionally engage in intimidating practices. As a penalty upon finding liability, civil damages could be available plus perhaps attorney’s fees.

Another, more modest measure would be, as has been suggested by Ana Henderson and Christopher Edley,\(^1\) to bring parity to fines for violations under the Voting Rights Act. Currently the penalty for fraud is $10,000 while the penalty for acts to deprive the right to vote is $5,000.

---

\(^1\) Department of Justice's Activities to Address Past Election-Related Voting Irregularities, General Accounting Office, October 14, 2004, GAO-04-1041R

\(^2\) The MyVote1 Project Final Report, Fels Institute of Government, University of Pennsylvania, November 1, 2005, Pg. 12

\(^3\) Department of Justice's Activities to Address Past Election-Related Voting Irregularities, General Accounting Office, October 14, 2004, GAO-04-1041R, p. 4. This same report criticizes some of the procedures the Section used for these systems and urged the Department to improve upon them in time for the 2004 presidential election. No follow-up report has been done since that time to the best of our knowledge.

\(^4\) "Department Of Justice To Hold Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium," U.S. Department of Justice press release, August 2, 2005


\(^6\) Ana Henderson and Christopher Edley, Jr., Voting Rights Act Reauthorization: Research-Based Recommendations to Improve Voting Access, Chief Justice Earl Warrant Institute on Race, Ethnicity and Diversity, University of California at Berkeley, School of Law, 2006, p. 29
Interviews

Common Themes

- There is virtually universal agreement that absentee ballot fraud is the biggest problem, with vote buying and registration fraud coming in after that. The vote buying often comes in the form of payment for absentee ballots, although not always. Some absentee ballot fraud is part of an organized effort; some is by individuals, who sometimes are not even aware that what they are doing is illegal. Voter registration fraud seems to take the form of people signing up with false names. Registration fraud seems to be most common where people doing the registration were paid by the signature.

- There is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud, or at least much less than is claimed, including voter impersonation, “dead” voters, noncitizen voting and felon voters. Those few who believe it occurs often enough to be a concern say that it is impossible to show the extent to which it happens, but do point to instances in the press of such incidents. Most people believe that false registration forms have not resulted in polling place fraud, although it may create the perception that vote fraud is possible. Those who believe there is more polling place fraud than reported/investigated/prosecuted believe that registration fraud does lead to fraudulent votes. Jason Torchinsky from the American Center for Voting Rights is the only interviewee who believes that polling place fraud is widespread and among the most significant problems in the system.

- Abuse of challenger laws and abusive challengers seem to be the biggest intimidation/suppression concerns, and many of those interviewed assert that the new identification requirements are the modern version of voter intimidation and suppression. However there is evidence of some continued outright intimidation and suppression, especially in some Native American communities. A number of people also raise the problem of poll workers engaging in harassment of minority voters. Other activities commonly raised were the issue of polling places being moved at the last moment, unequal distribution of voting machines, videotaping of voters at the polls, and targeted misinformation campaigns.

- Several people indicate – including representatives from DOJ – that for various reasons, the Department of Justice is bringing fewer voter intimidation and suppression cases now and is focusing on matters such as noncitizen voting, double voting and felon voting. While the civil rights section continues to focus on systemic patterns of malfeasance, the public integrity section is focusing now on individuals, on isolated instances of fraud.

- The problem of badly kept voter registration lists, with both ineligible voters remaining on the rolls and eligible voters being taken off, remains a common concern. A few people are also troubled by voters being on registration lists in two states. They said that there was no evidence that this had led to double voting, but it opens the door to the possibility. There is great hope that full implementation of the new requirements of HAVA – done well, a major caveat – will reduce this problem dramatically.
Common Recommendations:

- Many of those interviewed recommend better poll worker training as the best way to improve the process; a few also recommended longer voting times or voting on days other than election day (such as weekends) but fewer polling places so only the best poll workers would be employed.

- Many interviewed support stronger criminal laws and increased enforcement of existing laws with respect to both fraud and intimidation. Advocates from across the spectrum expressed frustration with the failure of the Department of Justice to pursue complaints.
  - With respect to the civil rights section, John Tanner indicated that fewer cases are being brought because fewer are warranted — it has become increasingly difficult to know when allegations of intimidation and suppression are credible since it depends on one’s definition of intimidation, and because both parties are doing it. Moreover prior enforcement of the laws has now changed the entire landscape — race based problems are rare now. Although challenges based on race and unequal implementation of identification rules would be actionable, Mr. Tanner was unaware of such situations actually occurring and the section has not pursued any such cases.
  - Craig Donsanto of the public integrity section says that while the number of election fraud related complaints have not gone up since 2002, nor has the proportion of legitimate to illegitimate claims of fraud, the number of cases the department is investigating and the number of indictments the section is pursuing are both up dramatically. Since 2002, the department has brought more cases against alien voters, felon voters and double voters than ever before. Mr. Donsanto would like more resources so it can do more and would like to have laws that make it easier for the federal government to assume jurisdiction over voter fraud cases.

- A couple of interviewees recommend a new law that would make it easier to criminally prosecute people for intimidation even when there is not racial animus.

- Almost everyone hopes that administrators will maximize the potential of statewide voter registration databases to prevent fraud. Of particular note, Sarah Ball Johnson, Executive Director of Elections for Kentucky, emphasized that having had an effective statewide voter registration database for more than thirty years has helped that state avoid most of the fraud problems that have been alleged elsewhere, such as double voting and felon voting.

- Several advocate expanded monitoring of the polls, including some associated with the Department of Justice.

- Challenge laws, both with respect to pre-election day challenges and challengers at the polls, need to be revised by all states to ensure they are not used for purposes of wrongful disenfranchisement and harassment.

- Several people advocate passage of Senator Barak Obama’s “deceptive practices” bill.
• There is a split on whether it would be helpful to have nonpartisan election officials – some indicated they thought even if elections officials are elected nonpartisanly they will carry out their duties in biased ways nonetheless. However, most agree that elections officials pursuing partisan agendas is a problem that must be addressed in some fashion. Suggestions included moving election responsibilities out of the secretary of states’ office; increasing transparency in the process; and enacting conflict of interest rules.

• A few recommend returning to allowing use of absentee ballots “for cause” only if it were politically feasible.

• A few recommend enacting a national identification card, including Pat Rogers, an attorney in New Mexico, and Jason Torchinsky from ACVR, who advocates the scheme contemplated in the Carter-Baker Commission Report.

• A couple of interviewees indicated the need for clear standards for the distribution of voting machines.
Defining Election Fraud

Note: The definition provided below is for the purposes of this EAC project. Most of the acts described come within the federal criminal definition of fraud, but some may not.

Election fraud is any intentional action, or intentional failure to act when there is a duty to do so, that corrupts the election process in a manner that can impact on election outcomes. This includes interfering in the process by which persons register to vote; the way in which ballots are obtained, marked, or tabulated; and the process by which election results are canvassed and certified.

Examples include the following:

- falsifying voter registration information pertinent to eligibility to cast a vote, (e.g. residence, criminal status, etc.);
- altering completed voter registration applications by entering false information;
- knowingly destroying completed voter registration applications (other than spoiled applications) before they can be submitted to the proper election authority;
- knowingly removing eligible voters from voter registration lists, in violation of HAVA, NVRA, or state election laws;
- intentional destruction by election officials of voter registration records or balloting records, in violation of records retention laws, to remove evidence of election fraud;
- vote buying;
- voting in the name of another;
- voting more than once;
- coercing a voter's choice on an absentee ballot;
- using a false name and/or signature on an absentee ballot;
- destroying or misappropriating an absentee ballot;
- felons, or in some states ex-felons, who vote when they know they are ineligible to do so;
- misleading an ex-felon about his or her right to vote;
- voting by non-citizens who know they are ineligible to do so;
- intimidating practices aimed at vote suppression or deterrence, including the abuse of challenge laws;
- deceiving voters with false information (e.g.; deliberately directing voters to the wrong polling place or providing false information on polling hours and dates);
• knowingly failing to accept voter registration applications, to provide ballots, or to accept and count voted ballots in accordance with the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act;
• intentional miscounting of ballots by election officials;
• intentional misrepresentation of vote tallies by election officials;
• acting in any other manner with the intention of suppressing voter registration or voting, or interfering with vote counting and the certification of the vote.

Voting fraud does not include mistakes made in the course of voter registration, balloting, or tabulating ballots and certifying results. For purposes of the EAC study, it also does not include violations of campaign finance laws.
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Absentee Ballots

According to press reports, absentee ballots are abused in a variety of ways:

1. Campaign workers, candidates and others coerce the voting choices of vulnerable populations, usually elderly voters.
2. Workers for groups and individuals have attempted to vote absentee in the names of the deceased.
3. Workers for groups, campaign workers and individuals have attempted to forge the names of other voters on absentee ballot requests and absentee ballots and thus vote multiple times.

It is unclear how often actual convictions result from these activities (a handful of articles indicate convictions and guilty pleas), but this is an area in which there have been a substantial number of official investigations and actual charges filed, according to news reports where such information is available. A few of the allegations became part of civil court proceedings contesting the outcome of the election.

While absentee fraud allegations turn up throughout the country, a few states have had several such cases. Especially of note are Indiana, New Jersey, South Dakota, and most particularly, Texas. Interestingly, there were no articles regarding Oregon, where the entire system is vote by mail.

Voter Registration Fraud

According to press reports, the following types of allegations of voter registration fraud are most common:

1. Registering in the name of dead people.
2. Fake names and other information on voter registration forms.
3. Illegitimate addresses used on voter registration forms.
4. Voters being tricked into registering for a particular party under false pretenses.
5. Destruction of voter registration forms depending on the party the voter registered with.

There was only one self evident instance of a noncitizen registering to vote. Many of the instances reported on included official investigations and charges filed, but few actual convictions, at least from the news reporting. There have been multiple reports of registration fraud in California, Colorado, Florida, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, South Dakota and Wisconsin.

Voter Intimidation and Suppression
This is the area which had the most articles in part because there were so many allegations of intimidation and suppression during the 2004 election. Most of these remained allegations and no criminal investigation or prosecution ensued. Some of the cases did end up in civil litigation.

This is not to say that these alleged activities were confined to 2004 – there were several allegations made during every year studied. Most notable were the high number of allegations of voter intimidation and harassment reported during the 2003 Philadelphia mayoral race.

A very high number of the articles were about the issue of challenges to voters' registration status and challengers at the polling places. There were many allegations that planned challenge activities were targeted at minority communities. Some of the challenges were concentrated in immigrant communities.

However, the tactics alleged varied greatly. The types of activities discussed also include the following:

- Photographing or videotaping voters coming out of polling places.
- Improper demands for identification
- Poll watchers harassing voters
- Poll workers being hostile to or aggressively challenging voters
- Disproportionate police presence
- Poll watchers wearing clothes with messages that seemed intended to intimidate
- Insufficient voting machines and unmanageably long lines

Although the incidents reported on occurred everywhere, not surprisingly, many came from “battleground” states. There were several such reports out of Florida, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

“Dead Voters and Multiple Voting”

There were a high number of articles about people voting in the names of the dead and voting more than once. Many of these articles were marked by allegations of big numbers of people committing these frauds, and relatively few of these allegations turning out to be accurate according to investigations by the newspapers themselves, elections officials and criminal investigators. Often the problem turned out to be a result of administrative error, poll workers mis-marking of voter lists, a flawed registration list and/or errors made in the attempt to match names of voters on the list with the names of the people who voted. In a good number of cases, there were allegations that charges of double voting by political leaders were an effort to scare people away from the voting process.

Nonetheless there were a few cases of people actually being charged and/or convicted for these kinds of activities. Most of the cases involved a person voting both by absentee ballot and in person. A few instances involved people voting both during early voting
and on Election Day, which calls into question the proper marking and maintenance of
the voting lists. In many instances, the person charged claimed not to have voted twice
on purpose. A very small handful of cases involved a voter voting in more than one
county and there was one substantiated case involving a person voting in more than one
state. Other instances in which such efforts were alleged were disproved by officials.

In the case of voting in the name of a dead person, the problem lay in the voter
registration list not being properly maintained, i.e. the person was still on the registration
list as eligible to vote, and a person taking criminal advantage of that. In total, the San
Francisco Chronicle found 5 such cases in March 2004; the AP cited a newspaper
analysis of five such persons in an Indiana primary in May 2004; and a senate committee
found two people to have voted in the names of the dead in 2005.

As usual, there were a disproportionate number of such articles coming out of Florida.
Notably, there were three articles out of Oregon, which has one hundred percent vote-by-
mail.

Vote Buying

There were a surprising number of articles about vote buying cases. A few of these
instances involved long-time investigations in three particular jurisdictions as detailed in
the vote buying summary. There were more official investigations, indictments and
convictions/pleas in this area. All of these cases are concentrated in the Midwest and
South.

Deceptive Practices

In 2004 there were numerous reports of intentional disinformation about voting eligibility
and the voting process meant to confuse voters about their rights and when and where to
vote. Misinformation came in the form of flyers, phone calls, letters, and even people
going door to door. Many of the efforts were reportedly targeted at minority
communities. A disproportionate number of them came from key battleground states,
particularly Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. From the news reports found, only one of
these instances was officially investigated, the case in Oregon involving the destruction
of voter registration forms. There were no reports of prosecutions or any other legal
proceeding.

Non-citizen Voting

There were surprisingly few articles regarding noncitizen registration and voting – just
seven all together, in seven different states across the country. They were also evenly
split between allegations of noncitizens registering and noncitizens voting. In one case
charges were filed against ten individuals. In one case a judge in a civil suit found there
was illegal noncitizen voting. Three instances prompted official investigations. Two
cases, from this nexis search, remained just allegations of noncitizen voting.
Felon Voting

Although there were only thirteen cases of felon voting, some of them involved large numbers of voters. Most notably, of course, are the cases that came to light in the Washington gubernatorial election contest (see Washington summary) and in Wisconsin (see Wisconsin summary). In several states, the main problem has been the large number of ineligible felons that remained on the voting list.

Election Official Fraud

In most of the cases in which fraud by elections officials is suspected or alleged, it is difficult to determine whether it is incompetence or a crime. There are several cases of ballots gone missing, ballots unaccounted for and ballots ending up in a worker's possession. In two cases workers were said to have changed peoples' votes. The one instance in which widespread ballot box stuffing by elections workers was alleged was in Washington State. The judge in the civil trial of that election contest did not find that elections workers had committed fraud. Four of the cases are from Texas.
Working Group Recommendations

1. **Use the 2006 and/or 2008 elections as a laboratory by employing observers.** At the working group meeting, there was much discussion about using observers to collect data regarding fraud and intimidation at the polls in the upcoming elections. Mr. Ginsberg recommended using representatives of both parties for the task. Mr. Bauer and others objected to this, believing that using partisans as observers would be unworkable and would not be credible to the public.

There was even greater concern about the difficulties in getting access to poll sites for the purposes of observation. Most states strictly limit who can be in the polling place. In addition, there are already so many groups doing observation and monitoring at the polls, administrators might object. There was further concern that observers would introduce a variable into the process that would impact the outcome. The very fact that observers were present would influence behavior and skew the results.

Moreover, it was pointed out, many of the problems we see now with respect to fraud and intimidation does not take place at the polling place, e.g. absentee ballot fraud and deceptive practices. Poll site monitoring would not capture this activity. Moreover, with increased use of early voting, poll site monitoring might have to go on for weeks to be effective, which would require tremendous resources.

Mr. Weinberg suggested using observers in the way they are utilized in international elections. Such observers come into a jurisdiction prior to the election, and use standardized forms at the polling sites to collect data.

2. **Do a study on absentee ballot fraud.** The working group agreed that since absentee ballot fraud is the main form of fraud occurring, and is a practice that is great expanding throughout the country, it would make sense to do a stand-alone study of absentee ballot fraud. Such a study would be facilitated by the fact that there already is a great deal of information on how, when, where and why such practices are carried out based on cases successfully prosecuted. Researchers could look at actual cases to see how absentee ballot fraud schemes are conducted in an effort to provide recommendations on more effective measures for preventing them.

3. **Use risk analysis methodology to study fraud.** Working group members were supportive of one of the methodologies recommended for studying this issue, risk analysis. As Mr. Bauer put it, based on the assumption that people act rationally, do an examination of what types of fraud people are most likely to commit, given the relative costs and benefits. In that way, researchers can rank the types of fraud that are the easiest to commit at the least cost with the greatest effect, from

---

1 See Appendix C, and section on methodology
most to least likely to occur. This might prove a more practical way of measuring the problems than trying to actually get a number of acts of fraud and/or intimidation occurring. Mr. Greenbaum added that one would want to examine what conditions surrounding an election would be most likely to lead to an increase in fraud. Mr. Rokita objected based on his belief that the passions of partisanship lead people to not act rationally in an election.

4. **Conduct research using a methodology of database comparison.** Picking up on a suggestion made by Spencer Overton and explained in the suggested methodology section, Mr. Hearne recommended studying the issue using statistical database matching. Researchers should compare the voter roll and the list of people who actually voted to see if there are “dead” and felon voters. Because of the inconsistent quality of the databases, however, a political scientist would need to work in an appropriate margin of error when using such a methodology.

5. **Conduct a study of deceptive practices.** The working group discussed the increasing use of deceptive practices, such as flyers with false and/or intimidating information, to suppress voter participation. A number of groups, including the Department of Justice, the EAC, and organizations such as the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, keep phone logs regarding complaints of such practices, which may be available for review and analysis. This is also an area in which there is often tangible evidence, such as copies of the flyers and postcards themselves. All of this information should be reviewed and analyzed to see how such practices are being conducted and what can be done about them.

6. **Study use of HAVA’s administrative complaint procedure to see if it can be used to measure some forms of fraud and intimidation.** The EAC should study the extent to which states are actually utilizing the administrative complaint procedure mandated by HAVA. In addition, the EAC should study whether data collected through the administrative complaint procedure can be used as another source of information for measuring fraud and intimidation.

7. **Examine the use of special election courts.** Given that many state and local judges are elected, it may be worth exploring whether special election courts that are running before, during and after election day would be an effective means of disposing with complaints and violations in an expeditious manner. Pennsylvania employs such a system, and the EAC should consider investigating how well it is working to deal with fraud and intimidation problems.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER EAC ACTIVITY ON VOTER FRAUD AND INTIMIDATION

Consultant Recommendations

- **Greatly expand the scope of individuals interviewed.** Time and resource constraints prevented the consultants from interviewing the full range of participants in the electoral process. As a result, we recommend that in the next phase of this project, further interviews be conducted. In particular, a greater sampling of state and local election officials from different parts of the country should be interviewed. These individuals have first-hand information and experience in the operation of elections.

  We also recommend that in the next phase interviews be conducted with people in law enforcement, specifically Federal District Election Officers ("DEOs")\(^1\) and local district attorneys and attorneys defending those accused of election crimes or civil violations. In many instances it is the local district attorney who will investigate election fraud and suppression complaints. Attorneys who defend people accused of election crimes will have a different perspective on how the system is working to detect, prevent, and prosecute election fraud.

- **Conduct Follow-Up Nexis Research.** The Nexis search conducted for this phase of the research was based on a list of search terms agreed upon by both consultants. Thousands of articles were reviewed and hundreds analyzed. Many of the articles contain allegations of fraud or intimidation. Similarly, many of the articles contain information about investigations into such activities or even charges brought. However, without being able to go beyond the search terms, we

---

\(^1\) The Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice has all of the 93 U.S. Attorneys appoint Assistant U.S. Attorneys to serve as DEOs for two years. DEOs are required to screen and conduct preliminary investigations of complaints, in conjunction with the FBI and PIN, to determine whether they constitute potential election crimes and should become matters for investigation; oversee the investigation and prosecution of election fraud and other election crimes in their districts; coordinate their district’s (investigative and prosecutorial) efforts with DOJ headquarters prosecutors; coordinate election matters with state and local election and law enforcement officials and make them aware of their availability to assist with election-related matters; issue press releases to the public announcing the names and telephone numbers of DOJ and FBI officials to contact on election day with complaints about voting or election irregularities and answer telephones on election day to receive these complaints; and supervise a team of Assistant U.S. Attorneys and FBI special agents who are appointed to handle election-related allegations while the polls are open on election day. *Department of Justice’s Activities to Address Past Election-Related Voting Irregularities:* General Accounting Office, October 14, 2004, GAO-04-1041R
could not determine whether there was any action taken regarding the allegations, investigation or charges brought. Consequently, it is impossible to know if the article is just reporting on "talk" or what turns out to be a serious affront to the system. We recommend that follow up Nexis research be conducted to establish what, if any, resolutions or further activity there was in each case.

We also believe that in the second phase of this project, there should be a sampling of local newspapers from around the country to analyze for articles on voter fraud and voter intimidation. This will lead to a better idea of problems that occur on city and county levels that are often not reported statewide.

- **Conduct follow-up research to the literature reviews.** Similarly, many allegations are made in the reports and books that we analyzed and summarized. Those allegations are often not substantiated in any way and are inherently time limited by the date of the writing. Despite this, various interested parties frequently cite such reports and books as evidence of fraud or intimidation. Therefore, we recommend as a follow up to the literature review, an analysis of the resolution, if any, of specific instances of fraud and intimidation cited in the books and reports reviewed in the first phase.

- **Review a sampling of state district court cases.** In the first phase, we read and analyzed over 44,000 cases. Unfortunately, few of these were found to be on point. We therefore recommend that in the second phase, research should be concentrated on a national sampling of state district court level electoral cases. Often the district courts settle important issues that are not subsequently appealed. We believe that there could be a storehouse of information regarding vote fraud and intimidation in these cases.

- **Survey state election fraud and intimidation laws.** We recommend that there be a sampling of state electoral laws (including criminal penalty provisions), in order to aid in the development of model legislation that would address voter fraud and intimidation.

- **Review which states collect data on fraud and intimidation.** Evidently a few states, such as Arkansas and Georgia, collect and maintain data on complaints of fraud and intimidation and the disposition of those allegations at the state level. Phase two should examine what other states have such information and seek to obtain it for review and analysis. Policies and protocols on gathering such information in these states should also be looked at as possible models for the states that do not employ this practice.

- **Analyze data collected by various organizations in the 2006 election.** Several organizations, such as Election Protection, 1-800-MYVOTE1, and the parties will be setting up hotlines and sending people into the field during the upcoming midterm elections both to assist voters and compile complete records of complaints and incidents from the period of voter registration through Election Day. Some of
these organizations have already agreed to share their data with the phase two EAC project consultants. We recommend that such data be used to the greatest extent possible to assess the incidence and the nature of the fraud and intimidation that occurred.

- **Obtain and analyze data retained by the Department of Justice.** Although according to a recent GAO report the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice tracks complaints of voter intimidation in a variety of ways, the Section was extremely reluctant to provide the consultants with useful information. Further attempts should be made to obtain relevant data. This includes the telephone logs of complaints the Section keeps and information from the database — the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system — the Section maintains on complaints received and the corresponding action taken. We also recommend that further research include a review and analysis of the observer and monitor field reports from Election Day that must be filed with the Section.

- **Obtain and analyze a sampling of DEO Reports.** Similarly, the consultants believe it would be useful for any further research to include a review of the reports that must be filed by every DEO to the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. As noted above, the DEOs play a central role in receiving reports of voter fraud and investigating and pursuing them. Their reports would likely provide tremendous insight into what actually transpired during the last several elections. Where necessary, information could be redacted or kept confidential.

- **Attend the Department of Justice’s Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium.** The consultants also believe it would be useful for any further activity in this area to include attendance at the next Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium. According to the Department, DEOs are required to attend annual training conferences centered on combating election fraud and voting rights abuses. These conferences sponsored by the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division and the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division, feature presentations by civil rights officials and senior prosecutors from the Public Integrity Section and the U.S. Attorneys’ Offices.

- **Consult with an academic/academic institution with unimpeachable political science statistical research credentials.** Included in this report is a summary of

---

2 By attending the symposium researchers could learn more about the following:

How **DEOs** are trained, e.g. what they are taught to focus their resources on; How they are instructed to respond to various types of complaints; How information about previous elections and voting issues is presented; and, How the Voting Rights Act, the criminal laws governing election fraud and intimidation, the National Voter Registration Act, and the Help America Vote Act are described and explained to participants.
various methodologies political scientists and others suggested to measure voter fraud and intimidation. While we note the skepticism of the Working Group in this regard, we nonetheless recommend that in order to further the mission of providing unbiased data, further activity in this area include an academic institution and/or individual that focuses on sound, statistical methods for political science research.

- **Review and Assess Whether Current Federal Laws on Fraud and Intimidation are Adequate.** Finally, we recommend that phase two project researchers review federal laws to explore ways to make it easier to impose either civil or criminal penalties for acts of intimidation that do not necessarily involve racial animus and/or a physical or economic threats.

According to Craig Donsanto, long-time director of the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice,

> As with other statutes addressing voter intimidation, in the absence of any jurisprudence to the contrary, it is the Criminal Division’s position that section 1973gg-10(1) applies only to intimidation which is accomplished through the use of threats of physical or economic duress. Voter “intimidation” accomplished through less drastic means may present violations of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1973i(b), which are enforced by the Civil Rights Division through noncriminal remedies.

Mr. Donsanto reiterated these points to us on several occasions, including at the working group meeting.

The second phase of this project should examine if current laws can be revised or new laws drafted that would address voter intimidation that does not threaten the voter physically or financially, but rather threatens the voter’s right to vote as something of tangible value in itself. Such legislation would penalize all forms of voter intimidation, regardless of the motivation. The law would, for example, potentially cover letters and postcards with contain language meant to deter voters from voting and pre-Election and Election Day challenges that are clearly illegitimate.

In the alternative to finding a way to penalize such behavior, researchers might examine ways to deter and punish voter intimidation under civil law. For example, there might be a private right of action created for voters or groups who have been subjected to intimidation tactics in the voting process. Such an action could be brought against individual offenders; any state or local actor where there is an unchecked pattern of repeated abuse; and organizations that intentionally engage in intimidating practices. Civil damage penalties and attorney fees should be included. Another, more modest measure, as has been suggested by Ana Henderson
and Christopher Edley,\textsuperscript{iv} would be to bring fines for violations under the Voting Rights Act up to parity. Currently, the penalty for fraud is $10,000 while the penalty for acts to deprive the right to vote is $5,000.

\textsuperscript{i} Department of Justice's Activities to Address Past Election-Related Voting Irregularities: General Accounting Office, October 14, 2004, GAO-04-1041R, p. 4. This same report criticizes some of the procedures the Section used for these systems and urged the Department to improve upon them in time for the 2004 presidential election. No follow-up report has been done since that time to the best of our knowledge.

\textsuperscript{ii} Department Of Justice To Hold Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium: U.S. Department of Justice press release, August 2, 2005.

\textsuperscript{iii} Craig C. Donsanto, Prosecution of Electoral Fraud Under United States Federal Law, IFES Political Finance White Paper Series, 2006, p. 29.

\textsuperscript{iv} Ana Henderson and Christopher Edley, Jr., Voting Rights Act Reauthorization: Research-Based Recommendations to Improve Voting Access, Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Race, Ethnicity and Diversity, University of California at Berkeley, School of Law, 2006, p. 29
Vote Fraud, Intimidation & Suppression In The 2004 Presidential Election

American Center for Voting Rights Report

According to its website, "the American Center For Voting Rights Legislative Fund was founded in February 2005 on the belief that public confidence in our electoral system is the cornerstone of our democracy... ACVR Legislative Fund supports election reform that protects the right of all citizens to participate in the election process free of intimidation, discrimination or harassment and which will make it easy to vote but tough to cheat.

Using court records, police reports and news articles, ACVR Legislative Fund presented this Report documenting hundreds of reported incidents and allegations from around the country. ACVR Legislative Fund found that thousands of Americans were disenfranchised by illegal votes cast on Election Day 2004. For every illegal vote cast and counted on Election Day, a legitimate voter is disenfranchised. This report alleges a coordinated effort by members of some organizations to rig the election system through voter registration fraud, the first step in any vote fraud scheme that corrupts the election process by burying local officials in fraudulent and suspicious registration forms. ACVR Legislative Fund further found that, despite their heated rhetoric, paid Democrat operatives were far more involved in voter intimidation and suppression activities than were their Republican counterparts during the 2004 presidential election.

In addition to recommended changes and a zero-tolerance commitment by the political parties, ACVR Legislative Fund has identified five cities as “hot spots” which require additional immediate attention. These cities were identified based on the findings of this report and the cities’ documented history of fraud and intimidation. These cities are: Philadelphia, PA, Milwaukee, WI, Seattle, WA, St. Louis/East St. Louis, MO/IL, and Cleveland, OH.

Without going into great detail in this review, this Report: refutes charges of voter intimidation and suppression made against Republican supporters, discusses similar charges against Democrats, details incidents vote fraud and illegal voting and finally discusses problems with vote fraud, voter registration fraud and election irregularities around the country. The majority of this Report is an attempt to redeem Republicans and vilify Democrats.

In terms of sheer numbers, the report most often alleges voter intimidation and voter registration fraud, and to a lesser degree absentee ballot fraud and vote buying.

The Report presented the following recommendations for future action:

* Both national political parties should formally adopt a zero-tolerance fraud and intimidation policy that commits the party to pursuing and fully prosecuting individuals and allied organizations who commit vote fraud or who seek to deter any eligible voter from participating in the election through fraud or intimidation. No amount of legislative
reform can effectively deter those who commit acts of fraud if there is no punishment for the crime and these acts continue to be tolerated.

* States should adopt legislation requiring government-issued photo ID at the polls and for any voter seeking to vote by mail or by absentee ballot. Government-issued photo identification should be readily available to all citizens without cost and provisions made to assure availability of government-issued identification to disabled and low-income citizens.

* States should adopt legislation requiring that all polling places be fully accessible and accommodating to all voters regardless of race, disability or political persuasion and that polling locations are free of intimidation or harassment.

* States should create and maintain current and accurate statewide voter registration databases as mandated by the federal Help America Vote Act ("HAVA") and establish procedures to assure that the statewide voter roll is current and accurate and that the names of eligible voters on the roll are consistent with the voter roll used by local election authorities in conducting the election.

* States should adopt legislation establishing a 30-day voter registration cutoff to assure that all voter rolls are accurate and that all registrants can cast a regular ballot on Election Day and the election officials have opportunity to establish a current and accurate voter roll without duplicate or fictional names and assure that all eligible voters (including all recently registered voters) are included on the voter roll at their proper precinct.

* States should adopt legislation requiring voter registration applications to be delivered to the elections office within one week of being completed so that they are processed in a timely manner and to assure the individuals registered by third party organizations are properly included on the voter roll.

* States should adopt legislation and penalties for groups violating voter registration laws, and provide the list of violations and penalties to all registration solicitors. Legislation should require those organizations obtaining a voter's registration to deliver that registration to election officials in a timely manner and should impose appropriate penalties upon any individual or organization that obtains an eligible voter's registration and fails to deliver it to election authorities.

* States should adopt legislation prohibiting “bounty” payment to voter registration solicitors based on the number of registration cards they collect.
America’s Modern Poll Tax: How Structural Disenfranchisement Erodes Democracy

Advancement Project

The thesis of the Report, America’s Modern Poll Tax, written after the 2000 election, is that structural disenfranchisement—the effect of breakdowns in the electoral system, is the new poll tax. Structural disenfranchisement includes “bureaucratic blunders, governmental indifference, and flagrant disregard for voting rights.” The blame for structural disenfranchisement is laid squarely at the feet of states and localities that “shirk their responsibilities or otherwise manipulate election systems,” resulting in voters “either turned away from the polls or their votes are thrown out.”

The interlocking practices and mechanics that comprise structural disenfranchisement are referred to as “ballot blockers” in the report. Most ballot blockers involve the structural elements of electoral administration: “ill-trained poll workers, failures to process registration cards on time or at all, inaccurate registration rolls, overbroad purges of voter rolls, unreasonably long lines, inaccurate ballot translations and a shortage of translators to assist voters who have limited English language skills.” The Report argues that a culture of indifference overlays these issues that both tolerates and excuses widespread disenfranchisement. This culture of indifference is exemplified by legislatures that do not properly fund election systems, officials that send antiquated equipment into poor and minority areas, poorly translated ballots and polling placed that are not wheelchair accessible.

The data and conclusions in the Report are taken from eight sample case studies of states and cities across the country and a survey of state election directors that reinforces the findings of the case studies. Examples of state and city problems were: New York City-in six polling places Chinese translations inverted the Democrats with the Republicans; Georgia-the state computer crashed two weeks before the election, dropping thousands of voters from the rolls; Virginia-registration problems kept an untold number from voting; Chicago-in inner-city precincts with predominately minority populations, almost four out of every ten votes cast for President (in 2000) were discarded; St. Louis-thousands of qualified voters were placed on inactive lists due to an overbroad purge; Florida-a voting list purge of voters whose name and birth date closely resembled those of people convicted of felonies; and, Texas-significant Jim Crow like barriers to minority voting.

The survey of state election directors found: election directors lack the resources to effectively do their jobs and some lack the “ability or will to force local election officials to fix serious problems”; election officials are highly under funded and legislatures refuse to grant their requests for more money; due to a lack of funds, election officials must use old and inferior equipment and can’t improve training or meet structural needs; election officials are generally unaware of racial disparities in voting; only three of the 50 state election administrators are non-white.

The Report “concludes that affected communities and democracy advocates should mobilize to force change.” A number of recommendations are made to protect the
electoral franchise including: Federal policies that set nationwide and uniform election policies; federal guarantee of access to provisional ballots; enforcement of voter disability laws; automatic restoration of voting rights to those convicted of a crime after they have completed their sentence; a centralized data base of voters administered by non-partisan individuals; federal standards limiting precinct discarded vote rates to .25 %; federal requirements that jurisdiction provide voter education, including how to protect their right to vote; and laws that strengthen the ability of individuals to bring actions to enforce voting rights and anti-discrimination laws.
A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the White House by David E. Johnson & Jonny R. Johnson

A Funny Thing Happened adds almost nothing to the present study. It contains no footnotes and no references to primary source material, save what may be able to be gleaned from the bibliography. The Johnsons take a historical look at United States Presidential elections from Andrew Jackson to George Bush by providing interesting stories and other historical information. Unfortunately, there are only three pages out of the entire book that touches on vote fraud in the first Bush election.

The authors assert that the exit polls in Florida were probably correct. The problem was the pollsters had no way of knowing that thousands of votes would be invalidated. But the authors do not believe that fraud was the cause of the tabulation inaccuracy. The major cause was undervotes and overvotes which, if all counted, would have altered the result, compounded by the use of the butterfly ballot in some strategic counties. Additionally, Ralph Nader’s votes were primarily a bleed off of needed Gore votes. The authors accused Katherine Harris, then Florida Secretary of State and co-chair of the Bush campaign in Florida for prematurely certifying the state vote. The authors also ridiculed United States Secretary of State James A. Baker III, for using the courts to block attempts to hand count votes. Finally, the authors indicated that a mob of Republican partisans descended on the vote counters in Dade County and effectively stopped the count.
Analysis of the September 15, 2005 Voter Fraud Report Submitted to the New Jersey Attorney General

By The Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law and Dr. Michael McDonald of George Mason University

General

A September 15, 2005 Report submitted to the New Jersey Attorney General included lists of purportedly illegitimate votes in New Jersey in the 2004 general election, including lists of 10,969 individuals who purportedly voted twice and lists of 4,756 voters who were purportedly dead or incarcerated in November 2004. For the present Analysis of the Report, the lists of voters submitted to the New Jersey Attorney General, as well as a copy of the New Jersey county voter registration files were obtained, and an initial investigation of the report’s claims was conducted. The analysis shows that the lists submitted are substantially flawed.

The Analysis is based on methodology only: its authors did not gain access to original documents related to registration or original pollbook records; only recently were copies of the counties’ original registration data files acquired and compiled, which contain some notable gaps; and the lists submitted to the Attorney General contain significant errors and little documentation, which complicated the analysis. Nonetheless, the analysts say that information collected is sufficient for generally assessing the quality of evidence presented to support the September 15 report. Analysis of the suspect lists reveals that the evidence submitted does not show what it purports to show: cause for concern that there is serious risk of widespread fraud given the state of the New Jersey voter registration rolls.

These suspect lists were compiled by attempting to match the first name, last name, and birth date of persons on county voter registration files. Entries that supposedly “matched” other entries were apparently deemed to represent the same individual, voting twice. This methodology was similar to the method used in compiling the notoriously inaccurate Florida “purge lists” of suspected ineligible felons in 2000 and 2004. As Florida’s experience shows, matching names and birth dates in the voter registration context can easily lead to false conclusions – as was almost certainly the case here.

This Analysis reveals several serious problems with the methodology used to compile the suspect lists that compromise the lists’ practical value. For example, the data used in the Report from one county appears to be particularly suspect and anomalous, and may have substantially skewed the overall results. In addition, middle initials were ignored throughout all counties, so that “J____ A. Smith” was presumed to be the same person as “J____ G. Smith.” Suffixes were also ignored, so that fathers and sons – like “B____ Johnson” and “B____ Johnson, Jr.” – were said to be the same person.

Underlying many of the entries on these lists, and similar lists compiled in Florida and elsewhere, is a presumption that two records with the same name and date of birth must
represent the same person. As explained in this analysis, this presumption is not consistent with basic statistical principles. Even when votes appear to have been cast in two different cities under the same name and birth date, statistics show that voter fraud is not necessarily to blame. With 3.6 million persons who voted in the 2004 election in New Jersey, the chance that some have the same name and birth date is not far-fetched.

Analysis of the Claim of Double Voting by 4,497 Individuals

Attempts to match data on one list to data on another list will often yield “false positives”: two records that at first appear to be a match but do not actually represent the same person. The natural incidence of “false positives” for a matching exercise of this scale – especially when, as here, conducted with relatively little attention to detail – readily explains the ostensible number of double votes.

1,803 of these 4,397 records of ostensibly illegal votes seem to be the product of a glitch in the compilation of the registration files. These records reflect two registration entries by the same person from the same address, with a notation next to each that the individual has voted. For example, 55-year-old W____ A. Connors, living at 253 B____ Ave. in a New York commuter suburb, is listed on the data files with an (erroneous) first registration date in 1901 and a second registration date in 1993; Mr. Connors is thus represented twice on the data files submitted. Each of these entries also indicates that W____ A. Connors at 253 B____ Ave voted in 2004. There is no credible indication, however, that Mr. Connors actually voted twice; indeed, given the clearly erroneous registration date on the files, it is far more likely that data error is to blame for the doubly logged vote as well.

More plausibly, the bulk of these 1,803 records may be traced to irregularities in the data processing and compilation process for one single county: the Middlesex County registration file accounts for only 10% of registered voters in the state but 78% of these alleged double votes. The suspect lists themselves contain an acknowledgment that the problem in Middlesex is probably not fraud: 99% of these Middlesex voters are labeled on the lists submitted to the Attorney General with a notation that the record is “less likely” to indicate an illegal double vote.

Another 1,257 entries of the 4,397 records probably represent similar data errors – also largely driven by a likely glitch in the Middlesex County file, which is also vastly over represented in this category. These records show ever-so-slight variations in records listed with the same date of birth at the same address: for example, the same first and last names, but different middle initials or suffixes (e.g., J____ T. Kearns, Sr., and J____ T. Kearns, Jr., both born the same day and living at the same address; or J____ E. Allen and J____ P. Allen, born the same day and living at the same address).

Approximately 800 of the entries on the list likely represent different people, with different addresses and different middle initials or suffixes. For example, W____ S. Smith, living in a northern New Jersey town, and W____ C. Smith, living in another town two hours away, share the same date of birth but are not the same person. Nor are
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T____ Brown, living in a New York commuter suburb, and T____ H. Brown, Jr., living in a small town over an hour west, despite the fact that they also share the same birth date. About three-quarters of the entries in this category reveal data that affirmatively conflict – for example, a middle initial ("W____ S.") in one case, and a different middle initial ("W____ C.") in another, listed at different addresses. There is absolutely no good reason to conclude that these individuals are in fact the same, when the available evidence indicates the contrary.

For approximately 200 of the entries in this category, however, less information is available. These entries show a middle initial ("J____ W. Davis") in one case, and no middle initial ("J____ Davis") in another – again, at different addresses. The lack of the middle initial is ambiguous: it could mean that one of the J____ Davis in question has no middle name, or it could mean that the middle initial was simply omitted in a particular registration entry. Although these entries involve less conclusive affirmative evidence of a false match than the entries noted above, there is still no good reason to believe that "J____ W. Davis" and "J____ Davis," at different addresses, represent the same person.

Of the individuals remaining, there are serious concerns with the accuracy of the dates of birth. Seven voters were apparently born in January 1, 1880 – which is most likely a system default for registrations lacking date-of-birth information. For 227 voters, only the month and year of birth are listed: this means only that two voters with the same name were born in the same month and year, an unsurprising coincidence in a state of several million people.

That leaves approximately 289 votes cast under the same name and birth date – like votes cast by "P____ S. Rosen," born in the middle of the baby boom – but from two different addresses. It may appear strange, but there may be two P____ S. Rosens, born on the same date in 1948 – and such coincidences are surprisingly common. For any one person, the odds of someone else having the same name and birth date is small. But because there are so many voters in New Jersey, a sizable number will have the same name and birth date simply by chance. In a group of just 23 people, it is more likely than not that two will share the same birthday. For 40 people, the probability is 90%. Many, if not most, of the 289 alleged double votes of persons registered at different addresses most likely reflect two separate individuals sharing a first name, last name, middle initial, and birth date.

The September 15 Report makes much of the raw potential for foul play based on the unsurprising fact that there are voters who appear on the New Jersey registration rolls more than once. As noted above, many of the names identified reflect two different individuals and not simply duplicate entries. But there is no doubt that there are duplicate entries on New Jersey's registration rolls. It is well known that voter registration rolls contain "deadwood" – registration entries for individuals no longer living at a given address or deceased. There is no evidence, however, that these extra registrations are used for widespread illegal voting. Moreover, the problem of deadwood will soon be largely resolved: both the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 and the Help America
Vote Act of 2002 require states to implement several systems and procedures as of January 1, 2006, that will clean the voter rolls of duplicate or invalid entries while protecting eligible voters from unintended disfranchisement.
Response to the Report of the 2005 Commission on Federal Election Reform

By The Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law and Spencer Overton, Commissioner and Law Professor at George Washington University School of Law

Introduction
On September 19, 2005, the Commission on Federal Election Reform, co-chaired by former President Jimmy Carter and former Secretary of State James Baker III, issued a report with recommendations for reforming the administration of U.S. elections. This Response addresses the main substantive flaws in the Report, refuting in detail its recommendations that “Real ID” cards be used for voter identification, that Social Security numbers be spread through interstate databases and on ID cards, and that states restore voting rights to people convicted of felony convictions only in certain cases and only after they have completed all the terms of their sentence.

Voter Identification Recommendation
According to the Response, the Report’s most troubling recommendation is that states require voters to present a Real ID card or a similar “template” ID as a condition of voting. This recommendation is more onerous than the photo ID proposal rejected by the Commission’s predecessor in 2001 and is more restrictive than any ID requirement adopted in any state to date. It would impose substantial – and for some, insurmountable – burdens on the right to vote. This ID requirement is purportedly intended to prevent “voter fraud,” and yet the Report itself concedes that “[t]here is no evidence of extensive fraud in U.S. elections or of multiple voting” before asserting, without any meaningful support, that “both occur.” Not only does the Report fail to justify the creation of stringent identification requirements, but it also does not explain why the goals of improved election integrity will not be met through the existing provisions in the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA). Additionally, the Report fails to consider alternative measures to advance its goals that are less restrictive to voters.

The Commission’s recommendation that eligible citizens be barred from voting unless they are able to present a souped-up “Real ID” card is a proposal guaranteed to disenfranchise a substantial number of eligible voters. Millions of Americans currently do not have driver’s licenses or government-issued photo ID cards. As the 2001 National Commission on Federal Election Reform recognized, research shows that between six and ten percent of voting-age Americans do not have driver’s licenses or state-issued non-driver’s photo ID. That translates into as many as 20 million eligible voters. Millions more may never get the new Real ID card, which requires substantially more cost and effort. The percentage of Americans without the documentary proof of citizenship necessary to obtain Real IDs is likely to remain high because, as discussed below, the requisite documents are both expensive and burdensome to obtain. The Report’s proposal to use Real ID as a condition of voting is so excessive that it would prevent eligible voters from proving their identity with even a valid U.S. passport or a U.S. military photo ID card. While Americans of all backgrounds would be excluded by the Report’s ID proposal, the burden would fall disproportionately on the elderly, the disabled, students, the poor, and people of color.
According to the Georgia chapter of the AARP, 36 percent of Georgians over age 75 do not have a driver's license. In Wisconsin, approximately 23 percent of persons aged 65 and older do not have driver's licenses or photo ID, and fewer than 3 percent of students have driver's licenses listing their current address. Across the country, more than 3 million Americans with disabilities do not have a driver's license or other form of state-issued photo ID. Moreover, given the frequency with which Americans move residences, it is likely that a far greater percentage of citizens lack driver's licenses or photo IDs bearing their current addresses. Since voting generally depends on the voter's address, and since many states will not accept IDs that do not bear an individual's current voting address, an additional 41.5 million Americans each year will have ID that they may not be able to use to vote.

As the Report recognizes, government-issued photo identification costs money. Thus, if required as a precondition for voting, photo identification would operate as a de facto poll tax that could disenfranchise low-income voters. To alleviate this burden, the Report appropriately recommends that the “Real ID” card itself be issued free of charge. This safeguard, however, does not address some of the most significant predicate costs in obtaining photo identification – costs incurred whether or not the card itself is free. First, each of the documents an individual is required to show in order to obtain a “Real ID” card or other government-issued photo ID card costs money or presumes a minimal level of economic resources. A certified copy of a birth certificate costs from $10.00 to $45.00, depending on the state; a passport costs $85.00; and certified naturalization papers cost $19.95. Unless the federal and all state governments waive the cost of each of these other forms of identification, the indirect costs of photo IDs will be even greater than their direct costs. In addition, since government-issued IDs may only be obtained at specified government offices, which may be far from voters’ residences and workplaces, individuals seeking such IDs will have to incur transportation costs and the costs of taking time off from work to visit those offices during often-abbreviated business hours. These are not insignificant burdens.

Strong empirical evidence also shows that photo ID requirements disproportionately burden people of color. The ID recommendations reduce the benefits of voter registration at disability and other social service agencies provided by the National Voter Registration Act of 1993. Individuals who seek to register at those offices—which generally do not issue IDs – will also have to make an additional visit to the motor vehicle department in order to obtain the documentation necessary to vote. Census data demonstrate that African Americans and Latinos are more than three times more likely than whites to register to vote at a public assistance agency, and that whites are more likely than African Americans and Latinos to register when seeking a driver's license. Accordingly, the voter registration procedure far more likely to be used by minorities than by whites will no longer provide Americans with full eligibility to vote. Not only are minority voters less likely to possess the requisite ID, but they are also more likely than white voters to be asked to furnish ID at the polls. As the Task Force Report of the prior Commission found, identification requirements create the opportunity for selective enforcement — either innocuous or invidious — when poll workers request photo ID only from voters.
unknown to them. This discretion has often led to special scrutiny of minority voters at the polls.

Faced with overwhelming evidence that Real IDs are both costly and difficult to obtain, the Report suggests that Real ID cards be made “easily available and issued free of charge.” While this is a laudable goal, the evidence suggests that it will not be attained. First, no State currently issues photo IDs free of charge to all voters. And even if the card itself were free, the Real ID would not be “free of charge” unless all documents required to obtain the Real ID were also “free of charge.” In addition, no State makes photo IDs “easily available” to all its citizens.

The Report premises its burdensome identification proposals on the need to ensure ballot integrity and on the existence of or potential for widespread fraud. However, the Report admits that there is simply “no evidence” that the type of fraud that could be solved by stricter voter identification – individual voters who misrepresent their identity at the polls – is a widespread problem. Indeed, the evidence that does exist shows that this sort of fraud occurs only at an extremely low rate. The Report’s photo ID proposal guards against only one type of fraud: individuals arriving at the polls to vote using false information, such as the name of another registered voter, or a recent but not current address. Since the costs of this form of fraud are extremely high (federal law provides for up to five years’ imprisonment), and the benefits to any individual voter are extremely low, it is highly unlikely that this will ever occur with any frequency. The limited types of fraud that could be prevented by a Real ID requirement are extremely rare and difficult. As the Report concedes, there is “no evidence of extensive fraud in U.S. elections” of the sort that can be cured by photo identification requirements. This admission – and not the hypothetical specter of fraud represented in the remainder of the Report – is amply borne out by independent research.

In the most comprehensive survey of alleged election fraud to date, Professor Loraine Minnite and David Callahan have shown that the incidence of individual voter fraud at the polls is negligible. A few prominent examples support their findings. In Ohio, a statewide survey found four instances of ineligible persons voting or attempting to vote in 2002 and 2004, out of 9,078,728 votes cast – a rate of 0.00004%. Earlier this year, Georgia Secretary of State Cathy Cox stated that she could not recall one documented case of voter fraud relating to the impersonation of a registered voter at the polls during her ten-year tenure as Secretary of State or Assistant Secretary of State. The Report attempts to support its burdensome identification requirements on four specific examples of purported fraud or potential fraud. None of the Report’s cited examples of fraud stand up under closer scrutiny. This response report goes through each instance of fraud raised by the Commission report and demonstrates that in each case the allegation in fact turned out later not to be true or the fraud cited was not of the type that would be addressed by a photo identification requirement.

The Report fails to provide a good reason to create greater hurdles for voters who vote at the polls than for those who vote absentee. Despite the fact that absentee ballots are more
susceptible to fraud than regular ballots, the Report exempts absentee voters from its proposed Real ID and proof of citizenship requirements.

To the extent that any limited fraud by individuals at the polls does trickle into the system, it can be addressed by far less restrictive alternatives. The first step is to recognize that only voters who appear on the registration list may vote a regular ballot. Proper cleaning of registration lists – and proper use of the lists at the poll—will therefore go a long way toward ensuring that every single ballot is cast by an eligible voter. Existing law has already accounted for this need – with proper safeguards for individual voters – and needs only adequate implementation. If inflated rolls create the specter of potential fraud, for example, the problem will be addressed by proper execution of the registration list related provisions of NVRA and HAVA, which are designed in part to remove ineligible voters from the rolls. In addition to the better registration lists that full implementation will provide, better record keeping and administration at the polls will reduce the limited potential for voting by ineligible persons. In the unlikely event that implementation of current law is not able to wipe out whatever potential for individual fraud remains, there are several effective and less burdensome alternatives to the Report’s Real ID recommendation that received wholly insufficient consideration.

Recommendation on Database Information Sharing Across States
It is unquestionably beneficial to account for voters who move across state lines. Nonetheless, the Report fails to consider the serious efficacy, privacy, and security concerns raised by a nationally distributed database of the magnitude it contemplates. These problems are exacerbated by the Report’s recommendation that an individual’s Social Security number be used as the broadly disseminated unique voting identifier. The Report’s recommendation creates substantial privacy and security hazards. The Report recommends —without any discussion—that the information used as an individual’s unique fingerprint to track a voter across state lines include not merely the date of birth, but also the person’s “place of birth.” As with the Social Security number, this information is often used as a key to private information wholly unrelated to voting, and as such, disclosure presents a substantial security hazard. Moreover, this information seems particularly susceptible to use in harassing legitimate voters, particularly naturalized citizens.

Recommendation on Voting Rights of Ex-Felons
The Report recommends that states restore voting rights only to certain people with criminal convictions, and only after they have “fully served their sentence.” This overly restrictive standard places the Commission out of step with the states, the American public, and the laws of other nations. This recommendation would set a standard more generous than the policies of the most regressive thirteen states in the nation but more restrictive than the remaining thirty-seven. The trend in the states is toward extension of the franchise. Since 1997, twelve states have reformed their laws or policies to allow more people with convictions to vote. These reforms are driven by some startling numbers. Approximately 4.7 million Americans have lost the right to vote because of a criminal conviction. This number includes 1.4 million African-American men, whose 13% rate of disenfranchisement is seven times the national average. More than 670,000
of the disenfranchised are women; more than 580,000 are veterans; and 1.7 million have completed their sentences.

The American people also support more generous re-enfranchisement than the Commission Report recommends. In a 2002 telephone survey of 1,000 Americans nationwide, researchers found that substantial majorities (64% and 62% respectively) supported allowing probationers and parolees to vote. Fully 80% favored restoring the franchise to people who had completed felony sentences. Even when questions were asked about certain unpopular offenses, majorities supported voting rights. Two-thirds of respondents supported allowing violent ex-felons to vote; 63% supported allowing ex-felons convicted of illegal stock-trading to vote; and 52% supported restoring the franchise to ex-felons who had been convicted of a sex crime. International norms are even more favorable to voting rights. Moreover, the Report's recommendation is unworkable. The general rule – that reenfranchisement should follow the completion of a criminal sentence – is itself difficult to administer.
Republican Ballot Security Programs: Vote Protection or Minority Vote Suppression – Or Both?

By Chandler Davidson

As the author describes it, this Report focuses on vote suppression through “ballot security programs”:

These are programs that, in the name of protecting against vote fraud, almost exclusively target heavily black, Latino, or Indian voting precincts and have the intent or effect of discouraging or preventing voters in those precincts from casting a ballot. In some cases, these programs have been found by courts to be illegal. Still, they continue to exist in spite of strong criticism by leaders of minority communities, their allies, and voting rights lawyers.

There are several noteworthy characteristics of these programs. They focus on minority precincts almost exclusively. There is often only the flimsiest evidence that vote fraud is likely to be perpetrated in such precincts. In addition to encouraging the presence of sometimes intimidating Republican poll watchers or challengers who may slow down voting lines and embarrass potential voters by asking them humiliating questions, these programs have sometimes posted people in official-looking uniforms with badges and side arms who question voters about their citizenship or their registration. In addition, warning signs may be posted near the polls, or radio ads may be targeted to minority listeners containing dire threats of prison terms for people who are not properly registered—messages that seem designed to put minority voters on the defensive. Sometimes false information about voting qualifications is sent to minority voters through the mail.”

He further states that a most common theme of the programs over the last 50 years is that of sending white challengers to minority precincts. He says that the tactic of doing mailings, collecting returned materials, and using that as a basis for creating challenger lists and challenging voters at the polls, started in the 1950s and continues to today. The problem with this practice is that reasons for a mailing to be returned include a wrong address, out of date or inaccurate addresses, poor mail delivery in minority areas, and matching mistakes. Davidson also sets out to demonstrate through documentary evidence that the practices have been and are approved of or winked at by high ups in the party.

Davidson goes on to provide numerous examples from the last 50 years to demonstrate his thesis, going through the historical development of Republican ballot security programs from the 1950s through to the present. The author cites and quotes internal Republican letters and memoranda, primary sources and original documents, media
reports, scholarly works, as well as the words of judges’ rulings in some of the cases that ended up in litigation to prove his argument.

In addition to describing how the schemes really were brought to the fore in the 1964 election, he describes more recent incidents such as 1981 in New Jersey, 1982 Dallas, Louisiana 1986, Houston 1986, Hidalgo 1988 Orange County 1988, North Carolina 1990, South Carolina 1980-1990, and South Dakota 2002. (Summaries of these examples are available)

Davidson concludes with an outline of some of the features of vote suppression efforts put forth by Republicans under the guise of ballot security programs, as described in the Report, from the 1950s to the present day:

1. An organized, often widely publicized effort to field poll watchers in what Republicans call “heavily Democratic,” but what are usually minority, precincts;
2. Stated concerns about vote fraud in these precincts, which are occasionally justified but often are not;
3. Misinformation and fear campaigns directed at these same precincts, spread by radio, posted signs in the neighborhoods, newspapers, fliers, and phone calls, which are often anonymously perpetrated;
4. Posting “official-looking” personnel at polling places, including but not limited to off-duty police—sometimes in uniform, sometimes armed;
5. Aggressive face-to-face challenging techniques at the polls that can confuse, humiliate, and intimidate—as well as slow the voting process—in these same minority precincts;
6. Challenging voters using inaccurate, unofficial lists of registrants derived from “do-not-forward” letters sent to low-income and minority neighborhoods;
7. Photographing, tape recording, or videotaping voters; and
8. Employing language and metaphors that trade on stereotypes of minority voters as venal and credulous.

The report ends with some observations on the state of research on the incidence of fraud, which the author finds lacking. He suggests that vote suppression of qualified minority voters by officials and partisan poll-watchers, challengers, and uniformed guards should also be considered as included in any definition of election fraud. Davidson also offers a few recommendations for reform, noting that Democrats should not protest all programs aimed at ballot integrity, but rather work with Republicans to find solutions to problems that confront both parties and the system as a whole.
A ‘Crazy-Quilt’ of Tiny Pieces: State and Local Administration of American Criminal Disenfranchisement Law

By Alec Ewald

“A Crazy-Quilt of Tiny Pieces” presents results from the first nationwide study to document the implementation of American felony disenfranchisement law. Data came from two main sources: a 33-state survey of state elections officials and telephone interviews with almost one hundred city, county, town, and parish officials drawn from 10 selected states. In the spring of 2004, a two-page survey consisting of questions regarding disqualification and restoration procedures was sent to the offices of the statewide elections director in each of the fifty states. Responses were collected through the summer and early fall of 2004. Thirty-three states responded. No state currently administers and enforces its criminal disqualification and restoration laws in an efficient, universally-understood and equitable way. Some do not appear to notify local elections officials of convictions, or do not do so in a clear and timely way; others risk “false positives” in disqualification, particularly with suspended sentences or offenses not subject to disenfranchisement; many ask local officials to handle disqualification and restoration with little or no guidance or supervision from the state; none have clear policies regarding new arrivals from other states with old convictions.

The report reaches seven major conclusions:

1. Broad variation and misunderstanding in interpretation and enforcement of voting laws:
   • More than one-third (37%) of local officials interviewed in ten states either described their state’s fundamental eligibility law incorrectly, or stated that they did not know a central aspect of that law.
   • Local registrars differ in their knowledge of basic eligibility law, often within the same state. Differences also emerge in how they are notified of criminal convictions, what process they use to suspend, cancel, or “purge” voters from the rolls, whether particular documents are required to restore a voter to eligibility, and whether they have information about the criminal background of new arrivals to the state.

2. Misdemeanants disenfranchised in at least five states:
   • The commonly-used term “felon disenfranchisement” is not entirely accurate, since at least five states – Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, South Carolina, and Maryland -- also formally bar some or all people convicted of misdemeanors from voting.
   • It is likely that misdemeanants in other states who do retain the formal right to vote could have difficulty exercising that right, given ignorance of their eligibility and the lack of clear rules and procedures for absentee voting by people in jail who have not been convicted of a felony.
   • Maryland excludes persons convicted of many misdemeanors, such as “Unlawful operation of vending machines,” “Misrepresentation of tobacco leaf weight,” and “Racing horse under false name.”

3. Significant ambiguities in voting laws:
   • Disenfranchisement in Tennessee is dependent on which of five different time periods a felony conviction occurred between 1973 and the present.
   • In Oregon, disenfranchisement is determined not by conviction or imprisonment for a felony, but for being placed under Department of Corrections supervision. Since 1997, some persons
convicted of a felony and sentenced to less than 12 months’ custody have been sent to county jails and hence, are eligible to vote.

4. Disenfranchisement results in contradictory policies within states:
   • The “crazy-quilt” pattern of disenfranchisement laws exists even within states. Alabama and Mississippi have both the most and least restrictive laws in the country, a result which is brought about by the fact that certain felonies result in the loss of voting rights for life, while others at least theoretically permit people in prison to vote.
   • Most felonies in Alabama result in permanent disenfranchisement, but drug and DUI offenses have been determined to not involve the “moral turpitude” that triggers the loss of voting rights.
   • In Mississippi, ten felonies result in disenfranchisement, but do not include such common offenses as burglary and drug crimes.

5. Confusing policies lead to the exclusion of legal voters and the inclusion of illegal voters:
   • The complexity of state disenfranchisement policies results in frequent misidentification of voter eligibility, largely because officials differ in their knowledge and application of disqualification and restoration law and procedures.

6. Significant variation and uncertainty in how states respond to persons with a felony conviction from other states:
   • No state has a systematic mechanism in place to address the immigration of persons with a felony conviction, and there is no consensus among indefinite-disenfranchisement states on whether the disqualification is properly confined to the state of conviction, or should be considered in the new state of residence.
   • Interpretation and enforcement of this part of disenfranchisement law varies not only across state lines, but also from one county to another within states. Local officials have no way of knowing about convictions in other states, and many are unsure what they would do if a would-be voter acknowledged an old conviction. Because there is no prospect of a national voter roll, this situation will continue even after full HAVA implementation.

7. Disenfranchisement is a time-consuming, expensive practice:
   • Enforcement requires elections officials to gather records from different agencies and bureaucracies, including state and federal courts, Departments of Corrections, Probation and Parole, the state Board of Elections, the state police, and other counties’ elections offices.

Policy Implications

1. Policies disenfranchising people living in the community on probation or parole, or who have completed a sentence are particularly difficult to enforce:
   • States which disenfranchise only persons who are currently incarcerated appear able to enforce their laws more consistently than those barring non-incarcerated citizens from voting.

2. Given large-scale misunderstanding of disenfranchisement law, many eligible persons incorrectly believe they cannot vote, or have been misinformed by election officials:
   • More than one-third of election officials interviewed incorrectly described their state’s law on voting eligibility.
   • More than 85% of the officials who misidentified their state’s law either did not know the eligibility standard or specified that the law was more restrictive than was actually the case.

3. Occasional violation of disenfranchisement law by non-incarcerated voters not surprising:
Given the complexity of state laws and the number of state officials who lack an understanding of restoration and disqualification procedures, it should come as no surprise that many voters are ignorant of their voting status, a fact that is likely to have resulted in hundreds of persons with a felony conviction registering and voting illegally in recent years.

4. Taken together, these findings undermine the most prominent rationale for disenfranchisement: that the policy reflects a strong, clear consensus that persons with a felony conviction are unfit to vote and constitute a threat to the polity:
   - First, when significant numbers of the people who administer elections do not know important aspects of disenfranchisement law, it is hard to conclude that the restriction is necessary to protect social order and the “purity” of the ballot box.
   - Second, because they are all but invisible in the sentencing process, “collateral” sanctions like disenfranchisement simply cannot accomplish the denunciatory, expressive purposes their supporters claim. We now know that disenfranchisement is not entirely “visible” even to the people running American elections.
   - Third, deep uncertainty regarding the voting rights of people with felony convictions who move from one state to another indicates that we do not even know what purpose disenfranchisement is supposed to serve – whether it is meant to be a punishment, or simply a non-penal regulation of the franchise.

Recommendations

1. Clarify Policies Regarding Out-of-State Convictions:
   - State officials should clarify their policies and incorporate into training programs the means by which a felony conviction in another state affects an applicant’s voting eligibility. For example, sentence-only disenfranchisement states should clarify that newcomers with old felony convictions from indefinite disenfranchisement states are eligible to vote. And those states which bar some people from voting even after their sentences are completed must clarify whether new arrivals with old felony convictions from sentence-only disenfranchisement states are automatically eligible, and must explain what procedures, if any, should be followed for restoration.

2. Train Election Officials:
   - Clarify disenfranchisement policies and procedures for all state and local election officials through development of materials and training programs in each state. At a minimum, this should include distribution of posters, brochures and FAQ sheets to local and state elections offices.

3. Train Criminal Justice Officials:
   - Provide training on disqualification and restoration policies for all correctional and criminal justice officials, particularly probation and parole staff. Correctional and criminal justice officials should also be actively engaged in describing these policies to persons under criminal justice supervision.

4. Review Voting Restrictions on Non-Incarcerated People:
   - Given the serious practical difficulty of enforcing laws disqualifying people who are not incarcerated from voting – problems which clearly include both excluding eligible people from voting and allowing those who should be ineligible to vote -- state policymakers should review such policies to determine if they serve a useful public purpose.
Deliver the Vote: A History of Election Fraud, An American Political Tradition---1742-2004

by Tracy Campbell.

In Deliver the Vote, Campbell traces the historical persistence of voter fraud from colonial times through the 2004 Bush-Kerry election. From the textual information, it quickly becomes obvious that voter fraud was not limited to certain types of people or to certain political parties. Major American political figures fail to emerge unscathed. For instance, before independence, George Washington plied potential voters with drink as payment for their vote. This type of early vote buying succeeded in electing Washington to the Virginia Assembly over a heavily favored candidate. Both the Democrat and Republican Parties also participated in vote fraud. Finally, there were several regions of the country know for fraudulent voting problems such as Chicago, St. Louis, Texas, and Kentucky, especially Louisville.

Germane to the voter fraud project, Campbell indicates that in the Bush-Gore election, both camps committed major errors. Campbell contends that the central problem in that election was the 175,000 invalidated votes. It is evident that Florida was procedurally unprepared to deal with the voluminous questions that arose in determining valid from invalid votes. Campbell glosses over the Bush-Kerry election but does note from one who opposed Kerry, that there was something amiss with the Ohio final vote tally. This book is well researched and provided numerous citations to source material.
Building Confidence in U.S. Election, National Commission on Federal Election Reform ("Carter/Baker Commission")

The impetus for the Carter-Baker Commission and its report was the sense of the members that not enough had been done to reform the system since the 2000 election and that Americans had lost confidence in elections. The report makes several observations about the current system and makes 87 recommendations. Several of those recommendations are meant to be implemented in conjunction with one another in order to be effective, so the report is really a push for a comprehensive overhaul of the system as it works today.

Among the observations made that are relevant to the EAC study of fraud and intimidation are the following:

- The November 2004 elections showed that irregularities and fraud still occur.
- Failure to provide voters with such basic information as their registration status and their polling site location raises a barrier to voting as significant as inconsistent procedures on provisional ballots or voter ID requirements.
- There is no evidence of extensive fraud in U.S. elections or of multiple voting, but both occur, and it could affect the outcome of a close election.
- The Commission is concerned that the different approaches to identification cards might prove to be a serious impediment to voting.
- Voter registration lists are often inflated by the inclusion of citizens who have moved out of state but remain on the lists. Moreover, under the National Voter Registration Act, names are often added to the list, but counties and municipalities often do not delete the names of those who moved. Inflated voter lists are also caused by phony registrations and efforts to register individuals who are ineligible. At the same time, inaccurate purges of voter lists have removed citizens who are eligible and are properly registered.
- Political party and nonpartisan voter registration drives generally contribute to the electoral process by generating interest in upcoming elections and expanding participation. However, they are occasionally abused. There were reports in 2004 that some party activists failed to deliver voter registration forms of citizens who expressed a preference for the opposing party.
- Vote by mail raises concerns about privacy, as citizens voting at home may come under pressure to vote for certain candidates, and it increases the risk of fraud.
- While election fraud is difficult to measure, it occurs. The U.S. Department of Justice has launched more than 180 investigations into election fraud since October 2002. These investigations have resulted in charges for multiple voting, providing false information on their felon status, and other offenses against 89 individuals and in convictions of 52 individuals. The convictions related to a variety of election fraud offenses, from vote buying to submitting false voter registration information and voting-related offenses by non-citizens. In addition to the federal investigations, state attorneys general and local prosecutors handle cases of election fraud. Other cases are never pursued because of the difficulty in...
obtaining sufficient evidence for prosecution or because of the low priority given to election fraud cases.

- Absentee ballots remain the largest source of potential voter fraud
- Non-citizens have registered to vote in several recent elections
- The growth of "third-party" (unofficial) voter registration drives in recent elections has led to a rise in reports of voter registration fraud.
- Many states allow the representatives of candidates or political parties to challenge a person's eligibility to register or vote or to challenge an inaccurate name on a voter roll. This practice of challenges may contribute to ballot integrity, but it can have the effect of intimidating eligible voters, preventing them from casting their ballot, or otherwise disrupting the voting process.

Its pertinent recommendations for reform are as follows:

- Interoperable state voter databases are needed to facilitate updates in the registration of voters who move to another state and to eliminate duplicate registrations, which are a source of potential fraud.
- Voters should be informed of their right to cast a provisional ballot if their name does not appear on the voter roll, or if an election official asserts that the individual is not eligible to vote, but States should take additional and effective steps to inform voters as to the location of their precinct.
- The Commission recommends that states use "REAL ID" cards for voting purposes.
- To verify the identity of voters who cast absentee ballots, the voter's signature on the absentee ballot can be matched with a digitized version of the signature that the election administrator maintains. While such signature matches are usually done, they should be done consistently in all cases, so that election officials can verify the identity of every new registrant who casts an absentee ballot.
- Each state needs to audit its voter registration files to determine the extent to which they are accurate (with correct and current information on individuals), complete (including all eligible voters), valid (excluding ineligible voters), and secure (with protections against unauthorized use). This can be done by matching voter files with records in other state agency databases in a regular and timely manner, contacting individuals when the matches are inconclusive, and conducting survey research to estimate the number of voters who believe they are registered but who are not in fact listed in the voter files.
- Each state should oversee political party and nonpartisan voter registration drives to ensure that they operate effectively, that registration forms are delivered promptly to election officials, that all completed registration forms are delivered to the election officials, and that none are "culled" and omitted according to the registrant's partisan affiliation. Measures should also be adopted to track and hold accountable those who are engaged in submitting fraudulent voter registrations. Such oversight might consist of training activists who conduct voter registration drives and tracking voter registration forms to make sure they are all accounted for. In addition, states should apply a criminal penalty to any activist who deliberately fails to deliver a completed voter registration form.
• Investigation and prosecution of election fraud should include those acts committed by individuals, including election officials, poll workers, volunteers, challengers or other nonvoters associated with the administration of elections, and not just fraud by voters.

• In July of even-numbered years, the U.S. Department of Justice should issue a public report on its investigations of election fraud. This report should specify the numbers of allegations made, matters investigated, cases prosecuted, and individuals convicted for various crimes. Each state’s attorney general and each local prosecutor should issue a similar report.

• The U.S. Department of Justice’s Office of Public Integrity should increase its staff to investigate and prosecute election-related fraud.

• In addition to the penalties set by the Voting Rights Act, it should be a federal felony for any individual, group of individuals, or organization to engage in any act of violence, property destruction (of more than $500 value), or threatened act of violence that is intended to deny any individual his or her lawful right to vote or to participate in a federal election.

• To deter systemic efforts to deceive or intimidate voters, the Commission recommends federal legislation to prohibit any individual or group from deliberately providing the public with incorrect information about election procedures for the purpose of preventing voters from going to the polls.

• States should define clear procedures for challenges, which should mainly be raised and resolved before the deadline for voter registration. After that, challengers will need to defend their late actions. On Election Day, they should direct their concerns to poll workers, not to voters directly, and should in no way interfere with the smooth operation of the polling station.

• State and local jurisdictions should prohibit a person from handling absentee ballots other than the voter, an acknowledged family member, the U.S. Postal Service or other legitimate shipper, or election officials. The practice in some states of allowing candidates or party workers to pick up and deliver absentee ballots should be eliminated.

• All states should consider passing legislation that attempts to minimize the fraud that has resulted from "payment by the piece" to anyone in exchange for their efforts in voter registration, absentee ballot, or signature collection.

• Nonpartisan structures of election administration are very important, and election administrators should be neutral, professional, and impartial.

• No matter what institutions are responsible for conducting elections, conflict-of-interest standards should be introduced for all federal, state, and local election officials. Election officials should be prohibited by federal and/or state laws from serving on any political campaign committee, making any public comments in support of a candidate, taking a public position on any ballot measure, soliciting campaign funds, or otherwise campaigning for or against a candidate for public office. A decision by a secretary of state to serve as co-chair of his or her party’s presidential election committee would clearly violate these standards.
Existing Research Analysis

There are many reports and books that describe anecdotes and draw broad conclusions from a large array of incidents. There is little research that is truly systematic or scientific. The most systematic look at fraud is the report written by Lori Minnite. The most systematic look at voter intimidation is the report by Laughlin McDonald. Books written about this subject seem to all have a political bias and a pre-existing agenda that makes them somewhat less valuable.

Researchers agree that measuring something like the incidence of fraud and intimidation in a scientifically legitimate way is extremely difficult from a methodological perspective and would require resources beyond the means of most social and political scientists. As a result, there is much more written on this topic by advocacy groups than social scientists. It is hoped that this gap will be filled in the “second phase” of this EAC project.

Moreover, reports and books make allegations but, perhaps by their nature, have little follow up. As a result, it is difficult to know when something has remained in the stage of being an allegation and gone no further, or progressed to the point of being investigated or prosecuted or in any other way proven to be valid by an independent, neutral entity. This is true, for example, with respect to allegations of voter intimidation by civil rights organizations, and, with respect to fraud, John Fund’s frequently cited book. Again, this is something that it is hoped will be addressed in the “second phase” of this EAC project by doing follow up research on allegations made in reports, books and newspaper articles.

Other items of note:

- There is as much evidence, and as much concern, about structural forms of disenfranchisement as about intentional abuse of the system. These include felon disenfranchisement, poor maintenance of databases and identification requirements.

- There is tremendous disagreement about the extent to which polling place fraud, e.g. double voting, intentional felon voting, noncitizen voting, is a serious problem. On balance, more researchers find it to be less of a problem than is commonly described in the political debate, but some reports say it is a major problem, albeit hard to identify.

- There is substantial concern across the board about absentee balloting and the opportunity it presents for fraud.

- Federal law governing election fraud and intimidation is varied and complex and yet may nonetheless be insufficient or subject to too many limitations to be as effective as it might be.
• Deceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004.

• Voter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities, although the American Center for Voting Rights uniquely alleges it is focused on Republicans.
General Background

The Public Integrity Reports are submitted to Congress pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, which requires the Attorney General to report annually to Congress on the operations and activities of the Justice Department’s Public Integrity Section. The Report describes the activities of the Public Integrity Section. It also provides statistics on the nationwide federal effort against public corruption. The Public Integrity Section was created in 1976 in order to consolidate in one unit of the Criminal Division the Department’s oversight responsibilities for the prosecution of criminal abuses of the public trust by government officials. Section attorneys prosecute selected cases involving federal, state, or local officials, and also provide advice and assistance to prosecutors and agents in the field regarding the handling of public corruption cases. In addition, the Section serves as the Justice Department’s center for handling various issues that arise regarding public corruption statutes and cases. An Election Crimes Branch was created within the Section in 1980 to supervise the Department’s nationwide response to election crimes, such as ballot fraud and campaign financing offenses. The Branch reviews all major election crime investigations throughout the country and all proposed criminal charges relating to election crime.

One of the Section’s law enforcement priorities is its supervision of the Justice Department’s nationwide response to election crimes. The purpose of Headquarters’ oversight of election crime matters is to ensure that the Department’s nationwide response to election crime is uniform, impartial, and effective. An Election Crimes Branch, headed by a Director and staffed by Section attorneys on a case-by-case basis, was created within the Section in 1980 to handle this supervisory responsibility.

The Election Crimes Branch oversees the Department’s handling of all election crime allegations other than those involving civil rights violations, which are supervised by the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division. Specifically, the Branch supervises four types of corruption cases: crimes that involve the voting process, crimes involving the financing of federal election campaigns, crimes relating to political shakedowns and other patronage abuses, and illegal lobbying with appropriated funds. Vote frauds and campaign-financing offenses are the most significant and also the most common types of election crimes.

Divisions of the Election Crimes Branch

As affecting the present EAC study, the appropriate divisions of the Election Crimes Branch are:

Vote frauds—During 2002 the Branch assisted United States Attorneys’ Offices in Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, and...
Wisconsin in handling vote fraud matters that occurred in their respective districts. This assistance included providing expertise in the evaluation of allegations to determine whether investigation would produce prosecutable federal criminal cases, helping to structure investigations, providing legal assistance with respect to the formulation of charges, and assisting in establishing task force teams of federal and state law enforcement officials to investigate vote fraud matters.

During 2003 the Branch assisted United States Attorneys’ Offices in Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virgin Islands, West Virginia, and Wisconsin in handling vote fraud matters that occurred in their respective districts. This assistance included providing expertise in the evaluation of allegations to determine whether investigation would produce prosecutable federal criminal cases, helping to structure investigations, providing legal assistance with respect to the formulation of charges, and assisting in establishing task force teams of federal and state law enforcement officials to investigate vote fraud matters.

During 2004 the Branch assisted United States Attorneys’ Offices in the following states in the handling of vote fraud matters that occurred in their respective districts: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. This assistance included evaluating vote fraud allegations to determine whether investigation would produce a prosecutable federal criminal case, helping to structure investigations, providing legal advice concerning the formulation of charges, and assisting in establishing several task force teams of federal and state law enforcement officials to investigate vote fraud matters.

Litigation-The Branch Director or Section attorneys also prosecute selected election crimes, either by assuming total operational responsibility for the case or by handling the case jointly with a United States Attorney’s Office. The Section also may be asked to supervise the handling of a case in the event of a partial recusal of the local office. For example, in 2002 the Branch continued to supervise the prosecution of a sheriff and his election attorney for using data from the National Crime Information Center regarding voters’ criminal histories to wage an election contest.

District Election Officer Program-The Branch also assists in implementing the Department’s long-standing District Election Officer (DEO) Program. This Program is designed to ensure that each of the 93 United States Attorneys’ Offices has a trained prosecutor available to oversee the handling of election crime matters within the district and to coordinate district responses with Headquarters regarding these matters. The DEO Program involves the appointment of an Assistant United States Attorney in each federal district to serve a two-year term as a District Election Officer; the training of these
prosecutors in the investigation and prosecution of election crimes; and the coordination of election-related initiatives and other law enforcement activities between Headquarters and the field. In addition, the DEO Program is a crucial feature of the Department’s nationwide Election Day Program, which occurs in connection with the federal general elections held in November of even-numbered years. The Election Day Program ensures that federal prosecutors and investigators are available both at the Department’s Headquarters in Washington and in each district to receive and handle complaints of election irregularities from the public while the polls are open and that the public is aware of how these individuals can be contacted on election day. In 2002 the Department enhanced the DEO Program by establishing a Ballot Integrity Initiative.

Ballot Integrity Initiative—Beginning in September of 2002, the Public Integrity Section, acting at the request of the Attorney General, assisted in the implementation of a Ballot Integrity Initiative for the 2002 general election and subsequent elections. This initiative included increasing the law enforcement priority the Department gives to election crimes; holding a special day-long training event in Washington, DC for representatives of the 93 United States Attorneys’ Offices; publicizing the identities and telephone numbers of the DEOs through press releases issued shortly before the November elections; and requiring the 93 U.S. Attorneys to communicate the enhanced federal prioritization of election crime matters to state and local election and law enforcement authorities. As part of Ballot Integrity Initiative, on October 8, 2002, the Public Integrity Section and the Voting Rights Section of the Department’s Civil Rights Division co-sponsored a Voting Integrity Symposium for District Election Officers representing each of the 93 federal judicial districts. Topics discussed included the types of conduct that are prosecutable as federal election crimes and the federal statutes used to prosecute such cases. Attorney General John Ashcroft delivered the keynote address on the importance of election crime and ballot integrity enforcement. Assistant Attorney General of the Civil Rights Division Ralph Boyd and Assistant Attorney General of the Criminal Division Michael Chertoff also spoke to attendees on the protection of voting rights and the prosecution of election cases.

As part of Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative, on September 23 and 24, 2003, the Public Integrity Section and the Voting Rights Section of the Department’s Civil Rights Division co-sponsored a two-day Symposium for DEOs representing each of the 93 federal judicial districts. Topics discussed included the types of conduct that are prosecutable as federal election crimes and the federal statutes used to prosecute such cases. Assistant Attorney General of the Civil Rights Division Alexander Acosta and Assistant Attorney General of the Criminal Division Christopher A. Wray delivered the keynote addresses on the importance of protecting voting rights and the prosecution of election cases.

On July 20 and 21, 2004, the Public Integrity Section and the Voting Section of the Department’s Civil Rights Division co-sponsored a two-day symposium for DEOs representing each of the 93 federal judicial districts. Topics discussed included the types of conduct that are prosecutable as federal election crimes and the federal statutes available to prosecute such cases, and the handling of civil rights matters involving
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voting. Attorney General John Ashcroft delivered the keynote address on the importance of protecting voting rights and the prosecution of election fraud. In addition, Assistant Attorney General Christopher A. Wray of the Criminal Division and Assistant Attorney General R. Alexander Acosta of the Civil Rights Division addressed conference attendees on voting rights and election fraud enforcement issues respectively.

Federal Election Crimes

During 2002 the Public Integrity Section continued its nationwide oversight role regarding the handling of election crime allegations. As part of a general Department effort to increase its effectiveness in this important area, the Section assisted in the planning and execution of the Department’s 2002 Ballot Integrity Initiative. The purpose of this ongoing Initiative is to increase the Department’s ability to deter, detect, and prosecute election crimes and voting abuses by prioritizing election crime cases. As a result of the Initiative, during 2002 the number of election crime matters opened by federal prosecutors throughout the country increased significantly, as did the Section’s active involvement in election crime matters stemming from the Initiative. At the end of 2002, the Section was supervising and providing advice on approximately 43 election crime matters nationwide. In addition, as of December 31, 2002, 11 matters involving possible election crimes were pending in the Section.

During 2002 the Section closed two election crime matters and continued its operational supervision of the following election crime case: United States v. Woodward and Jordan, Northern District of Alabama. Jimmy Woodward, the former Sheriff of Jefferson County, Alabama, and Albert Jordan, an attorney from Birmingham, were indicted in 2000 for conspiring to obtain criminal history records from the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) for use in an election contest, for converting NCIC records, and for accessing government computers without authority. The indictment charged that Woodward and Jordan conspired to use Sheriff’s office personnel to access NCIC computers to run criminal history checks on hundreds of voters in Jefferson County who had voted by absentee ballot in the 1998 general election, in the hopes they would find criminal histories they could use to challenge the qualifications of voters who cast votes for Woodward’s opponent. The charges were dismissed in 2000 on procedural grounds. The Department appealed the dismissal of the charges. In 2001 the case was argued before the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals by the Appellate Section of the Criminal Division. The Court of Appeals subsequently reversed the trial court’s dismissal of the charges and remanded the case for retrial. The former United States Attorney for the Northern District of Alabama was recused from the case. The case is being prosecuted by an Assistant United States Attorney under the supervision of the Public Integrity Section.

The following cases are the result of an extensive federal investigation into vote-buying in the May 1998 primary election in Knott County, Kentucky, an Appalachian county in the Eastern District of Kentucky. The primary was contested by two slates of candidates. The ballot included the race for the position of Knott County Judge Executive, which controls local government hiring, contracting, and services. The ballot also included a primary contest for the office of United States Senator, conferring federal jurisdiction
over vote buying in the election even though the electoral corruption was directed at local races.

The following cases are being handled jointly by the Section and the United States Attorney’s Office for the Eastern District of Kentucky:

**United States v. Calhoun.** On March 28, 2003, a federal grand jury indicted Jimmy Calhoun on two counts of vote-buying. On August 19, 2003, Calhoun pled guilty to two counts of vote-buying on behalf of a slate of candidates headed by Donnie Newsome, the successful candidate for County Judge Executive in the May 1998 Knott County, Kentucky primary election. Calhoun paid two persons to vote by absentee ballot. On April 7, 2004, Calhoun was sentenced to six months in prison and two years of supervised release. Calhoun pled guilty to two counts of vote-buying on behalf of a slate of candidates headed by Donnie Newsome, the successful candidate for County Judge Executive in the May 1998 Knott County, Kentucky primary election. Calhoun paid two persons to vote by absentee ballot.

**United States v. Conley.** On March 28, 2003, a federal grand jury indicted Jimmy Lee Conley on five counts of vote-buying and one count of making a false statement in a matter within federal jurisdiction. Conley was charged with paying five persons to vote by absentee ballot for a slate of candidates headed by Donnie Newsome, the successful candidate for County Judge Executive. During the investigation, Conley allegedly made false statements to an agent of the FBI. A jury acquitted Conley on June 19, 2003.

**United States v. Johnson.** On April 24, 2003, a federal grand jury indicted Newton Johnson on four counts of vote-buying, one count of making a false statement in a matter within federal jurisdiction, and two counts of obstructing justice. On June 2, 2003, Johnson pled guilty pursuant to a plea agreement to one count of vote-buying, and one count of obstructing justice. Johnson paid four persons to vote by absentee ballot in the May 1998 Knott County, Kentucky primary election. Johnson paid the voters to vote for a slate of candidates headed by Donnie Newsome, the successful candidate for County Judge Executive. During the investigation of this vote-buying, Johnson made a false statement to an agent of the FBI, and pressured grand jury witnesses to falsely deny that he bought their votes. Pursuant to his plea agreement, Johnson pled guilty to paying one of the voters for her vote, and to endeavoring to obstruct the grand jury investigation by urging her to lie under oath. Johnson agreed to cooperate with the government. On October 6, 2003, Johnson was sentenced to three years of probation. Johnson had previously testified at the trial of Donnie Newsome to the nature and extent of the broader conspiracy to approach and pay numerous impoverished, handicapped, illiterate, or otherwise impaired persons to vote for the slate of candidates headed by Newsome. Newsome offered Johnson a road improvement and a county job in exchange for participation in the conspiracy. Johnson, who is impoverished, illiterate, and unable to leave his remote mountain hollow without the road improvement, agreed and purchased the votes of four persons. A jury convicted Newsome on all counts.
United States v. Madden. On March 28, 2003, a federal grand jury indicted Patrick Wayne Madden on three counts of vote-buying and one count of making a false statement in a matter within federal jurisdiction. On October 6, 2003, Madden pled guilty to one count of vote-buying. Madden paid three persons to vote by absentee ballot for a slate of candidates headed by Donnie Newsome, the successful candidate for County Judge Executive in the May 1998 Knott County, Kentucky primary election. During the investigation of this vote-buying, Madden made a false statement to an agent of the FBI. On February 2, 2004, Madden was sentenced to 20 months in prison and two years of supervised release. Madden pled guilty to one count of vote-buying. Madden paid three persons to vote by absentee ballot for a slate of candidates headed by Newsome.

United States v. Newsome, Pigman, and Smith. On April 24, 2003, a federal grand jury indicted sitting County Judge Executive Donnie Newsome and two of his supporters, Willard Smith and Keith Pigman, on one count of conspiracy to commit vote-buying. The grand jury further charged five substantive counts of vote-buying, one count charging Newsome, two counts charging Smith, one count charging Smith and Pigman, and one count charging all three defendants. Newsome, Pigman, and Smith, working together and with other conspirators, approached and paid numerous impoverished, handicapped, illiterate, or otherwise impaired persons to vote for Newsome by absentee ballot, resulting in a large increase in the rate of absentee voting, and long lines at the County Clerk’s Office. Newsome won the election to remain the County Judge Executive.

On July 8, 2003, Pigman pled guilty pursuant to a plea agreement to conspiracy to commit vote-buying, and one count of vote-buying. Pigman cooperated with the government following his plea, and provided substantial assistance by testifying against Newsome and Smith. Pigman explained the nature and extent of the broader conspiracy to approach and pay numerous impoverished, handicapped, illiterate, or otherwise impaired persons to vote for the slate of candidates headed by Newsome. Pigman further explained that such voters were purposefully chosen because they would present severe credibility problems for the government in any investigation and prosecution of their conspiracy. Newsome offered and ultimately gave Pigman a county job in exchange for Pigman’s participation in the conspiracy. On October 30, 2003, Pigman was sentenced to four months of imprisonment, four months of community confinement, and two years of supervised release. On October 1, 2003, a jury convicted both Newsome and Smith on all counts. Newsome, while in office as a Kentucky State Representative, became a candidate for County Judge Executive. Newsome, Pigman, and Smith, working together and with other conspirators, approached and paid numerous persons to vote for Newsome and certain other candidates by absentee ballot, resulting in a large increase in the rate of absentee voting, and long lines at the County Clerk’s Office. Newsome, who won the primary election and subsequent elections, was ordered detained pending sentencing, together with Smith, in light of threats to government witnesses during the trial.

On March 16, 2004, Newsome, the former County Judge Executive for Knott County, Kentucky, was sentenced to 26 months of in prison, a $20,000 fine, and three years of supervised release. Smith was sentenced to 24 months in prison, a $5,000 fine, and three
years of supervised release. A jury previously convicted Newsome and Smith on all
counts of an indictment that charged them with conspiracy to buy votes and five counts
of vote-buying. Pigman, previously pled guilty to the conspiracy charge, and was
sentenced to four months in prison, four months of community service, and two years of
supervised release.

*United States v. Ronnie Slone and Brady Slone.* On March 28, 2003, a federal grand jury
indicted Ronnie Neal Slone and Brady Warren Slone (who are brothers) on three counts
of vote-buying, and on one count each of making a false statement in a matter within
federal jurisdiction. The Slones allegedly paid three persons to vote by absentee ballot
for a slate of candidates headed by Donnie Newsome. During the investigation of this
vote-buying, each of the Slones allegedly made a false statement to an agent of the FBI.
On August 15, 2003, a jury acquitted both defendants.

*United States v. Phillip Slone.* On March 28, 2003, a federal grand jury indicted Phillip
Slone (who is not directly related to Ronnie and Brady Slone) on seven counts of vote-
buying and one count of making a false statement in a matter within federal jurisdiction.
On June 4, 2003, Slone pled guilty pursuant to a plea agreement to one count of vote-
buying. Slone paid seven persons to vote for a slate of candidates headed by Homer
Sawyer, the unsuccessful incumbent candidate for County Judge Executive in the May
1998 Knott County, Kentucky primary election. During the investigation of this vote-
buying, Slone made a false statement to an agent of the FBI. On October 15, 2003, Slone
was sentenced to ten months in prison and two years supervised release. Slone appealed
his sentence and the district court’s jurisdiction, and that appeal is pending.
Democracy At Risk: The November 2004 Election in Ohio
Democratic National Committee

In December 2004, the DNC announced a comprehensive investigative study and analysis of election administration issues arising from the conduct of the 2004 general election in Ohio. The DNC decided to undertake this study because of the many reports, made to the Democratic Party, appearing in the press and made to advocacy groups, immediately after the election, of problems in the administration of the election in that state—problems that prevented many Ohio citizens who showed up at the polls to be able to vote and to have their vote counted. This study was intended to address the legitimate questions and concerns that have been raised and to develop factual information that would be important and useful in crafting further necessary election reforms.

Most Pertinent Findings

- Overall, 28 percent of Ohio voters reported problems with their voting experience, including ballot problems, locating their proper polling place and/or intimidation.
- Twice as many African American voters as white voters reported experiencing problems at the polls (52 percent vs. 25 percent).
- Scarcity of voting machines caused long lines that deterred many people from voting. Three percent of voters who went to the polls left their polling places and did not return due to the long lines.
- Statewide, African American voters reported waiting an average of 52 minutes before voting while white voters reported waiting an average of 18 minutes.
- Overall, 20 percent of white Ohio voters reported waiting more than twenty minutes, while 44 percent of African American voters reported doing so.
- Of provisional voters in Cuyahoga County, 35 percent were African American, compared to 25 percent of non-provisional voters, matched by geography. African American voters were 1.2 times more likely than white voters to be required to vote provisionally.
- Under Ohio law, the only voters who should have been asked for identification were those voting in their first Federal election who had registered by mail but did not provide identification in their registration application. Although only 7 percent of all Ohio voters were newly registered (and only a small percentage of those voters registered by mail and failed to provide identification in their registration application), more than one third (37 percent) reported being asked to provide identification—meaning large numbers of voters were illegally required to produce identification.
- African American voters statewide were 47 percent more likely to be required to show identification than white voters. Indeed, 61 percent of
African American men reported being asked to provide identification at the polls.
- 6 percent of all voters reported feelings of intimidation.
- Statewide, 16 percent of African Americans reported experiencing intimidation versus only 5 percent of white voters.

The report also includes a useful summary and description of the reports that came through Ohio Election Protection on Election Day, which included a wide variety of problems, including voter intimidation and discrimination.

**Most Pertinent Recommendations**

- States should be encouraged to codify into law all required election practices, including requirements for the adequate training of official poll workers.
- States should adopt uniform and clear published standards for the distribution of voting equipment and the assignment of official poll workers among precincts, to ensure adequate and nondiscriminatory access. These standards should be based on set ratios of numbers of machines and poll workers per number of voters expected to turn out, and should be made available for public comment before being adopting.
- States should adopt legislation to make clear and uniform the rules on voter registration.
- States should be urged to implement statewide voter lists in accordance with the Help America Vote Act (“HAVA”), the election reform law enacted by Congress in 2002 following the Florida debacle.
- State and local jurisdictions should adopt clear and uniform rules on the use of, and the counting of, provisional ballots, and distribute them for public comment well in advance of each election day.
- States should not adopt requirements that voters show identification at the polls, beyond those already required by federal law (requiring that identification be shown only by first time voters who did not show identification when registering.)
- State Attorneys General and local authorities should vigorously enforce, to the full extent permitted by state law, a voter’s right to vote without showing identification.
- States should make voter suppression a criminal offense at the state level, in all states.
- States should improve the training of poll workers.
- States should expend significantly more resources in educating voters on where, when and how to vote.
- Partisan officials who volunteer to work for a candidate should not oversee or administer any elections.

This report describes the pervasive and repeated practices of voter intimidation and vote suppression that have taken place in very recent years and during contemporary American history. It goes on to describe the numerous instances of voter intimidation and suppression during the 2000 election, the 1990s, the 1980s and back through the civil rights movement of the 1960s, putting current efforts in historical perspective. Describing the chronology of events in this way demonstrates the developing patterns and strategic underpinnings of the tactics used over the last forty years. Examples include:

- Florida law enforcement questioned elderly African American voters in Orlando regarding the 2003 mayoral race, which had already been resolved, shortly before the 2004 election;
- the 2004 Florida felon purge list;
- the case of South Dakota in 2004 in which Native Americans were improperly and illegally required to show photo identification at the polls or denied the right to vote, and similar improper demands for ID from minorities in other parts of the country;
- the use of challengers in minority districts in many locations;
- the challenge to the right of African American students to vote in Texas in 2004;
- the presence of men looking like law enforcement challenging African American voters at the polls in Philadelphia in 2003;
- the distribution of flyers in Louisiana and elsewhere in a number of elections over the last few years in minority areas telling them to vote on the wrong day; and
- the FBI investigation into thousands of Native American voters in South Dakota in 2002.


Argues that "the discriminatory use of so-called 'ballot security" programs" has been a reoccurring scandal since the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. These programs are deceptively presented as preventing voter fraud and thereby furthering good government. However, McDonald states "but far too often they [the ballot security programs] are actually designed to suppress minority voting -- and for nakedly partisan purposes." Blames the federal government as well as the states for use of suspect ballot security programs. McDonald cites several ballot security efforts that were really disguised attempts at minority voter suppression:

- SD-DOJ "voting integrity initiative".
- AR - poll watchers driving away voters in predominantly black precincts by taking photos of them and demanding identification during pre-election day balloting.
- MI - "spotters" at heavily Democratic precincts was an effort to intimidate black voters and suppress Democratic turnout
- SC - one county's officials instituted a new and unauthorized policy allowing them to challenge voters who gave rural route or box numbers for their registration address (disproportionately affecting African Americans).
- the 1981 gubernatorial election anti-fraud initiative leading to the well known consent decree prohibiting the Republicans from repeating this, a similar Republican effort in Louisiana in 1986 in Senator John Breaux's race which again resulted in prohibition by a state court Judge, and a similar effort by Republicans in Senator Jesse Helms 1990 reelection.

States that HAVA "contains provisions that may enhance the opportunities for harassment and intimidation of minorities through ballot-security..."
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programs (especially voter ID). Indicates that the crux of the problem is lax enforcement of federal voters rights laws ("there is no record of the purveyors of any ballot-security program being criminally prosecuted by federal authorities for interfering with the right to vote." The only positive case law McDonald cited was a decision by the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit that affirmed "an award of damages ranging from $500 to $2,000, payable by individual poll officials to each of seven black voters who had been unlawfully challenged, harassed, denied assistance in voting or purged from the rolls in the town of Crawfordsville [Arkansas].")

Recommends that Congress and the states should adopt "nondiscriminatory, evenly applied measures to ensure the integrity of the ballot."


Current voter registration practices were determined to be insufficient to ensure the accuracy of voter registration lists used by poll workers or to prevent ineligible persons from registering to vote. In six municipalities where sufficient information was available, there was 105 instances of potentially improper or fraudulent voting in the 2004 elections. These included: 98 ineligible felons who may have voted; 2 individuals who may have voted twice; 1 voter who may have been underage; and 4 absentee ballots that should not have been counted because the voters who cast them died before Election Day (all but dead voters were forwarded to appropriate district attorneys for investigation). Statutes require that clerks send cards to everyone who registers by mail or on Election Day. However, only 42.7 % of the 150 municipalities surveyed sent cards to both groups, and 46 % did not send any address verification cards to those registering to vote on Election Day in November 2004. Statutes also require clerks to provide the local district attorney with the names of any Election Day registrants whose cards are undeliverable at the address provided. However, only 24.3 % of the clerks who sent cards also forwarded names from undeliverable cards to district attorneys. District attorneys surveyed indicated that they require more information than is typically provided to conduct effective investigations. To ensure that voter registration lists contain only the names of qualified electors, municipal clerks are required by statute to remove or inactivate the names of individuals who have not voted in four years, to update registration information for individuals who move or change their names, and to remove or inactivate the names of deceased individuals. They are also required to notify registered voters before removing their names from registration lists. These statutory requirements are not consistently followed:

- 85.3 % of municipalities removed the names of inactive voters from their voter registration lists;
- 71.4 % sometimes or always notified registered voters before removing their names; and
- 54.0 % reported removing the names of ineligible felons.

registration lists contain duplicate records and the names of ineligible individuals (e.g.; more than 348,000 electronic voter registration records from eight municipalities were reviewed, identifying 3,116 records that appear to show individuals who are registered more than once in the same municipality).

Recommendations:

- adjust the early registration deadline to provide clerks more time to prepare registration lists;
- establish more stringent requirements for special registration deputies, including prohibiting compensation based on the number of individuals registered;
- establish uniform requirements for demonstrating proof of residence for all registrants;
- provide municipal clerks with more flexibility in the use of address verification cards;
- Authorize civil penalties for local election officials and municipalities that fail to comply with election laws; and
- implement mandatory elections training requirements for municipal clerks.

Report also recognized that the new HAVA registration procedures would help with existing registration problems.

On January 26, 2005, the Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee County District Attorney’s Office, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the United States Attorney’s Office formed a task force to investigate alleged voting irregularities during the November 2004 elections. The task force has made the following specific determinations based on evidence examined to date:

- evidence of more than 100 individual instances of suspected double-voting, voting in names of persons who likely did not vote, and/or voting in names believed to be fake.
- more than 200 felons voted when they were not eligible to do so. (In order to establish criminal cases, the government must establish willful violations in individual instances);
- persons who had been paid to register voters as “deputy registrars” falsely listed approximately 65 names in order to receive compensation for the registrations. (The evidence does not indicate that these particular false registrations were later used to cast votes); and,
- the number of votes counted from the City of Milwaukee exceeds the number of persons recorded as voting by more than 4,500. (Evidence indicates widespread record keeping errors with respect to recording the number of voters)

The investigation concentrated on the 70,000+ same-day registrations. It found that a large majority of the reported errors were the result of data entry errors, such as street address numbers being transposed. However, the investigation also found more than 100 instances where votes were cast in a manner suggesting fraud. These include:

- persons with the same name and date of birth recorded as voting more than once;
- persons who live outside Milwaukee, but who used non-existent City addresses to register and vote in the City (141 of them were same day registrants; in several instances, the voter explicitly listed municipality names other than Milwaukee on the registration cards);
- persons who registered and voted with identities and addresses that cannot in any way be linked to a real person;
- persons listed as voting under a name and identity of a person known to be deceased;
- persons whose identities were used to vote, but who in subsequent interviews told task force investigators that they did not, in fact, vote in the City of Milwaukee.

Investigation also found:

- persons who were paid money to obtain registrations allegedly falsified approximately 65 names on registration forms, allegedly to obtain more money for each name submitted.
- more than 200 felons who were not eligible to vote in the 2004 election, but who are recorded as having done so.
- same-day registrations were accepted in which the card had incomplete information that would help establish identity. For example: 48 original cards for persons listed as voting had no name; 548 had no address; 28 did not have signatures; and another 23 cards had illegible information (part of approximately 1,300 same-day registrations for which votes were cast, but which election officials could not authenticate as proper voters within the City).
- the post-election misfiling or loss of original green registration cards that were considered duplicates, but that in fact corresponded to additional votes. These cards were used to record votes, but approximately 100 cards of interest to investigators can no longer be located. In addition, other original green registration cards continue to be found.
Among the observations made that are relevant to the EAC study of fraud and intimidation are the following:

- The November 2004 elections showed that irregularities and fraud still occur.
- Failure to provide voters with such basic information as their registration status and their polling site location raises a barrier to voting as significant as inconsistent procedures on provisional ballots or voter ID requirements.
- There is no evidence of extensive fraud in U.S. elections or of multiple voting, but both occur, and it could affect the outcome of a close election.
- The Commission is concerned that the different approaches to identification cards might prove to be a serious impediment to voting.
- Voter registration lists are often inflated by the inclusion of citizens who have moved out of state but remain on the lists. Moreover, under the National Voter Registration Act, names are often added to the list, but counties and municipalities often do not delete the names of those who moved. Inflated voter lists are also caused by phony registrations and efforts to register individuals who are ineligible. At the same time, inaccurate purges of voter lists have removed citizens who are eligible and are properly registered.
- Political party and nonpartisan voter registration drives generally contribute to the electoral process by generating interest in upcoming elections and expanding participation. However, they are occasionally abused. There were reports in 2004 that some party activists failed to deliver voter registration forms of citizens who expressed a preference for the opposing party.
- Vote by mail raises concerns about privacy, as citizens voting at home may come under pressure to vote for certain candidates, and it increases the risk of fraud.
- While election fraud is difficult to measure, it occurs. The U.S. Department of Justice has launched more than 180 investigations into election fraud since October 2002. These investigations have resulted in charges for multiple voting, providing false information on their felon status, and other offenses against 89 individuals and in convictions of 52 individuals. The convictions related to a variety of election fraud offenses, from vote buying to submitting false voter registration information and voting-related offenses by non-citizens. In addition to the federal investigations, state attorneys general and local prosecutors handle cases of election fraud. Other cases are never pursued because of the difficulty in obtaining sufficient evidence for prosecution or because of the low priority given to election fraud cases.
- Absentee ballots remain the largest source of potential voter fraud.
- Non-citizens have registered to vote in several recent elections.
- The growth of "third-party" (unofficial) voter registration drives in recent elections has led to a rise in reports of voter registration fraud.
- Many states allow the representatives of candidates or political parties to challenge a person's eligibility to register or vote or to challenge an inaccurate name on a voter roll. This practice of challenges may contribute to ballot integrity, but it can have the effect of intimidating eligible voters, preventing them from casting their ballot, or otherwise disrupting the voting process.

It's pertinent recommendations for reform are as follows:

- Interoperable state voter databases are needed to facilitate updates in the registration of voters who move to another state and to eliminate duplicate registrations, which are a source of potential fraud.
- Voters should be informed of their right to cast a provisional ballot if their name does not appear on the voter roll, or if an election official asserts that the individual is not eligible to vote, but States should take additional and effective steps to inform voters as to the location of their precinct.
- The Commission recommends that states use "REAL ID" cards for voting purposes.
- To verify the identity of voters who cast absentee ballots, the voter's signature on the absentee ballot can be matched with a digitized
version of the signature that the election administrator maintains. While such signature matches are usually done, they should be done consistently in all cases, so that election officials can verify the identity of every new registrant who casts an absentee ballot.

- Each state needs to audit its voter registration files to determine the extent to which they are accurate (with correct and current information on individuals), complete (including all eligible voters), valid (excluding ineligible voters), and secure (with protections against unauthorized use). This can be done by matching voter files with records in other state agency databases in a regular and timely manner, contacting individuals when the matches are inconclusive, and conducting survey research to estimate the number of voters who believe they are registered but who are not in fact listed in the voter files.

- Each state should oversee political party and nonpartisan voter registration drives to ensure that they operate effectively, that registration forms are delivered promptly to election officials, that all completed registration forms are delivered to the election officials, and that none are "culled" and omitted according to the registrant's partisan affiliation. Measures should also be adopted to track and hold accountable those who are engaged in submitting fraudulent voter registrations. Such oversight might consist of training activists who conduct voter registration drives and tracking voter registration forms to make sure they are all accounted for. In addition, states should apply a criminal penalty to any activist who deliberately fails to deliver a completed voter registration form.

- Investigation and prosecution of election fraud should include those acts committed by individuals, including election officials, poll workers, volunteers, challengers or other nonvoters associated with the administration of elections, and not just fraud by voters.

- In July of even-numbered years, the U.S. Department of Justice should issue a public report on its investigations of election fraud. This report should specify the numbers of allegations made, matters investigated, cases prosecuted, and individuals convicted for various crimes. Each state's attorney general and each local prosecutor should issue a similar report.

- The U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Public Integrity should increase its staff to investigate and prosecute election-related fraud.

- In addition to the penalties set by the Voting Rights Act, it should be a federal felony for any individual, group of individuals, or organization to engage in any act of violence, property destruction (of more than $500 value), or threatened act of violence that is intended to deny any individual his or her lawful right to vote or to participate in a federal election.

- To deter systemic efforts to deceive or intimidate voters, the Commission recommends federal legislation to prohibit any individual or group from deliberately providing the public with incorrect information about election procedures for the purpose of preventing voters from going to the polls.

- States should define clear procedures for challenges, which should mainly be raised and resolved before the deadline for voter registration. After that, challengers will need to defend their late actions. On Election Day, they should direct their concerns to poll workers, not to voters directly, and should in no way interfere with the smooth operation of the polling station.

- State and local jurisdictions should prohibit a person from handling absentee ballots other than the voter, an acknowledged family member, the U.S. Postal Service or other legitimate shipper, or election officials. The practice in some states of allowing candidates or party workers to pick up and deliver absentee ballots should be eliminated.

- All states should consider passing legislation that attempts to minimize the fraud that has resulted from "payment by the piece" to anyone in exchange for their efforts in voter registration, absentee ballot, or signature collection.

- Nonpartisan structures of election administration are very important, and election administrators should be neutral, professional, and impartial.

- No matter what institutions are responsible for conducting elections, conflict-of-interest standards should be introduced for all federal, state, and local election officials. Election officials should be prohibited by federal and/or state laws from serving on any political campaign committee, making any public comments in support of a candidate, taking a public position on any ballot measure, soliciting campaign funds, or otherwise campaigning for or against a candidate for public office. A decision by a secretary of state to serve as co-chair of his or her party's presidential

**Recommendation on Voter Identification**

- Report premises its burdensome identification proposals on the need to ensure ballot integrity and on the existence of or potential for widespread fraud. However, the Report admits that there is simply “no evidence” that the type of fraud that could be solved by stricter voter identification – individual voters who misrepresent their identity at the polls – is a widespread problem.

- The photo ID proposal guards against only one type of fraud: individuals arriving at the polls to vote using false information, such as the name of another registered voter, or a recent but not current address. Since the costs of this form of fraud are extremely high (federal law provides for up to five years’ imprisonment), and the benefits to any individual voter are extremely low, it is highly unlikely that this will ever occur with any frequency. The limited types of fraud that could be prevented by a Real ID requirement are extremely rare and difficult.

- In the most comprehensive survey of alleged election fraud to date, Professor Loraine Minnite and David Callahan have shown that the incidence of individual voter fraud at the polls is negligible. A few prominent examples support their findings. In Ohio, a statewide survey found four instances of ineligible persons voting or attempting to vote in 2002 and 2004, out of 9,078,728 votes cast – a rate of 0.00004%. Earlier this year, Georgia Secretary of State Cathy Cox stated that she could not recall one documented case of voter fraud relating to the impersonation of a registered voter at the polls during her ten-year tenure as Secretary of State or Assistant Secretary of State.

- The Report attempts to support its burdensome identification requirements on four specific examples of purported fraud or potential fraud. None of the Report’s cited examples of fraud stand up under closer scrutiny. This response report goes through each instance of fraud raised by the Commission report and demonstrates that in each case the allegation in fact turned out later not to be true or the fraud cited was not of the type that would be addressed by a photo identification requirement.

- The Report fails to provide a good reason to create greater hurdles for voters who vote at the polls than for those who vote absentee. Despite the fact that absentee ballots are more susceptible to fraud than regular ballots, the Report exempts absentee voters from its proposed Real ID and proof of citizenship requirements.

**Other points in ID requirement:**

- Report does not explain why the goals of improved election integrity will not be met through the existing provisions in the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA).

- Report fails to consider alternative measures to advance its goals that are less restrictive to voters. To the extent that any limited fraud by individuals at the polls does trickle into the system, it can be addressed by far less restrictive alternatives. The first step is to recognize that only voters who appear on the registration list may vote a regular ballot. Proper cleaning of registration lists – and proper use of the lists at the poll—will therefore go a long way toward ensuring that every single ballot is cast by an eligible voter.

- In addition to the better registration lists that full implementation will provide, better record keeping and administration at the polls will reduce the limited potential for voting by ineligible persons. In the unlikely event that implementation of current law is not able to wipe out whatever potential for individual fraud remains, there are several effective and less burdensome alternatives to the Report’s Real ID recommendation that received wholly insufficient consideration.

- Costs - If required as a precondition for voting, photo identification would operate as a de facto poll tax that could disenfranchise low-income voters. To alleviate this burden, the Report appropriately recommends that the “Real ID” card itself be issued free of charge. Nevertheless, the
percentage of Americans without the documentary proof of citizenship necessary to obtain Real IDs is likely to remain high because the requisite documents are both expensive and burdensome to obtain. (Each of the documents an individual is required to show in order to obtain a “Real ID” card or other government-issued photo ID card costs money or presumes a minimal level of economic resources. Unless the federal and all state governments waive the cost of each of these other forms of identification, the indirect costs of photo IDs will be even greater than their direct costs. In addition, since government-issued IDs may only be obtained at specified government offices, which may be far from voters’ residences and workplaces, individuals seeking such IDs will have to incur transportation costs and the costs of taking time off from work to visit those offices during often-abbreviated business hours.)

- Since voting generally depends on the voter’s address, and since many states will not accept IDs that do not bear an individual’s current voting address, an additional 41.5 million Americans each year will have ID that they may not be able to use to vote.
- The burden would fall disproportionately on the elderly, the disabled, students, the poor, and people of color.
- The ID recommendations reduce the benefits of voter registration at disability and other social service agencies provided by the National Voter Registration Act of 1993. Individuals who seek to register at those offices—which generally do not issue IDs Census data demonstrate that African Americans and Latinos are more than three times more likely than whites to register to vote at a public assistance agency, and that whites are more likely than African Americans and Latinos to register when seeking a driver’s license. Accordingly, the voter registration procedure far more likely to be used by minorities than by whites will no longer provide Americans with full eligibility to vote.
- The Report’s proposal to use Real ID as a condition of voting is so excessive that it would prevent eligible voters from proving their identity with even a valid U.S. passport or a U.S. military photo ID card. The Report’s proposal to use Real ID as a condition of voting is so excessive that it would prevent eligible voters from proving their identity with even a valid U.S. passport or a U.S. military photo ID card.

Recommendation on Database Information Sharing Across States - serious efficacy, privacy, and security concerns raised by a nationally distributed database of the magnitude it contemplates. These problems are exacerbated by the Report’s recommendation that an individual’s Social Security number be used as the broadly disseminated unique voting identifier.

Recommendation on Voting Rights of Ex-Felons - This recommendation would set a standard more generous than the policies of the most regressive thirteen states in the nation but more restrictive than the remaining thirty-seven. The trend in the states is toward extension of the franchise.


Focuses on vote suppression through “ballot security programs” (programs that, in the name of protecting against vote fraud, almost exclusively target heavily black, Latino, or Indian voting precincts and have the intent or effect of discouraging or preventing voters in those precincts from casting a ballot). Noteworthy characteristics of these programs:

- focus on minority precincts almost exclusively
- is often on only the flimsiest evidence that vote fraud is likely to be perpetrated in such precincts;
- in addition to encouraging the presence of sometimes intimidating white Republican poll watchers or challengers who may slow down voting lines and embarrass potential voters by asking them humiliating questions, these programs have sometimes posted people in official-looking uniforms with badges and side arms who question voters about their citizenship or their registration
- warning signs may be posted near the polls, or radio ads may be targeted to minority listeners containing dire threats of prison terms for people who are not properly registered—messages that seem designed to put minority voters on the defensive.
- sometimes false information about voting qualifications is sent to minority voters through the mail.
- doing mailings, collecting returned materials, and using that as a basis for creating challenger lists and challenging voters at the polls,
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started in the 1950s and continues to today (problem with this practice is that reasons for a mailing to be returned include a wrong address, out of date or inaccurate addresses, poor mail delivery in minority areas, and matching mistakes)

Provide numerous examples from the last 50 years to demonstrate his thesis, going through the historical development of Republican ballot security programs from the 1950s through to the present (including more recent incidents, such as 1981 in New Jersey, 1982 Dallas, Louisiana 1986, Houston 1986, Hidalgo 1988 Orange County 1988, North Carolina 1990, South Carolina 1980-1990, and South Dakota 2002). Author cites and quotes internal Republican letters and memoranda, primary sources and original documents, media reports, scholarly works, as well as the words of judges’ rulings in some of the cases that ended up in litigation to prove his argument. Author cites and quotes internal Republican letters and memoranda, primary sources and original documents, media reports, scholarly works, as well as the words of judges’ rulings in some of the cases that ended up in litigation to prove his argument.

Some of the features of vote suppression efforts put forth by Republicans under the guise of ballot security programs:

1. An organized, often widely publicized effort to field poll watchers in what Republicans call “heavily Democratic,” but what are usually minority, precincts;
2. Stated concerns about vote fraud in these precincts, which are occasionally justified but often are not;
3. Misinformation and fear campaigns directed at these same precincts, spread by radio, posted signs in the neighborhoods, newspapers, fliers, and phone calls, which are often anonymously perpetrated;
4. Posting “official-looking” personnel at polling places, including but not limited to off-duty police—sometimes in uniform, sometimes armed;
5. Aggressive face-to-face challenging techniques at the polls that can confuse, humiliate, and intimidate—as well as slow the voting process—in these same minority precincts;
6. Challenging voters using inaccurate, unofficial lists of registrants derived from “do-not-forward” letters sent to low-income and minority neighborhoods;
7. Photographing, tape recording, or videotaping voters; and
8. Employing language and metaphors that trade on stereotypes of minority voters as venal and credulous.

The report ends with some observations on the state of research on the incidence of fraud, which the author finds lacking. He suggests that vote suppression of qualified minority voters by officials and partisan poll-watchers, challengers, and uniformed guards should also be considered as included in any definition of election fraud. Recommends Democrats should not protest all programs aimed at ballot integrity, but rather work with Republicans to find solutions to problems that confront both parties and the system as a whole.


Presents results from the first nationwide study to document the implementation of American felony disenfranchisement law. Data came from two main sources: a 33-state survey of state elections officials (spring 2004) and telephone interviews with almost one hundred city, county, town, and parish officials drawn from 10 selected states.

Major Conclusions:

1. **Broad variation and misunderstanding in interpretation and enforcement of voting laws** (more than one-third [37%] of local officials interviewed in ten states either described their state's fundamental eligibility law incorrectly, or stated that they did not know a central aspect of that law. / Local registrars differ in their knowledge of basic eligibility law, often within the same state. Differences also emerge in how they are notified of criminal convictions, what process they use to suspend, cancel, or “purge” voters from the rolls, whether particular documents are required to restore a voter to eligibility, and whether they have information about the criminal background of new arrivals to the state.)
2. **Misdemeanants disenfranchised in at least five states** (the commonly-used term "felon disenfranchisement" is not entirely accurate, since at
least five states – Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, South Carolina, and Maryland – also formally bar some or all people convicted of misdemeanors from voting (it is likely that misdemeanants in other states who do retain the formal right to vote could have difficulty exercising that right, given ignorance of their eligibility and the lack of clear rules and procedures for absentee voting by people in jail who have not been convicted of a felony. Maryland excludes persons convicted of many misdemeanors, such as "Unlawful operation of a vending machine," "Misrepresentation of tobacco leaf weight," and "Racing horse under false name.")

3. Significant ambiguities in voting laws (disenfranchisement in Tennessee is dependent on which of five different time periods a felony conviction occurred between 1973 and the present; in Oregon, disenfranchisement is determined not by conviction or imprisonment for a felony, but for being placed under Department of Corrections supervision; since 1997, some persons convicted of a felony and sentenced to less than 12 months' custody have been sent to county jails and hence, are eligible to vote.

4. Disenfranchisement results in contradictory policies within states (the "crazy-quilt" pattern of disenfranchisement laws exists even within states. Alabama and Mississippi have both the most and least restrictive laws in the country, a result which is brought about by the fact that certain felonies result in the loss of voting rights for life, while others at least theoretically permit people in prison to vote, most felonies in Alabama result in permanent disenfranchisement, but drug and DUI offenses have been determined to not involve the "moral turpitude" that triggers the loss of voting rights; in Mississippi, ten felonies result in disenfranchisement, but do not include such common offenses as burglary and drug crimes.

5. Confusing policies lead to the exclusion of legal voters and the inclusion of illegal voters: The complexity of state disenfranchisement policies results in frequent misidentification of voter eligibility, largely because officials differ in their knowledge and application of disqualification and restoration law and procedures.

6. Significant variation and uncertainty in how states respond to persons with a felony conviction from other states: No state has a systematic mechanism in place to address the immigration of persons with a felony conviction, and there is no consensus among indefinite-disenfranchisement states on whether the disqualification is properly confined to the state of conviction, or should be considered in the new state of residence. Interpretation and enforcement of this part of disenfranchisement law varies not only across state lines, but also from one county to another within states. Local officials have no way of knowing about convictions in other states, and many are unsure what they would do if a would-be voter acknowledged an old conviction. Because there is no prospect of a national voter roll, this situation will continue even after full HAVA implementation.

7. Disenfranchisement is a time-consuming, expensive practice: Enforcement requires elections officials to gather records from different agencies and bureaucracies, including state and federal courts, Departments of Corrections, Probation and Parole, the state Board of Elections, the state police, and other counties' elections offices.

Policy Implications

1. Policies disenfranchising people living in the community on probation or parole, or who have completed a sentence are particularly difficult to enforce: States which disenfranchise only persons who are currently incarcerated appear able to enforce their laws more consistently than those barring non-incarcerated citizens from voting.

2. Given large-scale misunderstanding of disenfranchisement law, many eligible persons incorrectly believe they cannot vote, or have been misinformed by election officials: More than one-third of election officials interviewed incorrectly described their state's law on voting eligibility. More than 85% of the officials who misidentified their state's law either did not know the eligibility standard or specified that the law was more restrictive than was actually the case.

3. Occasional violation of disenfranchisement law by non-incarcerated voters not surprising: Given the complexity of state laws and the number of state officials who lack an understanding of restoration and disqualification procedures, it should come as no surprise that many voters are ignorant of their voting status, a fact that is likely to have resulted in hundreds of persons with a felony conviction registering and voting illegally in recent years.
Taken together, these findings undermine the most prominent rationale for disenfranchisement: that the policy reflects a strong, clear consensus that persons with a felony conviction are unfit to vote and constitute a threat to the polity: First, when significant numbers of the people who administer elections do not know important aspects of disenfranchisement law, it is hard to conclude that the restriction is necessary to protect social order and the "purity" of the ballot box. Second, because they are all but invisible in the sentencing process, "collateral" sanctions like disenfranchisement simply cannot accomplish the denunciatory, expressive purposes their supporters claim. We now know that disenfranchisement is not entirely "visible" even to the people running American elections. Third, deep uncertainty regarding the voting rights of people with felony convictions who move from one state to another indicates that we do not even know what purpose disenfranchisement is supposed to serve -- whether it is meant to be a punishment, or simply a non-penal regulation of the franchise.

Recommendations

1. **Clarify Policies Regarding Out-of-State Convictions:** State officials should clarify their policies and incorporate into training programs the means by which a felony conviction in another state affects an applicant’s voting eligibility. For example, sentence-only disenfranchisement states should clarify that newcomers with old felony convictions from indefinite disenfranchisement states are eligible to vote. And those states which bar some people from voting even after their sentences are completed must clarify whether new arrivals with old felony convictions from sentence-only disenfranchisement states are automatically eligible, and must explain what procedures, if any, should be followed for restoration.

2. **Train Election Officials:** Clarify disenfranchisement policies and procedures for all state and local election officials through development of materials and training programs in each state. At a minimum, this should include distribution of posters, brochures and FAQ sheets to local and state elections offices.

3. **Train Criminal Justice Officials:** Provide training on disqualification and restoration policies for all correctional and criminal justice officials, particularly probation and parole staff. Correctional and criminal justice officials should also be actively engaged in describing these policies to persons under criminal justice supervision.

4. **Review Voting Restrictions on Non-Incarcerated People:** Given the serious practical difficulty of enforcing laws disqualifying people who are not incarcerated from voting – problems which clearly include both excluding eligible people from voting and allowing those who should be ineligible to vote -- state policymakers should review such policies to determine if they serve a useful public purpose.

---


Using court records, police reports and news articles, ACVR Legislative Fund presented this Report documenting hundreds of reported incidents and allegations from around the country. The report most often alleges voter intimidation and voter registration fraud, and to a lesser degree absentee ballot fraud and vote buying. This report alleges a coordinated effort by members of some organizations to rig the election system through voter registration fraud, the first step in any vote fraud scheme that corrupts the election process by burying local officials in fraudulent and suspicious registration forms. Paid Democrat operatives were far more involved in voter intimidation and suppression activities than were their Republican counterparts during the 2004 presidential election. Identified five cities as "hot spots" which require additional immediate attention, based on the findings of this report and the cities’ documented history of fraud and intimidation: Philadelphia, PA, Milwaukee, WI, Seattle, WA, St. Louis/East St. Louis, MO/IL, and Cleveland, OH. Refutes charges of voter intimidation and suppression made against Republican supporters, discusses similar charges against Democrats, details incidents vote fraud and illegal voting and finally discusses problems with vote fraud, voter registration fraud and election irregularities around the country. Recommends:

- Both national political parties should formally adopt a zero-tolerance fraud and intimidation policy that commits the party to pursuing and fully prosecuting individuals and allied organizations who commit vote fraud or who seek to deter any eligible voter from participating in the election through fraud or intimidation. No amount of legislative reform can effectively deter those who commit acts of fraud if there is no punishment for the crime and these acts continue to be tolerated.
States should adopt legislation requiring government-issued photo ID at the polls and for any voter seeking to vote by mail or by absentee ballot. Government-issued photo identification should be readily available to all citizens without cost and provisions made to assure availability of government-issued identification to disabled and low-income citizens.

States should adopt legislation requiring that all polling places be fully accessible and accommodating to all voters regardless of race, disability or political persuasion and that polling locations are free of intimidation or harassment.

States should create and maintain current and accurate statewide voter registration databases as mandated by the federal Help America Vote Act ("HAVA") and establish procedures to assure that the statewide voter roll is current and accurate and that the names of eligible voters on the roll are consistent with the voter roll used by local election authorities in conducting the election.

States should adopt legislation establishing a 30-day voter registration cutoff to assure that all voter rolls are accurate and that all registrants can cast a regular ballot on Election Day and the election officials have opportunity to establish a current and accurate voter roll without duplicate or fictional names and assure that all eligible voters (including all recently registered voters) are included on the voter roll at their proper precinct.

States should adopt legislation requiring voter registration applications to be delivered to the elections office within one week of being completed so that they are processed in a timely manner and to assure the individuals registered by third party organizations are properly included on the voter roll.

States should adopt legislation and penalties for groups violating voter registration laws, and provide the list of violations and penalties to all registration solicitors. Legislation should require those organizations obtaining a voter's registration to deliver that registration to election officials in a timely manner and should impose appropriate penalties upon any individual or organization that obtains an eligible voter's registration and fails to deliver it to election authorities.

States should adopt legislation prohibiting "bounty" payment to voter registration solicitors based on the number of registration cards they collect.


Written after the 2000 election, thesis of report is that structural disenfranchisement—the effect of breakdowns in the electoral system, is the new poll tax. Structural disenfranchisement includes "bureaucratic blunders, governmental indifference, and flagrant disregard for voting rights." Blame for structural disenfranchisement is laid squarely at the feet of states and localities that "shirk their responsibilities or otherwise manipulate election systems," resulting in voters "either turned away from the polls or their votes are thrown out." Data and conclusions in the Report are taken from eight sample case studies of states and cities across the country and a survey of state election directors that reinforces the findings of the case studies (New York City-in six polling places Chinese translations inverted the Democrats with the Republicans; Georgia-the state computer crashed two weeks before the election, dropping thousands of voters from the rolls; Virginia-registration problems kept an untold number from voting; Chicago-in inner-city precincts with predominately minority populations, almost four out of every ten votes cast for President (in 2000) were discarded; St. Louis-thousands of qualified voters were placed on inactive lists due to an overbroad purge; Florida-a voting list purge of voters whose name and birth date closely resembled those of people convicted of felonies; and, Texas-significant Jim Crow like barriers to minority voting.) Most ballot blockers involve the structural elements of electoral administration: "ill-trained poll workers, failures to process registration cards on time or at all, inaccurate registration rolls, overbroad purges of voter rolls, unreasonably long lines, inaccurate ballot translations and a shortage of translators to assist voters who have limited English language skills."

Findings:

- election directors lack the resources to effectively do their jobs and some lack the "ability or will to force local election officials to fix serious
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problems;
- election officials are highly under funded and legislatures refuse to grant their requests for more money;
- due to a lack of funds, election officials must use old and inferior equipment and can’t improve training or meet structural needs;
- election officials are generally unaware of racial disparities in voting; only three of the 50 state election administrators are non-white.

Recommendations:
- federal policies that set nationwide and uniform election policies;
- federal guarantee of access to provisional ballots;
- enforcement of voter disability laws;
- automatic restoration of voting rights to those convicted of a crime after they have completed their sentence;
- a centralized data base of voters administered by non-partisan individuals;
- federal standards limiting precinct discarded vote rates to .25 %;
- federal requirements that jurisdiction provide voter education, including how to protect their right to vote; and laws that strengthen the ability of individuals to bring actions to enforce voting rights and anti-discrimination laws.


A September 15, 2005 Report submitted to the New Jersey Attorney General included lists of purportedly illegitimate votes in New Jersey in the 2004 general election, including lists of 10,969 individuals who purportedly voted twice and lists of 4,756 voters who were purportedly dead or incarcerated in November 2004. Analysis of the suspect lists reveals that the evidence submitted does not show what it purports to show: cause for concern that there is serious risk of widespread fraud given the state of the New Jersey voter registration rolls. These suspect lists were compiled by attempting to match the first name, last name, and birth date of persons on county voter registration files. Analysis reveals several serious problems with the methodology used to compile the suspect lists that compromise the lists’ practical value. For example, middle initials were ignored throughout all counties, so that "J A. Smith" was presumed to be the same person as "J G. Smith." Suffixes were also ignored, so that fathers and sons – like "B Johnson" and "B Johnson, Jr." – were said to be the same person. A presumption that two records with the same name and date of birth must represent the same person is not consistent with basic statistical principles.

Re Claim of Double Voting by 4,497 Individuals:
- 1,803 of these 4,397 records of ostensibly illegal votes seem to be the product of a glitch in the compilation of the registration files (far more likely that data error is to blame for the doubly logged vote - to irregularities in the data processing and compilation process for one single county);
- another 1,257 entries of the 4,397 records probably represent similar data errors;
- approximately 800 of the entries on the list likely represent different people, with different addresses and different middle initials or suffixes;
- for approximately 200 of the entries in this category, however, less information is available (lack of or differences in middle initial or middle name);
- 7 voters were apparently born in January 1, 1880 – which is most likely a system default for registrations lacking date-of-birth information;
- for 227 voters, only the month and year of birth are listed: this means only that two voters with the same name were born in the same month and year, an unsurprising coincidence in a state of several million people;
- leaves approximately 289 votes cast under the same name and birth date – like votes cast by "P S. Rosen," born in the middle of the baby boom – but from two different addresses. It may appear strange, but there may be two P S. Rosens, born on the same date in 1948 – and
such coincidences are surprisingly common. In a group of just 23 people, it is more likely than not that two will share the same birthday. For 40 people, the probability is 90%. Many, if not most, of the 289 alleged double votes of persons registered at different addresses most likely reflect two separate individuals sharing a first name, last name, middle initial, and birth date. But there is no doubt that there are duplicate entries on New Jersey's registration rolls. It is well known that voter registration rolls contain "deadwood" – registration entries for individuals no longer living at a given address or deceased. There is no evidence, however, that these extra registrations are used for widespread illegal voting. Moreover, the problem of deadwood will soon be largely resolved: both the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 and the Help America Vote Act of 2002 require states to implement several systems and procedures as of January 1, 2006, that will clean the voter rolls of duplicate or invalid entries while protecting eligible voters from unintended disfranchisement.

Democratic National Committee, "Democracy at Risk: The November 2004 Election in Ohio," DNC Services Corporation, 2005

Study re 2004 election in Ohio. Findings considered related to EAC study:

- Statewide, 6% of all voters reported feelings of intimidation: 16 percent of African Americans reported experiencing intimidation versus only 5% of white voters.
- African American voters were 1.2 times more likely than white voters to be required to vote provisionally. Of provisional voters in Cuyahoga County, 35% were African American, compared to 25% of non-provisional voters, matched by geography.
- Under Ohio law, the only voters who should have been asked for identification were those voting in their first Federal election who had registered by mail but did not provide identification in their registration application. Although only 7% of all Ohio voters were newly registered (and only a small percentage of those voters registered by mail and failed to provide identification in their registration application), more than one third (37% reported being asked to provide identification) of those voters were illegally required to produce identification. African American voters statewide were 47% more likely to be required to show identification than white voters. Indeed, 61% of African American men reported being asked to provide identification at the polls.
- Scarcity of voting machines caused long lines that deterred many people from voting: 3% of voters who went to the polls left their polling places and did not return due to the long lines; statewide, African American voters reported waiting an average of 52 minutes before voting while white voters reported waiting an average of 18 minutes; overall, 20% of white Ohio voters reported waiting more than twenty minutes, while 44% of African American voters reported doing so.

The report also includes a useful summary and description of the reports that came through Ohio Election Protection on Election Day, which included a wide variety of problems, including voter intimidation and discrimination.

Pertinent recommendations:

- **codify into law all required election practices**, including requirements for the adequate training of official poll workers
- adopt legislation to make clear and uniform the rules on voter registration.
- adopt uniform and clear published standards for the distribution of voting equipment and the assignment of official pollworkers among precincts, to ensure adequate and nondiscriminatory access
- improve training of official poll workers
- adopt clear and uniform rules on the use of, and the counting of, provisional ballots, and distribute them for public comment well in advance of each election day
- not adopt requirements that voters show identification at the polls, beyond those already required by federal law; vigorously enforce, to the full extent permitted by state law, a voter's right to vote without showing identification.
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- make voter suppression a criminal offense at the state level, in all states
- implement statewide voter lists in accordance with the Help America Vote Act ("HAVA")
- expend significantly more resources in educating voters on where, when and how to vote.
- partisan officials who volunteer to work for a candidate should not oversee or administer any elections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>&quot;Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2002.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>&quot;Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2003.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>&quot;Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2004.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supervision of the Justice Department's nationwide response to election crimes:**

Election Crimes Branch oversees the Department's handling of all election crime allegations other than those involving civil rights violations, which are supervised by the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division. Specifically, the Branch supervises four types of corruption cases: crimes that involve the voting process, crimes involving the financing of federal election campaigns, crimes relating to political shakedowns and other patronage abuses, and illegal lobbying with appropriated funds. Vote frauds and campaign-financing offenses are the most significant and also the most common types of election crimes. The purpose of Headquarters' oversight of election crime matters is to ensure that the Department's nationwide response to election crime is uniform, impartial, and effective. An Election Crimes Branch, headed by a Director and staffed by Section attorneys on a case-by-case basis, was created within the Section in 1980 to handle this supervisory responsibility.

**Voting Fraud:**

During 2002 the Branch assisted United States Attorneys' Offices in Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, and Wisconsin in handling vote fraud matters that occurred in their respective districts. During 2003 the Branch assisted United States Attorneys' Offices in Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virgin Islands, West Virginia, and Wisconsin in handling vote fraud matters that occurred in their respective districts. During 2004 the Branch协助 United States Attorneys' Offices in the following states in the handling of vote fraud matters that occurred in their respective districts: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. This assistance included evaluating vote fraud allegations to determine whether investigation would produce a prosecutable federal criminal case, helping to structure investigations, providing legal advice concerning the formulation of charges, and assisting in establishing several task force teams of federal and state law enforcement officials to investigate vote fraud matters.

**Litigation:**

The Branch Director or Section attorneys also prosecute selected election crimes, either by assuming total operational responsibility for the case or by handling the case jointly with a United States Attorney's Office. The Section also may be asked to supervise the handling of a case in the event of a partial recusal of the local office. For example, in 2002 the Branch continued to supervise the prosecution of a sheriff and his election attorney for using data from the National Crime Information Center regarding voters' criminal histories to wage an election contest.
District Election Officer Program:
The Branch also assists in implementing the Department's long-standing District Election Officer (DEO) Program. This Program is designed to ensure that each of the 93 United States Attorneys' Offices has a trained prosecutor available to oversee the handling of election crime matters within the district and to coordinate district responses with Headquarters regarding these matters. The DEO Program involves the appointment of an Assistant United States Attorney in each federal district to serve a two-year term as a District Election Officer; the training of these prosecutors in the investigation and prosecution of election crimes; and the coordination of election-related initiatives and other law enforcement activities between Headquarters and the field. In addition, the DEO Program is a crucial feature of the Department's nationwide Election Day Program, which occurs in connection with the federal general elections held in November of even-numbered years. The Election Day Program ensures that federal prosecutors and investigators are available both at the Department's Headquarters in Washington and in each district to receive and handle complaints of election irregularities from the public while the polls are open and that the public is aware of how these individuals can be contacted on election day. In 2002 the Department enhanced the DEO Program by establishing a Ballot Integrity Initiative.

Ballot Integrity Initiative:
Beginning in September of 2002, the Public Integrity Section, acting at the request of the Attorney General, assisted in the implementation of a Ballot Integrity Initiative for the 2002 general election and subsequent elections. This initiative included increasing the law enforcement priority the Department gives to election crimes; holding a special day-long training event in Washington, DC for representatives of the 93 United States Attorneys' Offices; publicizing the identities and telephone numbers of the DEOs through press releases issued shortly before the November elections; and requiring the 93 U.S. Attorneys to communicate the enhanced federal prioritization of election crime matters to state and local election and law enforcement authorities. As part of Ballot Integrity Initiative, on October 8, 2002, the Public Integrity Section and the Voting Rights Section of the Department's Civil Rights Division co-sponsored a Voting Integrity Symposium for District Election Officers representing each of the 93 federal judicial districts. Topics discussed included the types of conduct that are prosecutable as federal election crimes and the federal statutes used to prosecute such cases. Attorney General John Ashcroft delivered the keynote address on the importance of election crime and ballot integrity enforcement. Assistant Attorney General of the Civil Rights Division Ralph Boyd and Assistant Attorney General of the Criminal Division Michael Chertoff also spoke to attendees on the protection of voting rights and the prosecution of election cases. As part of Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative, on September 23 and 24, 2003, the Public Integrity Section and the Voting Rights Section of the Department's Civil Rights Division co-sponsored a two-day Symposium for DEOs representing each of the 93 federal judicial districts. Topics discussed included the types of conduct that are prosecutable as federal election crimes and the federal statutes used to prosecute such cases. Assistant Attorney General of the Civil Rights Division Alexander Acosta and Assistant Attorney General of the Criminal Division Christopher A. Wray delivered the keynote addresses on the importance of protecting voting rights and the prosecution of election cases. On July 20 and 21, 2004, the Public Integrity Section and the Voting Section of the Department's Civil Rights Division co-sponsored a two-day Symposium for DEOs representing each of the 93 federal judicial districts. Topics discussed included the types of conduct that are prosecutable as federal election crimes and the federal statutes available to prosecute such cases, and the handling of civil rights matters involving voting. Attorney General John Ashcroft delivered the keynote address on the importance of protecting voting rights and the prosecution of election fraud. In addition, Assistant Attorney General Christopher A. Wray of the Criminal Division and Assistant Attorney General R. Alexander Acosta of the Civil Rights Division addressed conference attendees on voting rights and election fraud enforcement issues respectively.

As a result of the Initiative, during 2002 the number of election crime matters opened by federal prosecutors throughout the country increased significantly, as did the Section's active involvement in election crime matters stemming from the Initiative. At the end of 2002, the Section was supervising and providing advice on approximately 43 election crime matters nationwide. In addition, as of December 31, 2002, 11 matters involving possible election crimes were pending in the Section. During 2002 the Section closed two election crime matters and continued its operational supervision of 8 voting fraud cases (conspiracy to illegally obtain criminal history records to use to challenge voters (AL) and 7 cases of vote buying involving 10 defendants (KY).

Addresses the role of the United States Department of Justice in matters of election fraud, specifically: what sort of election-related conduct is potentially actionable as a federal crime; what specific statutory theories apply to frauds occurring in elections lacking federal candidates on the ballot, what federalism; procedural, and policy considerations impact on the federalization of this type of case; and how Assistant United States Attorneys should respond to this type of complaint. As a general rule, the federal crime of voter fraud embraces only organized efforts to corrupt the election process itself: i.e., the registration of voters, the casting of ballots, and the tabulation and certification of election results. Moreover, this definition excludes all activities that occur in connection with the political campaigning process, unless those activities are themselves illegal under some other specific law or prosecutorial theory. This definition also excludes isolated acts of individual wrongdoing that are not part of an organized effort to corrupt the voting process. Mistakes and other gaffs that inevitably occur are not included as voter fraud. Prosecuting election fraud offenses in federal court is further complicated by the constitutional limits that are placed on federal power over the election process. The conduct of elections is primarily a state rather than a federal activity.

**Four situations where federal prosecution is appropriate:**
1. Where the objective of the conduct is to corrupt the outcome of a federal elective contest, or where the consequential effect of the corrupt conduct impacts upon the vote count for federal office;
2. Where the object of the scheme is to discriminate against racial, ethnic or language minority groups, the voting rights of which have been specifically protected by federal statutes such as the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. section 1973 et seq.;
3. Where federalization is required in order to redress longstanding patterns of electoral fraud, either at the request of state or local authorities, or in the face of longstanding inaction by state authorities who appear to be unwilling or unable to respond under local law; and,
4. Where there is a factual basis to believe that fraudulent registration or voting activity is sufficiently connected to other from of criminal activity that pursuing the voter fraud angle will yield evidence useful in the prosecution of other categories of federal offense.

**Four advantages to federal prosecution:**
1. Voter fraud investigations are labor intensive - local law enforcement agencies often lack the manpower and the financial resources to take these cases on;
2. Voter fraud matters are always politically sensitive and very high profile endeavors at the local level – local prosecutors (who are usually themselves elected) often shy away from prosecuting them for that reason; the successful prosecution of voter fraud cases demands that critical witnesses be examined under oath before criminal charges based on their testimony are filed.
3. Many states lack the broad grand jury process that exists in the federal system; and
4. The defendants in voter fraud cases are apt to be politicians - or agents of politicians - and it is often impossible for either the government or the defendant to obtain a fair trial in a case that is about politics and is tried to a locally-drawn jury. The federal court system provides for juries to be drawn from broader geographic base, thus often avoiding this problem.

Several prosecutorial theories used by United States Attorneys to federalize election frauds are discussed.

**Four questions used by prosecutors in evaluating the credibility of election complaints:**
1. does the substance of the complaint assuming it can be proven through investigation - suggest a potential crime;
2. is the complaint sufficiently fact-specific that it provides leads for investigators to pursue;
3. is there a federal statute that can be used to federalize the criminal activity at issue; and,
4. is there a special federal interest in the matter that warrants federalization rather than deferral to state law enforcement.

All federal election investigations must avoid the following: non-interference in elections unless absolutely necessary to preserve evidence; interviewing voters during active voting periods; seizing official election documentation; investigative activity inside open polls; and prosecutors must adhere to 18 U.S.C. section 592, prohibiting the stationing of armed men at places where voting activity is taking place.
Election crimes based on race or language minority status are treated as civil rights matters under the Voting Rights Act.


Election Protection 2004 was the nation's most far-reaching effort to protect voter rights before and on Election Day. The historic nonpartisan program included: (1) a toll-free number, 1-866-OUR-VOTE, with free, immediate and multi-lingual assistance to help voters with questions about registration and voting, and assist voters who encounter barriers to the ballot box; (2) distribution of more than five million "Voters' Bills of Rights" with state-specific information; (3) 25,000 volunteers, including 6,000 lawyers and law students, who watched for problems and assisted voters on the spot at more than 3,500 predominantly African-American and Latino precincts with a history of disenfranchisement in at least 17 states; and (4) civil rights lawyers and advocates represented voters in lawsuits, preserved access to the polls, exposed and prevented voter intimidation, worked with election officials to identify and solve problems with new voting machines, technology and ballot forms, and protected voter rights in advance and on Election Day.

**Voter Intimidation and Suppression Stories (Abridged):**

- An Associated Press story noted Election Protection's exposure of reported voter suppression tactics in Colorado: Officials with the Election Protection Coalition, a voter-rights group, also said some voters in a predominantly black neighborhood north of Denver found papers on their doorsteps giving them the wrong address for their precinct.
- Election Protection received a report from Boulder County, Colorado that a poll worker made racist comments to Asian American voter and then told her she was not on the list and turned her away. The voter saw others filling out provisional ballots and asked for one but was denied. Another Asian American woman behind her in line was also given trouble by the same poll worker (he questioned her nationality and also turned her away).
- Election Protection received a report from Florissant County, Missouri from a voter who lives in predominantly white neighborhood. While waiting in line to vote, a Republican challenger challenged the black voters by requesting more proof of identification, residence, and signature match, while asking nothing from white voters. Also, the same voter reportedly asked a few questions about voting but an election officials refused to provide any meaningful answer, insisting that "it's very simple", but provided white voters with information when requested. There was one other black voter in line who was also singled out for same treatment while white voters were not.
- The Election Protection hotline received reports from Pinellas County, Florida that individuals purporting to be from the Kerry campaign are going door-to-door handing out absentee ballots, and asking voters to fill them out, and then taking the ballots from them, saying "Vote here for Kerry. Don't bother going to the polls."
- The Election Protection Coalition received a report from a woman whose sister lives in Milwaukee and is on government assistance. Her sister was reportedly told by her "case manager" that if she voted for Kerry, she would stop receiving her checks.
- An illiterate, older and disabled voter in Miami-Dade asked for assistance reading the ballot and reported that a poll worker yelled at him and refused to allow him to bring a friend into the booth in order to read the ballot to him.
- The Election Protection Coalition have gathered reports that flyers are circulating in a black community in Lexington, South Carolina claiming they those who are behind on child support payments will be arrested as the polls.
- Minority voters from Palm Beach County, Florida reported to the hotline that they received middle-of-the-night, live harassing phone calls warning them away from the polls.
- A volunteer for Rock the Vote reported that two illiterate voters in Michigan requested assistance with their ballots but were refused and reportedly mocked by poll workers.
- The hotline received a call from a radio DJ in Hillsborough County, Florida, who stated that he has received many calls (most of which were from African-Americans) claiming that poll workers were turning voters away and not "letting" them vote.
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• The hotline received a call from Pima County, Arizona, indicating that Democratic voters received calls throughout Monday evening, providing incorrect information about the precinct location. Voters have had to be transported en masse in order to correct the problem.
• A caller from Alabama claims that he was told at his polling place that he could vote there for everything but the President and that he would have to go elsewhere in order to vote for a presidential candidate.
• Poll monitors in Philadelphia report groups of lawyers, traveling in threes, who pull voters out of line and challenge them to provide ID, but when challenged themselves, they hop into waiting cars or vans and leave. Similar activity by Republican lawyers in Philadelphia was reported in the 2002 election.
• In Cuyahoga, Ohio, a caller reported that all black voters are being asked to show ID, while white voters are not. Caller report that he is black and had to show ID while his girlfriend is white and did not have to show ID.
• Two months ago, suspicious phone calls to newly registered Democrats—telling them they weren’t, in fact, registered to vote—were traced to the Republican headquarters in the Eastern Panhandle. On Monday, Democrats there said the calls have started again, even after the Berkeley County Clerk—a Republican—sent the party a cease-and-desist letter. The Berkeley prosecutor, who also is county Democratic chairman, has called on the U.S. attorney to investigate.
• In Tuscon, Arizona a misleading call informing voters that they should vote on November 3 has been traced back to the state GOP headquarters. The FBI is investigating.
• A man driving around in a big van covered in American flags and a big picture of a policeman was reportedly parked in front of a polling place; he then got out and moved within the 75 ft limit, until he was asked to leave; he then was found inside the polling place and was again asked to leave. Election Protection volunteers contacted officials and the man was eventually removed.
• The Election Protection hotline has received a report from individuals who claim to have received recorded telephone messages coming from Bill Clinton and ACT and reminding them to vote on Nov. 3rd.
• In Massachusetts, the EP Hotline has received a report that a radio station (WILD) is broadcasting that voters will be arrested on the spot if they have outstanding parking tickets.
• In Richland, South Carolina Election Protection has received a report of a poll manager turning away individuals who do not have photo ID issued to the county or a driver’s license; an EP lawyer spoke with the Poll Manager at 8:20 am and told her that people with other forms of ID should be allowed to vote by provisional ballot.
• In Greenville, a caller reported that a white poll worker was asking Blacks for multiple forms of I.D. Fortunately, the voter who reported the problem did have a second I.D. but reported that some others were turned away. Election Protection attorneys have alerted election officials.
• In Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, an official looking flyer advises Democratic voters to "create a peaceful voting environment" by voting on Wednesday, November 3.
• The week before the election, flyers were circulated in Milwaukee under the heading "Milwaukee Black Voters League" with some "warnings for election time." The flyer listed false reasons for which you would be barred from voting (such as a traffic ticket) and then warned that "if you violate any of these laws you can get ten years in prison and your children will get taken away from you."
• There is a Jefferson County flyer which tells voters "See you at the Polls[sic]... on November 4.


[NO SUMMARY FOUND] This is summary of federal role in prosecuting election crimes.

General Accounting Office, "Elections: Views of Selected Local Election Officials on Managing Voter Registration and Ensuring Eligible Citizens Can Vote,"
EAC SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW FOR VOTING FRAUD-VOTER INTIMIDATION RESEARCH


[SUMMARY FAILS TO NOTE ELECTION OFFICIALS’ RESPONSES THAT LITTLE VOTING FRAUD OR VOTER INTIMIDATION WAS DETECTED. DETECTED VOTING FRAUD WAS RELATED TO SUBMISSION OF FALSE/MATERIALLY INCORRECT VOTER REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS AND TO ABSENTEE BALLOT FRAUD. VOTER SUPPRESSION EFFORTS OCCUR.] This Report focuses on the efforts of local election officials in 14 jurisdictions within 7 states to manage the registration process, maintain accurate voter registration lists, and ensure that eligible citizens in those jurisdictions had the opportunity to cast ballots during the 2004 election. The Report concentrates on election officials’ characterization of their experiences with regard to (1) managing the voter registration process and any challenges related to receiving voter registration applications; checking them for completeness, accuracy, and duplication; and entering information into voter registration lists; (2) removing voters’ names from voter registration lists and ensuring that the names of eligible voters were not inadvertently removed; and (3) implementing HAVA provisional voting and identification requirements and addressing any challenges encountered related to these requirements. The Report also provides information on motor vehicle agency (MVA) officials’ characterization of their experiences assisting citizens who apply to register to vote at MVA offices and forwarding voter registration applications to election offices. The Report analyzed information collected from elections and motor vehicle agency offices in seven states—Arizona, California, Michigan, New York, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin. The 14 jurisdictions we selected were Gila and Maricopa Counties, Arizona; Los Angeles and Yolo Counties, California; City of Detroit and Delta Township, Michigan; New York City and Rensselaer County, New York; Bexar and Webb Counties, Texas; Albemarle and Arlington Counties, Virginia; and the cities of Franklin and Madison, Wisconsin.

Election officials representing all but one of the jurisdictions surveyed following the November 2004 election said they faced some challenges managing the voter registration process, including (1) receiving voter registration applications; (2) checking them for completeness, accuracy, and duplication; and (3) entering information into voter registration lists; when challenges occurred, election officials reported they took various steps to address them. All but 1 of the jurisdictions reported removing names from registration lists during 2004 for various reasons, including that voters requested that their names be removed from the voter registration list; information from the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) showing that voters had moved outside the jurisdiction; felony records received from federal, state, or local governments identifying voters as ineligible due to felony convictions; and death records received from state or local vital statistics offices. All of the jurisdictions reported that they permitted citizens to cast provisional ballots during the November 2004 election. In addition, 12 of the 14 jurisdictions to which this was applicable reported that they offered certain first-time voters who registered by mail the opportunity to cast provisional ballots. Local election officials in 12 of the 13 jurisdictions we surveyed reported that they set up mechanisms to inform voters—without cost—about the outcome of their provisional votes during the November 2004 election. These mechanisms included toll-free telephone numbers, Web sites, and letters sent to the voters who cast provisional ballots. Election officials representing 8 of the 14 jurisdictions reported facing challenges implementing provisional voting for various reasons, including some poll workers not being familiar with provisional voting or, in one jurisdiction representing a large number of precincts, staff not having sufficient time to process provisional ballots.


A comprehensive survey and analysis of vote fraud in the United States. The methodology included doing nexis searches for all 50 states and surveying existing research and reports. In addition, Minnite did a more in-depth study of 12 diverse states by doing nexis searches, studying statutory and case law, and conducting interviews with election officials and attorneys general. Finally, the study includes an analysis of a few of the most high profile cases of alleged fraud in the last 10 years, including the Miami mayoral election (1997), Orange County congressional race (1996), and the general election in Missouri (2000). In these cases, Minnite shows that many allegations of fraud do not end up being meritorious. Minnite finds that available evidence suggests that the incidence of election fraud is minimal and rarely affects election outcomes. Election officials generally do a very good job of protecting against fraud. Conditions that give rise to election fraud have steadily declined over the last century as a result of weakened political parties, strengthened election administration, and improved voting technology. There is little available evidence that election reforms such as the National Voter Registration Act, election day registration, and mail-in voting have resulted in increases in election fraud. Election
fraud appears also to be very rare in the 12 states examined more in-depth. Legal and news records turned up little evidence of significant fraud in these states or any indication that fraud is more than a minor problem. Interviews with state officials further confirmed this impression. Minniti found that, overall, the absentee mail-in ballot process is the feature most vulnerable to voter fraud. There is not a lot of evidence of absentee ballot fraud but the potential for fraud is greatest in this area because of a lack of uniformly strong security measures in place in all states to prevent fraud.

Suggested reforms to prevent what voter fraud does take place:
1. effective use of new statewide voter registration databases;
2. identification requirements for first time voters who register by mail should be modified to expand the list of acceptable identifying documents;
3. fill important election administration positions with nonpartisan professionals;
4. strengthen enforcement through adequate funding and authority for offices responsible for detecting and prosecuting fraud; and
5. establish Election Day Registration because it usually requires voter identification and authorization in person before a trained election worker, which reduces the opportunity for registration error or fraud.


A description and analysis of the complaints and allegations of voting irregularities gathered by the Election Protection program during the 2004 presidential election. Election Protection received more than a thousand complaints of voter suppression or intimidation. Complaints ranged from intimidating experiences at polling places to coordinated suppression tactics. For example:

- Police stationed outside a Cook County, Illinois, polling place were requesting photo ID and telling voters if they had been convicted of a felony that they could not vote.
- In Pima, Arizona, voters at multiple polls were confronted by an individual, wearing a black tee shirt with "US Constitution Enforcer" and a military-style belt that gave the appearance he was armed. He asked voters if they were citizens, accompanied by a cameraman who filmed the encounters.
- There were numerous incidents of intimidation by partisan challengers at predominately low income and minority precincts.
- Voters repeatedly complained about misinformation campaigns via flyers or phone calls encouraging them to vote on a day other than November 2, 2004 or of false information regarding their right to vote. In Polk County, Florida, for example, a voter received a call telling her to vote on November 3. Similar complaints were also reported in other counties throughout Florida. In Wisconsin and elsewhere voters received flyers that said:
  - "If you already voted in any election this year, you can't vote in the Presidential Election."
  - "If anybody in your family has ever been found guilty of anything you can't vote in the Presidential Election."
  - "If you violate any of these laws, you can get 10 years in prison and your children will be taken away from you."

There were also numerous reports of poll workers refusing to give voters provisional ballots.

The following is a summary of the types of acts of suppression and intimidation included in the report and a list of the states in which they took place. All instances of irregularities that were more administrative in nature have been omitted:

1. Improper implementation of voter identification rules, especially asking only African Americans for proof of identity: Florida, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana
2. Individuals at the polls posing as some sort of law enforcement authority and intimidating and harassing voters: Arizona, Missouri
3. Intimidating and harassing challengers at the polls: Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Missouri, Minnesota
4. Deceptive practices and disinformation campaigns, such as the use of flyers with intentional misinformation about voting rights or voting procedures, often directed at minority communities; the use of phone calls giving people misinformation about polling sites and
other procedures; and providing verbal misinformation at the polls in a way that appears to have been intentionally misleading: Florida, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Wisconsin, Missouri, North Carolina, Arkansas, Texas

5. Refusal to provide provisional ballots to certain voters: Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, Colorado, Missouri, Texas, Georgia, Louisiana

6. Registration applications submitted through third parties that were not processed: Arizona, Michigan, Nevada (registration forms destroyed by Sproul Associates)

7. Improper removal from the voter registration list: Arizona

8. Individuals questioning voters’ citizenship: Arizona


The report does not provide corroborating evidence for the allegations it describes. However, especially in the absence of a log of complaints received by the Department of Justice, this report provides a very useful overview of the types of experiences some voters more than likely endured on Election Day in 2004.

Books


Focuses almost entirely on alleged transgressions by Democrats. Fund's accusations, if credible, would indicate that fraud such as voter registration fraud, absentee ballot fraud, dead people voting, and felon voting is prevalent throughout the country. However, due to its possible biases, lack of specific footnoting, and insufficient identification of primary source material, caution is strongly urged with respect to utilizing this book for assessing the amount and types of voter fraud and voter intimidation occurring.

Fund says that "Election fraud, whether its phony voter registrations, illegal absentee ballots, shady recounts or old-fashioned ballot-box stuffing, can be found in every part of the United States, although it is probably spreading because of the ever-so-tight divisions that have polarized the country and created so many close elections lately. Fund argues that fraud has been made easier by the passage of the National Voting Rights Act because it allows ineligible voters to remain on the voter rolls, allowing a voter to vote in the name of someone else. He claims dead people, people who have moved, and people in jail remain on the voting list. He believes because of NVRA illegal aliens have been allowed to vote.

Absentee balloting makes it even worse: someone can register under false names and then use absentee ballots to cast multiple votes. Groups can get absentee ballots for the poor and elderly and then manipulate their choices. Provides a number of examples of alleged voter fraud, mostly perpetrated by Democrats. For example, he claims much fraud in St. Louis in 2000, including illegal court orders allowing people to vote, felons voting, people voting twice, dead people voting, voters were registered to vacant lots, election judges were not registered and evidence of false registrations. Another case he pays a great deal of attention to are the alleged transgressions by Democrats in Indian Country in South Dakota 2002, including voter registration fraud, suspicious absentee ballot requests, vote hauling, possible polling place fraud, abusive lawyers at polling sites, and possible vote buying.


Bulk of the book comprises stories from United States electoral history outside the scope of this project; however, tales are instructive in showing how far back irregular and illegal voting practices go. Focuses almost entirely on alleged transgressions by Republican, although at times it does include complaints about Democratic tactics. Gumbel's accusations, if credible, especially in the Bush-Gore election, would indicate there were a number of problems in key states in such areas as intimidation, vote counting, and absentee ballots. However, due to its possible biases, lack of specific footnoting, and insufficient identification of primary source material, caution is strongly urged with respect to utilizing this book for assessing the amount
and types of voter fraud and voter intimidation occurring:


Traces the historical persistence of voter fraud from colonial times through the 2004 Bush-Kerry election. From the textual information, it quickly becomes obvious that voter fraud was not limited to certain types of people or to certain political parties. [SKIMPy SUMMARY-DOES NOT SAY MUCH.]


Adds almost nothing to the present study. It contains no footnotes and no references to primary source material, save what may be able to be gleaned from the bibliography. Takes a historical look at United States Presidential elections from Andrew Jackson to George Bush by providing interesting stories and other historical information. There are only three pages out of the entire book that touches on vote fraud in the first Bush election. The authors assert that the exit polls in Florida were probably correct. The problem was the pollsters had no way of knowing that thousands of votes would be invalidated. But the authors do not believe that fraud was the cause of the tabulation inaccuracy.

**Mark Crispin Miller, Fooled Again, Basic Books, 2005.**

Sets out to show that the 2004 election was won by Bush through nefarious means, and indicts the news media for not taking anomalies, irregularities, and alleged malfeasance in the process seriously enough. However, book is well sourced, and individual instances of alleged malfeasance discussed may be worth looking at. He accuses Republicans of committing crimes and improprieties throughout the country, including:

1. deliberate disparities in voting machine distribution and long lines in Democratic jurisdictions;
2. misinterpretation of voting laws by elections officials to the detriment of Democratic voters;
3. dirty tricks and deceptive practices to mislead Democratic and minority voters about voting times, places and conditions;
4. machine irregularities in Democratic jurisdictions;
5. relocating polling sites in Democratic and minority areas;
6. suspicious mishandling of absentee ballots;
7. refusing to dispense voter registration forms to certain voter registration groups;
8. intimidation of students;
9. suspicious ballot spoilage rates in certain jurisdictions;
11. harassment of Native American voters;
12. a Republican backed organization engaging in voter registration efforts throughout the country that allegedly destroyed the voter registration forms of Democrats;
13. illegitimate challenges at the polls by Republican poll watchers;
14. improper demands for identification in certain areas;
15. Republican challenges to the voter registration status of thousands of voters before the election, and the creation of lists of voters to challenge at the polls;
16. wrongful purging of eligible voters from voting rolls;
17. partisan harassment;
18. the selective placement of early voting sites; and
19. failure to send out absentee ballots in time for people to vote.

Details what he says was the inappropriate use of the Federal Voter Assistance Program that made voting for the military easy while throwing up obstacles
for civilians overseas in their efforts to vote by absentee ballot, leading many of them to be disenfranchised.

Legal

Indiana Democratic Party vs. Rokita, U.S. District Court Southern District of Indiana (Indianapolis) 1:05-cv-00634, U.S. Court of Appeals, 7th Circuit 06-2218

Although the proponents of SEA 483 asserted that the law was intended to combat voter fraud, no evidence of the existence of such fraud has ever been provided. No voter has been convicted of or even charged with the offense of misrepresenting his identity for purposes of casting a fraudulent ballot in person, King Dep. 95-96; Mahern Aff. ¶ 2-3, though there have been documented instances of absentee ballot fraud. King Dep. 120. Indeed, no evidence of in person, on-site voting fraud was presented to the General Assembly during the legislative process leading up to the enactment of the Photo ID Law. Mahern Aff. ¶ 2.

The State cannot show any compelling justification for subjecting only voters who vote in person to the new requirements of the Photo ID Law, while exempting absentee voters who vote by mail or persons who live in state-certified residential facilities.

On the other hand, absentee ballots are peculiarly vulnerable to coercion and vote tampering since there is no election official or independent election observer available to ensure that there is no illegal coercion by family members, employers, churches, union officials, nursing home administrators, and others.

Law gives virtually unbridled discretion to partisan precinct workers and challengers to make subjective determinations such as (a) whether a form of photo identification produced by a voter conforms to what is required by the Law, and (b) whether the voter presenting himself or herself at the polls is in fact the voter depicted in the photo. Robertson Dep. 29-34, 45; King Dep. 86, 89. This is significant because any voter who is challenged under this Law will be required to vote by provisional ballot and to make a special trip to the election board's office in order to have his vote counted. Robertson Dep. 37; King Dep. 58.

The Photo ID Law confers substantial discretion, not on law enforcement officials, but on partisan precinct poll workers and challengers appointed by partisan political officials, to determine both whether a voter has presented a form of identification which conforms to that required by the Law and whether the person presenting the identification is the person depicted on it. Conferring this degree of discretion upon partisan precinct officials and members of election boards to enforce the facially neutral requirements of the Law has the potential for becoming a means of suppressing a particular point of view.

The State arguably might be justified in imposing uniform, narrowly-tailored and not overly-burdensome voter identification requirements if the State were able to show that there is an intolerably high incidence of fraud among voters misidentifying themselves at the polls for the purpose of casting a fraudulent ballot. But here, the State has utterly failed to show that this genre of fraud is rampant or even that it has ever occurred in the context of on-site, in-person voting (as opposed to absentee voting by mail) so as to justify these extra burdens, which will fall disproportionately on the poor and elderly.

And where the State has already provided a mechanism for matching signatures, has made it a crime to misrepresent one's identity for purposes of voting, and requires the swearing out of an affidavit if the voter's identity is challenged, it already has provisions more than adequate to prevent or minimize fraud in the context of in-person voting, particularly in the absence of any evidence that the problem the Law seeks to address is anything more than the product of hypothesis, speculation and fantasy.

In-person voter-identity fraud is notoriously difficult to detect and investigate. In his book Stealing Elections, John Fund observes that actual in-person voter fraud is nearly undetectable without a voter photo-identification requirement because anybody who provides a name that is on the rolls may vote and then walk away with no record of the person's actual identity. The problem is only exacerbated by the increasingly transient nature of society. Documentation of in-person voter fraud often occurs only when a legitimate voter at the polls hears a fraudulent voter trying to use her name, as happened to a woman in California in 1994. See Larry J. Sabato & Glenn R. Simpson, Dirty Little Secrets 292 (1996).

Regardless of the lack of extensive evidence of in-person voter fraud, the Commission on
Federal Election Reform (known as the Baker-Carter Commission) recently concluded that "there is no doubt that it occurs." State Ex. 1, p. 18.1 Legal cases as well as newspaper and other reports confirm that in-person voter-identity fraud, including voter impersonation, double votes, dead votes, and fake addresses, plague federal and state elections. [The memorandum details several specific cases of various types of alleged voting fraud from the past several years]

Though they are largely unable to study verifiable data concerning in-person voter fraud, scholars are well aware of the conditions that foster fraudulent voting. See Fund, supra; Sabato & Simpson, supra, 321. In particular, fraud has become ever more likely as "it has become more difficult to keep the voting rolls clean of 'deadwood' voters who have moved or died" because such an environment makes "fraudulent voting easier and therefore more tempting for those so inclined." Sabato & Simpson, supra, 321. "In general, experts believe that one in five names on the rolls in Indiana do not belong there." State Ex. 25.

For this case, Clark Benson, a nationally recognized expert in the collection and analysis of voter-registration and population data, conducted his own examination of Indiana's voter registration lists and concluded that they are among the most highly inflated in the nation.

The Crawford Plaintiffs cite the concessions by Indiana Election Division Co-Director King and the Intervenor-State that they are unaware of any historical in-person incidence of voter fraud occurring at the polling place (Crawford Brief, p. 23) as conclusive evidence that in-person voter fraud does not exist in Indiana. They also seek to support this conclusion with the testimony of two "veteran poll watchers," Plaintiff Crawford and former president of the Plaintiff NAACP, Indianapolis Chapter, Roderick E. Bohannon, who testified that they had never seen any instances of in-person voter fraud.

While common sense, the experiences of many other states, and the findings of the Baker-Carter Commission all lead to the reasonable inferences that (a) in-person polling place fraud likely exists, but (b) is nearly impossible to detect without requiring photo identification, the State can cite to no confirmed instances of such fraud. On the other hand, the Plaintiffs have no proof that it does not occur.

At the level of logic, moreover, it is just reasonable to conclude that the lack of confirmed incidents of in-person voting fraud in Indiana is the result of an ineffective identification security system as it is to conclude there is no in-person voting fraud in Indiana. So while it is undisputed that the state has no proof that in-person polling place fraud has occurred in Indiana, there does in fact remain a dispute over the existence vel non of in-person polling place fraud.

It is also important to understand that the nature of in-person election fraud is such that it is nearly impossible to detect or investigate. Unless a voter stumbles across someone else trying to use her identity, see Sabato & Simpson, supra, 292, or unless the over-taxed poll worker happens to notice that the voter's signature is different from her registration signature State Ext. 37, ¶ 9, the chances of detecting such in-person voter fraud are extremely small. Yet, inflated voter-registration rolls provide ample opportunity for those who wish to commit in-person voter fraud. See Fund, supra, 24, 65, 69, 138; Sabato & Simpson, supra, 321. And there is concrete evidence that the names of dead people have been used to cast fraudulent ballots. See Fund, supra, 64. Particularly in light of Indiana's highly inflated voter rolls State Ex. 27, p. 9, Plaintiffs' repeated claims that there has never been any in-person voter fraud in Indiana can hardly be plausible, even if the state is unable to prove that such fraud has in fact occurred.

Common Cause of Georgia vs. Billups, U.S. District Court, Northern District of Georgia (Rome) 4:05-cv-00201-HLM U.S. Court of Appeals, 11th Circuit 05-15784

The Secretary of State, as the Chief Election Officer in Georgia, informed the General Assembly before the passage of Act 53 in a letter (attached hereto as Exhibit A), and also informed the Governor in a letter (attached hereto as Exhibit B) before he signed the bill into law, that there had been no documented cases of fraudulent voting by persons who obtained ballots unlawfully by misrepresenting their Identities as registered voters to poll workers reported to her office during her nine years as Secretary of State.

Although the Secretary of State had informed the members of the General Assembly and the Governor prior to the enactment of Act 53, that her office had
received many complaints of voter fraud involving absentee ballots and no documented complaints of fraud that involve ballots that were cast in person at the polls, the General Assembly ignored this information and arbitrarily chose instead to require only those registered voters who vote in person to present a Photo ID as a condition of voting, but deliberately refused to impose the same requirement on absentee voters. The Stated Purpose Of The Photo ID Requirement Fraud Is A Pretext. According to a press release prepared by the Communications Office of the Georgia House of Representatives, the purpose of Act 53 is: to address the issue of voter fraud by placing tighter restrictions on voter identification procedures. Those casting ballots will now be required to bring a photo ID with them before they will be allowed to vote. Al Marks, Vice Chairman for Public Affairs and Communication of the Hall County GOP told the Gainesville Times: I don't think we need it for voting, because I don't think there's a voter fraud problem. Gainesville Times, "States Voters Must Present Picture IDs" (September 15, 2005) (www.gainesvilletimes.com). There is no evidence that the existing provisions of Georgia law have not been effective in deterring and preventing imposters from fraudulently obtaining and casting ballots at the polls by misrepresenting their true identities to election officials and passing themselves off as registered voters whose names appear on the official voter registration list. The pretextual nature of the purported justification for the burden which the Photo ID requirement imposes on the right to vote is shown by the following facts:

(a) Fraudulent voting was already prohibited by existing Georgia law without unduly burdening the right of a citizen to vote.

(i) Fraudulent voting was already prohibited as a crime under O.C.G.A. §§ 21-2-561, 21-2-562, 21-2-566, 21-2-571, 21-2-572 and 21-2-600, punishable by a fine of up to $10,000 or imprisonment for up to ten years, or both.

(ii) Voter registration records are updated periodically by the Secretary of State and local election officials to eliminate people who have died, have moved, or are no longer eligible to vote in Georgia for some other reason.

(iii) Existing Georgia law also required election officials in each precinct to maintain a list of names and addresses of registered voters residing in that precinct, and to check off the names of each person from that official list as they cast their ballots.

(iv) Registered voters were also required by existing Georgia law to present at least one of the seventeen forms of documentary identification to election officials who were required, before issuing the voter a ballot, to match the name and address shown on the document to the name and address on the official roll of registered voters residing in the particular precinct. O.C.G.A.§ 21-2-417.

(b) There is no evidence that the existing Georgia law has not been effective in deterring or preventing fraudulent in-person voting by impersonators - the only kind of fraudulent voting that might be prevented by the Photo ID requirement. To the contrary, the Secretary of State, who, as the Superintendent of Elections, is the highest election official in Georgia, informed both the General Assembly (Exhibit A) and the Governor (Exhibit B) in writing that there had been no documented cases of fraudulent in-person voting by imposters reported to her during her nine years in office.

(c) If the true intention of the General Assembly had been to prevent fraudulent voting by imposters, the General Assembly would have imposed the same restrictions on the casting of absentee ballots - particularly after the Secretary of State had called to their attention the fact that there had been many documented instances of fraudulent casting of absentee ballots reported to her office.

(d) Fraudulent in-person voting is unlikely, would be easily detected if it had occurred in significant numbers, and would not be likely to have a substantial impact on the outcome of an election:

(i) Many people vote at a local neighborhood polling place where they are likely to be known to and recognized by neighbors or poll workers.

(ii) Voters were required by existing Georgia law (O.C.G.A. § 21-2-417), to provide one of the seventeen means of identification to election officials.

(iii) Election officials are required, before issuing the ballot to the voter, to check off the name of either voter from an up-to-date list of the names and addresses of every registered voter residing in the precinct. If an imposter arrived at a poll and was successful in fraudulently obtaining a ballot before
the registered voter arrived at the poll, a registered voter, who having taken the time to go to the polls to vote, would undoubtedly complain to elections
officials if he or she were refused a ballot and not allowed to vote because his or her name had already been checked off the list of registered voters as
having voted. Likewise, if an imposter arrived at the polls after the registered voter had voted and attempted to pass himself off as someone he was not,
the election official would instantly know of the attempted fraud, would not issue the imposter a ballot or allow him to vote, and presumably would have the
imposter arrested or at least investigate the attempted fraud and report the attempt to the Secretary of State as Superintendent of Elections.

U.S. Department of Justice Section 5 Recommendation Memorandum (regarding HB 244), August 25, 2005 at

Overview: Five career attorneys with the civil rights department investigated and analyzed Georgia’s election reform law. Four of those attorneys
recommended objecting to Section 59, the voter identification requirement. The provision required all voters to present government issued photo
identification in order to vote. The objection was based on the attorneys' findings that there was little to no evidence of polling place fraud, the only kind of
fraud an ID requirement would address, and that the measure would disenfranchise many voters, predominantly minority voters, in violation of Section 5 of
the Voting Rights Act.

Factual Analysis: The sponsor of the measure in the state legislature said she was motivated by the fact that she is aware of vote buying in
certain districts; she read John Fund's book; and that "If there are fewer black voters because of this bill, it will only be because there is less
opportunity for fraud. She said that when black voters in her black precincts are not paid to vote, they do not go to the polls."
A member of the Fulton County Board of Registrations and Elections said that prior
to November 2004, Fulton County received 8,112 applications
containing “missing or irregular” information. Only 55 of those registrants responded to BCE
letters. The member concluded that the rest must
be “bogus” as a result. He also stated that 15,237 of
105,553 precinct cards came back as undeliverable, as did 3,071 cards sent to 45,907 new
voters. Of these 3,071, 921 voted.
Secretary of State Cathy Cox submitted a letter testifying to the absence of any complaints of voter fraud via impersonation during her tenure.
In the legal analysis, the attorneys state that if they determine that Georgia could have fulfilled its stated purpose of election fraud, while preventing or
ameliorating the retrogression, an objection is appropriate. They conclude that the state could have avoided retrogression by retaining various forms
of currently accepted voter ID for which no substantiated security concerns were raised. Another non-retrogressive alternative would have been to maintain
the affidavit alternative for those without ID, since “There is no evidence that penalty of law is an insufficient deterrent to falsely signing an affidavit
of identity.” The attorneys point out that the state’s recitation of a case upholding voter fraud in Dodge County does not support the purpose of
the Act because that case involved vote buying and selling, not impersonation or voting under a false identity.
1. Everyone does not define voting fraud and voter intimidation the same way.

In some cases, what may have been honest administrative mistakes or errors due to poor poll worker training are lumped together with genuine voter suppression efforts and labeled as voter intimidation or voting fraud. Examples: (1) many authors consider certain voter suppression tactics to be voter intimidation that do not rise to the definition used in criminal enforcement of election crimes; (2) some charge that a DOJ ballot integrity measure in South Dakota was voter intimidation; and (3) some mistakes made in the maintenance of voter registration lists are labeled as fraud.

2. There seems to be no systematic nationwide study that reports all (or most) verified instances of voting fraud and voter intimidation or suppression efforts in a particular election or a particular period in U.S. history.

Some sources focus on certain areas of the country, which can bias the study if these areas are more or less susceptible to fraud and suppression. Some focus on the alleged (but not necessarily verified) misdeeds of one political party or another. Still others focus on unverified allegations reported to a toll-free phone line. In some cases, it is not clear if the incidents were intentional voter suppression or genuine poll worker mistakes (e.g.; not providing provisional ballots or in appropriately asking voters for ID). Minnité’s study is as close as they get to a systematic study.

3. There are a number of obstacles to gathering compete data on voting fraud and voter intimidation/suppression nationwide in any election.

Authors often have limited resources (time and money) to collect such information. Investigation and prosecution of voting fraud and voter intimidation or suppression occurs at different levels of government (Federal, state and local). These investigations and prosecutions are not reported to and recorded by a central authority. Some voting fraud is inherently more difficult to identify and to prove than others (e.g.; impersonation of another voter at the polls is more difficult, due to the transient nature of some jurisdictions and the fact that impersonators not identified as a fraud at the polls are hard to identify later, than voter registration, vote buying, and absentee ballot fraud). At least some voting fraud and voter intimidation appears to go unreported and uninvestigated, and some prosecutions are unsuccessful due to local politics and law enforcement affiliations and the lack of sufficient resources at the Federal, state, and local levels to support the labor intensive effort.

4. Most sources seem to agree that voter registration and absentee balloting fraud are the most common forms of voting fraud. Absentee ballot fraud often is accompanied by vote buying or voter coercion. Also frequently alleged were instances of ineligible voters (usually felons, but sometime non-citizens, under aged individuals, or non-residents) that voted. But not all agree that these are the only common forms of fraud.
Some contend that voting in the name of another at the polling place is common, but that such instances are extremely hard to prove. Most instances of ineligible voters voting were linked to improper voter list maintenance or confusion on the part of local election officials as to state law on felon disenfranchisement.

5. A number of sources have identified numerous instances of attempted voter suppression, but no instances of voter intimidation that could be prosecuted under Federal criminal laws is alleged.

Examples of voter suppression efforts include: (1) phone calls and mailings deliberately directing targeted voters to vote on the wrong day or to go to the wrong polling place, or that provide incorrect and threatening information about the voter qualifications and legal consequences of voting; (2) targeted, inappropriate challenges to voters at the polls or shortly before election day; (3) people posing as law enforcement agents at targeted polling places. When such tactics target minority communities, they may be attacked through civil action by DOJ under Voting Rights Act provisions, but they do not qualify for criminal penalties under Federal voter intimidation law. Currently, there is no Federal election law providing criminal penalties for voter suppression efforts. When the suppression adversely affects a political party, but does not have a racial component, DOJ may be hard pressed to pursue the matter unless other Federal criminal law has been violated (e.g.; suppression of phone banks in New Hampshire).

6. Unsupervised voter registration drives by political parties and advocacy groups are a primary source of fraudulent voter registration applications and missing (perhaps deliberately) voter registration applications.

The practice of paying persons to man voter registration drives (particularly, but not only, when the person is paid by the head) is a frequent source of fraudulent voter registration applications. Partisan drives have resulted in applications from persons of “the wrong party” being held back or destroyed. Therefore, while the applicant believes they have registered, the election official has no record of that registration.

7. Many authors contend that proper implementation of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (NVRA) and the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) will reduce or at least not increase the potential for fraud and voter suppression, but some argue that provisions in these laws increase the likelihood of fraud or voter suppression.

Many argue that proper implementation of the list maintenance and fail-safe voting provisions of the NVRA and HAVA’s requirements for the statewide voter registration list, voter ID for certain first-time voters, and provisional voting will reduce the potential for voting fraud and voter intimidation. Others argue that the list maintenance provisions of NVRA cause “dead wood” to be left on the voter rolls, providing opportunity for fraud, or that HAVA’s voter ID and list matching requirements can be used as voter suppression tactics.
8. Proper recordkeeping and post-election auditing is an important key to identifying and preventing voting fraud, and for subsequent prosecution of such activities; but is not being done consistently.

9. Poll worker recruitment and training is a key component to combating actions that are perceived as suppressing or intimidating voters.

10. Both sides on election reform debates are using incomplete data to bolster their arguments.
The Federal Crime of Election Fraud
By Craig Donsanto

In The Federal Crime of Election Fraud, Donsanto addresses the role of the United States Department of Justice in matters of election fraud. Specifically, it answers the most frequently asked questions concerning the federal law enforcement role in election matters. Particularly, what sort of election-related conduct is potentially actionable as a federal crime, what specific statutory theories apply to frauds occurring in elections lacking federal candidates on the ballot, what federalism, procedural, and policy considerations impact on the federalization of this type of case, and how Assistant United States Attorneys should respond to this type of complaint.

Donsanto indicates that as a general rule, the federal crime of voter fraud embraces only organized efforts to corrupt the election process itself: i.e., the registration of voters, the casting of ballots, and the tabulation and certification of election results. Moreover, this definition excludes all activities that occur in connection with the political campaigning process, unless those activities are themselves illegal under some other specific law or prosecutorial theory. This definition also excludes isolated acts of individual wrongdoing that are not part of an organized effort to corrupt the voting process. Finally, Donsanto points out that mistakes and other gaffs that inevitably occur are not included as voter fraud. Where mistakes occur on a significant enough level to potentially affect the outcome of an election, the appropriate remedy is an election contest brought by the loser seeking civil judicial redress through the appropriate state election contest process.

Along with the limits discussed above, prosecuting election fraud offenses in federal court is further complicated by the constitutional limits that are placed on federal power over the election process. The conduct of elections is primarily a state rather than a federal activity.

Donsanto lists four types of election fraud: schemes to purposely and corruptly register voters who either do not exist, or who are known by the putative defendant to be ineligible to vote under applicable state law; schemes to cast, record or fraudulently tabulate votes for voters who do not participate in the voting act at all; schemes to corrupt the voting act of voters who do participate in the voting act to a limited extent; and, schemes to knowingly prevent voters qualified voters from voting.

Donsanto lists four situations where federal prosecution is appropriate: Where the objective of the conduct is to corrupt the outcome of a federal elective contest, or where the consequential effect of the corrupt conduct impacts upon the vote count for federal office; Where the object of the scheme is to discriminate against racial, ethnic or language minority groups, the voting rights of which have been specifically protected by federal statues such as the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. section 1973 et seq.; Where federalization is required in order to redress longstanding patters of electoral fraud, either at the request of state or local authorities, or in the face of longstanding inaction by state authorities who appear to be unwilling or unable to respond under local law; and, Where there is a factual basis to believe that fraudulent registration or voting activity is sufficiently connected to other from of criminal activity that perusing the voter fraud
angle will yield evidence useful in the prosecution of other categories of federal offense.

Donsanto lists four advantages to federal prosecution: voter fraud investigations are labor intensive. Local law enforcement agencies often lack the manpower and the financial resources to take these cases on; voter fraud matters are always politically sensitive and very high profile endeavors at the local level. Local prosecutors (who are usually themselves elected) often shy away from prosecuting them for that reason; the successful prosecution of voter fraud cases demands that critical witnesses be examined under oath before criminal charges based on their testimony are filed. Many states lack the broad grand jury process that exists in the federal system; and, the defendants in voter fraud cases are apt to be politicians - or agents of politicians - and it is often impossible for either the government or the defendant to obtain a fair trial in a case that is about politics and is tried to a locally-drawn jury. The federal court system provides for juries to be drawn from broader geographic base, thus often avoiding this problem.

Several prosecutorial theories used by United States Attorneys to federalize election frauds are discussed. These include: schemes by polling officers to violate their duty under state law to safeguard the integrity of the election process by purposefully allowing void ballots to be cast (stuffing the ballot box), or by intentionally rendering fraudulent vote tallies which can be prosecuted as civil rights violations under 18 U.S.C. sections 241 or 242; schemes to stimulate or reward voter registration by offering or giving voters things having monetary value violate the “payment for registering” clause of 42 U.S.C. section 19731(c); schemes to register voters fraudulently through providing election officials materially false information about the voter’s eligibility for the franchise; and, schemes to obtain and cast ballots that are materially defective in nonfederal elections can still be prosecuted under 18 U.S.C. section 1341. There are also some other federal statutes involved in election fraud cases such as 18 U.S.C. section 597 that prohibits making expenditures for the specific purpose of stimulating voters to cast ballots for candidates seeking the federal offices of Senator, Congressman or President and 42 U.S.C. section 1973i (e) that prohibits voting more than once in elections where federal candidates are on the ballot.

Donsanto lists four questions used by prosecutors in evaluating the credibility of election complaints: does the substance of the complaint assuming it can be proven through investigation - suggest a potential crime; is the complaint sufficiently fact-specific that it provides leads for investigators to pursue; is there a federal statute that can be used to federalize the criminal activity at issue; and, is there a special federal interest in the matter that warrants federalization rather than deferral to state law enforcement.

All federal election investigations must avoid the following: non-interference in elections unless absolutely necessary to preserve evidence; interviewing voters during active voting periods; seizing official election documentation; investigative activity inside open polls; and prosecutors must adhere to 18 U.S.C. section 592, prohibiting the stationing of armed men at places where voting activity is taking place.

Finally, Donsanto indicates that election crimes based on race or language minority status are treated as civil rights matters under the Voting Rights Act.
Fooled Again, Mark Crispin Miller

Fooled Again sets out to show that the 2004 election was won by Bush through nefarious means, and indicts the news media for not taking anomalies, irregularities, and alleged malfeasance in the process seriously enough.

Miller identifies a number of statistical anomalies based on polling and turnout results that he alleges puts the validity of the 2004 election in doubt. He accuses Republicans of committing crimes and improprieties throughout the country. These include deliberate disparities in voting machine distribution and long lines in Democratic jurisdictions; misinterpretation of voting laws by elections officials to the detriment of Democratic voters; dirty tricks and deceptive practices to mislead Democratic and minority voters about voting times, places and conditions; machine irregularities in Democratic jurisdictions; relocating polling sites in Democratic and minority areas; suspicious mishandling of absentee ballots; refusing to dispense voter registration forms to certain voter registration groups; intimidation of students; suspicious ballot spoilage rates in certain jurisdictions; “strategic distribution of provisional ballots,” and trashing of provisional ballots; harassment of Native American voters; a Republican backed organization engaging in voter registration efforts throughout the country that allegedly destroyed the voter registration forms of Democrats; illegitimate challenges at the polls by Republican poll watchers; improper demands for identification in certain areas; Republican challenges to the voter registration status of thousands of voters before the election, and the creation of lists of voters to challenge at the polls; wrongful purging of eligible voters from voting rolls; partisan harassment; the selective placement of early voting sites; and the failure to send out absentee ballots in time for people to vote.

Miller details what he says was the inappropriate use of the Federal Voter Assistance Program that made voting for the military easy while throwing up obstacles for civilians overseas in their efforts to vote by absentee ballot, leading many of them to be disenfranchised. Miller says that most of the military voters would be Republicans and most of the overseas civilians Kerry voters.

In this book, Miller clearly tries to prove the Republican Party won the 2004 through illegitimate means. This must be kept strongly in mind in making any use of this work. However, the book is well sourced, and individual instances of alleged malfeasance discussed may be worth looking at.
Election Protection 2004

By the Election Protection Coalition

Election Protection – the Program

Election Protection 2004 was the nation’s most far-reaching effort to protect voter rights before and on Election Day. The historic nonpartisan program included:

- A toll-free number, 1-866-OUR-VOTE, with free, immediate and multi-lingual assistance to help voters with questions about registration and voting, and assist voters who encounter barriers to the ballot box.
- Distribution of more than five million “Voters’ Bills of Rights” with state-specific information.
- 25,000 volunteers, including 6,000 lawyers and law students, who watched for problems and assisted voters on the spot at more than 3,500 predominantly African-American and Latino precincts with a history of disenfranchisement in at least 17 states.
- Civil rights lawyers and advocates represented voters in lawsuits, preserved access to the polls, exposed and prevented voter intimidation, worked with election officials to identify and solve problems with new voting machines, technology and ballot forms, and protected voter rights in advance and on Election Day.

Voter Intimidation and Suppression Stories (Abridged)

- An Associated Press story noted Election Protection's exposure of reported voter suppression tactics in Colorado: Officials with the Election Protection Coalition, a voter-rights group, also said some voters in a predominantly black neighborhood north of Denver found papers on their doorsteps giving them the wrong address for their precinct.

- Election Protection received a report from Florissant County, Missouri from a voter who lives in predominantly white neighborhood. While waiting in line to vote, a Republican challenger challenged the black voters by requesting more proof of identification, residence, and signature match, while asking nothing from white voters. Also, the same voter reportedly asked a few questions about voting but an election officials refused to provide any meaningful answer, insisting that "it's very simple", but provided white voters with information when requested. There was one other black voter in line who was also singled out for same treatment while white voters were not.

- Election Protection received a report from Boulder County, Colorado that a poll worker made racist comments to Asian American voter and then told her she was not on the list and turned her away. The voter saw others filling out provisional ballots and asked for one but was denied. Another Asian American woman behind
her in line was also given trouble by the same poll worker (he questioned her nationality and also turned her away).

- The Election Protection hotline received reports from Pinellas County, Florida that individuals purporting to be from the Kerry campaign are going door-to-door handing out absentee ballots, and asking voters to fill them out, and then taking the ballots from them, saying "Vote here for Kerry. Don't bother going to the polls."

- The Election Protection Coalition received a report from a woman whose sister lives in Milwaukee and is on government assistance. Her sister was reportedly told by her "case manager" that if she voted for Kerry, she would stop receiving her checks.

- An illiterate, older and disabled voter in Miami-Dade asked for assistance reading the ballot and reported that a poll worker yelled at him and refused to assist him and also refused to allow him to bring a friend into the booth in order to read the ballot to him.

- The Election Protection Coalition have gathered reports that flyers are circulating in a black community in Lexington, South Carolina claiming they those who are behind on child support payments will be arrested as the polls.

- Minority voters from Palm Beach County, Florida reported to the hotline that they received middle-of-the-night, live harassing phone calls warning them away from the polls.

- A volunteer for Rock the Vote reported that two illiterate voters in Michigan requested assistance with their ballots but were refused and reportedly mocked by poll workers.

- The hotline received a call from a radio DJ in Hillsborough County, Florida, who stated that he has received many calls (most of which were from African-Americans) claiming that poll workers were turning voters away and not "letting" them vote.

- The hotline received a call from Pima County, Arizona, indicating that Democratic voters received calls throughout Monday evening, providing incorrect information about the precinct location. Voters have had to be transported en masse in order to correct the problem.

- A caller from Alabama claims that he was told at his polling place that he could vote there for everything but the President and that he would have to go elsewhere in order to vote for a presidential candidate.
Poll monitors in Philadelphia reports groups of lawyers, traveling in threes, who pull voters out of line and challenge them to provide ID, but when challenged themselves, they hop into waiting cars or vans and leave. Similar activity by Republican lawyers in Philadelphia was reported in the 2002 election.

In Cuyahuga, Ohio, a caller reported that all black voters are being asked to show ID, while white voters are not. Caller report that he is black and had to show ID while his girlfriend is white and did not have to show ID.

Two months ago, suspicious phone calls to newly registered Democrats — telling them they weren’t, in fact, registered to vote — were traced to the Republican headquarters in the Eastern Panhandle. On Monday, Democrats there said the calls have started again, even after the Berkeley County Clerk — a Republican — sent the party a cease-and-desist letter. The Berkeley prosecutor, who also is county Democratic chairman, has called on the U.S. attorney to investigate.

In Tuscon, Arizona a misleading call informing voters that they should vote on November 3 has been traced back to the state GOP headquarters. The FBI is investigating.

A man driving around in a big van covered in American flags and a big picture of a policeman was reportedly parked in front of a polling place; he then got out and moved within the 75 ft limit, until he was asked to leave; he then was found inside the polling place and was again asked to leave. Election Protection volunteers contacted officials and the man was eventually removed.

The Election Protection hotline has received a report from individuals who claim to have received recorded telephone message coming from Bill Clinton and ACT and reminding them to vote on Nov. 3rd.

In Massachusetts, the EP Hotline has received a report that a radio station (WILD) is broadcasting that voters will be arrested on the spot if they have outstanding parking tickets.

In Richland, South Carolina Election Protection has received a report of a poll manager turning away individuals who do not have photo ID issued to the county or a driver's license; an EP lawyer spoke with the Poll Manager at 8:20 am and told her that people with other forms of ID should be allowed to vote by provisional ballot.

In Greenville, a caller reported that a white poll worker was asking Blacks for multiple form of I.D. Fortunately, the voter who reported the problem did have a second I.D. but reported that some others were turned away. Election Protection attorneys have alerted election officials.
• In Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, an official looking flyer advises Democratic voters to "create a peaceful voting environment" by voting on Wednesday, November 3.

• The week before the election, flyers were circulated in Milwaukee under the heading "Milwaukee Black Voters League" with some "warnings for election time." The flyer listed false reasons for which you would be barred from voting (such as a traffic ticket) and then warned that "If you violate any of these laws you can get ten years in prison and your children will get taken away from you."

• There is a Jefferson County flyer which tells voters "See you at the Poles![sic]... on November 4."
Summary and Relevant Excerpts From Georgia Voter ID Litigation

Complaint For Declaratory And Injunctive Relief

The Secretary of State, as the Chief Election Officer in Georgia, informed the General Assembly before the passage of Act 53 in a letter (attached hereto as Exhibit A), and also informed the Governor in a letter (attached hereto as Exhibit B) before he signed the bill into law, that there had been no documented cases of fraudulent voting by persons who obtained ballots unlawfully by misrepresenting their identities as registered voters to poll workers reported to her office during her nine years as Secretary of State.

Although the Secretary of State had informed the members of the General Assembly and the Governor prior to the enactment of Act 53, that her office had received many complaints of voter fraud involving absentee ballots and no documented complaints of fraud that involve ballots that were cast in person at the polls, the General Assembly ignored this information and arbitrarily chose instead to require only those registered voters who vote in person to present a Photo ID as a condition of voting, but deliberately refused to impose the same requirement on absentee voters.

The Stated Purpose Of The Photo ID Requirement Fraud Is A Pretext

According to a press release prepared by the Communications Office of the Georgia House of Representatives, the purpose of Act 53 is:

... to address the issue of voter fraud by placing tighter restrictions on voter identification procedures. Those casting ballots will now be required to bring a photo ID with them before they will be allowed to vote.

AI Marks, Vice Chairman for Public Affairs and Communication of the Hall County GOP told the Gainesville Times:

I don't think we need it for voting, because I don't think there's a voter fraud problem. Gainesville Times, "States Voters Must Present Picture IDs" (September 15, 2005) (www.gainesvilletimes.com).

There is no evidence that the existing provisions of Georgia law have not been effective in deterring and preventing imposters from fraudulently obtaining and casting ballots at the polls by misrepresenting their true identities to election officials and passing themselves off as registered voters whose names appear on the official voter registration list.

The pretextual nature of the purported justification for the burden which the Photo ID requirement imposes on the right to vote is shown by the following facts:

(a) Fraudulent voting was already prohibited by existing Georgia law without unduly burdening the right of a citizen to vote.
(i) Fraudulent voting was already prohibited as a crime under O.C.G.A. §§ 21-2-561, 21-2-562, 21-2-566, 21-2-571, 21-2-572 and 21-2-600, punishable by a fine of up to $10,000 or imprisonment for up to ten years, or both.

(ii) Voter registration records are updated periodically by the Secretary of State and local election officials to eliminate people who have died, have moved, or are no longer eligible to vote in Georgia for some other reason.

(iii) Existing Georgia law also required election officials in each precinct to maintain a list of names and addresses of registered voters residing in that precinct, and to check off the names of each person from that official list as they cast their ballots.

(iv) Registered voters were also required by existing Georgia law to present at least one of the seventeen forms of documentary identification to election officials who were required, before issuing the voter a ballot, to match the name and address shown on the document to the name and address on the official roll of registered voters residing in the particular precinct. O.C.G.A. § 21-2-417.

(b) There is no evidence that the existing Georgia law has not been effective in deterring or preventing fraudulent in-person voting by impersonators - the only kind of fraudulent voting that might be prevented by the Photo ID requirement. To the contrary, the Secretary of State, who, as the Superintendent of Elections, is the highest election official in Georgia, informed both the General Assembly (Exhibit A) and the Governor (Exhibit B) in writing that there had been no documented cases of fraudulent in person voting by imposters reported to her during her nine years in office.

(c) If the true intention of the General Assembly had been to prevent fraudulent voting by imposters, the General Assembly would have imposed the same restrictions on the casting of absentee ballots - particularly after the Secretary of State had called to their attention the fact that there had been many documented instances of fraudulent casting of absentee ballots reported to her office.

(d) Fraudulent in-person voting is unlikely, would be easily detected if it had occurred in significant numbers, and would not be likely to have a substantial impact on the outcome of an election:

(i) Many people vote at a local neighborhood polling place where they are likely to be known to and recognized by neighbors or poll workers.

(ii) Voters were required by existing Georgia law (O.C.G.A. § 21-2-417), to provide one of the seventeen means of identification to election officials.

(iii) Election officials are required, before issuing the ballot to the voter, to check off the name of either voter from an up-to-date list of the names and addresses of every registered voter residing in the precinct. If an imposter arrived at a poll and was successful in fraudulently obtaining a ballot before the registered voter arrived at the poll, a registered voter, who having taken the time to go to the polls to vote, would undoubtedly complain to elections officials if he or she were refused a ballot and not allowed to vote because his or her name had already been checked off the list of registered voters as having voted. Likewise, if an imposter arrived at the polls after the registered voter had voted and attempted to pass himself off as someone he was not, the election official would instantly know of the attempted fraud, would not issue the imposter a ballot or allow him to vote, and presumably would have the imposter arrested or at least investigate the attempted fraud and report the attempt to the Secretary of State as Superintendent of Elections.
EXHIBIT B

Letter from Secretary of State Cathy Cox to Governor Sonny Purdue, April 8, 2005

One of the primary justifications given by the Legislature for the passage of the photo identification provisions of House Bill 244 - the elimination of voter ID fraud at the polls is an unfounded justification I cannot recall one documented case of voter fraud during my tenure as Secretary of State or Assistant Secretary of State that specifically related to the impersonation of a registered voter at voting polls. Our state currently has several practices and procedures in existence to ensure that such cases of voter fraud would have been detected if they in fact occurred, and at the very least, we would have complaints of voters who were unable to vote because someone had previously represented himself or herself as such person on that respective Election Day. As a practical matter, there is no possibility that vote fraud of this type would have gone undetected if it had in fact occurred because there is a list of registered voters at each polling place that is checked off as each person votes. If the impersonates voted first and the legitimate voter came to the polling place later in the day and tried to vote, he or she would be told that they had already voted and would not be allowed to vote a second time in the same day. It is reasonable to suspect that a voter who cared enough to show up at the polls to cast a ballot would almost certainly have complained - but there have been no such complaints. If the opposite occurred, and the legitimate person came to the polls first and cast his ballot, the impersonator who showed up later would not be allowed to vote for the same reason and the attempted fraud would have been prevented.

In addition, this state has adopted severe criminal sanctions for the type of vote impersonation that is purportedly of concern and it is evident that such penalties have been a sufficient deterrent. In essence, there is no voter fraud problem currently in existence that House Bill 244 addresses.

In contrast to the lack of voter fraud relating to impersonation of voters at polls during my tenure the State Election Board has reviewed numerous cases of voter fraud relating to the use of absentee ballots.

State Defendants' Initial Brief In Opposition To Plaintiffs' Motion For Preliminary Injunction

There are 159 counties and an even larger number of municipalities in Georgia that conduct elections. Neither the Secretary of State nor her staff can be physically present at the polling places for those elections and therefore could not possibly be aware of all in-person voter fraud that might occur. (Cox Decl. ¶ 6.)

Under the prior law before enactment of HB 244, it is beyond argument that in person voter fraud could have taken place. (Id. ¶ 5.) The Secretary of State's view of the scenario in which voter fraud would occur is when an imposter votes at the polling place and the actual voter shows up later and is unable to cast a ballot. (Id. ¶ 5.) However, the Secretary of State agrees that the scenario she describes is only one instance of potential voter
fraud, and both her scenario and others were possible under the law as it existed prior to the enactment of HB 244. (Id.) As stated by the Director of Elections for the Forsyth County Board of Elections, the typical case of in-person voter fraud would be committed by identifying persons who do not typically vote and then having other individuals vote as those persons. (Smith Decl. ¶ 4.)

The Executive Director of the Richmond County Board of Elections has been aware of such complaints, but has been unable to gather evidence to prove the violations because the nature of the conduct makes such evidence hard to develop. (Bailey Decl. ¶ 9.) Indeed, past incidents of fraudulent registrations in Forsyth County and Fulton County were reported to the District Attorneys’ offices in those respective counties. (Smith Decl. ¶ 6; MacDougald Decl. ¶ 4.) In Fulton County, the fraudulent registrations were also reported to the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, and he has opened an investigation of the fraudulent registrations. (MacDougald Decl. ¶ 4.)

Order for a Preliminary Injunction

As part of the order, Judge Murphy describes the testimony of Harry MacDougald, a member of the Fulton County Board of Registration and Election. Mr. MacDougald had stated he had observed voter registration fraud, which he referred to the U.S. Attorney and the District Attorney. In addition, since some precinct cards the Board sent out in 2004 were returned as undeliverable, MacDougald believes they were not eligible voters, yet they were allowed to vote.

Although the Secretary of State said she knew of no incidents of impersonation at the polls, she and her staff are not physically present in every polling site. Secretary Cox stated local officials are in the best position to know of such incidents. The State Election Board has received a number of complaints of irregularities with respect to absentee ballots. Cox is also aware of a case of vote buying of absentee ballots. She is also aware of efforts to submit fraudulent registrations.

According to Secretary of State Cox, Georgia has procedures and practices in place to detect voter fraud. Those procedures include verifying the voter’s correct address, as well as the voter’s name, during the check-in process for in-person voters. Georgia also imposes criminal penalties for voter impersonation. Most violations of Georgia election laws are punishable as felonies. No evidence indicates that the criminal penalties do not sufficiently deter in-person voter fraud.

The integrity of the voter list also is extremely important in preventing voter fraud. The Atlanta Journal Constitution published an article indicating that Georgia had experienced 5,412 instances of voter fraud during a twenty-year period. Secretary of State Cox’s office undertook an investigation in response to that article. The investigation revealed that the specific instance of voter fraud outlined in the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, involving a report that Alan J. Mandel had voted after his death, actually did not occur. Instead, an individual with a similar name, Alan J. Mandle, had voted at the polls, and the poll worker had marked Alan J. Mandel’s name rather than marking Alan J. Mandle, the name of the individual who actually voted. Secretary of State Cox’s office compared the
signature on the voter certificate to the voter registration card of the living individual, and concluded that the living individual, Alan J. Mandle, rather than the deceased Alan J. Mandel, had voted.

The Secretary of State's Office subsequently attempted to ensure that voter records were maintained and up to date. The Secretary of State's Office sends information concerning dead voters to local elections officials on a monthly basis, and now has the authority to remove the names of deceased voters from the voter rolls if the local elections officials fail to do so in a timely manner. Secretary of State Cox is not aware of any reports of dead individuals voting since her office received authority to remove the names of deceased individuals from the voter rolls.

There seems to be little doubt that the Photo ID requirement fails the strict scrutiny test: accepting that preventing voter fraud is a legitimate and important State concern, the statute is not narrowly drawn to prevent voter fraud. Indeed, Secretary of State Cox pointed out that, to her knowledge, the State had not experienced one complaint of in-person fraudulent voting during her tenure. In contrast, Secretary of State Cox indicated that the State Election Board had received numerous complaints of voter fraud in the area of absentee voting. Furthermore, the Secretary of State's Office removes deceased voters from the voting rolls monthly, eliminating the potential for voter fraud noted by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution article alleging that more than 5,000 deceased people voted during a twenty—year period.

Further, although Defendants have presented evidence from elections officials of fraud in the area of voting, all of that evidence addresses fraud in the area of voter registration, rather than in-person voting. The Photo ID requirement does not apply to voter registration, and any Georgia citizen of appropriate age may register to vote without showing a Photo ID. Indeed, individuals may register to vote by producing copies of bank statements or utility bills, or without even producing identification at all. The Photo ID law thus does nothing to address the voter fraud issues that conceivably exist in Georgia.
Summary and Relevant Excerpts From Georgia Voter ID Litigation

Complaint For Declaratory And Injunctive Relief

The Secretary of State, as the Chief Election Officer in Georgia, informed the General Assembly before the passage of Act 53 in a letter (attached hereto as Exhibit A), and also informed the Governor in a letter (attached hereto as Exhibit B) before he signed the bill into law, that there had been no documented cases of fraudulent voting by persons who obtained ballots unlawfully by misrepresenting their identities as registered voters to poll workers reported to her office during her nine years as Secretary of State.

Although the Secretary of State had informed the members of the General Assembly and the Governor prior to the enactment of Act 53, that her office had received many complaints of voter fraud involving absentee ballots and no documented complaints of fraud that involve ballots that were cast in person at the polls, the General Assembly ignored this information and arbitrarily chose instead to require only those registered voters who vote in person to present a Photo ID as a condition of voting, but deliberately refused to impose the same requirement on absentee voters.

The Stated Purpose Of The Photo ID Requirement Fraud Is A Pretext

According to a press release prepared by the Communications Office of the Georgia House of Representatives, the purpose of Act 53 is:

... to address the issue of voter fraud by placing tighter restrictions on voter identification procedures. Those casting ballots will now be required to bring a photo ID with them before they will be allowed to vote.

Al Marks, Vice Chairman for Public Affairs and Communication of the Hall County GOP told the Gainesville Times:

I don't think we need it for voting, because I don't think there's a voter fraud problem. Gainesville Times, "States Voters Must Present Picture IDs" (September 15, 2005) (www.gainesvilletimes.com).

There is no evidence that the existing provisions of Georgia law have not been effective in deterring and preventing imposters from fraudulently obtaining and casting ballots at the polls by misrepresenting their true identities to election officials and passing themselves off as registered voters whose names appear on the official voter registration list.

The pretextual nature of the purported justification for the burden which the Photo ID requirement imposes on the right to vote is shown by the following facts:

(a) Fraudulent voting was already prohibited by existing Georgia law without unduly burdening the right of a citizen to vote.
(i) Fraudulent voting was already prohibited as a crime under O.C.G.A. §§ 21-2-561, 21-2-562, 21-2-566, 21-2-571, 21-2-572 and 21-2-600, punishable by a fine of up to $10,000 or imprisonment for up to ten years, or both.

(ii) Voter registration records are updated periodically by the Secretary of State and local election officials to eliminate people who have died, have moved, or are no longer eligible to vote in Georgia for some other reason.

(iii) Existing Georgia law also required election officials in each precinct to maintain a list of names and addresses of registered voters residing in that precinct, and to check off the names of each person from that official list as they cast their ballots.

(iv) Registered voters were also required by existing Georgia law to present at least one of the seventeen forms of documentary identification to election officials who were required, before issuing the voter a ballot, to match the name and address shown on the document to the name and address on the official roll of registered voters residing in the particular precinct. O.C.G.A.§ 21-2-417.

(b) There is no evidence that the existing Georgia law has not been effective in deterring or preventing fraudulent in-person voting by impersonators - the only kind of fraudulent voting that might be prevented by the Photo ID requirement. To the contrary, the Secretary of State, who, as the Superintendent of Elections, is the highest election official in Georgia, informed both the General Assembly (Exhibit A) and the Governor (Exhibit B) in writing that there had been no documented cases of fraudulent in person voting by imposters reported to her during her nine years in office.

(c) If the true intention of the General Assembly had been to prevent fraudulent voting by imposters, the General Assembly would have imposed the same restrictions on the casting of absentee ballots - particularly after the Secretary of State had called to their attention the fact that there had been many documented instances of fraudulent casting of absentee ballots reported to her office.

(d) Fraudulent in-person voting is unlikely, would be easily detected if it had occurred in significant numbers, and would not be likely to have a substantial impact on the outcome of an election:

   (i) Many people vote at a local neighborhood polling place where they are likely to be known to and recognized by neighbors or poll workers.

   (ii) Voters were required by existing Georgia law (O.C.G.A. § 21-2-417), to provide one of the seventeen means of identification to election officials.

   (iii) Election officials are required, before issuing the ballot to the voter, to check off the name of either voter from an up-to-date list of the names and addresses of every registered voter residing in the precinct. If an imposter arrived at a poll and was successful in fraudulently obtaining a ballot before the registered voter arrived at the poll, a registered voter, who having taken the time to go to the polls to vote, would undoubtedly complain to elections officials if he or she were refused a ballot and not allowed to vote because his or her name had already been checked off the list of registered voters as having voted. Likewise, if an imposter arrived at the polls after the registered voter had voted and attempted to pass himself off as someone he was not, the election official would instantly know of the attempted fraud, would not issue the imposter a ballot or allow him to vote, and presumably would have the imposter arrested or at least investigate the attempted fraud and report the attempt to the Secretary of State as Superintendent of Elections.
EXHIBIT B

Letter from Secretary of State Cathy Cox to Governor Sonny Purdue, April 8, 2005

One of the primary justifications given by the Legislature for the passage of the photo identification provisions of House Bill 244 - the elimination of voter ID fraud at the polls is an unfounded justification I cannot recall one documented case of voter fraud during my tenure as Secretary of State or Assistant Secretary of State that specifically related to the impersonation of a registered voter at voting polls. Our state currently has several practices and procedures in existence to ensure that such cases of voter fraud would have been detected if they in fact occurred, and at the very least, we would have complaints of voters who were unable to vote because someone had previously represented himself or herself as such person on that respective Election Day. As a practical matter, there is no possibility that vote fraud of this type would have gone undetected if it had in fact occurred because there is a list of registered voters at each polling place that is checked off as each person votes. If the impersonates voted first and the legitimate voter came to the polling place later in the day and tried to vote, he or she would be told that they had already voted and would not be allowed to vote a second time in the same day. It is reasonable to suspect that a voter who cared enough to show up at the polls to cast a ballot would almost certainly have complained - but there have been no such complaints. If the opposite occurred, and the legitimate person came to the polls first and cast his ballot, the impersonator who showed up later would not be allowed to vote for the same reason and the attempted fraud would have been prevented.

In addition, this state has adopted severe criminal sanctions for the type of vote impersonation that is purportedly of concern and it is evident that such penalties have been a sufficient deterrent. In essence, there is no voter fraud problem currently in existence that House Bill 244 addresses.

In contrast to the lack of voter fraud relating to impersonation of voters at polls during my tenure the State Election Board has reviewed numerous cases of voter fraud relating to the use of absentee ballots.

State Defendants' Initial Brief In Opposition To Plaintiffs' Motion For Preliminary Injunction

There are 159 counties and an even larger number of municipalities in Georgia that conduct elections. Neither the Secretary of State nor her staff can be physically present at the polling places for those elections and therefore could not possibly be aware of all in-person voter fraud that might occur. (Cox Decl. ¶ 6.)

Under the prior law before enactment of HB 244, it is beyond argument that in person voter fraud could have taken place. (Id. ¶ 5.) The Secretary of State's view of the scenario in which voter fraud would occur is when an imposter votes at the polling place and the actual voter shows up later and is unable to cast a ballot. (Id. ¶ 5.) However, the Secretary of State agrees that the scenario she describes is only one instance of potential voter fraud.
fraud, and both her scenario and others were possible under the law as it existed prior to the enactment of HB 244. (Id.) As stated by the Director of Elections for the Forsyth County Board of Elections, the typical case of in-person voter fraud would be committed by identifying persons who do not typically vote and then having other individuals vote as those persons. (Smith Decl. ¶ 4.)

The Executive Director of the Richmond County Board of Elections has been aware of such complaints, but has been unable to gather evidence to prove the violations because the nature of the conduct makes such evidence hard to develop. (Bailey Decl. ¶ 9.) Indeed, past incidents of fraudulent registrations in Forsyth County and Fulton County were reported to the District Attorneys’ offices in those respective counties. (Smith Decl. ¶ 6; MacDougald Decl. ¶ 4.) In Fulton County, the fraudulent registrations were also reported to the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, and he has opened an investigation of the fraudulent registrations. (MacDougald Decl. ¶ 4.)

Order for a Preliminary Injunction

As part of the order, Judge Murphy describes the testimony of Harry MacDougald, a member of the Fulton County Board of Registration and Election. Mr. MacDougald had stated he had observed voter registration fraud, which he referred to the U.S. Attorney and the District Attorney. In addition, since some precinct cards the Board sent out in 2004 were returned as undeliverable, MacDougald believes they were not eligible voters, yet they were allowed to vote.

Although the Secretary of State said she knew of no incidents of impersonation at the polls, she and her staff are not physically present in every polling site. Secretary Cox stated local officials are in the best position to know of such incidents. The State Election Board has received a number of complaints of irregularities with respect to absentee ballots. Cox is also aware of a case of vote buying of absentee ballots. She is also aware of efforts to submit fraudulent registrations.

According to Secretary of State Cox, Georgia has procedures and practices in place to detect voter fraud. Those procedures include verifying the voter’s correct address, as well as the voter’s name, during the check-in process for in-person voters. Georgia also imposes criminal penalties for voter impersonation. Most violations of Georgia election laws are punishable as felonies. No evidence indicates that the criminal penalties do not sufficiently deter in-person voter fraud.

The integrity of the voter list also is extremely important in preventing voter fraud. The Atlanta Journal Constitution published an article indicating that Georgia had experienced 5,412 instances of voter fraud during a twenty-year period. Secretary of State Cox’s office undertook an investigation in response to that article. The investigation revealed that the specific instance of voter fraud outlined in the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, involving a report that Alan J. Mandel had voted after his death, actually did not occur. Instead, an individual with a similar name, Alan J. Mandle, had voted at the polls, and the poll worker had marked Alan J. Mandel’s name rather than marking Alan J. Mandle, the name of the individual who actually voted. Secretary of State Cox’s office compared the
signature on the voter certificate to the voter registration card of the living individual, and concluded that the living individual, Alan J. Mandle, rather than the deceased Alan J. Mandel, had voted.

The Secretary of State’s Office subsequently attempted to ensure that voter records were maintained and up to date. The Secretary of State’s Office sends information concerning dead voters to local elections officials on a monthly basis, and now has the authority to remove the names of deceased voters from the voter rolls if the local elections officials fail to do so in a timely manner. Secretary of State Cox is not aware of any reports of dead individuals voting since her office received authority to remove the names of deceased individuals from the voter rolls.

There seems to be little doubt that the Photo ID requirement fails the strict scrutiny test: accepting that preventing voter fraud is a legitimate and important State concern, the statute is not narrowly drawn to prevent voter fraud. Indeed, Secretary of State Cox pointed out that, to her knowledge, the State had not experienced one complaint of in-person fraudulent voting during her tenure. In contrast, Secretary of State Cox indicated that the State Election Board had received numerous complaints of voter fraud in the area of absentee voting. Furthermore, the Secretary of State’s Office removes deceased voters from the voting rolls monthly, eliminating the potential for voter fraud noted by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution article alleging that more than 5,000 deceased people voted during a twenty—year period.

Further, although Defendants have presented evidence from elections officials of fraud in the area of voting, all of that evidence addresses fraud in the area of voter registration, rather than in-person voting. The Photo ID requirement does not apply to voter registration, and any Georgia citizen of appropriate age may register to vote without showing a Photo ID. Indeed, individuals may register to vote by producing copies of bank statements or utility bills, or without even producing identification at all. The Photo ID law thus does nothing to address the voter fraud issues that conceivably exist in Georgia.
**Views of Selected Local Election Officials on Managing Voter Registration and Ensuring Eligible Citizens Can Vote**

**GAO Report**

In 2002, the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) was enacted and, among other things, it requires states to implement provisional voting for elections for federal office. HAVA, in general, requires that individuals not listed as registered or whose eligibility is questioned by an election official must be notified about and permitted to cast a provisional ballot that is set aside for review by election officials at a later time so that they can determine whether the person is eligible to vote under state law. HAVA also requires that provisional ballots be provided to first-time voters who had registered to vote by mail on or after January 1, 2003, but were unable to show photo identification or another qualifying identification document when voting in person or by mail in a federal election. In addition, HAVA requires that election officials must provide access to information that permits voters to learn if their provisional ballot was counted, and, if not, why not.

This Report focuses on the efforts of local election officials in 14 jurisdictions within 7 states to manage the registration process, maintain accurate voter registration lists, and ensure that eligible citizens in those jurisdictions had the opportunity to cast ballots during the 2004 election. Specifically, for the 2004 election, the Report concentrates on election officials' characterization of their experiences with regard to (1) managing the voter registration process and any challenges related to receiving voter registration applications; checking them for completeness, accuracy, and duplication; and entering information into voter registration lists; (2) removing voters’ names from voter registration lists and ensuring that the names of eligible voters were not inadvertently removed; and (3) implementing HAVA provisional voting and identification requirements and addressing any challenges encountered related to these requirements.

The Report also provides information on motor vehicle agency (MVA) officials’ characterization of their experiences assisting citizens who apply to register to vote at MVA offices and forwarding voter registration applications to election offices.

The Report analyzed information collected from elections and motor vehicle agency offices in seven states—Arizona, California, Michigan, New York, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin. These states take various approaches to administering elections. Within each of the seven states, using population data from the 2000 U.S. Census, two jurisdictions were selected: a local jurisdiction with a large population and a local jurisdiction with a small population. The 14 jurisdictions we selected were Gila and Maricopa Counties, Arizona; Los Angeles and Yolo Counties, California; City of Detroit and Delta Township, Michigan; New York City and Rensselaer County, New York; Bexar and Webb Counties, Texas; Albemarle and Arlington Counties, Virginia; and the cities of Franklin and Madison, Wisconsin.

Information was gathered for the Report in a number of ways. First, relevant laws, state reports, and documents related to the voter registration process in the seven states were reviewed. Second, state and local election officials in the 7 states and 14 jurisdictions
were interviewed to obtain information on their registration processes and implementation of the HAVA requirements for provisional voting and voter identification. Third, a survey was sent to election officials in the 14 jurisdictions to gather information about their experiences with the November 2004 election. Finally, a survey was sent to state and local MVA officials in 6 of the 7 states and 12 of the 14 jurisdictions. The survey primarily asked questions about the MVA offices’ experiences with (1) assisting citizens with completing voter registration applications, (2) forwarding the applications to election offices, and (3) responding to individuals and state or local election officials who contacted their offices about individuals who declared they had applied to register to vote at MVA offices but their names were not on voter registration lists when they went to vote in the November 2004 election.

Election officials representing all but one of the jurisdictions surveyed following the November 2004 election said they faced some challenges managing the voter registration process, including (1) receiving voter registration applications; (2) checking them for completeness, accuracy, and duplication; and (3) entering information into voter registration lists; when challenges occurred, election officials reported they took various steps to address them. Officials in 7 of the 14 jurisdictions reported that their staff faced challenges checking voter registration applications for completeness, accuracy, or duplicates. According to these officials, these challenges occurred for a variety of reasons, including problems contacting individuals to obtain complete and accurate information and insufficient staffing to check the applications. They reported that, among other things, their staff addressed these challenges by sending letters or calling applicants to obtain correct information. Finally, 6 of the 14 election officials reported that their staff faced challenges entering or scanning voter information into registration lists for reasons such as the volume of applications received close to Election Day and problems with the scanning equipment. To address these challenges, they reported that more staff were hired and staff worked overtime.

All but 1 of the jurisdictions reported removing names from registration lists during 2004 for various reasons, including that voters requested that their names be removed from the voter registration list; information from the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) showing that voters had moved outside the jurisdiction; felony records received from federal, state, or local governments identifying voters as ineligible due to felony convictions; and death records received from state or local vital statistics offices. When removing names from registration lists, election officials reported that they took various steps to ensure that the names of eligible voters were not inadvertently removed from voter registration lists. These steps included sending letters or postcards to registrants to verify that voters wanted their names removed; matching voters’ identifying information with USPS data and sending voters identified by USPS as having moved outside the jurisdiction notices of removal; and matching voter registration records with felony records or death records to confirm it was the same person.

All of the jurisdictions reported that they permitted citizens to cast provisional ballots during the November 2004 election. In addition, 12 of the 14 jurisdictions to which this was applicable reported that they offered certain first-time voters who registered by mail
the opportunity to cast provisional ballots. Election officials in 13 of the 14 jurisdictions reported that 423,149 provisional ballots were cast, and 70 percent (297,662) were counted. Not all provisional votes were counted because, as election officials reported, not all provisional ballots met states’ criteria for determining which ballots should be counted. Reasons that provisional ballots cast during the 2004 election were not counted, as reported by election officials, included, among others, that individuals did not meet the residency eligibility requirements, had not registered or tried to register to vote with the election office, had not submitted the voter registration applications at motor vehicle agency offices, or election officials did not have time to enter information from applicants into their voter registration lists because applications were received at the election offices very close to or after the state registration deadline.

Local election officials in 12 of the 13 jurisdictions we surveyed reported that they set up mechanisms to inform voters—without cost—about the outcome of their provisional votes during the November 2004 election. These mechanisms included toll-free telephone numbers, Web sites, and letters sent to the voters who cast provisional ballots. Election officials also reported that provisional voters in their jurisdictions received written information at their polling places about how to find out the outcome of their provisional ballots, and provisional voters in 8 of the 13 jurisdictions had the opportunity to access information about the outcome of their ballots within 10 days after the election. Finally, election officials representing 8 of the 14 jurisdictions reported facing challenges implementing provisional voting for various reasons, including some poll workers not being familiar with provisional voting or, in one jurisdiction representing a large number of precincts, staff not having sufficient time to process provisional ballots. To address these challenges, the officials reported that they provided additional training to poll workers and hired additional staff to count provisional ballots.
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Existing Research Analysis

There are many reports and books that describe anecdotes and draw broad conclusions from a large array of incidents. There is little research that is truly systematic or scientific. The most systematic look at fraud is the report written by Lori Minnite. The most systematic look at voter intimidation is the report by Laughlin McDonald. Books written about this subject seem to all have a political bias and a pre-existing agenda that makes them somewhat less valuable.

Researchers agree that measuring something like the incidence of fraud and intimidation in a scientifically legitimate way is extremely difficult from a methodological perspective and would require resources beyond the means of most social and political scientists. As a result, there is much more written on this topic by advocacy groups than social scientists. It is hoped that this gap will be filled in the "second phase" of this EAC project.

Moreover, reports and books make allegations but, perhaps by their nature, have little follow up. As a result, it is difficult to know when something has remained in the stage of being an allegation and gone no further, or progressed to the point of being investigated or prosecuted or in any other way proven to be valid by an independent, neutral entity. This is true, for example, with respect to allegations of voter intimidation by civil rights organizations, and, with respect to fraud, John Fund's frequently cited book. Again, this is something that it is hoped will be addressed in the "second phase" of this EAC project by doing follow up research on allegations made in reports, books and newspaper articles.

Other items of note:

- There is as much evidence, and as much concern, about structural forms of disenfranchisement as about intentional abuse of the system. These include felon disenfranchisement, poor maintenance of databases and identification requirements.

- There is tremendous disagreement about the extent to which polling place fraud, e.g. double voting, intentional felon voting, noncitizen voting, is a serious problem. On balance, more researchers find it to be less of a problem than is commonly described in the political debate, but some reports say it is a major problem, albeit hard to identify.

- There is substantial concern across the board about absentee balloting and the opportunity it presents for fraud.

- Federal law governing election fraud and intimidation is varied and complex and yet may nonetheless be insufficient or subject to too many limitations to be as effective as it might be.
• Deceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004.

• Voter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities, although the American Center for Voting Rights uniquely alleges it is focused on Republicans.
INDIANA ID LITIGATION SUMMARY

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF DEMOCRATS. MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Although the proponents of SEA 483 asserted that the law was intended to combat voter fraud, no evidence of the existence of such fraud has ever been provided. No voter has been convicted of or even charged with the offense of misrepresenting his identity for purposes of casting a fraudulent ballot in person, King Dep. 95-96; Mahern Aff. ¶ 2-3, though there have been documented instances of absentee ballot fraud. King Dep. 120. Indeed, no evidence of in person, on-site voting fraud was presented to the General Assembly during the legislative process leading up to the enactment of the Photo ID Law. Mahern Aff. ¶ 2-

The State cannot show any compelling justification for subjecting only voters who vote in person to the new requirements of the Photo ID Law, while exempting absentee voters who vote by mail or persons who live in state-certified residential facilities. On the other hand, absentee ballots are peculiarly vulnerable to coercion and vote tampering since there is no election official or independent election observer available to ensure that there is no illegal coercion by family members, employers, churches, union officials, nursing home administrators, and others.

The Law gives virtually unbridled discretion to partisan precinct workers and challengers to make subjective determinations such as (a) whether a form of photo identification produced by a voter conforms to what is required by the Law, and (b) whether the voter presenting himself or herself at the polls is in fact the voter depicted in the photo. Robertson Dep. 29-34, 45; King Dep. 86, 89. This is significant because any voter who is challenged under this Law will be required to vote by provisional ballot and to make a special trip to the election board's office in order to have his vote counted. Robertson Dep. 37; King Dep. 58.

The Photo ID Law confers substantial discretion, not on law enforcement officials, but on partisan precinct poll workers and challengers appointed by partisan political officials, to determine both whether a voter has presented a form of identification which conforms to that required by the Law and whether the person presenting the identification is the person depicted on it. Conferring this degree of discretion upon partisan precinct officials and members of election boards to enforce the facially neutral requirements of the Law has the potential for becoming a means of suppressing a particular point of view.

The State arguably might be justified in imposing uniform, narrowly-tailored and not overly-burdensome voter identification requirements if the State were able to show that there is an intolerably high incidence of fraud among voters misidentifying themselves at the polls for the purpose of casting a fraudulent ballot. But here, the State has utterly failed to show that this genre of fraud is rampant or even that it has ever occurred in the context of on-site, in-person voting (as opposed to absentee voting by mail) so as to justify these extra burdens, which will fall disproportionately on the poor and elderly.
In evaluating the breadth of the law and whether the State has used the least restrictive means for preventing fraud, the Court must take into account the other mechanisms the State currently employs to serve the statute’s purported purposes, as well as other, less restrictive means it could reasonably employ. Krislov, 226 F.3d at 863. The State of Indiana has made it a felony for a voter to misrepresent his or her identity for purposes of casting a fraudulent ballot.

And where the State has already provided a mechanism for matching signatures, has made it a crime to misrepresent one’s identity for purposes of voting, and requires the swearing out of an affidavit if the voter’s identity is challenged, it already has provisions more than adequate to prevent or minimize fraud in the context of in-person voting, particularly in the absence of any evidence that the problem the Law seeks to address is anything more than the product of hypothesis, speculation and fantasy.

MEMORANDUM OF THE STATE OF INDIANA, THE INDIANA SECRETARY OF STATE, AND THE CO-DIRECTORS OF THE INDIANA ELECTION DIVISION IN SUPPORT OF THEIR JOINT MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND IN OPPOSITION TO THE MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT FILED BY BOTH SETS OF PLAINTIFFS

In-person voter-identity fraud is notoriously difficult to detect and investigate. In his book Stealing Elections, John Fund observes that actual in-person voter fraud is nearly undetectable without a voter photo-identification requirement because anybody who provides a name that is on the rolls may vote and then walk away with no record of the person’s actual identity. See generally John Fund, Stealing Elections (2004). The problem is only exacerbated by the increasingly transient nature of society. Documentation of in-person voter fraud often occurs only when a legitimate voter at the polls hears a fraudulent voter trying to use her name, as happened to a woman in California in 1994. See Larry J. Sabato & Glenn R. Simpson, Dirty Little Secrets 292 (1996).

Regardless of the lack of extensive evidence of in-person voter fraud, the Commission on Federal Election Reform (known as the Baker-Carter Commission) recently concluded that “there is no doubt that it occurs.” State Ex. 1, p. 18. Legal cases as well as newspaper and other reports confirm that in-person voter-identity fraud, including voter impersonation, double votes, dead votes, and fake addresses, plague federal and state elections. [The memorandum details several specific cases of various types of alleged voting fraud from the past several years]

Though they are largely unable to study verifiable data concerning in-person voter fraud, scholars are well aware of the conditions that foster fraudulent voting. See Fund, supra; Sabato & Simpson, supra, 321. In particular, fraud has become ever more likely as “it has become more difficult to keep the voting rolls clean of ‘deadwood’ voters who have moved or died” because such an environment makes “fraudulent voting easier and therefore more tempting for those so inclined.” Sabato & Simpson, supra, 321. “In
general, experts believe that one in five names on the rolls in Indiana do not belong there." State Ex. 25.

For this case, Clark Benson, a nationally recognized expert in the collection and analysis of voter-registration and population data, conducted his own examination of Indiana’s voter registration lists and concluded that they are among the most highly inflated in the nation.

The Crawford Plaintiffs cite the concessions by Indiana Election Division Co-Director King and the Intervenor-State that they are unaware of any historical in-person incidence of voter fraud occurring at the polling place (Crawford Brief, p. 23) as conclusive evidence that in-person voter fraud does not exist in Indiana. They also seek to support this conclusion with the testimony of two “veteran poll watchers,” Plaintiff Crawford and former president of the Plaintiff NAACP, Indianapolis Chapter, Roderick E. Bohannon, who testified that they had never seen any instances of in-person voter fraud. (Id.)

At best, the evidence on this issue is in equipoise. While common sense, the experiences of many other states, and the findings of the Baker-Carter Commission all lead to the reasonable inferences that (a) in-person polling place fraud likely exists, but (b) is nearly impossible to detect without requiring photo identification, the State can cite to no confirmed instances of such fraud. On the other hand, the Plaintiffs have no proof that it does not occur.

At the level of logic, moreover, it is just reasonable to conclude that the lack of confirmed incidents of in-person voting fraud in Indiana is the result of an ineffective identification security system as it is to conclude there is no in-person voting fraud in Indiana. So while it is undisputed that the state has no proof that in-person polling place fraud has occurred in Indiana, there does in fact remain a dispute over the existence vel non of in-person polling place fraud.

It is also important to understand that the nature of in-person election fraud is such that it is nearly impossible to detect or investigate. Unless a voter stumbles across someone else trying to use her identity, see Sabato & Simpson, supra, 292, or unless the over-taxed poll worker happens to notice that the voter’s signature is different from her registration signature State Ext. 37, ¶ 9, the chances of detecting such in-person voter fraud are extremely small. Yet, inflated voter-registration rolls provide ample opportunity for those who wish to commit in-person voter fraud. See Fund, supra, 24, 65, 69, 138; Sabato & Simpson, supra, 321. And there is concrete evidence that the names of dead people have been used to cast fraudulent ballots. See Fund, supra, 64. Particularly in light of Indiana’s highly inflated voter rolls State Ex. 27, p. 9, Plaintiffs’ repeated claims that there has never been any in-person voter fraud in Indiana can hardly be plausible, even if the state is unable to prove that such fraud has in fact occurred.
Securing the Vote: An Analysis of Election Fraud, by Lorraine Minnite

Professor Lori Minnite conducted a comprehensive survey and analysis of vote fraud in the United States. The methodology included doing nexis searches for all 50 states and surveying existing research and reports. In addition, Minnite did a more in-depth study of 12 diverse states by doing nexis searches, studying statutory and case law, and conducting interviews with election officials and attorneys general. Finally, the study includes an analysis of a few of the most high profile cases of alleged fraud in the last 10 years, including the Miami mayoral election (1997), Orange County congressional race (1996), and the general election in Missouri (2000). In these cases, Minnite shows that many allegations of fraud do not end up being meritorious.

Minnite finds that available evidence suggests that the incidence of election fraud is minimal and rarely affects election outcomes. Election officials generally do a very good job of protecting against fraud. Conditions that give rise to election fraud have steadily declined over the last century as a result of weakened political parties, strengthened election administration, and improved voting technology. There is little available evidence that election reforms such as the National Voter Registration Act, election day registration, and mail-in voting have resulted in increases in election fraud.

Election fraud appears also to be very rare in the 12 states examined more in-depth. Legal and news records turned up little evidence of significant fraud in these states or any indication that fraud is more than a minor problem. Interviews with state officials further confirmed this impression.

Minnite found that, overall, the absentee mail-in ballot process is the feature most vulnerable to voter fraud. There is not a lot of evidence of absentee ballot fraud but the potential for fraud is greatest in this area because of a lack of uniformly strong security measures in place in all states to prevent fraud.

Minnite suggest several reforms to prevent what voter fraud does take place. These include effective use of new statewide voter registration databases; identification requirements for first time voters who register by mail should be modified to expand the list of acceptable identifying documents; fill important election administration positions with nonpartisan professionals; strengthen enforcement through adequate funding and authority for offices responsible for detecting and prosecuting fraud; and establish Election Day Registration because it usually requires voter identification and authorization in person before a trained election worker, which reduces the opportunity for registration error or fraud.
Shattering the Myth: An Initial Snapshot of Voter Disenfranchisement in the 2004 Elections, People for the American Way, NAACP, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights

Shattering the Myth is a description and analysis of the complaints and allegations of voting irregularities gathered by the Election Protection program during the 2004 presidential election. Election Protection was an effort involving hundreds of organizations and thousands of citizens to protect the voting rights of Americans across the country. The project included sending thousands of monitors to the polls and hosting a national toll free voters' rights hotline. EP mounted extensive field efforts in 17 states.

Election Protection received more than a thousand complaints of voter suppression or intimidation. Complaints ranged from intimidating experiences at polling places to coordinated suppression tactics. For example:

- Police stationed outside a Cook County, Illinois, polling place were requesting photo ID and telling voters if they had been convicted of a felony that they could not vote.
- In Pima, Arizona, voters at multiple polls were confronted by an individual, wearing a black tee shirt with “US Constitution Enforcer” and a military-style belt that gave the appearance he was armed. He asked voters if they were citizens, accompanied by a cameraman who filmed the encounters.
- There were numerous incidents of intimidation by partisan challengers at predominately low income and minority precincts.
- Voters repeatedly complained about misinformation campaigns via flyers or phone calls encouraging them to vote on a day other than November 2, 2004 or of false information regarding their right to vote. In Polk County, Florida, for example, a voter received a call telling her to vote on November 3. Similar complaints were also reported in other counties throughout Florida. In Wisconsin and elsewhere voters received flyers that said:
  - “If you already voted in any election this year, you can’t vote in the Presidential Election.”
  - “If anybody in your family has ever been found guilty of anything you can’t vote in the Presidential Election.”
  - “If you violate any of these laws, you can get 10 years in prison and your children will be taken away from you.”

There were also numerous reports of poll workers refusing to give voters provisional ballots.

The following is a summary of the types of acts of suppression and intimidation included in the report and a list of the states in which they took place. All instances of irregularities that were more administrative in nature have been omitted:

1. Improper implementation of voter identification rules, especially asking only African Americans for proof of identity: Florida, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana
2. Individuals at the polls posing as some sort of law enforcement authority and intimidating and harassing voters: Arizona, Missouri
3. Intimidating and harassing challengers at the polls: Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Missouri, Minnesota
4. Deceptive practices and disinformation campaigns, such as the use of flyers with intentional misinformation about voting rights or voting procedures, often directed at minority communities; the use of phone calls giving people misinformation about polling sites and other procedures; and providing verbal misinformation at the polls in a way that appears to have been intentionally misleading: Florida, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Wisconsin, Missouri, North Carolina, Arkansas, Texas
5. Refusal to provide provisional ballots to certain voters: Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, Colorado, Missouri, Texas, Georgia, Louisiana
6. Registration applications submitted through third parties that were not processed: Arizona, Michigan, Nevada (registration forms destroyed by Sproul Associates)
7. Improper removal from the voter registration list: Arizona
8. Individuals questioning voters' citizenship: Arizona

The report does not provide corroborating evidence for the allegations it describes. However, especially in the absence of a log of complaints received by the Department of Justice, this report provides a very useful overview of the types of experiences some voters more than likely endured on Election Day in 2004.
Overview: Five career attorneys with the civil rights department investigated and analyzed Georgia’s election reform law. Four of those attorneys recommended objecting to Section 59, the voter identification requirement. The provision required all voters to present government issued photo identification in order to vote. The objection was based on the attorneys’ findings that there was little to no evidence of polling place fraud, the only kind of fraud an ID requirement would address, and that the measure would disenfranchise many voters, predominantly minority voters, in violation of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

Factual Analysis: The sponsor of the measure in the state legislature said she was motivated by the fact that she is aware of vote buying in certain districts; she read John Fund’s book; and that “if there are fewer black voters because of this bill, it will only be because there is less opportunity for fraud. She said that when black voters in her black precincts are not paid to vote, they do not go to the polls.”

A member of the Fulton County Board of Registrations and Elections said that prior to November 2004, Fulton County received 8,112 applications containing “missing or irregular” information. Only 55 of those registrants responded to BOE letters. The member concluded that the rest must be “bogus” as a result. He also stated that 15,237 of 105,553 precinct cards came back as undeliverable, as did 3,071 cards sent to 45,907 new voters. Of these 3,071, 921 voted.

Secretary of State Cathy Cox submitted a letter testifying to the absence of any complaints of voter fraud via impersonation during her tenure.

In the legal analysis, the attorneys state that if they determine that Georgia could have fulfilled its stated purpose of election fraud, while preventing or ameliorating the retrogression, an objection is appropriate. They conclude that the state could have avoided retrogression by retaining various forms of currently accepted voter ID for which no substantiated security concerns were raised. Another non-retrogressive alternative would have been to maintain the affidavit alternative for those without ID, since “there is no evidence that penalty of law is an insufficient deterrent to falsely signing an affidavit of identity.”

The attorneys point out that the state’s recitation of a case upholding voter fraud in Dodge County does not support the purpose of the Act because that case involved vote buying and selling, not impersonation or voting under a false identity.
Stealing Elections, John Fund

In *Stealing Elections*, John Fund says that “Election fraud, whether its phony voter registrations, illegal absentee ballots, shady recounts or old-fashioned ballot-box stuffing, can be found in every part of the United States, although it is probably spreading because of the ever-so-tight divisions that have polarized the country and created so many close elections lately. Although most fraud is found in urban areas, there are current scandals in rural South Dakota and Texas.” Fund admits that “Democrats figure prominently in the vast majority of examples of election fraud described in this book.” He argues Republican fraud is less common because Republicans are middle class and Democrats are poor and most fraud occurs in inner cities where there are a lot of minorities. However, because of politics, state and local prosecutors are reluctant to go after fraud.

He also stipulates that Democrats and Republicans have different worldviews on voting: Democrats are concerned about intimidation and disenfranchisement while Republicans are concerned with fraud and the need to police the polls.

Fund argues that fraud has been made easier by the passage of the National Voting Rights Act because it allows ineligible voters to remain on the voter rolls, allowing a voter to vote in the name of someone else. He claims dead people, people who have moved, and people in jail remain on the voting list. He believes because of NVRA illegal aliens have been allowed to vote. Absentee balloting makes it even worse: someone can register under false names and then use absentee ballots to cast multiple votes. Groups can get absentee ballots for the poor and elderly and then manipulate their choices.

Fund goes through a number of examples of alleged voter fraud, mostly perpetrated by Democrats. For example, he claims much fraud in St. Louis in 2000, including illegal court orders allowing people to vote, felons voting, people voting twice, dead people voting, voters were registered to vacant lots, election judges were not registered and evidence of false registrations.

Another case he pays a great deal of attention to are the alleged transgressions by Democrats in Indian Country in South Dakota 2002, including voter registration fraud, suspicious absentee ballot requests, vote hauling, possible polling place fraud, abusive lawyers at polling sites, and possible vote buying.

Fund criticizes and scorns “conspiracy theories” around electronic voting perpetuated by Democrats. He says that “By whipping up a frenzy of suspicion about electronic voting, Democrats will have built a platform from which, if the presidential or key Senate elections in November 2004 are close, the can launch endless lawsuits everywhere there were problems with electronic machines.”

*Stealing Elections* focuses almost entirely on alleged transgressions by Democrats. Fund’s accusations, if credible, would indicate that fraud such as voter registration fraud, absentee ballot fraud, dead people voting, and felon voting is prevalent throughout the country. However, due to its possible biases, lack of specific footnoting, and insufficient
identification of primary source material, caution is strongly urged with respect to utilizing this book for assessing the amount and types of voter fraud and voter intimidation occurring.
This report describes the pervasive and repeated practices of voter intimidation and vote suppression that have taken place in very recent years and during contemporary American history. The most recent cases included in the report are the incident in which Florida law enforcement questioned elderly African American voters in Orlando regarding the 2003 mayoral race, which had already been resolved, shortly before the 2004 election; the 2004 Florida felon purge list; the case of South Dakota in 2004 in which Native Americans were improperly and illegally required to show photo identification at the polls or denied the right to vote, and similar improper demands for ID from minorities in other parts of the country; the use of challengers in minority districts in many locations; the challenge to the right of African American students to vote in Texas in 2004; the presence of men looking like law enforcement challenging African American voters at the polls in Philadelphia in 2003; the distribution of flyers in Louisiana and elsewhere in a number of elections over the last few years in minority areas telling them to vote on the wrong day; and the FBI investigation into thousands of Native American voters in South Dakota in 2002, which resulted in no showing of wrongdoing.

The report also points out that, "Over the past two decades, the Republican Party has launched a series of 'ballot security' and 'voter integrity' initiatives which have targeted minority communities. At least three times, these initiatives were successfully challenged in federal courts as illegal attempts to suppress voter participation based on race.

It goes on to describe the numerous instances of voter intimidation and suppression during the 2000 election, the 1990s, the 1980s and back through the civil rights movement of the 1960s, putting current efforts in historical perspective. Describing the chronology of events in this way demonstrates the developing patterns and strategic underpinnings of the tactics used over the last forty years.
Steal this Vote: Dirty Elections and the Rotten History of Democracy in America by Andrew Gumbel

The bulk of the book comprises stories from United States electoral history outside the scope of this project. However, these tales are instructive in showing how far back irregular and illegal voting practices go. Cases include the 1868 New York City elections; the Tilden-Hayes election; the impact of the introduction of the secret ballot; the 1981 consent decree; the 1990 Helms campaign; the 1960 presidential election controversy in Chicago; the rise of the voting machine business, including the introduction of punch card machines; and allegations by Republicans regarding NVRA.

Steal this Vote focuses almost entirely on alleged transgressions by Republican, although at times it does include complaints about Democratic tactics. Gumbel’s accusations, if credible, especially in the Bush-Gore election, would indicate there were a number of problems in key states in such areas as intimidation, vote counting, and absentee ballots. However, due to its possible biases, lack of specific footnoting, and insufficient identification of primary source material, caution is strongly urged with respect to utilizing this book for assessing the amount and types of voter fraud and voter intimidation occurring.

The Joint Legislative Audit Committee of the Wisconsin Legislature required the Wisconsin Audit Report. The Report obviously does not include the 2006 statistics for statewide voter registration as required by HAVA. Wisconsin voter registration is required by statute in only 172 municipalities—those with populations of 5,000 or more. Another 167 smaller municipalities opted to maintain voter registration lists. Currently, 28.9% of the voting-age population is not required to register before voting.

According to the Report, great variation was found in the implementation of existing voter registration laws. For example, 46% of municipalities that responded to the survey did not send address verification cards to individuals who registered by mail or at the polls on Election Day in November 2004. Further, only 85.3% of survey respondents reported updating their voter registration lists to remove inactive voters, as required by law.

Current voter registration practices were determined to be insufficient to ensure the accuracy of voter registration lists used by poll workers or to prevent ineligible persons from registering to vote. The Report identified 105 instances of voting irregularities in six municipalities, including 98 ineligible felons who may have voted. The names of these individuals were forwarded to appropriate district attorneys for investigation.

Due to concerns about ineligible voting, stemming from the 2004 election, the Joint Legislative Audit Committee requested that voter registration procedures be evaluated. The following was investigated for this Report:

* voter registration requirements and the methods by which voters register, including requirements in other states; □

* the address verification process, including the use of address verification cards to confirm the residency of those who register by mail or at the polls;

* procedures and practices for updating voter registration lists; and, □

* the role of the Elections Board.

Wisconsin allows qualified electors to register in person, by mail, or with a special registration deputy before Election Day, and at the polls on Election Day. In municipalities where registration is required by statute, 20.3% of Wisconsin voters registered at the polls on Election Day in November 2004. Municipal clerks rely on registrants to affirm their eligibility, including citizenship and age. However, requirements for providing identification or proof of residence vary depending on when an individual registers and by which method.
Address verification cards are the primary tool available to municipal clerks for verifying the residency of registered voters and detecting improper registrations by mail or at the polls. Statutes require that clerks send cards to everyone who registers by mail or on Election Day. However, only 42.7% of the 150 municipalities surveyed sent cards to both groups, and 46% did not send any address verification cards.

Statutes also require clerks to provide the local district attorney with the names of any Election Day registrants whose cards are undeliverable at the address provided. However, only 24.3% of the clerks who sent cards also forwarded names from undeliverable cards to district attorneys. District attorneys surveyed indicated that they require more information than is typically provided to conduct effective investigations.

To ensure that voter registration lists contain only the names of qualified electors, municipal clerks are required by statute to remove or inactivate the names of individuals who have not voted in four years, to update registration information for individuals who move or change their names, and to remove or inactivate the names of deceased individuals. They are also required to notify registered voters before removing their names from registration lists. These statutory requirements are not consistently followed:

* 85.3% of municipalities removed the names of inactive voters from their voter registration lists; 
* 71.4% sometimes or always notified registered voters before removing their names; and
* 54.0% reported removing the names of ineligible felons.

Because of such inconsistencies, registration lists contain duplicate records and the names of ineligible individuals. For example, more than 348,000 electronic voter registration records from eight municipalities were reviewed, identifying 3,116 records that appear to show individuals who are registered more than once in the same municipality.

In six municipalities where sufficient information was available, there was 105 instances of potentially improper or fraudulent voting in the 2004 elections. These included: 98 ineligible felons who may have voted; 2 individuals who may have voted twice; 1 voter who may have been underage; and 4 absentee ballots that should not have been counted because the voters who cast them died before Election Day.

Recommendations:

* adjusting the early registration deadline to provide clerks more time to prepare registration lists;
* establishing more stringent requirements for special registration deputies, including prohibiting compensation based on the number of individuals registered;
* establishing uniform requirements for demonstrating proof of residence for all registrants;

* providing municipal clerks with more flexibility in the use of address verification cards;

* Authorizing civil penalties for local election officials and municipalities that fail to comply with election laws; and,

* implementing mandatory elections training requirements for municipal clerks.

The Report also recognized that the new HAVA registration procedures would help with existing registration problems.
Preliminary Findings of Joint Task Force Investigating Possible Election Fraud: May 10, 2005

On January 26, 2005, the Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee County District Attorney’s Office, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the United States Attorney’s Office formed a task force to investigate alleged voting irregularities during the November 2004 elections. The purpose of the task force was to determine whether evidence of criminal fraud existed in the irregularities and, if evidence of fraud was found, to pursue criminal prosecutions.

The task force has made the following specific determinations based on evidence examined to date:

* evidence of more than 100 individual instances of suspected double-voting, voting in names of persons who likely did not vote, and/or voting in names believed to be fake. Those investigations continue;

* more than 200 felons voted when they were not eligible to do so. In order to establish criminal cases, the government must establish willful violations in individual instances;

* persons who had been paid to register voters as “deputy registrars” falsely listed approximately 65 names in order to receive compensation for the registrations. The evidence does not indicate that these particular false registrations were later used to cast votes; and,

* the number of votes counted from the City of Milwaukee exceeds the number of persons recorded as voting by more than 4,500.

The investigation concentrated on the 70,000+ same-day registrations. It found that a large majority of the reported errors were the result of data entry errors, such as street address numbers being transposed. However, the investigation also found more than 100 instances where votes were cast in a manner suggesting fraud. These include:

* persons with the same name and date of birth recorded as voting more than once;

* persons who live outside Milwaukee, but who used non-existent City addresses to register and vote in the City;

* persons who registered and voted with identities and addresses that cannot in any way be linked to a real person;

* persons listed as voting under a name and identity of a person known to be deceased; and

* persons whose identities were used to vote, but who in subsequent interviews told task force investigators that they did not, in fact, vote in the City of Milwaukee.
The investigation found persons who were paid money to obtain registrations allegedly falsified approximately 65 names on registration forms, allegedly to obtain more money for each name submitted. There is no evidence gathered to date that votes were cast under these specific false names. Also found were more than 200 felons who were not eligible to vote in the 2004 election, but who are recorded as having done so.

An additional finding of the task force was that the number of votes cast far exceeds the total number of recorded voters. The day after the 2004 election, the City of Milwaukee reported the total number of votes as 277,344. In late November an additional 191 previously uncounted absentee ballots were added, for a total of 277,535 votes cast. Still later, an additional 30 ballots were added, bringing the total number of counted votes to 277,565. City records, however, have been unable to match this total to a similar number of names of voters who cast ballots — either at the polls (under a prior registration or same day registration) or cast absentee ballots. At present, the records show a total of 272,956 voter names — for a discrepancy of 4,609. This part of the investigation was hampered by widespread record keeping errors with respect to recording the number of voters.

In the 2004 election, same-day registrations were accepted in which the card had incomplete information that would help establish identity. For example: 48 original cards for persons listed as voting had no name; 548 had no address; 28 did not have signatures; and another 23 cards had illegible information. These were part of approximately 1,300 same-day registrations for which votes were cast, but which election officials could not authenticate as proper voters within the City. Included in this 1,300 were 141 same-day registrants from addresses outside the City of Milwaukee, but who voted within the City of Milwaukee. In several instances, the voter explicitly listed municipality names other than Milwaukee on the registration cards.

Another record keeping procedure hampering the investigation appears to be the post-election misfiling or loss of original green registration cards that were considered duplicates, but that in fact corresponded to additional votes. These cards were used to record votes, but approximately 100 cards of interest to investigators can no longer be located. In addition, other original green registration cards continue to be found.
**The New Poll Tax: Republican-Sponsored Ballot-Security Measures are Being Used to Keep Minorities from Voting**

By Laughlin McDonald

McDonald argues that “the discriminatory use of so-called ‘ballot security’ programs” has been a recurring scandal since the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. These programs are deceptively presented as preventing voter fraud and thereby furthering good government. However, McDonald states “but far too often they [the ballot security programs] are actually designed to suppress minority voting -- and for nakedly partisan purposes.”

McDonald blames the federal government as well as the states for use of suspect ballot security programs. He cites the implementation of the U.S. Department of Justice’s “Voting Integrity Initiative” in South Dakota as the worst example of a joint federal-state effort to prevent voter fraud. Alleged voter fraud only in counties with significant Native American populations was targeted. South Dakota Attorney General Mark Barnett “working with the FBI, announced plans to send state and federal agents to question almost 2,000 new Native-American registrants, many of whom were participating in the political process for the first time.” However, statistics show that these efforts only served to increase Native American voter participation. Native Americans “were targeted based on fraud allegations that proved to be grossly exaggerated; at the end of the investigation, only one Native American was even charged with a voting-rules violation.”

McDonald cites several other ballot security efforts that were really disguised attempts at minority voter suppression:

In Pine Bluff, Ark., Democrats accused Republican poll watchers of driving away voters in predominantly black precincts by taking photos of them and demanding identification during pre-election day balloting. Democrats in Michigan charged that a plan by Republicans to station hundreds of "spotters" at heavily Democratic precincts was an effort to intimidate black voters and suppress Democratic turnout. In South Carolina, a lawsuit filed the day before the election alleged that officials in Beaufort County had adopted a new and unauthorized policy allowing them to challenge voters who gave rural route or box numbers for their registration address. According to the complaint, a disproportionate number of those affected by the new rule would be African-American voters who lived in the rural areas of the county.

McDonald is also critical of the Help America Vote Act (HAVA). He states that HAVA "contains other provisions that may enhance the opportunities for harassment and intimidation of minorities through ballot-security programs.” McDonald specifically attacks the photo ID requirement for anyone who registered by mail but has not previously voted. McDonald argues that the ID requirement will suppress minority voting because minorities are less likely than non-minorities to have a photo ID, a photo ID is expensive to obtain and all the alternatives to photo ID present similar obstacles to minority voters. He also argues that there is no evidence that photo ID will combat voter
fraud but it only really provides “another opportunity for aggressive poll officials to single out minority voters and interrogate them.”

McDonald lists some classic past ballot security efforts by the Republicans that have been abused: the 1981 gubernatorial election anti-fraud initiative leading to the well known consent decree prohibiting the Republicans from repeating this, a similar Republican effort in Louisiana in 1986 in Senator John Breaux’s race which again resulted in prohibition by a state court judge, and a similar effort by Republicans in Senator Jesse Helms 1990 reelection. This time the Department of Justice sued the Republican Party and Helm’s reelection committee, resulting in another consent decree prohibiting future ballot security programs without court approval.

McDonald indicates that the crux of the problem is lax enforcement of federal voters rights laws. He states, “there is no record of the purveyors of any ballot-security program being criminally prosecuted by federal authorities for interfering with the right to vote.” The only positive case law McDonald cited was a decision by the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit that affirmed “an award of damages ranging from $500 to $2,000, payable by individual poll officials to each of seven black voters who had been unlawfully challenged, harassed, denied assistance in voting or purged from the rolls in the town of Crawfordsville [Arkansas].”

McDonald concludes by stating that Congress and the states should adopt “nondiscriminatory, evenly applied measures to ensure the integrity of the ballot.”
May 9, 2007

Mr. Greg Gordon
National Correspondent
McClatchy Newspapers
Washington, DC

Dear Mr. Gordon:

This letter is in response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request received by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) on April 11, 2007. The request sought “all emails between Job Serebrov and Elections Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for the EAC.”

Responsive records. In regard to your request, copies of the responsive documents are attached (approximately 1,000 pages). Upon review of the records, you will find a few places where small portions of information have been redacted (in black). As required by FOIA exemption 6, the EAC has redacted personal information, including home addresses, telephone numbers, personal e-mail addresses, personal financial information, social security numbers, and tax identification numbers.

Withheld records. In reference to your request, an estimated 300 pages of e-mails have been withheld because the information in these e-mails is pre-decisional and protected by the Deliberative Process Privilege. As you may know, the Deliberative Process Privilege protects intra-agency documents that are (1) pre-decisional in nature and (2) part of the deliberative process. In other words, the documents must be part of a process that recommends or presents opinions on a policy matter or governmental decision before that matter is finally decided. It is a well settled matter of law that the work of contract employees and contractors (“consultants”) constitute intra-agency documents. This is true even where the consultants are deemed to be independent contractors and are not subject to the degree of control that agency employment entails. The courts have made this determination after recognizing that agencies have a special need for the opinions and recommendations of temporary consultants. Ultimately, deliberative

2 Klamath, at 10.
3 Hoover, 611 F.2d at 1138.
documents are exempt from release (1) to encourage open and frank discussions on policy matters between agency subordinates and superiors, (2) to protect against premature disclosure of proposed policies and (3) to protect against public confusion that might result from disclosure of rationales that were not in fact the ultimate basis for agency action.\footnote{NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 41 U.S. at 151.}

The EAC has decided to waive the processing fees for your request. If you interpret any portion of this response as an adverse action, you will have an opportunity to appeal it to the Election Assistance Commission. However, as this letter is only partially responsive to your request, please hold any appeal until your request has been fully addressed. At that time, your appeal must be in writing and sent to the address noted on the above letterhead. Any appeal submitted, must be postmarked no later than 60 calendar days from the date of EAC’s final response letter. Please include your reasons for reconsideration and attach a copy of this and subsequent EAC responses.

Sincerely,

Jeanie Layson
Director of Communications
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Attachments:
1. Your Request (dated April 11, 2007)
2. Responsive Documents
April 11, 2007

Ms. Jeannie Layson  
Director of Communications  
Suite 110  
1225 New York Avenue NW  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Fax: 202-566-3127  
Phone: 202-566-3100  
HAVAinfo@eac.gov

Dear Ms. Layson:

This is an official request under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C., 552 as amended.

I am writing on behalf of McClatchy Newspapers to request copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Elections Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for the EAC.

In the event that this request results in research or copying, McClatchy Newspapers requests a public interest fee waiver because the material being sought is likely to be used in a newspaper story. We would argue strongly that there is a significant public interest in our reviewing the material being sought. As the nation's second largest newspaper group with 32 daily newspapers and a new service serving 400 newspapers, McClatchy easily qualifies as acting in the public interest.

If possible, I would appreciate your expediting this request, especially any emails transmitted after the draft report was submitted, because of the obvious topical import of these documents.

Should this letter prompt questions, please feel free to phone me at 202-383-0005. Thanks for your assistance.

Sincerely,
Greg Gordon
McClatchy Newspapers
Washington correspondent

Greg Gordon
National Correspondent
McClatchy Newspapers Washington Bureau
202-383-0005
ggordon@mcclatchydc.com
Ms. Wang,

Commissioner Gracia Hillman has asked that I send you a copy of her statement regarding the "EAC Report On Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation." It is attached for your perusal.

[File attachment: Statement.doc]

Regards,

Sheila A. Banks
Special Assistant to Commissioner Gracia Hillman
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202.566.3111
Fax: 202.566.1392
www.eac.gov
Mr. Serebrov,

Commissioner Gracia Hillman has asked that I send you a copy of her statement regarding the "EAC Report On Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation." It is attached for your perusal.

Statement.doc

Regards,

Sheila A. Banks
Special Assistant to Commissioner Gracia Hillman
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202.566.3111
Fax: 202.566-1392
www.eac.gov
Sheila:

Please convey my sincere gratitude to Commissioner Hillman. Her remarks will be very helpful both for public perception of our study and for any future work in this area. I am very appreciative that she took the time and effort to draft this statement.

Regards,

Job

--- sbanks@eac.gov wrote:

> Mr. Serebrov,
> 
> Commissioner Gracia Hillman has asked that I send you a copy of her statement regarding the "EAC Report On Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation." It is attached for your perusal.
> 
> Regards,
> 
> Sheila A. Banks
> Special Assistant to Commissioner Gracia Hillman
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 1100
> Washington, D.C. 20005
> Telephone: 202.566.3111
> Fax: 202.566-1392
> www.eac.gov
FYI

Thomas R. Wilkey
Executive Director
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3109 phone
TWilkey@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV on 03/13/2006 03:38 PM -----

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV
03/13/2006 03:36 PM

To "Tova Wang"@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject Re: fraud and intimidation project

How about after 3 tomorrow until 5 9-10 on Wednesday or 3-5 on Wednesday. If you call my assistant Bert she will find you a good time frame. Sorry that's my life these days.

Tom

----- End forwarded message -----
Hey Tom,

How are you? I hope you're doing well.

I'd like to talk to you about some issues we are having with respect to the project when you have a free moment. Is there a good time to call? Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Sounds good. I will come by the EAC since its literally a few feet from my office. I look forward to seeing you. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

From: bbenavides@eac.gov [mailto:bbenavides@eac.gov]  
Sent: Thursday, November 09, 2006 4:21 PM  
To:  
Cc: twilkey@eac.gov; jhodgkins@eac.gov; bbenavides@eac.gov  
Subject: Conference call

Tova, Job -- I have scheduled 6:00 PM EST on Wednesday, November 15 for a conference call with Tom Wilkey and Julie Thompson-Hodgkins.

Conference call in # is 866-222-9044, Passcode.
What is the call in number then? Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 741-6263
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

From: bbenavides@eac.gov [mailto:bbenavides@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2006 2:20 PM
To: ...
Cc: bbenavides@eac.gov
Subject: RE: Conference call
Importance: High

Tova, due to the change in time, both Julie and Tom will be calling into the conference call from their respective residences. Thanks. Take care.

Bert A. Benavides
Special Assistant to the Executive Director
U. S. Elections Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3114

Sounds good. I will come by the EAC since its literally a few feet from my office. I look forward to seeing
Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

From: bbenavides@eac.gov [mailto:bbenavides@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, November 09, 2006 4:21 PM
To: Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
Cc: ttwilkey@eac.gov; jthompson-hodgkins@eac.gov; bbenavides@eac.gov
Subject: Conference call

Tova, Job -- I have scheduled 6:00 PM EST on Wednesday, November 15 for a conference call with Tom Wilkey and Julie Thompson-Hodgkins.

Conference call In # is 866-222-9044, Passcode 012464
What is the proposal?

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 741-6263
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

From: bwhitener@eac.gov [mailto:bwhitener@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 06, 2006 6:06 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: EAC to Assess 2006 Election; Decide on Voting System Certification Program & Election Crimes Report

Only that they will consider and vote tomorrow.
What is the proposal?

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 741-6263
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Only that they will consider and vote tomorrow.
Hi Bryan, Are you able to tell me anything more about the proposed comprehensive election crimes study? Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 741-6263
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Ave. NW – Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

MEDIA ADVISORY - Reminder
December 6, 2006

Contact: Bryan Whitener
(202) 566-3100

EAC to Hold Public Meeting on December 7

Agenda to Include Assessment of 2006 Election, Voting System Testing and Certification Program and Recommendations for a Comprehensive Elections Crimes Study
WHAT: Public Meeting - Commissioners will hear an assessment of the 2006 election and will vote to approve the adoption of a voting system testing and certification program manual and recommendations for conducting a comprehensive elections crimes study. Commissioners will also hear a report by the chair of EAC's Technical Guidelines Development Committee (TGDC).

WHO: EAC commissioners, the director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), election officials, community interest groups, academicians and technology experts.

WHERE: EAC Offices, 1225 New York Ave., Suite 150, Washington, DC

WHEN: Thursday, December 7, 10:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m. (EST)

To view the agenda, click here.

A webcast of the meeting will be available Friday at the link 12/07/06 - Public Meeting.

###

To learn more about the EAC, please visit www.eac.gov.
Hi Tom,

Got your message. Thanks. Job and I actually did not do the presentation, Peg did. Attached is what she sent to us at the time as what she was presenting, but I was not actually in attendance <<...>>.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
This is one of the two e-mails I have.

----- Forwarded by Bert A. Benavides/EAC/GOV on 04/26/2007 09:56 AM -----

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV
03/13/2006 04:37 PM
To Bert A. Benavides/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Fw: fraud and intimidation project

FYI

Thomas R. Wilkey
Executive Director
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3109 phone
TWilkey@eac.gov
----- Forwarded by Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV on 03/13/2006 03:38 PM -----

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV
03/13/2006 03:36 PM
To "Tova Wang" GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject Re: fraud and intimidation project
(Document link: Thomas R. Wilkey)
How about after 3 tomorrow until 5 9-10 on Wednesday or 3-5 on Wednesday. If you call my assistant Bert she will find you a good time frame. Sorry that's my life these days.

Tom

Thomas R. Wilkey
Executive Director
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3109 phone
TWilkey@eac.gov

Hey Tom,

How are you? I hope you're doing well.

I'd like to talk to you about some issues we are having with respect to the project when you have a free moment. Is there a good time to call?

Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events. Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
So, Vegas it is. I will forward the report once finalized. The Commissioners comments are supposed to be in by Wednesday (we shall see).

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins  
General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3100  
"Job Serebrov" <serebrov@sbcglobal.net>

Julie:  
Hope your trip to Jordan went well. The decision is finally in---we are going to Las Vegas. I will give you my contact information as soon as I get it. From the last week of December on you can get me on my cell. Let me know how the new Congress treats the EAC.  

When you release the final report from our project, please send me a copy. I may retain this e-mail.

Job
It is being reissued to your current address.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
"Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>

I'm betting its the NY address. Who can I call?

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 741-6263
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

From: jhodgkins@eac.gov [mailto:jhodgkins@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2007 5:17 PM
To: Tova Wang
Subject: Re: Taxes

It was sent to the address that we had on file for invoices.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
To: Juliet Hodgkins  
Subject: RE: Taxes

I wonder if they know to send it to my DC address. It just occurs to me that they could have sent it to my old NY address. Is there someone I should check that with? Thanks again.

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 741-6263  
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

From: jhodgkins@eac.gov [mailto:jhodgkins@eac.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2007 3:43 PM  
To:  
Subject: RE: Taxes

Hi again Julie,

Tova,

I found out that your 1099 was issued on January 31, 2007. So, if you have not received it already, it should be arriving shortly.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins  
General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC  20005  
(202) 566-3100

"Tova Wang"
I still have not received anything. Is there someone I should contact? Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 741-6263
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

From: jhodgkins@eac.gov [mailto:jhodgkins@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 18, 2007 5:55 PM
To: Tova
Subject: Re: Taxes

Tova,

Since you were hired on a contract, you will be issued a 1099. GSA does our financial work for us, so it will come from them, but should include the EAC information.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

*Tova Wang*

01/17/2007 10:34 AM

Hi Julie, I didn't know who to ask about this -- should I be getting a 1099 form from the EAC? Thanks so much. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 741-6263
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
I am checking on this. I think that the deadline for issuing 1099s is later than the deadline for issuing W-2s. I will let you know what I find out.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
I have passed your question along to Finance. I will let you know the answer as soon as I have it.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
"Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>

Hi Julie, I didn't know who to ask about this -- should I be getting a 1099 form from the EAC? Thanks so much. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 741-6263
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Based on your answer, I assume then that you are not asking us for any documents. Please confirm that this is correct.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
"Tova Wang"

Thanks Julie. Actually, I ended up doing all of the Nexis research myself on The Century Foundation's account. Using one of your interns to do it never worked out, as Job can also tell you. I assume that takes care of that issue. Thanks again. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 741-6263
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
agreement from you that you would not reproduce or distribute those copyrighted materials. I will have one of my law clerks work on getting the information burned to a CD and drafting an agreement concerning the use of these documents.

I will be in touch with you next week to let you know when we will have these documents and agreement available.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

Dear Tom and Julie,

Happy New Year. I hope you both enjoyed the holidays.

As you know, I am well aware that the research Job and I produced belongs to the EAC. Nonetheless, I was wondering whether there might be some way I can use just the Nexis material solely for my own further research purposes. Anything I might publish using that underlying data as enhanced by my further research would be in my name and my name only, not that of the EAC. I put a tremendous amount of work into collecting and organizing that data and I would like the opportunity to continue this research on an ongoing basis. It would be a shame if it was not put to some further use.

Is there something we might arrange in this regard? Thanks so much.

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 741-6263
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Unfortunately, the issue is not whether either of you would/could release the document, but the fact that releasing it at all to non-EAC employees could be viewed as a waiver of our privilege.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

Thanks Julie. What if we both agreed to sign a confidentiality agreement, embargoing any discussion of the report until after it is released? Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: jhodgkins@eac.gov [mailto:jhodgkins@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2006 4:57 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: fraud and intimidation report

Tova & Job,

As you know, because the two of you are no longer under contract with the EAC, EAC is not afforded the same protections as if you were still functioning as EAC employees. As such, releasing the document to you would be the same as releasing it to any other member of the public.

Thus, EAC will not be able to release a copy of the proposed final report to you prior to its consideration and adoption by the Commission. The Commission will take up this report at its meeting on Thursday, Dec. 7. I
will have a copy available for you immediately following their consideration - assuming that they do not change the report during their deliberations and voting on Dec. 7. If changes are made, I will have a copy available to you as soon as possible following that meeting.

In the final report, you will see that EAC took the information and work provided by the two of you and developed a report that summarizes that work, provides a definition for use in future study, and adopts parts or all of many of the recommendations made by you and the working group. In addition, you will note that EAC will make the entirety of your interview summaries, case summaries, and book/report summaries available to the public as appendixes to the report.

I know that you are anxious to read the report and that you may have questions that you would like to discuss following the release of the report. Please feel free to contact me with those questions or issues.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

Julie,

I understand from Tom Wilkey that you are planning on releasing our report at the public meeting next Thursday, December 7. As we discussed, I respectfully request that Job and I be permitted to review what you are releasing before it is released. I would like us both to be provided with an embargoed copy as soon as possible so we have time to properly review it before Thursday. I can be contacted by email, cell phone at 917-656-7905, or office phone 202-741-6263. I hope to hear from you soon. Thanks.

Tova
Julie:

I just added my invoices and I get only around $39,700 including the travel expense reimbursement. The 1099 needs to be corrected.

Job
Julie:

I received my 1099 and the figure looks too high. It is listed at $58,065.35. Can you check on this?

Job
Julie:

It looks like the most likely place Mari & I will go is DC. I have a number of job applications out there with different fed agencies. I will keep you posted. On another subject, what ever happened with Tova's protest?

Happy New Year!

Job
Julie:

I sent this to Tova on Saturday to make it clear about my feelings and what my actions will be if she proceeds with her protest any further. I think it makes it clear that she would be fighting both of us. I know I am going to hear from her on this but the issue needs to be put to bed.

Job

--- Job Serebrov wrote:

> Date: Sat, 9 Dec 2006 07:17:24 -0800 (PST)
> From: Job Serebrov
> Subject: Conclusions
> To: Tova Wang
> 
> Tova:
> 
> I spoke to Julie late yesterday and she told me that you sent a letter, as you said you would. I must ask you to drop this if your request is denied. We were never guaranteed that our report, paid for by the EAC, would be published in the form that we sent it or with the conclusions that we arrived at.
> 
> As I told you, I am satisfied with the published report from the EAC. I can live with the removal of the Donsanto comment and the other alterations. What I am very concerned about is that further action on your part would cause the EAC, in defending its final report, to criticize the report we submitted or to attack our report out right as some how unusable, even if this is not the case. Should this occur, I will defend both the final EAC report and our submission which will leave you alone fighting a two front war. I think it is more important to preserve the integrity of the over all project submission than to press the issue over how it was used. I hope this will not be necessary.
> 
> Job
Julie:

Well I see you left out the controversial Donsanto remark. I really think the report is well done. It should have served to satisfy both sides---but wait---there is the Tova on the war path factor. Tova is totally disgusted with the report. She especially hates the omission of the summaries of the various sections (interviews, case law, reports, literature, and interviews). She is really upset with the Donsanto omission. I can see her going to some of the members of Congress she knows and trying to get a hearing. I know she will be sending you a letter, asking or demanding that you retract this report and publish the original one we submitted.

I told her that I am satisfied with the report and that I will have nothing to do with her future actions---which I expect will be plentiful like Santa's Christmas gifts or like the bubonic plague. In any case, this is a Tova production.

Now for the I told you so---this would have been far better had we been able to stick to the original plan to have me do this project alone. I told you so!!!

Keep a stiff upper lip,

Job
Julie:

I was hoping that my e-mail reply to Tova would end all of this. On another note, Las Vegas fell apart mostly due to timing issues. Unfortunately that leaves me, for now, looking for a job. Any ideas?

Job

--- jhodgkins@eac.gov wrote:

> Unfortunately, the issue is not whether either of you would/could release the document, but the fact that releasing it at all to non-EAC employees could be viewed as a waiver of our privilege.

> Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
> General Counsel
> United States Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> (202) 566-3100

> "Tova Wang"  12/05/2006 09:09 AM
> To
> jhodgkins@eac.gov
> cc
> Subject RE: fraud and intimidation report

> Thanks Julie. What if we both agreed to sign a confidentiality agreement, embargoing any discussion of the report until after it is released? Tova
As you know, because the two of you are no longer under contract with the EAC, EAC is not afforded the same protections as if you were still functioning as EAC employees. As such, releasing the document to you would be the same as releasing it to any other member of the public.

Thus, EAC will not be able to release a copy of the proposed final report to you prior to its consideration and adoption by the Commission. The Commission will take up this report at its meeting on Thursday, Dec. 7. I will have a copy available for you immediately following their consideration - assuming that they do not change the report during their deliberations and voting on Dec. 7. If changes are made, I will have a copy available to you as soon as possible following that meeting.

In the final report, you will see that EAC took the information and work provided by the two of you and developed a report that summarizes that work, provides a definition for use in future study, and adopts parts or all of many of the recommendations made by you and the working group. In addition, you will note that EAC will make the entirety of your interview summaries, case summaries, and book/report summaries available
> to the public as
> appendixes to the report.
> I know that you are anxious to read the report and
> that you may have
> questions that you would like to discuss following
> the release of the
> report. Please feel free to contact me with those
> questions or issues.
>
> Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
> General Counsel
> United States Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> (202) 566-3100
>
> 12/01/2006 02:07
> To
> PM
> jthompson@eac.gov
> cc
> Serebrov*
> Subject
> intimidation report
>
> Julie,
> I understand from Tom Wilkey that you are planning
> on releasing our report
> at the public meeting next Thursday, December 7. As
> we discussed, I
> respectfully request that Job and I be permitted to
> review what you are
> releasing before it is released. I would like us
> both to be provided with
> an embargoed copy as soon as possible so we have
> time to properly review
> it
before Thursday. I can be contacted by email, cell phone at ________, or office phone 202-741-6263. I hope to hear from you soon. Thanks.

Tova
Tova:

I don't want to go that far. I am fine with a Thursday release given the circumstances that we are under.

Job

_Tova Wang <wang@tcf.org>_ wrote:

Thanks Julie. What if we both agreed to sign a confidentiality agreement, embargoing any discussion of the report until after it is released? Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 741-6263
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

-----Original Message-----
From: jhodgkins@eac.gov [mailto:jhodgkins@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2006 4:57 PM
To: []
Cc: []
Subject: Re: fraud and intimidation report

Tova & Job,

As you know, because the two of you are no longer under contract with the EAC, EAC is not afforded the same protections as if you were still functioning as EAC employees. As such, releasing the document to you would be the same as releasing it to any other member of the public.

Thus, EAC will not be able to release a copy of the proposed final report to you prior to its consideration and adoption by the Commission. The Commission will take up this report at its meeting on Thursday, Dec. 7. I will have a copy available for you immediately following their consideration.
- assuming that they do not change the report during their deliberations and voting on Dec. 7. If changes are made, I will have a copy available to you as soon as possible following that meeting.

In the final report, you will see that EAC took the information and work provided by the two of you and developed a report that summarizes that work, provides a definition for use in future study, and adopts parts or all of many of the recommendations made by you and the working group. In addition, you will note that EAC will make the entirety of your interview summaries, case summaries, and book/report summaries available to the public as appendixes to the report.

I know that you are anxious to read the report and that you may have questions that you would like to discuss following the release of the report. Please feel free to contact me with those questions or issues.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

12/01/2006 02:07 To
PM jthompson@eac.gov
cc
"Job Serebrov"

Subject
fraud and intimidation report

Julie,
I understand from Tom Wilkey that you are planning on releasing our report at the public meeting next Thursday, December 7. As we discussed, I respectfully request that Job and I be permitted to review what you are releasing before it is released. I would like us both to be provided with an embargoed copy as soon as possible so we have time to properly review it before Thursday. I can be contacted by email, cell phone at 917-656-7905, or office phone 202-741-6263. I hope to hear from you soon. Thanks.

Tova
More

--- jhodgkins@eac.gov wrote:

> Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
> General Counsel
> United States Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
> Washington, DC 20005

> (202) 566-3100 GAO_Report_JS.doc indiana_ligation_official.doc

Section_5_Recommendation_Memorandum_summary.doc Securing_the_Vote.doc Shattering_the_Myth.doc

South_Dakota_FINAL.doc Steal_this_Vote_Review_final.doc The_Long_Shadow_of_Jim_Crow.doc The_New_Poll_Tax_JS.doc

Washington_FINAL.doc Wisconsin_Audit_Report.doc Wisconsin_FINAL.doc Wisconsin_Vote_Fraud_TF.doc
Julie:

You should have these as existing literature summaries.

Job

--- jhodgkins@eac.gov wrote:

> Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
> General Counsel
> United States Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
> Washington, DC 20005

> (202) 566-3100 A_Funny_ThingReview.doc American_Center_Report_FINAL.doc Americas_Modern_Poll_Tax_JS.doc

Brennan_Analysis_Voter_Fraud_Report_FINAL.doc cb_summary.doc Chandler_Davidson_summary_official.doc Crazy_Quit.doc

Deliver_the_Vote_Review.doc dnc_ohio.doc DOJ_Public_Integrity_Reports_JS.doc Donsanto_IFES_FINAL.doc

Election_Protection_stories.doc Existing_Literature_Reviewed.doc fooled_again_review.doc GA_ligation_summary2.doc
I believe I have everything I need already, but will let you know if I discover that's not the case. Thank you!

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 741-6263
Visit our Web site, www.tef.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Based on your answer, I assume then that you are not asking us for any documents. Please confirm that this is correct.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Thanks Julie. Actually, I ended up doing all of the Nexis research myself on The Century Foundation’s account. Using one of your interns to do it never worked out, as Job can also tell you. I assume that takes care of that issue. Thanks again. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 741-6263  
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

From: jhodgkins@eac.gov  
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2007 11:50 AM  
To:  
Cc: cey@eac.gov; 'Tova Wang'  
Subject: Re:  

Tova,  

I see no reason why we cannot allow you to have the research for your use. The one caveat to that is that this research was obtained on our Westlaw/Nexis accounts. Therefore, we would have to have an agreement from you that you would not reproduce or distribute those copyrighted materials. I will have one of my law clerks work on getting the information burned to a CD and drafting an agreement concerning the use of these documents.  

I will be in touch with you next week to let you know when we will have these documents and agreement available.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins  
General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3100

"Tova Wang"
Dear Tom and Julie,

Happy New Year. I hope you both enjoyed the holidays.

As you know, I am well aware that the research Job and I produced belongs to the EAC. Nonetheless, I was wondering whether there might be some way I can use just the Nexis material solely for my own further research purposes. Anything I might publish using that underlying data as enhanced by my further research would be in my name and my name only, not that of the EAC. I put a tremendous amount of work into collecting and organizing that data and I would like the opportunity to continue this research on an ongoing basis. It would be a shame if it was not put to some further use.

Is there something we might arrange in this regard? Thanks so much.

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 741-6263
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC  20005
(202) 566-3100
--- Forwarded by Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV on 12/01/2006 12:13 PM ---
"Job Serebrov" (Redacted)
11/03/2006 06:04 PM

To jhodgkins@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Please send me the summary

Julie:
You should have these as existing literature summaries.

Job

--- jhodgkins@eac.gov wrote:

> Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
> General Counsel
> United States Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
> Washington, DC  20005
> (202) 566-3100
--- Forwarded by Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV on 12/01/2006 12:13 PM ---
"Job Serebrov" (Redacted)
11/03/2006 06:08 PM

To jhodgkins@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Please send me the summary

More
--- jhodgkins@eac.gov wrote:

> Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
> General Counsel
> United States Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> (202) 566-3100

----
Forwarded by Juliet E Hodgkins/EAC/GOV on 12/01/2006 12:13 PM ----

"Tova Wang"

11/09/2006 04:54 PM

To: bbenavides@eac.gov
Cc: twilkey@eac.gov, jhodgkins@eac.gov
Subject: RE: Conference call

Sounds good. I will come by the EAC since its literally a few feet from my office. I look forward to seeing you. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

---

From: bbenavides@eac.gov
Sent: Thursday, November 09, 2006 4:21 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: twilkey@eac.gov; jhodgkins@eac.gov; bbenavides@eac.gov
Subject: Conference call

Tova, Job -- I have scheduled 6:00 PM EST on Wednesday, November 15 for a conference call with Tom Wilkey and Julie Thompson-Hodgkins.

Conference call in # is 866-222-9044, Passcode [redacted]

Bert A. Benavides
Special Assistant to the Executive Director
U. S. Elections Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Thanks!

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Job Serebrov" [jerebrov@eac.gov] Sent: 11/03/2006 06:04 PM To: Juliet Hodgkins Subject: Re: Please send me the summary

Julie:

You should have these as existing literature summaries.

Job

--- jhodgkins@eac.gov wrote:

> Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
> General Counsel
> United States Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
Karen:

Either day is fine for me.

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> All-
> > Although Tom Wilkey and I are still working to
> > process each of your
> > contracts on this project, we would like to
> > tentatively schedule an
> > in-person meeting on September 12, here in
> > Washington.
> > In the meantime, I'd like to propose that we all
> > have a short
> > teleconference call next Wednesday or Thursday at
> > 1:00 PM to begin to talk
> > through the scope of this project and the respective
> > roles and
> > responsibilities each of you might take on.
> > Could you let me know your availability for a 45
> > minute call on August 31
> > or September 1 at 1:00?
> > Thanks
Just a reminder that we have a telephone conference for the vote fraud group at 4:00 today. You were going to see if you could talk to Commissioner Davidson before that time so I could know what the possibilities are for serving as her executive assistant. If this is even possible and if the Commission is willing to raise the salaries of the executive assistants, her time table could affect the vote fraud project time table.

Regards,

Job

---- Forwarded by Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV on 12/01/2006 12:18 PM ----
*Job Serebrov

09/08/2005 11:42 AM

To twilkey@eac.gov, klynndyson@eac.gov, sda@mit.edu,
jthompson@eac.gov

cc

Subj: Draft Schedule Proposal for Vote Fraud Group

I have attached a draft proposed schedule of events for our discussion today. Please keep in mind that this is only a proposal but I thought that we needed somewhere to start from.

Regards,

Job

---- Forwarded by Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV on 12/01/2006 12:18 PM ----
*Job Serebrov

09/06/2005 11:46 AM

To twilkey@eac.gov, klynndyson@eac.gov, sda@mit.edu,
jthompson@eac.gov

cc

Subj: Once again

I neglected to send the last attachment as a .doc. Please ignore it.

Job
Julie:

Any luck finding the whereabouts of our contracts? Also, I assume that we will not hear from Peg until Monday.

Job

Julie:

I see that I will have to drive folks up there crazy Monday to make the Tuesday deadline for the signing of our contracts so we get paid on time.

At this point, on Tuesday I just plan to e-mail a standard invoice for this month.

Job
Julie:

As we just discussed, at this time and in light of the recent inquiry, I think it prudent to postpone our meeting in DC until the first or second week of November in order to:

1. Finalize the Working Group list (I am still waiting to hear from Kay James and Governor Barbour);
2. Finalize the Interview list;
3. Finish the search on existing voter fraud research;
4. Assure participation from the Department of Justice; and,
5. Get everyone on the same page and assure all outside parties that this will not be a radical venture

What do you think and can we get agreement on this with Peggy?

Regards,

Job
Julie:

I need clarification on something in the project before the conference call at 2:00 today between Peggy, Tova, and me. How much of what we are investigating should involve DOJ’s jurisdictional matters under such things as the Voting Rights Act?

Also, did you have a chance to talk to Karen about a second project? I need to know because if there will not be one I will have to get a job with a local law firm until the 2006 elections.

Job
Both criminal and civil

--- jthompson@eac.gov wrote:

> As to paragraph 1, are you referring to criminal
division actions or civil
division actions?
>
> As to paragraph 2, I have talked to Karen. At this
time, the anticipation
is that the future project on this will be
competitively let, and you and
others will, of course, be able to respond to the
solicitation. We are
not sure what our needs will be for
consultants/experts on this issue or
other issues at this time.
>
> Juliet E. Thompson
> General Counsel
> United States Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> (202) 566-3100
>
> "Job Serebrov" 0125CS

> 11/18/2005 09:27 AM
>
> To
> jthompson@eac.gov
> cc
>
> Subject
> Question
>
> Julie:

> I need clarification on something in the project
before the conference call at 2:00 today between
Peggy, Tova, and me. How much of what we are
investigating should involve DOJ's jurisdictional
matters under such things as the Voting Rights Act?

> Also, did you have a chance to talk to Karen about a
second project? I need to know because if there will
not be one I will have to get a job with a local law
firm until the 2006 elections.
Julie:

Do you have an answer for me on the DOJ issue? We have a conference call in half an hour.

Job

Julie:

Tova has not been paid yet for the first invoice. I left a message with Peggy but this has me concerned on several levels. First, I was paid and Tova is way over due. Second, Tova and I now have two more invoices out with you and that are due to be paid before the end of December. Can you check on all of this?

Thanks,

Job
Hi Karen and Tom,

As we discussed yesterday, attached is a preliminary work plan/division of labor for your review. Please let us know if this is sufficient for the present and if you have any comments or questions.

In terms of hours dedicated to the project, Job and Tova are able to commit to 15-20 hours per week assuming that includes reimbursed periodic travel. Steve can do approximately 2 hours per week. We have tentatively scheduled to meet at your offices in DC, if that is convenient for you, on September 20. We will be able to confirm that within the next day or so.

All of us are very eager to get started on this important work as soon as possible. However, because we also have other work related responsibilities, we are a bit reluctant to do so before having an opportunity to review our contracts. We look forward to receiving them so we can get going right away.

Thanks so much. Speak to you soon.

Tova, Job and Steve

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2005 3:19 PM
To: klynndyson@eac.gov; nmortellito@eac.gov
Cc: jthompson@eac.gov; nmortellito@eac.gov; sda@mit.edu; "Job Serebrov"

"Tova Wang"

09/07/2005 05:14 PM

To: klynndyson@eac.gov, twilkey@eac.gov
Cc: jthompson@eac.gov, nmortellito@eac.gov, sda@mit.edu, "Job Serebrov"

Subje work plan
ct
Subject: Re: Kick off activities for the EAC Voting fraud/voter intimidation project

All-

In anticipation of our 45-minute conference call scheduled for Tuesday, September 6 at 4:00 PM, I would ask the three consultants (Steve, Job and Tova) to come prepared to talk about the following:

The major topics and issues which you see as needing immediate attention, definition, delineation, etc.
Rough timelines and timeframes for addressing these major issues and topics
Your major roles and responsibilities and the timelines you envision for meeting your major deliverables

We all realize that this conversation is just a start; I look forward to this beginning and to framing the tasks that lie ahead of us between now and September 30.

Have a wonderful holiday!!

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Just one question on the receipt of contract -- it says that the first invoice was for September, but it actually was for October when we really got started, right? Should this be adjusted to say October 1 to October 31?

Thanks.

Tova
-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2005 3:28 PM
To: psims@eac.gov, jthompson@eac.gov
cc
Subject: Letters Were Signed
As to paragraph 1, are you referring to criminal division actions or civil division actions?

As to paragraph 2, I have talked to Karen. At this time, the anticipation is that the future project on this will be competitively let, and you and others will, of course, be able to respond to the solicitation. We are not sure what our needs will be for consultants/experts on this issue or other issues at this time.

Juliet E. Thompson
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
As to paragraph 1, are you referring to criminal division actions or civil division actions?

As to paragraph 2, I have talked to Karen. At this time, the anticipation is that the future project on this will be competitively let, and you and others will, of course, be able to respond to the solicitation. We are not sure what our needs will be for consultants/experts on this issue or other issues at this time.

Juliet E. Thompson
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Julie:

I need clarification on something in the project before the conference call at 2:00 today between Peggy, Tova, and me. How much of what we are investigating should involve DOJ's jurisdictional matters under such things as the Voting Rights Act?

Also, did you have a chance to talk to Karen about a second project? I need to know because if there will not be one I will have to get a job with a local law firm until the 2006 elections.

Job
Sounds good. I will come by the EAC since its literally a few feet from my office. I look forward to seeing you. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
I'll need to get back to you on this and the definition tomorrow (too many things going on today). In the meantime, I have attached the written status report that was presented to the EAC Standards Board and Board of Advisors, because I can't remember if I ever provided the final version to the two of you. The status report is primarily made up of your preliminary reports, with some intro information provided and a brief summary of recommendations discussed at the Working Group meeting. This may or may not help the two of you in preparing the final. You can use any of it, or none of it. I am sure that your product will be much better than this quickly pulled together thing. --- Peggy
I wasn't planning on circulating the transcript to the Commissioners. Most of them probably don't have the time to go through the whole thing. I will let them know it is available, if they are interested in reviewing it. --- Peggy

Wow, there are a lot of errors in this. But at least it gets at the substance. Will this be circulated to the commissioners?

Good news!!! The transcript is finally here.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: dromig@eac.gov [mailto:dromig@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2006 2:45 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
Cc: 
Subject: Fw: May 18, 2006 Meeting
Dear EAC,

Attached please note the ASCII file for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Meeting taken on Wednesday, May 18, 2006. Your transcript has been shipped to you.

ASCII file name: 051806.txt

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Timothy Brischler, Office Manager, 703.273.9221

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

"Job Sarebroy"

To psims@eac.gov

06/27/2006 10:07 PM

I am ok with it.

--- Tova Wang wrote:

> Is this OK now?
> Tova Andrea Wang
> Democracy Fellow
> The Century Foundation
> 41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
> phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
> www.tcf.org, for the latest news,
> analysis, opinions, and events.
> <mailto:join-tcfmain@mailhost.groundspring.org>
> Click here to receive our
> weekly e-mail updates.
Peg, We don't need to re-send you all of the material that we gave you to provide to the working group for the final report, eg the individual interviews, research summaries, nexis and case charts, right? Thanks.
Happy 4th. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Do you just need to have the excess returns removed, or do you think it needs other clean up as well? --- Peggy
Is this OK now?

Tova Andrea Wang  
Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534  

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.  

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Once is enough. You don't need to resend. --- Peggy

Peg, We don't need to re-send you all of the material that we gave you to provide to the working group for the final report, eg the individual interviews, research summaries, nexis and case charts, right? Thanks. Happy 4th. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

I've asked Devon to do it. She can get it to you faster than I. --- Peggy
The excess returns would be a great start, and then I can do the rest. Thanks a lot.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 03, 2006 10:14 AM
To:
Cc:
Subject: Re: FW: methodology

Do you just need to have the excess returns removed, or do you think it needs other clean up as well? --- Peggy

It would be great if someone there could work on cleaning it up. Let us know. Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov 
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Friday, June 30, 2006 5:25 PM
Subject: Re: FW: methodology

The attached is the text extracted from pages 8-19 and the Attachment C referenced within the text. The formatting is still a little weird. Can you work with this, or do I need to play with it some more? --- Peggy
En route to DC, I did a thorough review of the whole package. There are just a few typographical and grammatical errors I would like to fix. Is that OK? Peg, have you had a chance to look at it yet? Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

appendices attached, except Peg I think you put together the list of the working group members? In any case, I can't find one at the moment, but it would be easy enough to put together. Perhaps even Devon or someone could do that, especially since I don't think I have any hours left, and probably shouldn't even be writing this email. I don't remember the conversation about adding to the list of interviewees, but we can talk about that later.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2006 9:13 AM
To:
Thanks. I probably won't be able to start getting into this until tomorrow AM. I noticed that the appendices weren't attached. I think we discussed earlier that the list of interviewees needed to have more information for the final report, and the list of books and documents should be presented in the same manner as a bibliography for the final report. We can talk more about this tonight during our teleconference at 7 PM EST. --- Peggy
Can you send it over? As I recall, it includes bios, right? I'm assuming on the interviewees you think we should have very short biographical information? Also, Peg, I'm not sure if I'll still be at work at 7 or home. Is it ok if I email you late in the day as to where I am? My home phone (for only two more weeks!) is

Thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2006 11:26 AM
To: 
Cc: Job Serebrov;
Subject: RE: final report
Yes, I have the list of Working Group members. --- Peggy

appendices attached, except Peg I think you put together the list of the working group members? In any case, I can't find one at the moment, but it would be easy enough to put together. Perhaps even Devon or someone could do that, especially since I don't think I have any hours left, and probably shouldn't even be writing this email. I don't remember the conversation about adding to the list of interviewees, but we can talk about that later.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2006 9:13 AM
To:  
Cc: Job Serebrov; 
Subject: Re: final report

Thanks. I probably won't be able to start getting into this until tomorrow AM. I noticed that the appendices weren't attached. I think we discussed earlier that the list of interviewees needed to have more information for the final report, and the list of books and documents should be presented in the same manner as a bibliography for the final report. We can talk more about this tonight during our teleconference at 7 PM EST. --- Peggy
Yes, I have the list of Working Group members. --- Peggy

appendices attached, except Peg I think you put together the list of the working group members? In any case, I can't find one at the moment, but it would be easy enough to put together. Perhaps even Devon or someone could do that, especially since I don't think I have any hours left, and probably shouldn't even be writing this email. I don't remember the conversation about adding to the list of interviewees, but we can talk about that later.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2006 9:13 AM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Job Serebrov;
Subject: Re: final report

Thanks. I probably won't be able to start getting into this until tomorrow AM. I noticed that the appendices weren't attached. I think we discussed earlier that the list of interviewees needed to have more information for the final report, and the list of books and documents should be presented in the same manner as a bibliography for the final report. We can talk more about this tonight during our teleconference at 7 PM EST. --- Peggy
Here are the emails sent from 1/1/06 - 4/30/06 related to the voting fraud report. More to follow. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM ----

• 04/03/2006 05:15 PM

Subject RE: DOJ Training Materials

Please do ask him. Thanks
-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2006 4:14. PM.
To:
Subject Fw: DOJ Training materials

Devon's response is attached. Guess I'll add this to the list of questions going to Donsanto.
---Peggy

• 04/05/2006 05:01 PM

Subject Re: Fw: Nonpartisan Local Election Official Needed for Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Working Group

Hi Peg,

I will call J.R. on Thursday to run it by him and let you know what he says. As for my availability on Wednesday, April 12, the answer is "yes". Morning is best for me, although I could be available in the afternoon. You choose a time and I will be here.

Thanks,
Subject: Nonpartisan Local Election Official Needed for Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Working Group
Tony:

Thanks for being willing to help me identify a qualified, nonpartisan local election official to serve on our Project Working Group for the preliminary research being conducted on voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Background

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the issues listed in the statute are the development of:

1. nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office [section 241(b)(6)]; and
2. methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)].

EAC's Board of Advisors recommended that EAC make research on these topics a high priority.

Preliminary EAC Research

Subsequently, the Commission contracted with two consultants (Tova Wang and Job Serebrov) to:

1. develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;
2. perform preliminary research on these topics (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify related activities of key government agencies and civic and advocacy organizations, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;
3. convene a meeting of a project working group composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation, provide the results of the preliminary research to the working group, and record the working group's deliberations; and
4. produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future EAC action, if any.

The Project Working Group will probably meet only once during this preliminary research effort (probably in late April) to review the consultants research and provide input. Other members of the Working Group are lawyers from advocacy groups and major political parties, two State election officials, and Barry Weinberg, former Deputy Chief of DOJ's Voting Section, Civil Rights Division. Craig Donsanto, Director of DOJ's Election Crimes Branch will serve as a technical advisor to the group.

I really appreciate any help you can offer in identifying a qualified individual to fill the slot on the Working Group that has been reserved for an experienced, nonpartisan local election official.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov
Good Afternoon Peg,

How about J. R. Perez, Elections Administrator, Guadalupe County or Patricia Benavides, Voting Registration Supervisor, Tarrant County, Texas?

Tony

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Helen Jamison 
To: Tony J. Sirvello III 
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2006 11:46 AM 
Subject: RE: Nonpartisan Local Election Official Needed for Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Working Group

Dear Tony,
Unfortunately both Javier and myself have to decline in being members of the working group from Texas. It is a bad time of the year where we have so many elections and would not be able to contribute enough time to doing research of any kind. Please keep us in mind for future meetings.

Helen Jamison

-----Original Message-----
From: Tony J. Sirvello III [mailto:tjsthree@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2006 1:19 PM
To: Helen Jamison; Javier Chacon
Subject: Fw: Nonpartisan Local Election Official Needed for Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Working Group

Helen, Javier,

Attached is the information from the EAC requesting your services as a member of the working group from Texas. Please let me know in a couple of days if one of you will be able to participate. If you need more information, call me and I will conference in with Peggy Sims, who can give you more details.
I really appreciate any help you can offer in identifying a qualified individual to fill the slot on the Working Group that has been reserved for an experienced, nonpartisan local election official.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

Tony: How about scheduling the teleconference with our consultants for 10 AM CST/11 AM EST on Wednesday, April 12? — Peggy

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Tova: Apparently he is at NASS. Peg, can we both try to catch him to set something up? Thanks. Tova
No problem.

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

12_26.zip
"Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>

I need the first one

-----Original Message-----
From: tnedzar@eac.gov [mailto:tnedzar@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2006 2:15 PM
To: *redacted*
Cc: psims@eac.gov
Subject: RE: 3rd of 3 emails

There should be three total for today. All email subject lines should say something like, "First of 3, second of 3," etc.

Please let me know if I need to resend anything.

Thanks,

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
I got the first two now. What's the total number we should have for the day?

-----Original Message-----
From: tnedzar@eac.gov [mailto:tnedzar@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2006 2:07 PM
To: wang@tcf.org
Cc: psims@eac.gov; serebrov@sbcglobal.net
Subject: RE: 3rd of 3 emails

Hi Tova,

The first two emails were on another server, which could explain the delay. All three should be released today; if you don't receive them by 5, please send me an email and I will follow up with GSA. Job, if you have any problems with receiving emails, please also let me know.

Keeping my fingers crossed!

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov
I am very confused. I didn't get the first two.

-----Original Message-----
From: tnedzar@eac.gov [mailto:tnedzar@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2006 9:49 AM
To:   
Cc: psims@eac.gov
Subject: 3rd of 3 emails

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM -----
"Tova Wang"
01/11/2006 11:51 AM
To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebro
cc
Subject nexis search

My suspicion is that if she did a nexis search at all, she used the terms of our definition, ie the titles of the
folders, not the long list of search terms that we gave her. It would be best to be able to ask her directly if
that's possible. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM -----
"Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov"
By all means, yes Peg.

---

From: psims@eac.gov
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2006 3:03 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Upcoming Interview

Craig:

Would it be possible to hold Friday's interview in a room that has a phone? One of the 2 consultants has had a family emergency and can only participate by phone. I hope that we can call him from the meeting room and put the phone on Speaker, so that he can participate as if he were there in person. Can that be arranged?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM -----

"Job Serebmv" To psims@eac.gov
04/03/2006 04:57 PM cc
Subject Re: Working Group Contact Info

Norcross's assistant is Maria Rivers:

Rokita's assistant is:

Amy Miller
Executive Assistant
Indiana Secretary of State Todd Rokita  
317-232-6536  
assistant@sos.in.gov  

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:  
> Please review the attached and let me know of any  
> corrections that should  
> be made. Thanks! --- Peggy  
>

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM -----

Yes, although we probably won't need 2 hours. I look forward to seeing you tomorrow.

----- Original Message ------
From: psims@eac.gov
To: wang@tcf.org
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2006 8:42 AM
Subject: RE: Friday Meetings

I think we will need the break, don't you? --- Peggy

"Tova Wang"  
01/11/2006 05:49 PM  

Do I still get the lunch? :)  

----- Original Message ------
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2006 5:41 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Friday Meetings

Tova and Job:

As agreed, Tova and I can connect with Job by telephone during our Friday morning meeting. Tova would like to start the meeting at 10 AM EST. Job, we will call you from the meeting room.

Craig Donsanto says we can use a meeting room over at DOJ that has a phone, so that we can bring Job into the interview. The meeting is scheduled to begin an 2 PM EST, but it may take up to 10 minutes for us to settle in over there. We will call Job as soon as we can begin the interview. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM ---

"Tova Wang"
01/09/2006 01:34 PM
To tnedzar@eac.gov
cc psims@eac.gov
Subject RE: 3rd of 3 emails

I am very confused. I didn't get the first two.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: tnedzar@eac.gov [mailto:tnedzar@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2006 9:49 AM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: psims@eac.gov
Subject: 3rd of 3 emails

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM -----

"Tova Wang"
03/14/2006 11:55 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: I'm BAAACK

Have we figured this out yet? I have someone else now asking to have a meeting at 2 and I'd like to get back to them. Thanks. Tova

----- Original Message -----
Great. I'll see you there. We have each others cell numbers in case we have trouble finding one another. Can you please deal with Job on the Sandler interview? He's being a bit difficult about it. Thanks. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2006 1:09 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: FW: Tanner Interview

Tova:

Yes, I copied the questions into an email I sent to him to give him an idea of questions he might expect. His office is in the main Justice Dept building at 950 Pennsylvania Ave, NW. If the entry procedures remain the same, he will have to send someone down to fetch us and we will have to go through the "beam me up, Scotty" security chambers --- so we should probably arrive 10 minutes early for those shenanigans. --- Peggy
I think we should stick with the original, agreed upon list. We worked hard to assemble it and keep it manageable. Otherwise, there are some people that I would like to add to the list as well. Let me know if that's how you want to proceed.

Tova Andrea Wang  
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM -----

*Tova Wang*  
01/31/2006 04:20 PM  
To psims@eac.gov  
cc psims@eac.gov  
Subject RE: Wendy Weiser
Wendy's number is [redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2006 4:17 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Wendy Weiser

I've put this on my schedule. Please provide Wendy's phone number so that I can set the
teleconference up from my office phone. Thanks. --- Peggy

"Tova Wang" [redacted]

01/31/2006 02:55 PM

To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov" [redacted]
cc [redacted]
Subject Wendy Weiser

I have scheduled her for 11 AM EST on February 22

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM -----
"Job Serebrov"

02/29/2006 01:56 PM

To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Interviews

What about the Sandler interview tomorrow? What has
been arranged for telephones?
--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

If you do not mind giving up some of the travel funds allocated to you, I will check with our Executive Director and Finance Officer to see if we can reallocate on this next contract the amounts remaining for travel. Both of the folks I need to see are in other meetings this morning, so I cannot get to them until this afternoon. --- Peggy

---

"Job Serebrov"
02/23/2006 08:55 AM

To
psims@eac.gov
cc

Subject
Re: Interviews

I would rather not spread them out over a lot of time. I still have three to schedule outside of what you are doing. As far as Baker is concerned, you never answered my question. Can Tova use any unused travel funds that I have? A trip to DC and Houston for me should not exceed $3000-$3500. That will leave $1500-$2000.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Job and Tova:
> I'd like to suggest a moratorium on adding interviewees to the list until we complete interviews on the last list prepared. Frankly, in terms of the enforcement mechanics, I think you will get more out of your interviews with Donsanto, Tanner, and Joe Rich than you will get from an interview with Hans. Hans worked at DOJ for a relatively short time, compared to those folks. You also will have input from Barry Weinberg (former Deputy Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, DOJ) who has confirmed that he is available for the Working
Group.

Regarding upcoming interviews that I schedule for you two, are there any times that you are NOT available next week or the week thereafter?

--- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM ---

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
02/23/2006 02:36 PM

To "Job Serebrov"
<serebrov@sbcglobal.net>@GSAEXTERNAL

cc

Subject Re: Interviews

Call me a little before Noon EST on our toll-free line (1-866-747-1471). I will either transfer you to Sandler's number or conference you into his number. Either way, EAC will pay the bill. --- Peggy

"Job Serebrov" [Redacted]

"Job Serebrov" [Redacted]
02/23/2006 01:56 PM

To psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject Re: Interviews

What about the Sandler interview tomorrow? What has been arranged for telephones?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> If you do not mind giving up some of the travel funds allocated to you, I will check with our Executive Director and Finance Officer to see if we can reallocate on this next contract the amounts remaining for travel. Both of the folks I need to see are in other meetings this morning, so I cannot get to them until this afternoon. --- Peggy

> "Job Serebrov" [Redacted]
I would rather not spread them out over a lot of time. I still have three to schedule outside of what you are doing. As far as Baker is concerned, you never answered my question. Can Tova use any unused travel funds that I have? A trip to DC and Houston for me should not exceed $3000-$3500. That will leave $1500-$2000.
Harry VanSickle, Director of Elections for PA, Wednesday, March 1 at 11 AM EST.

Should I just tell him the usual call in number and pass code?

Thanks

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM -----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 10:10 AM
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: Tanner Interview

Tova:

I've been trying to connect with Tanner, but I realized that I had not asked you some important questions:

* If you meet with him on Monday, February 6, how were you planning on bringing Job into the interview? I'll be at the meeting all day Monday, so I won't be in the office to set up a conference call.

* Are you still free to meet with Tanner on Tuesday or Wednesday, if Monday does not work out, in which case we can have you meet in his office and conference Job in by speaker phone.

* Are there any times that are better for you and Job than others on these three days?

* Do you have an advance list of questions that is different from the Donsanto list (shown below), or should I just sent the Donsanto list to Tanner?

--- Peggy
Probably. We should come up with some different questions for Tanner.

Job

--- Tova Wang wrote:

> I am available any time after noon on the 7th and after 3 on the 8th. I think in terms of data that we would like from him, that one point on the Donsanto memo is applicable. Job, do we want to come up with a separate set of questions?
> 
> --- Original Message ----
Peg, does 11 am work for you? If so, I'll try to reschedule my meeting that was at that time. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2006 1:24 PM
To:
Subject: Re: I'm BAAACK

Any time on Thursday possible?
--- Peggy

"Job Serebrov"*

Peggy:

Good to hear from you. No, unfortunately this week is very bad for me. Today is covered, tomorrow from 1-2 your time is out, Wednesday and Friday are out. Pick a time between all, of this. I am in Nevada from March 25 to the 28.

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job:
> > I apologize for my unanticipated and lengthy absence. I am back in the office, though I will have to work short days through Wednesday.
> > Are you two available for a teleconference this afternoon, say 3:00 PM
> EST, so that we can re-evaluate where we are and
> what needs to be done to
> schedule the working group?
> 
> ---- Peggy
> 
> ---- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM ----

"Tova Wang"

04/12/2006 12:30 PM

To: "Job Serebrov" psims@eac.gov

cc "Nicole Mortellito" <nmortellito@eac.gov>

Subject: RE: working group meeting

That's fine, just asking

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2006 11:26 AM
To: Tova Wang; psims@eac.gov
Cc: 'Job Serebrov'; 'Nicole Mortellito'
Subject: Re: working group meeting

It was my understanding that the meeting would be on
the 15th or later.

Tova, Peggy is out of the office this week.

--- Tova Wang wrote:

> I cannot do it on May 5 now. Any update on a date?
> I will be in DC for
> other meetings May 4 - May 7 if that makes any
> difference (EAC would not
> have to pay my transportation if it was on, for
> example, Monday May 8 or
> possibly even the 9th) Thanks.
> 
> Tova Andrea Wang
> Democracy Fellow
> The Century Foundation
> 41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
> phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
> 
> www.tcf.org, for the latest news,
> analysis, opinions, and events.
> 
> <mailto:join-tcfmain@mailhost.groundspring.org>
> Click here to receive our
No problem

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov
To: Tanner, John K (CRT)
Subject: RE: Upcoming Interview

Hi, John:

I apologize that I will not be there this afternoon to introduce you to our consultants for EAC's Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation project. Tova Wang will be at your office at 2 PM, today. She can call our other consultant, Job Serebrov, and put him on speaker phone. Please let me know if you need anything from me, or want to express any concerns about the project. Thanks.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov
Your two contractors asked for a Directory to the Public Integrity Section staff.

We just got a new one, which is attached.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM ---

Also, should I expect to hear back from Devon about my queries? They're pretty important. And any word on whether we can grab Tamar? Thanks. Tova

--- Original Message ----
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: <wang@tcf.org>
Cc: "Job Serebrov" <serebrov@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2006 3:14 PM
Subject: Re: conf call?

> If you would like a conference call, how about some time tomorrow morning. Tomorrow afternoon is booked. Today, I am trying to get through all the emails left in my short absence. --- Peggy
I will be out for the next few hours, but I'm available any time after 3:30 on my cell and all day tomorrow at my office. Let me know when you'd like to talk. Thanks. Tova

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM -----
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
01/03/2006 05:24 PM	 To
cc
Subject Re: conf call & Devon's Research

Tova:

If you and Job can work things out between you, that's good enough for me. We can talk about the meeting with Donsanto when we meet on January 13, unless you really need to discuss it before then.

As Devon's last day was 12/9, I don't think she has access to the EAC email address any longer. I don't think she received the email you sent her after that date. I did further spot checks of the articles she included on the CD. I see several pdf files that came from the Lexis search. She would not have picked up anything that duplicated the newsclops I had saved. I did see one false drop (an article about a union election) and a few articles that I would have filed in a different voting fraud subject folder, but I think she finished all of the work we asked her to do.

--- Peggy
----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM -----
"Job Serebroy."
02/22/2006 02:15 PM	 To psims@eac.gov, wang@tcf.org
cc
Subject Pat Rogers Interview

We have an interview with Pat Rogers on Friday March 3rd at 10:00 Mountain Time---that is 12:00 Eastern and 11:00 Correct Time.

Job

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM -----
Tamar Nedzar /EAC/GOV
01/09/2006 09:45 AM	 To

012552
As I have alerted Nicole, the call is not working. Someone ought to get in touch with Kevin -- I do not have his contact information.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2006 8:45 PM
To: Tova Andrea Wang; Job Serebrov
Subject: Kennedy Interview

It appears that the teleconference with Kevin Kennedy is set for tomorrow, April 11, at 10:30 AM CST/11:30 AM EST. Use the usual phone number.

If you have trouble connecting, contact Nicole.

Peg

--------------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
the call is up and running!! you may dial in

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Research Assistant
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.2209 phone
202.566.3128 fax

As I have alerted Nicole, the call is not working. Someone ought to get in touch with Kevin -- I do not have his contact information.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2006 8:45 PM
To: Tova Andrea Wang; Job Serebrov
Subject: Kennedy Interview

It appears that the teleconference with Kevin Kennedy is set for tomorrow, April 11, at 10:30 AM CST/11:30 AM EST. Use the usual phone number (866-222-9044) and passcode.

If you have trouble connecting, contact Nicole.

Peg

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Shucks! I did not see your message until now. I spoke to him several times this morning at our public meeting, which was held at the Hyatt. How are you planning to bring Job into the interviews conducted during the NASS/NASED conference? Have you already scheduled interviews during the next four days of which I should be aware (so that I won't double book you)? --- Peg

 Apparently he is at NASS. Peg, can we both try to catch him to set something up? Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Tova and Job:

As agreed, Tova and I can connect with Job by telephone during our Friday morning meeting. Tova would like to start the meeting at 10 AM EST. Job, we will call you from the meeting room.

Craig Donsanto says we can use a meeting room over at DOJ that has a phone, so that we can bring Job into the interview. The meeting is scheduled to begin at 2 PM EST, but it may take up to 10 minutes for us to settle in over there. We will call Job as soon as we can begin the interview. --- Peggy
Hi again,

I'm just scanning over Devon's collection and do not believe she could have possibly searched all of the terms we gave her. I am aware of tons of articles that were written on many of these topics in 2004 that do not appear in the folder. I think someone is going to have to do it over again from scratch, and I'm thinking about doing at least some of it myself. We should discuss this in detail on Thursday. Thanks.

Tova
Thanks Peg. I do plan to be in DC next Friday. Also, once again, please include Alex at Tova.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2006 10:19 AM
To: wang@tcf.org; serebrov@sbcglobal.net
Cc: ecortes@eac.gov
Subject: Interview Schedule

Here is the latest schedule. --- Peggy
Tovia Wang
To psims@eac.gov

To: psims@eac.gov
cc:

Subject: 4th of 5 emails

African American Vote Fraud Terms.zip

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM -----
May that you would NOT be available?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

— Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM -----

04/03/2006 03:45 PM

Subject RE: Mentioning DOJ Training Guidance

I didn't have anything specific in mind yet, especially as I have not finished going through the voluminous documentation, but I will let you know

-----Original Message-----
Peggy:

May looks pretty good right now. I will not be available May 1, or in the morning (before 12:30) on May 4 or May 11, or in the afternoon on May 10.

Barry

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov 
To: 
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2006 3:15 PM 
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Hi, Barry:

I'm trying to arrange a meeting of the Working Group for EAC's Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation project. Would you please look at your schedule and let me know if there are any days during the first 2 weeks of
It was my understanding that the meeting would be on the 15th or later.

Tova, Peggy is out of the office this week.

--- Tova Wang <wang@tcf.org> wrote:

> I cannot do it on May 5 now. Any update on a date?
> I will be in DC for other meetings May 4 - May 7 if that makes any
difference (EAC would not have to pay my transportation if it was on, for
example, Monday May 8 or possibly even the 9th) Thanks.
> Tova Andrea Wang
> Democracy Fellow
> The Century Foundation
> 41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
> phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
> www.tcf.org, for the latest news,
> analysis, opinions, and events.
> <mailto:join-tcfmain@mailhost.groundspring.org>
> Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
any issues you think we should talk about. What time would you like us to arrive?

Creating a plan for conducting the interviews
Working Group: current status, schedule, integrating the ideas of the working group into the final product
Status of nexis research, analysis, and organization; process for charting the research; plan for going forward
Status of lexis research, analysis, and organization; process for charting the research; plan for going forward
Finalizing fraud definition
Meeting with Craig Donsanto; role of DOJ generally; integrating the materials from DOJ into the final product
Outstanding administrative issues

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM ----

That time is fine. A half hour earlier would be better. I also have a 12 CDT meeting.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 07, 2006 12:27 PM
To: Kevin Kennedy
Subject: Interview

Kevin:
I'm just following up on my request for your availability to be interviewed by our consultants for our voting fraud/voter intimidation project. Are you available Tuesday, April 11 at 11 AM CST?
Peggy Sims

-----------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM ---
Can we please do Heather Dawn Thompson on Friday at 3PM? Tova

Tova ... let me know when this is concretized and I'll set up a conf. call. Thanks!

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Research Assistant
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.2209 phone
202.566.3128 fax

Can we please do Heather Dawn Thompson on Friday at 3PM? Tova

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
04/03/2006 05:11 PM
To "Job Serebrov"
Thanks, Job! --- Peggy

"Job Serebrov"

"Job Serebrov"
<serebrov@sbcglobal.net>
04/03/2006 04:57 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Working Group Contact Info

Norcross's assistant is Maria Rivers:

Rokita's assistant is:

Amy Miller
Executive Assistant
Indiana Secretary of State Todd Rokita
317-232-6536
assistant@sos.in.gov

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Please review the attached and let me know of any
> corrections that should
> be made. Thanks! --- Peggy
> 

Since we have Sandler and Tanner on the 24th, I'd like to come down for the day. Would that be permissable Peg? Thanks

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov
To: wang@tcf.org ; serebrov@sbcglobal.net
Hi Nicole,

We would like to change the time of the call today from 4 pm EST to 1 pm EST. The call is with Neil Bradley, myself and Job Serebrov. Please let us know if the call in number and pass code will remain the same. Thanks so much.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang  
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events. 

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM ---

Tova:

The time has been changed your conference will be available as of 12:50 this afternoon for a 1pm conference.  
The dial in number is still 866-222-9044 and the passcode is still [blanked out].

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito  
Research Assistant  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100  
Washington, DC  
202.566.2209 phone
Hi Nicole,

We would like to change the time of the call today from 4 pm EST to 1 pm EST. The call is with Neil Bradley, myself and Job Serebrov. Please let us know if the call-in number and pass code will remain the same. Thanks so much.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:00 PM ---

Hi Peg,

In reviewing some of the Missouri materials, I was reminded by this article that DOJ sued five jurisdictions after the 2000 election, including St. Louis. We’d like to see the case materials but they’re not on the DOJ website. Do you think Mr. Donsanto would provide that material for us? Should I contact him directly?
or should you ask him for us? Have you been able to copy and send the other materials from him yet? It would be good for us to have it prior to talking to Mr. Tanner. Thanks and see you tomorrow. Tova

> Copyright 2002 St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Inc.
> St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri)
> May 24, 2002 Friday Five Star Lift Edition
> SECTION: EDITORIAL; Pg. C18
> LENGTH: 508 words
> HEADLINE: VOTER RIGHTS AND VOTER FRAUD
> BODY:
> ELECTION REFORMS
> IT SEEMS that Ritzy the dog got a better deal from the city's Election Board than thousands of eligible St. Louis voters who were turned away from the polls last fall. After last November's election, a fuming Sen. Christopher S. Bond, R-Mo., showed the U.S. Senate an oversized copy of a 1994 voter registration card issued to the English springer spaniel. This political stunt called attention to the real problem of vote fraud. But it overshadowed a more disturbing election-day development that is just coming to light.

The Justice Department said this week it was suing the city Election Board for allegedly preventing thousands of eligible voters from casting ballots. The city is one of five jurisdictions being sued. The others are in Florida and Tennessee. Assistant Attorney General Ralph Boyd alleges that the city's board removed the names of inactive but eligible voters from the list given election judges, didn't notify the inactive voters that their names had been removed and required these voters to get authorization from Election Board headquarters before casting ballots. These developments led to turmoil on election day, with hundreds of voters jamming the Election Board headquarters after being turned away at the polls.

Some fraud did occur. St. Louis Circuit Attorney Jennifer Joyce has charged three people after reviewing 3,800 voter registration cards. But Rep. William Lacy Clay, D-St. Louis, had warned that the alleged fraud paled in comparison to voters whose civil rights were violated. They had been put on an inactive list of more than 50,000 voters, Mr. Boyd said.

The Missouri Legislature has corrected part of the problem. A bill sponsored by Sen. Anita Yeckel, R-Sunset Hills, allows provisional voting for people who insist they are eligible to cast ballots after being challenged by an election board. But that law, awaiting the governor's signature, covers only
statewide and federal elections. Sen. Yeckel says Missouri must look for additional answers that make it "harder to cheat and easier to vote." One is a state database of voters that local election officials could tap into to determine voter eligibility on election day.

The Legislature also approved two other promising voter reforms. One would require the secretary of state's office to review all butterfly ballots because those crowded with too many candidates or issues can confuse voters. The other is to allow early voting up to 10 days before an election.

As might be expected, the U.S. Justice Department won't try to use its lawsuits to overturn the results of last fall's presidential election. And, just as predictably, the city Election Board claims it has corrected all the problems. Even so, this fiasco has made St. Louis look little better than Selma during the '60s.

The best outcome of the lawsuits would be fair elections for all, guaranteed by a technologically sophisticated, functional elections bureaucracy that will eliminate the problems both Mr. Bond and Mr. Clay have highlighted.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO; Photo - Ritzy's voter application.

LOAD-DATE: May 24, 2002
Project ID: news Document 2 of 2
It was my understanding that the meeting would be on the 15th or later.

Tova, Peggy is out of the office this week.

--- Tova Wang <wang@tcf.org> wrote:

> I cannot do it on May 5 now. Any update on a date?
> I will be in DC for other meetings May 4 - May 7 if that makes any difference (EAC would not have to pay my transportation if it was on, for example, Monday May 8 or possibly even the 9th) Thanks.
> Tova Andrea Wang
> Democracy Fellow
> The Century Foundation
> 41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
> phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
> www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
> __________
> <mailto:join-tcfmain@mailhost.groundspring.org>
> Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Subject RE: Tanner Interview

Probably. We should come up with some different questions for Tanner.

Job

--- Tova Wang wrote:

> I am available any time after noon on the 7th and after 3 on the 8th. I
> think in terms of data that we would like from him, that one point on the
> Donsanto memo is applicable. Job, do we want to come up with a separate set
> of questions?

> -----Original Message-----
> From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
> Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 10:10 AM
> To: wang@tcf.org
> Cc: serebrov@sbcglobal.net
> Subject: Tanner Interview

>
Verizon has reserved lines for you for the 11 AM and 2 PM interviews today. All participants should dial 1-866-222-9044 and enter Pass Code (Yes, they are the same numbers we had set up for tomorrow's interview of the academics.) --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM -----

"Tova Wang"

To: psims@eac.gov
cc: "Nicole Mortellito" <nmortellittoo@eac.gov>, "Job Serebrov"

Subject: working group
To
PM

psim@sce.com - "Job Serebrov"

cc

Subject

nexis articles
Hi again,

I'm just scanning over Devon's collection and do not believe she could have possibly searched all of the terms we gave her. I am aware of tons of articles that were written on many of these topics in 2004 that do not appear in the folder. I think someone is going to have to do it over again from scratch, and I'm thinking about doing at least some of it myself. We should discuss this in detail on Thursday. Thanks.

Tova

---- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM ----

Hi Tamar, Did you send anything after this? If so, I didn't get it.... Thanks. Tova

----- Original Message ------
From: tnedzar@eac.gov
To: wang@tcf.org ; serebrov@shcglobal.net
Cc: psims@eac.gov
Sent: Friday, January 06, 2006 4:53 PM
Subject: 5th of 5 emails

More to come either tonight or tomorrow.

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
T Nedzar@eac.gov

---- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM ----

"Tova Wang"
Five. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2006 10:44 AM
To: 
Subject: Re: conf call of academics

Tova:
Please refresh my memory — how many people will be on the conference call (including you and Job, but probably not me)? — Peggy

"Tova Wang"
01/30/2006 09:22 AM
To “Job Serebrov” , psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject conf call of academics

Three of the four can do noon on the 17th, and I think that’s the best we’ll do. We’ll talk to Lori Minnite separately. Peg, can you please help set up the call? Thank you.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM -----
I've put a request in for the teleconference set up. I'll get back to you as soon as it is set up. --- Peggy

Five. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2006 10:44 AM
To:
Subject: RE: conf call of academics

Tova:
Please refresh my memory --- how many people will be on the conference call (including you and Job, but probably not me)? --- Peggy

Three of the four can do noon on the 17th, and I think that's the best we'll do. We'll talk to Lori Minnite separately. Peg, can you please help set up the call? Thank you.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
Hi Tova,

The first two emails were on another server, which could explain the delay. All three should be released today; if you don't receive them by 5, please send me an email and I will follow up with GSA. Job, if you have any problems with receiving emails, please also let me know.

Keeping my fingers crossed!

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

I am very confused. I didn't get the first two.
-----Original Message-----
From: tnedzar@eac.gov
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2006 9:49 AM
To: wang@tcf.org; serebrov@sbcglobal.net
Cc: psims@eac.gov
Subject: 3rd of 3 emails

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM -----

"Tova Wang"
02/13/2006 11:16 AM
To "Job Serebrov"
cc psims@eac.gov, ecortes@eac.gov
Subject Interview with Wade Henderson tomorrow

... at 11 AM. His number is...

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM -----

"Job Serebrov"
02/14/2006 05:25 PM
To psims@eac.gov
Subject Re: Doug Webber Call

Yes. It is Feb 16th. I gave all the information to Edgardo. I don't have the time written down. Tova probably still has it. Please ask her about the time for Robin. Neil Bradley's interview is at 4 EST on
Feb 21. He is with the Georgia plaintiffs.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Do you mean Robin DeJarnette? When is this interview? --- Peggy

---

> "Job Serebrov" 02/14/2006 04:53 PM

> To
> psims@eac.gov
> cc

> Subject
> Re: Doug Webber Call

> By the way, can you add Robin and Neil to the chart?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> > Thanks! --- Peggy

---

> "Job Serebrov" 02/14/2006 04:39 PM

> To
> ecortes@eac.gov, cc
> psims@eac.gov
> Subject
> Doug Webber Call

> Douglas Webber will be at a funeral in Southern Indiana early tomorrow so he asked if we could use his cell number for the conference call. That is

> Thanks,

> Job
FYI, here are my notes

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

More to come either tonight or tomorrow.

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNezdzar@eac.gov
Douglas Webber will be at a funeral in Southern Indiana early tomorrow so he asked if we could use his cell number for the conference call. That is

Thanks,

Job

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM ---

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
01/11/2006 12:33 PM  To Tova Andrea Wang
               cc
               Subject Nexis Article Searches

Tova:
I just found the Lexis word search list used by Devon with all of the search terms crossed off. I have to assume that means she searched using each term. --- Peggy
--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM ---

Hi again,

Have you had a chance to send us the new handbook, training materials, and the draft mail fraud bill that he wanted to give us? Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Three of the four can do noon on the 17th, and I think that's the best we'll do. We'll talk to Lori Minnite separately. Peg, can you please help set up the call? Thank you.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 2:12 PM
To: wang@tcf.org
Subject: Re: Lori Minnite

Got it! Would you please send me an electronic copy of your updated list of interviewees. (You gave me a hard copy when we met in DC, but it helps to have an electronic copy for our computer files.) --- Peggy
I rescheduled for noon on February 22, just after Wendy Weiser. Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang  
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534  

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM ----

Peggy:

With the addition of these two March interviews, can you update the schedule? Also, what will the procedure be for the Sandler interview?

Job

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM ----
Hi Peg,

Attached is a draft of an agenda for the working group. Let us know what you think. Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM ---

How's this?

---

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2006 2:19 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Public Integrity Section Roster

Craig:
I can't open the attached document because we use Microsoft Word. Our consultants also use Word. Any chance I could get a hard copy that I can put in pdf form for the consultants? --- Peggy

''Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov'' <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
01/18/2006 11:56 AM
To
"psims@eac.gov" <psims@eac.gov>

cc

Subject

Public Integrity Section Roster

Peggy — —

Your two contractors asked for a Directory to the Public Integrity Section staff.

We just got a new one, which is attached.

I rescheduled for noon on February 22, just after Wendy Weiser. Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
Sorry, you mean its today. OK, thanks. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2006 8:45 PM
To: Tova Andrea Wang; Job Serebrov
Subject: Kennedy Interview

It appears that the teleconference with Kevin Kennedy is set for tomorrow, April 11, at 10:30 AM CST/11:30 AM EST. Use the usual phone number (866-222-9044) and passcode [redacted].

If you have trouble connecting, contact Nicole.
Peg

---------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM -----
-----Original Message-----
From: nmortellito@eac.gov [mailto:nmortellito@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2006 9:50 AM
To: Tova
Cc: psims@eac.gov; 'Job Serebrov'; dscott@eac.gov
Subject: Re: new interview

Tova:

Your conference call is all set for 3:30pm (EST) March 14th for 1 hour.

Call in is 866-222-9044
Pass code: [redacted]

Let me know if you need anything else

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Research Assistant
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.2209 phone
202.566.3128 fax

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
See the following email regarding teleconference arrangements for the 2/17 call among consultants, 3
academics, and others. I am drafting a spreadsheet for the interviews being set up. When I reach a
logical stopping point, I will send the spreadsheet to you for corrections/clarifications/additions. --- Peggy

Peg:
The teleconference will be set up by Diana. I will follow up to be sure next week some time.
In the meantime, the following is the info your callers will need.

Dial in number 1-866-222-9044
EAC's consultants for the Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation project need to set up a teleconference on February 17, 2006 at Noon EST. The call will involve approximately five people, including our consultants and the academics being interviewed for the project. Please let me know if you have any questions. Otherwise, please let me know the phone number and password to be used. Thanks.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist

I'm happy to do anytime next Thursday the 2nd, and the week after that is totally free except for the Nina Perales interview and before 11 am on Thursday the 9th.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov
To: wang@tcf.org ; serebrov@sbcglobal.net
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2006 8:39 AM
Subject: Interviews

Job and Tova:
I have scheduled her for 11 AM EST on February 22

Tova Andrea Wang  
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534  

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.  
Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM -----  
"Tova Wang"  
<wang@tcf.org>  
04/11/2006 10:12 AM  
To: psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov"  
cc  
Subject: RE: Kennedy Interview

That gives us no time between interviews though, right? We've never been able to really limit it to 30 minutes.

-----Original Message-----  
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]  
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2006 8:45 PM  
To: Tova Andrea Wang; Job Serebrov  
Subject: Kennedy Interview

It appears that the teleconference with Kevin Kennedy is set for tomorrow, April 11, at 10:30 AM CST/11:30 AM EST. Use the usual phone number (866-222-9044) and passcode  

If you have trouble connecting, contact Nicole.  
Peg  

--------------------------------------  
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
That won't work well. I did not realize it was a federal holiday. We will need to move the call.

Job

--- Tova Wang [REDACTED] wrote:

> Job, Maybe you can just call us from your cell phone?
> ----Original Message----
> From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
> Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2006 4:02 PM
> To: wang@tcf.org
> Cc: serebrov@sbcglobal.net
> Subject: Re: lori minnite
> 
> Tova:
> When the teleconference is for an interview with just one individual, an EAC staff person (usually I) will set the teleconference up through our office telephone. Unfortunately, I just noticed that Monday, February 20 is a Federal holiday. Our office won't be open to coordinate this teleconference. I don't have access to EAC's toll-free line from home. Do you want to try to reschedule?--- Peggy

"Tova Wang" [REDACTED]

01/30/2006 06:26 PM

To
"Job Serebrov" [REDACTED],
psims@eac.gov
cc

Subject
lori minnite
I have set up the interview for 12 noon on Monday, February 20. I will meet her in her office (its blocks from my house) so it will just be us and Job and Alex calling in. Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

<mailto:join-tcfmain@mailhost.groundspring.org>
Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM ----

"Tova Wang"  To "Job Serebrov"
psims@eac.gov, nmortellito@eac.gov
Subject new interview

Secretary of State Rebecca Vigil Giron, 1:30 Mountain time (which I believe is 3:30 EST). Let me know if its the same number and pass code. thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Tova:

Your conference call is all set for 3:30pm (EST) March 14th for 1 hour.

Call in is 866-222-9044
Pass code:

Let me know if you need anything else

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Research Assistant
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.2209 phone
202.566.3128 fax

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation

Secretary of State Rebecca Vigil Giron, March 14th at 1:30 Mountain time (which I believe is 3:30 EST). Let me know if its the same number and pass code. thanks.
Hi Peg,

I don't know if you're still around, but just a silly question – do you have a sense of when we will be done tomorrow? I'm assuming around 4, but just wanted to check. Also, I'll get there a bit before 10 so that we can actually start at 10. Look forward to seeing you.

Tova

---Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2006 4:02 PM
To: Tova
Cc: 
Subject: Ion m nnite

Tova:
When the teleconference is for an interview with just one individual, an EAC staff person (usually I) will set the teleconference up through our office telephone. Unfortunately, I just noticed that Monday, February 20 is a Federal holiday. Our office won't be open to coordinate this teleconference. I don't have access to EAC's toll-free line from home. Do you want to try to reschedule?-- Peggy
I have set up the interview for 12 noon on Monday, February 20. I will meet her in her office (its blocks from my house) so it will just be us and Job and Alex calling in. Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:59 PM ---
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
02/08/2006 04:48 PM
To: John Tanner
cc
Subject: Interview Request Re EAC Research on Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation

Dear John:

I have been assigned to manage the U.S. Election Assistance Commission’s (EAC) preliminary research project on voting fraud and voter intimidation. Obviously, obtaining information regarding the Voting Section’s actions against voter intimidation and other voting rights violations is important to this effort. Would you be available for an interview by our project consultants on February 24 at 2:00 PM? The interview may take place by phone, or one of the consultants may visit your office and connect the other consultant by phone.

Background

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the issues listed in the statute are the development of:

- nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections
for Federal office [section 241(b)(6)]; and
• methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)].

EAC's Board of Advisors recommended that EAC make research on these topics a high priority. Subsequently, the Commission contracted with two consultants (Tova Wang and Job Serebrov) to:

• develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;
• perform preliminary research on these topics (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify related activities of key government agencies and civic and advocacy organizations, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;
• convene a meeting of a project working group composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation, provide the results of the preliminary research to the working group, and record the working group's deliberations; and
• produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future EAC action, if any.

Possible Questions
Possible interview questions include the following:

1. According to a GAO report dated September 14, 2004 entitled Department of Justice's Activities to Address Past Election-Related Voting Irregularities, the "Voting Section has used several means of tracking allegations of voting irregularities and the Section's actions with regard to those allegations. First, the Voting Section used telephone logs to track telephone calls regarding allegations of voting irregularities it received related to the November 2000 and 2002 elections. Second, DOJ tracks matters and cases through its Interactive Case Management (ICM) system-its formal process for tracking and managing work activities. Third, the Voting Section tracked monitoring of elections using logs and for some election-monitoring activities they opened matters; thus, it has not routinely tracked election-monitoring activities through the ICM system."

Can you provide us with the following:

a) The telephone logs referred to in the report
b) The matters and cases tracked through the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system
c) The other logs referred to in the report
d) Any other data the division has maintained electronically during the last three federal election cycles


Can you provide us with the following:

a) Any reports that were developed with respect to those efforts, before, during and after its implementation
b) Any field notes from federal attorneys and their staff
c) Information on any lawsuits and/or prosecutions for voter intimidation and/or suppression from the last five years
3. Does it matter if the complaint does or does not come from a member of a racial or language minority?

4. What kinds of complaints would routinely override principles of federalism?

5. Are you of the opinion that there are too few prosecutions?

6. What should be done to improve the system?

Let me know if you have any questions about this request or the research project. I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

Tamar Nedzar/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM

Tova and Job,

I haven't forgotten about you. The server has been returning my batches of results for you because they exceed the maximum file size, so I will be sending you 5 emails today and one or two more from my home computer either tonight or tomorrow.

Please call if you have questions.

Thank you,

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov
Peggy:

Good to hear from you. No, unfortunately this week is very bad for me. Today is covered, tomorrow from 1-2 your time is out, Wednesday and Friday are out. Pick a time between all of this. I am in Nevada from March 25 to the 28.

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job:
> 
> I apologize for my unanticipated and lengthy absence. I am back in the office, though I will have to work short days through Wednesday.
> 
> Are you two available for a teleconference this afternoon, say 3:00 PM EST, so that we can re-evaluate where we are and what needs to be done to schedule the working group?
> 
> ---- Peggy
> 
> Thanks for letting me know Job. As I'm sure Peg told you, we are subject to GSA's file size restrictions and they are not always timely in letting us know when they block emails. Unfortunately, until they notify me that they are holding the email hostage, I cannot send it along. However, if I don't hear from them by 5, I will force the issue.
Tamar-

I received all but file number 5.

Regards,

Job

--- tnedzar@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job,
> 
> I haven't forgotten about you. The server has been
> returning my batches of
> results for you because they exceed the maximum file
> size, so I will be
> sending you 5 emails today and one or two more from
> my home computer
> either tonight or tomorrow.
> 
> Please call if you have questions.
> 
> Thank you,
> 
> Tamar Nedzar
> Law Clerk
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> (202) 566-2377
> http://www.eac.gov
> TNedzar@eac.gov
>
I am available any time after noon on the 7th and after 3 on the 8th. I think in terms of data that we would like from him, that one point on the Donsanto memo is applicable. Job, do we want to come up with a separate set of questions?
I would like to be able to talk to her -- is there an email address I can reach her at? I actually think I emailed her at an address that was not the EAC. Regarding Donsanto, were you OK with the information request I sent you? Tova

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: <psims@eac.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2006 5:24 PM
Subject: Re: conf call & Devon's Research

> Tova:
> If you an Job can work things out between you, that's good enough for me.
> We can talk about the meeting with Donsanto when we meet on January 13,
> unless you really need to discuss it before then.
> As Devon's last day was 12/9, I don't think she has access to the EAC
> email address any longer. I don't think she received the email you sent her
> after that date. I did further spot checks of the articles she included
> on the CD. I see several pdf files that came from the Lexis search. She
> would not have picked up anything that duplicated the newscips I had
> saved. I did see one false drop (an article about a union election) and a
> few articles that I would have filed in a different voting fraud subject
> folder, but I think she finished all of the work we asked her to do.
> --- Peggy
>

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---
I will be out for the next few hours, but I'm available any time after 3:30 on my cell and all day tomorrow at my office. Let me know when you'd like to talk. Thanks. Tova

If you would like a conference call, how about some time tomorrow morning. Tomorrow afternoon is booked. Today, I am trying to get through all the emails left in my short absence. --- Peggy

I will be out for the next few hours, but I'm available any time after 3:30 on my cell and all day tomorrow at my office. Let me know when you'd like to talk. Thanks. Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---
Peggy,

I will be more than happy to help in any way. I will check on what information it is possible to release. There are, as you can imagine restrictions. I will be available for the interview at 2:00 on the 24th. How long do you expect the interview to take?

John

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 4:49 PM
To: Tanner, John K (CRT)
Subject: Interview Request Re EAC Research on Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation

Dear John:

I have been assigned to manage the U.S. Election Assistance Commission's (EAC) preliminary research project on voting fraud and voter intimidation. Obviously, obtaining information regarding the Voting Section's actions against voter intimidation and other voting rights violations is important to this effort. Would you be available for an interview by our project consultants on February 24 at 2:00 PM? The interview may take place by phone, or one of the consultants may visit your office and connect the other consultant by phone.

Background

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the issues listed in the statute are the development of:

- nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office (section 241(b)(6)); and
- methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation (section 241(b)(7)).

EAC's Board of Advisors recommended that EAC make research on these topics a high priority. Subsequently, the Commission contracted with two consultants (Tova Wang and Job Serebrov) to:

- develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;
- perform preliminary research on these topics (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify related activities of key government agencies and civic and advocacy organizations, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;
- convene a meeting of a project working group composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation, provide the results of the preliminary research to the working group, and record the working group's deliberations; and
- produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future EAC action, if any.
Possible Questions

Possible interview questions include the following:

1. According to a GAO report dated September 14, 2004 entitled Department of Justice's Activities to Address Past Election-Related Voting Irregularities, the Voting Section has used several means of tracking allegations of voting irregularities and the Section's actions with regard to those allegations. First, the Voting Section used telephone logs to track telephone calls regarding allegations of voting irregularities it received related to the November 2000 and 2002 elections. Second, DOJ tracks matters and cases through its Interactive Case Management (ICM) system—its formal process for tracking and managing work activities. Third, the Voting Section tracked monitoring of elections using logs and for some election-monitoring activities they opened matters; thus, it has not routinely tracked election-monitoring activities through the ICM system.

Can you provide us with the following:

a) The telephone logs referred to in the report

b) The matters and cases tracked through the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system

c) The other logs referred to in the report

d) Any other data the division has maintained electronically during the last three federal election cycles


Can you provide us with the following:

a) Any reports that were developed with respect to those efforts, before, during and after its implementation

b) Any field notes from federal attorneys and their staff

c) Information on any lawsuits and/or prosecutions for voter intimidation and/or suppression from the last five years

3. Does it matter if the complaint does or does not come from a member of a racial or language minority?

4. What kinds of complaints would routinely override principals of federalism?

5. Are you of the opinion that there are too few prosecutions?

6. What should be done to improve the system?

Let me know if you have any questions about this request or the research project. I look forward to hearing from you.
I'm rescheduling

-----Original Message-----
From: Mike Alvarez [mailto:rma@hss.caltech.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2006 11:34 AM
To: Tova Wang
Subject: RE: EAC Voter Fraud Project

Tova, unfortunately I'm not going to be able to participate on Friday morning. Can I catch up on this early next week?

On Wed, 15 Feb 2006, Tova Wang wrote:

> Just a reminder about Friday. Look forward to speaking to you then.
> Thanks again.
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Tova Wang [mailto:wang@tcf.org]
> Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 1:46 PM
> To: 'Tova Wang'; 'Mike Alvarez'; 'Chandler Davidson'; 'Stephen Ansolabehere'
> Cc: baker@tcf.org; psims@eac.gov
> Subject: RE: EAC Voter Fraud Project
> 
> Hi all,
> 
> Here is the call in information for our discussion on Feb 17 at noon.
> 
> Dial in number 1-866-222-9044
> Pass code: 
> 
> I'll try to remember to send out a reminder between now and then...
> 
> Thanks again
Craig:

This is just to remind you of the interview appointment we had set up for 2 PM, Friday, January 13. I'll accompany our consultants, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, to your office. I invited both of them to submit questions in advance of the interview. The questions they have submitted so far, are attached. I realize that you may not have the answers to questions involving Voting Section activities. Perhaps you can recommend someone in that section who could answer such questions.

Look forward to seeing you!
To: [Redacted]
Cc: "Job Serebrov" [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2006 3:14 PM
Subject: Re: conf call?

If you would like a conference call, how about some time tomorrow morning.
Tomorrow afternoon is booked. Today, I am trying to get through all the
emails left in my short absence. --- Peggy

> 01/03/2006 12:24
> PM
> psims@eac.gov
> "Job Serebrov"
> Subject
> conf call?

> I will be out for the next few hours, but I'm available any time after
> 3:30
> on my cell and all day tomorrow at my office. Let me know when you'd like
> to talk. Thanks. Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---
Tamar Nedzar/EAC/GOV
01/09/2006 09:40 AM
To wang@tcf.org, [Redacted]
cc Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject First of three emails

Good morning,

All of the emails I sent from home were sent back to me, so I'm trying from work. Please let me know if you do not recieve three emails from me by the end of the day today.

Thanks,
I agree.

Job

--- Tova Wang --- wrote:

> My suspicion is that if she did a nexis search at all, she used the terms of our definition, ie the titles of the folders, not the long list of search terms that we gave her. It would be best to be able to ask her directly if that's possible. Tova

> Tova Andrea Wang
> Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
> The Century Foundation
> 41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
> phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
> www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
> 
> <mailto:join-tcfmain@mailhost.groundspring.org>
> Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Peggy:

We will need to do the Friday interviews the same way we are doing all of the others. Despite Tova being in DC, we will have to do a conference call from your office. I only have a cell phone to make long distance calls and limited minutes.

Job

I have asked Tanner for permission to call you from DOJ. That way we can bring you in by speaker phone, as we did with Donsanto. I'll have to check with Sandler re: what we can set up at his office. --- Peggy

Peggy:

We will need to do the Friday interviews the same way we are doing all of the others. Despite Tova being in DC, we will have to do a conference call from your office. I only have a cell phone to make long distance calls and limited minutes.

Job
11:00 am your time.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Any time on Thursday possible?
> --- Peggy
>
> "Job Serebrov"
> 03/13/2006 12:53 PM
>
> To
> psims@eac.gov
> cc
>
> Subject
> Re: I'm BAAACK
>
> Peggy:
> 
> Good to hear from you. No, unfortunately this week is very bad for me. Today is covered, tomorrow from 1-2 your time is out, Wednesday and Friday are out. Pick a time between all, of this. I am in Nevada from March 25 to the 28.
>
> Job
>
> --- psims@eac.gov wrote:
>
> Tova and Job:
>
> I apologize for my unanticipated and lengthy absence. I am back in the office, though I will have to work short days through Wednesday.
>
> Are you two available for a teleconference this afternoon, say 3:00 PM
EST, so that we can re-evaluate where we are and what needs to be done to schedule the working group?

----- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM -----

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
01/30/2006 01:23 PM
To "Tova Wang" [REDACTED], Job Serebrov
cc "Job Serebrov"
Subject Re: donsanto materials

We have not received the draft anti-fraud bill from him, yet. Let me see if I can locate the previous version on-line. I haven't had time to photocopy the hard copy materials, or to copy the CD he gave us. I'll try to get some help with that, but most of our folks are not available because there is a long lasting virus going around. --- Peggy

"Tova Wang" [REDACTED]

Hi again,

Have you had a chance to send us the new handbook, training materials, and the draft mail fraud bill that he wanted to give us? Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
I just realized I still need to provide a Secretary of State: Rebecca Vigil-Giron from New Mexico

--- Original Message ---

Tova Andrea Wang  
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

--- Original Message ---

Peg and Nicole, Could you please set up this call with SOS Vigil-Giron noon next Friday? Thanks.

--- Original Message ---

From: Anaya, Anna, SOS  
To: wang@tcf.org  
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2006 9:30 AM  
Subject: RE: FW: EAC interview

10:00am mst is good for her, thanks for being so considerate.

--- Original Message ---

From:  
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 8:00 PM  
To: Anaya, Anna, SOS  
Subject: Re: FW: EAC Interview

Hi Anna, No problem. How is noon EST? Tova
From: Anaya, Anna, SOS
To: Tova Wang
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 3:17 PM
Subject: RE: FW: EAC interview

Tova, guess who? we need to change the conference call hopefully same day but earlier. Rebecca is available from 8am to noon our time. Sorry...hope she can be accommodated.

Thanks

Anna

From: Tova Wang [mailto:]
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2006 2:15 PM
To: Anaya, Anna, SOS
Subject: FW: FW: EAC interview

Hi Anna,

Looks like we're all set. Let me know if you have any questions and thanks again. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: nmortellito@eac.gov [mailto:nmortellito@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2006 4:09 PM
To: Tova Wang
Cc: psims@eac.gov
Subject: Re: FW: EAC interview

Tova I have set this up for 3:30pm (eastern time) 1:30pm new mexico time for 1 hour on March 24th.

Dial in 866-222-9044 and passcode [redacted]

Let me know if you need anything else

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Research Assistant
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.2209 phone
202.566.3128 fax

"Tova Wang"

03/13/2006 01:25 PM

To psims@eac.gov, nmortellito@eac.gov
cc
Can you please set this up? Thanks.

PS -- I understand you have sent me email, but something is wrong with our server. If you need to talk to me please give me a call at [redacted] Thanks

Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: Anaya, Anna, SOS [mailto:anna.anaya@state.nm.us]
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2006 11:14 AM
To: Tova Wang
Subject: RE: EAC interview

How about Friday, March 24 at 1:30pm our time??

From: Tova Wang [mailto:tnv_2005@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2006 8:48 AM
To: Anaya, Anna, SOS
Subject: RE: EAC interview

Anna,

I'm so sorry to hear that. Is there some time next week that works for the Secretary? Thanks. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: Anaya, Anna, SOS [mailto:anna.anaya@state.nm.us]
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2006 9:29 AM
To: Tova Wang
Subject: RE: EAC interview

Good morning, we will need to reschedule your call with Rebecca. There has been a death in her family and the services are Tuesday.

From: Tova Wang [mailto:tnv_2005@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2006 11:58 AM
To: Anaya, Anna, SOS
Subject: EAC Interview

Anna, Thanks so much for setting up our appointment with the Secretary. The call-in information is below. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks again. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: nmortellito@eac.gov [mailto:nmortellito@eac.gov]
Tova:

Your conference call is all set for 3:30pm (EST) March 14th for 1 hour.

Call in is 866-222-9044
Pass code [redacted]

Let me know if you need anything else

Regards,
Nicole K. Mortellito
Research Assistant
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.2209 phone
202.566.3128 fax

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail, including all attachments is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited unless specifically provided under the New Mexico Inspection of Public Records Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this message. -- This email has been scanned by the Sybari - Antigen Email System.
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Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail, including all attachments is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited unless specifically provided under the New Mexico Inspection of Public Records Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this message. -- This email has been scanned by the Sybari - Antigen Email System.
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----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM -----

"Tova Wang"

To psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject FW: Interviews

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:serebrov@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 4:59 PM
To: Tova Wang
Subject: Re: interviews

I really don't know if we will get these two interviews scheduled but if so, go ahead and add two more.
--- Tova Wang wrote:

> I think we should stick with the original, agreed upon list. We worked hard to assemble it and keep it manageable. Otherwise, there are some people that I would like to add to the list as well. Let me know if that's how you want to proceed.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704    fax: 212-535-7534

www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

---

Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
04/06/2006 09:35 AM   To Job Serebrov, Tova Andrea Wang
cc
Subject Upcoming Interviews-DOJ Info

Hi, Job and Tova:

Tony Sirvello (former election director for Harris County, TX and current Executive Director of the International Association of Clerks, Recorders, Election Officials and Treasurers) can make himself available for an interview next Wednesday morning (4/12). He is on CST. Is there a time that works well for the two of you? How about 10 AM CST/11 AM EST? I saw Kevin Kennedy at a meeting in our office this past Tuesday. We are trying to set up an interview with him next Tuesday (4/11).

I asked Donsanto about an updated version of his *Prosecution of Election Offenses*. He responded that it is at the printers and will not be available for a couple of months. In the interim, he referred me to the white paper he did for IFES, which I have attached. He said that the white paper includes the same information on the prosecution of election fraud that will be in the book. --- Peggy
Hi Peg,

I should meet you at the building where John Tanner is a little before 2, right? Can you please tell me the location? Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Barry:

Hope you have been doing well. Scott Lansell (IFES) was in the office last week and spoke well of you. He said that you had worked with IFES on a project they were doing in Africa.

I am now working for the new Election Assistance Commission (EAC), as the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) required the transfer of the FEC's Office of Election Administration to EAC. I have been assigned to manage the U.S. Election Assistance Commission's (EAC) preliminary research project on voting fraud and voter intimidation. I wondered if you would be interested in and available to serve on a project working group for EAC's preliminary research on voting fraud and voter intimidation. I appreciated your insight when we worked on the implementation of NVRA, and hope that you will be available to provide us the benefit of your expertise.

EAC is conducting this research to meet HAVA requirements. Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the issues listed in the statute are the development of:
nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office [section 241(b)(6)]; and
methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)].

EAC's Board of Advisors recommended that EAC make research on these topics a high priority. Subsequently, the Commission contracted with two consultants (Tova Wang and Job Serebrov) to:

• develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;
• perform preliminary research on these topics (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify related activities of key government agencies and civic and advocacy organizations, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;
• convene a meeting of a project working group composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation, provide the results of the preliminary research to the working group, and record the working group's deliberations; and
• produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future EAC action.

The working group members would need to review the results of preliminary research done by the two consultants to EAC and brainstorm ideas for future EAC action in this area, if any. I expect that the group will meet only once this year, probably in April in DC.

Please call me or send an email if you have any questions about the project or this request. I look forward to hearing from you.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

I cannot do it on May 5 now. Any update on a date? I will be in DC for other meetings May 4 - May 7 if that makes any difference (EAC would not have to pay my transportation if it was on, for example, Monday May 8 or possibly even the 9th) Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534
I have set up the interview for 12 noon on Monday, February 20. I will meet her in her office (its blocks from my house) so it will just be us and Job and Alex calling in. Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Does this mean that the articles you collected were already scanned and are on the CD?
Hi again,

I'm just scanning over Devon's collection and do not believe she could have possibly searched all of the terms we gave her. I am aware of tons of articles that were written on many of these topics in 2004 that do not appear in the folder. I think someone is going to have to do it over again from scratch, and I'm thinking about doing at least some of it myself. We should discuss this in detail on Thursday. Thanks.

Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---
Here is the latest schedule. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

I apologize for my unanticipated and lengthy absence. I am back in the office, though I will have to work short days through Wednesday.

Are you two available for a teleconference this afternoon, say 3:00 PM EST, so that we can re-evaluate where we are and what needs to be done to schedule the working group?

--- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

Is the passcode for the 2/17 interviews 62209?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Here is the latest schedule. --- Peggy

>
Peggy

It will be easiest to meet in office, which is at 1800 G St NW, 7th floor. (You can call as you approach or when you get to the 7th floor.) I can patch anyone in by phone.

Much of the information you have requested is, as you can imagine, internal. I'll get you as much as we can, however, and look forward to talking with you.

John

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2006 1:14 PM
To: Tanner, John K (CRT)
Subject: Upcoming Interview

Dear John:

This is just to confirm the interview I set up with you this Friday at 2 PM. I'll bring Tova Wang, one of the two consultants on the project. Would it be possible to bring the other consultant into the conference via speaker phone? (He is in Little Rock, AR, so it would be a long distance call.)

I assume that we should go to the main entrance for 950 Pennsylvania Ave, NW and that Security will let you know when we've arrived. Is that correct?

Thanks, again, for time out for us.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

-----Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 1/29/2006 03:58 PM-----
"Tova Wang"
To tnedzar@eac.gov
cc psims@eac.gov,
Subject RE: 3rd of 3 emails
I got the first two now. What's the total number we should have for the day?

---Original Message---
From: tnedzar@eac.gov [mailto:tnedzar@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2006 2:07 PM
To: wang@tcf.org
Cc: psims@eac.gov; serebrov@sbcglobal.net
Subject: RE: 3rd of 3 emails

Hi Tova,

The first two emails were on another server, which could explain the delay. All three should be released today; if you don't receive them by 5, please send me an email and I will follow up with GSA. Job, if you have any problems with receiving emails, please also let me know.

Keeping my fingers crossed!

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

I am very confused. I didn't get the first two.

---Original Message---
From: tnedzar@eac.gov [mailto:tnedzar@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2006 9:49 AM
To: tnedzar@eac.gov
Cc: psims@eac.gov
Subject: 3rd of 3 emails

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
There should be three total for today. All email subject lines should say something like, "First of 3, second of 3," etc.

Please let me know if I need to resend anything.

Thanks,

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

I got the first two now. What's the total number we should have for the day?

-----Original Message-----
From: tnedzar@eac.gov (mailto:tnedzar@eac.gov)
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2006 2:07 PM
To: wang@tcf.org
Hi Tova,

The first two emails were on another server, which could explain the delay. All three should be released today; if you don't receive them by 5, please send me an email and I will follow up with GSA. Job, if you have any problems with receiving emails, please also let me know.

Keeping my fingers crossed!

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov
Hi Peg,

Do you think it will be possible to get a meeting with him while I am in DC, the 7th or the 8th?

Also, just an administrative question: with travel reimbursements, will they be direct deposited or will I get something separate?

Thanks.
Tova

PS -- I'm off to Little Rock later today...

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ----

"Tova Wang"

To: nmortellito@eac.gov, psims@eac.gov
cc

Subject: FW: EAC interview

I'll let you know what we figure out. Thanks. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: Anaya, Anna, SOS [mailto:anna.anaya@state.nm.us]
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2006 9:29 AM
To: Tova Wang
Subject: RE: EAC interview

Good morning, we will need to reschedule your call with Rebecca. There has been a death in her family and the services are Tuesday.

-----Original Message-----
From: Tova Wang [mailto:wang@tcf.org]
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2006 11:58 AM
To: Anaya, Anna, SOS
Subject: EAC interview

Anna, Thanks so much for setting up our appointment with the Secretary. The call-in information is below. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks again. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: nmortellito@eac.gov [mailto:nmortellito@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2006 9:50 AM
To: 
Cc: psims@eac.gov; 'Job Serebrov'; dscott@eac.gov
Subject: Re: new interview

Tova:

Your conference call is all set for 3:30pm (EST) March 14th for 1 hour.

Call in is 866-222-9044
Pass code:

Let me know if you need anything else

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Research Assistant
Got it!

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job:
>
> As agreed, Tova and I can connect with Job by telephone during our Friday morning meeting. Tova would like to start the meeting at 10 AM EST. Job,
> we will call you from the meeting room.
>
> Craig Donsanto says we can use a meeting room over
Peggy:

How nice to hear from you! I'd be happy to be a part of the working group for the research on voting fraud and intimidation. Thank you for asking me. When you know the whole make-up of the working group I'd be interested in knowing who else is on it.

The Email address you used is our farm (Garrett County) address, which we check infrequently. For future messages it will be better to use our Bethesda Email address which we check that inbox even when we're at the farm.

From the reports I get on doings at the EAC I hear you are doing well. That's good news. Barry

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov  
To:  
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 9:18 AM  
Subject: Your Input Requested-Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Project 

Barry:

Hope you have been doing well. Scott Lansell (IFES) was in the office last week and spoke well of you. He said that you had worked with IFES on a project they were doing in Africa.

I am now working for the new Election Assistance Commission (EAC), as the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) required the transfer of the FEC's Office of Election Administration to EAC. I have been assigned to manage the U.S. Election Assistance Commission's (EAC) preliminary research project on voting fraud and voter intimidation. I wondered if you would be interested in and available to serve on a project working group for EAC's preliminary research on voting fraud and voter intimidation. I appreciated your insight when we worked on the implementation of NVRA, and hope that you will be available to provide us the benefit of your expertise.

EAC is conducting this research to meet HAVA requirements. Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the issues listed in
the statute are the development of:
- nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office [section 241(b)(6)]; and
- methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)].

EAC's Board of Advisors recommended that EAC make research on these topics a high priority. Subsequently, the Commission contracted with two consultants (Tova Wang and Job Serebrov) to:
- develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;
- perform preliminary research on these topics (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify related activities of key government agencies and civic and advocacy organizations, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;
- convene a meeting of a project working group composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation, provide the results of the preliminary research to the working group, and record the working group's deliberations; and
- produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future EAC action.

The working group members would need to review the results of preliminary research done by the two consultants to EAC and brainstorm ideas for future EAC action in this area, if any. I expect that the group will meet only once this year, probably in April in DC.

Please call me or send an email if you have any questions about the project or this request. I look forward to hearing from you.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM -----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
04/05/2006 05:45 PM To "Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc Subject Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

OK, thanks. I can access the IFES web site. That will give the consultants something to work with. --- Peg

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
The fraud chapter has been published by IFES as part of their Money and Politics Program. It's on their website. I tweaked the text a bit and presented it in Abjua. The rest of it is regrettably not public at present.

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed Apr 05 17:26:12 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Is there any way to get an advance copy? Our consultants will need to review it before you receive your printed versions. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

04/05/2006 04:14 PM

To
psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject
Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

The 7th edition is done and on its way to the printer. It is my hope to get it our in a couple months.

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed Apr 05 13:05:15 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project
Craig:

In reviewing the great materials you gave our consultants, we have not found an updated draft of your famous Prosecution of Election Offenses. Is that available for review? If you have a pdf version, I could pass that on to our consultants (noting any restrictions you may have on use).

Also, we noticed some gaps in the 2004 DOJ training binder. It appears that we are missing the Chris Herren information from Panel 3 and something titled "July 21, 2004" from Panel 4. If these were removed because we should not see them, just let me know.

I also have to check your availability the week of May 15. I'm still trying to find a date that everyone will be available for the working group meeting.

Sorry to bug you. Hope all is going well.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
02/15/2006 01:40 PM
To: "Job Serebrov"
cc
Subject: Re: Interview Schedule

Yes, for the teleconference with the group of academics. For the teleconference with Justice Stratton, I will call everyone into the conference. --- Peggy

"Job Serebrov" <

02/15/2006 10:24 AM
To: psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: Re: Interview Schedule

Is the passcode for the 2/17 interview?
--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Here is the latest schedule. --- Peggy

>  

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM -----

"Job Serebrov"

To: psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject: Surprising Interview

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM -----

"Tova Wang"

To: psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject: RE: Friday Interviews

Ok, Justice Stratton of Ohio has consented to an interview on Feb 17 at 3 pm EST. Her number is

Job

We're not going to be at the EAC. The meetings are at Sandler and Tanner's offices.

----- Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:]
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2006 12:49 PM
To: psims@eac.gov;
Subject: Friday Interviews

Peggy:

We will need to do the Friday interviews the same way we are doing all of the others. Despite Tova being in DC, we will have to do a conference call from your office. I only have a cell phone to make long distance calls and limited minutes.

Job
Hi Peg,

I got all of Tamar's emails from yesterday, but I guess I am still missing the 29th if she sent something on that day.

Also, will we be getting statements reflecting our payments? The number of dollars in my account isn't exactly the number I calculated, but I can't tell if there were withholdings or its because of something else. Thanks.

Hope you are enjoying the weekend.

Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

01/11/2006 04:06 PM

To wang@tcf.org@GSAEXTERNAL

cc "Job Serebrov"

Subject Re: Tamar's files

Tova and Job:
The first three of the five emails that Tamar sent you on 1/6/05 included the three zip files that she originally tried to send together on 12/29. So, you should have everything she has produced. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

wang@tcf.org

01/07/2006 12:45 PM

To psims@eac.gov

cc "Job Serebrov"

Subject tamar's files

Hi Peg,

I got all of Tamar's emails from yesterday, but I guess I am still missing the 29th if she sent something on
that day.

Also, will we be getting statements reflecting our payments? The number of dollars in my account isn't exactly the number I calculated, but I can't tell if there were withholdings or it's because of something else. Thanks.

Hope you are enjoying the weekend.

Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
04/03/2006 03:15 PM
To Barry Weinberg
cc
Subject Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Hi, Barry:

I'm trying to arrange a meeting of the Working Group for EAC's Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation project. Would you please look at your schedule and let me know if there are any days during the first 2 weeks of May that you would NOT be available?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
02/15/2006 02:33 PM
To Tova Andrea Wang, Job Serebrov
cc
Subject Telephone Interviews

Tova and Job:
I am sorry about the problems we had trying to set up the Webber interview from here. I've asked someone to help me expedite the set up of the remaining teleconferences scheduled (except the two on 2/24) using a toll-free number and pass code. I will have to keep you posted, though, because we have had some trouble with follow through at Verizon. (If it's not one thing, it's another.) — Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

"Job Serebrov."
01/18/2006 12:45 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: extension
Yes. I believe we will have to cull the cases even more because we will run out of time.

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job:
> 
> Does this estimate take into account the time remaining under both contracts through the end of February? In other words, would all of the time that you listed be spent on the project after February 28? --- Peggy

01/14/2006 01:05 PM

To psims@eac.gov

cc "Job Serebrov", "Tova Wang"

Subject extension

Hi Peg, Thanks for everything yesterday. It was quite a day. Below please find a breakdown of the 200 additional hours we will require to complete the project. Let me know if you have any questions.

Expert Interviews:
3 hours of scheduling
17 hours conducting the interviews
15 hours summarizing and analyzing the interviews
Total: 35 hours

Nexis research, organization of research, summary of research (Tova): 100 hours
Lexis research, organization of research, summary of research (Job): 100 hours
Working Group preparation and meeting time: 20 hours

Final Report: 45 hours

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

02/13/2006 10:08 PM  
To "Job Serebrov", psims@eac.gov
cc ecortes@eac.gov
Subject Neil Bradley

4 PM on Tuesday, the 21st. He's the lawyer for the plaintiffs in the Georgia case.

Tova

PS -- No clue why this is in purple

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
03/13/2006 01:23 PM
To "Job Serebrov"
<serebrov@sbcglobal.net> @GSAEXTERNAL, Tova Andrea Wang
cc
Subject Re: I'm BAAACK

Any time on Thursday possible?
--- Peggy

"Job Serebrov"

03/13/2006 12:53 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: I'm BAAACK

Peggy:

Good to hear from you. No, unfortunately this week is very bad for me. Today is covered, tomorrow from 1-2 your time is out, Wednesday and Friday are out. Pick a
time between all, of this. I am in Nevada from March 25 to the 28.

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job:
> > I apologize for my unanticipated and lengthy 
> > absence. I am back in the 
> > office, though I will have to work short days 
> > through Wednesday.
> >
> > Are you two available for a teleconference this 
> > afternoon, say 3:00 PM 
> > EST, so that we can re-evaluate where we are and 
> > what needs to be done to 
> > schedule the working group?
> >
> > ---- Peggy
> >

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

02/09/2006 05:30 PM

To "John.K.Tanner@usdoj.gov"

<John.K.Tanner@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL

Subject RE: Interview Request Re EAC Research on Voting Fraud 
and Voter Intimidation

John:

I suspect that we will need an hour (or less) for the interview. Depending on our consultants' travel schedules, we may do this in person or over the phone. I'll get back to you with the details when I have confirmed them. Thanks!

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

"John.K.Tanner@usdoj.gov" <John.K.Tanner@usdoj.gov>
Peggy,

I will be more than happy to help in any way. I will check on what information it is possible to release. There are, as you can imagine restrictions. I will be available for the interview at 2:00 on the 24th. How long do you expect the interview to take?

John

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 4:49 PM
To: Tanner, John K (CRT)
Subject: Interview Request Re EAC Research on Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation

Dear John:

I have been assigned to manage the U.S. Election Assistance Commission's (EAC) preliminary research project on voting fraud and voter intimidation. Obviously, obtaining information regarding the Voting Section's actions against voter intimidation and other voting rights violations is important to this effort. Would you be available for an interview by our project consultants on February 24 at 2:00 PM? The interview may take place by phone, or one of the consultants may visit your office and connect the other consultant by phone.

Background

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the issues listed in the statute are the development of:

- nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office (section 241(b)(6)); and
- methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation (section 241(b)(7)).

EAC's Board of Advisors recommended that EAC make research on these topics a high priority. Subsequently, the Commission contracted with two consultants (Tova Wang and Job Serebrov) to:

- develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;
- perform preliminary research on these topics (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify related activities of key government agencies and civic and advocacy organizations, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;
- convene a meeting of a project working group composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation, provide the results of the
preliminary research to the working group, and record the working group's deliberations; and
produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future EAC action, if any.

Possible Questions

Possible interview questions include the following:

1. According to a GAO report dated September 14, 2004 entitled Department of Justice's Activities to Address Past Election-Related Voting Irregularities, the "Voting Section has used several means of tracking allegations of voting irregularities and the Section's actions with regard to those allegations. First, the Voting Section used telephone logs to track telephone calls regarding allegations of voting irregularities it received related to the November 2000 and 2002 elections. Second, DOJ tracks matters and cases through its Interactive Case Management (ICM) system-its formal process for tracking and managing work activities. Third, the Voting Section tracked monitoring of elections using logs and for some election-monitoring activities they opened matters; thus, it has not routinely tracked election-monitoring activities through the ICM system."

Can you provide us with the following:

a) The telephone logs referred to in the report

b) The matters and cases tracked through the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system

c) The other logs referred to in the report

d) Any other data the division has maintained electronically during the last three federal election cycles


Can you provide us with the following:

a) Any reports that were developed with respect to those efforts, before, during and after it implementation

b) Any field notes from federal attorneys and their staff

c) Information on any lawsuits and/or prosecutions for voter intimidation and/or suppression from the last five years

3. Does it matter if the complaint does or does not comes from a member of a racial or language minority?

4. What kinds of complaints would routinely override principals of federalism?

5. Are you of the opinion that there are too few prosecutions?
6. What should be done to improve the system?

Let me know if you have any questions about this request or the research project. I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ----

"Tova Wang"
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject more on nexis articles

Would it be possible for someone to scan the articles you have printed out in folders and then put them in the appropriate electronic folders that Devon created? Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

01/14/2006 01:24 PM
To "Job Serebrov", psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject interviews

Attached is our assignment list in case you need it. Thanks.
Tova:
When the teleconference is for an interview with just one individual, an EAC staff person (usually I) will set the teleconference up through our office telephone. Unfortunately, I just noticed that Monday, February 20 is a Federal holiday. Our office won't be open to coordinate this teleconference. I don't have access to EAC's toll-free line from home. Do you want to try to reschedule? --- Peggy

"Tova Wang"

01/30/2006 06:26 PM

To "Job Serebrov", psims@eac.gov
cc "Tova Wang"

Subject ion minnite
I have set up the interview for 12 noon on Monday, February 20. I will meet her in her office (its blocks from my house) so it will just be us and Job and Alex calling in. Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang  
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534  

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ----

"Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov"  
To: "psims@eac.gov" <psims@eac.gov>  
cc  
01/11/2006 10:52 PM  
Subject Re: Upcoming Interview

Friday at 2 -- right??  
--------------------------------------  
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----  
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>  
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>  
Subject: RE: Upcoming Interview

Thanks! --- Peg

"Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>  
01/11/2006 03:29 PM  
To  
"psims@eac.gov" <psims@eac.gov>  
cc  
Subject  
RE: Upcoming Interview
By all means, yes Peg.

---

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2006 3:03 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Upcoming Interview

Craig:

Would it be possible to hold Friday's interview in a room that has a phone? One of the 2 consultants has had a family emergency and can only participate by phone. I hope that we can call him from the meeting room and put the phone on Speaker, so that he can participate as if he were there in person. Can that be arranged?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
01/12/2006 08:43 AM
To "Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov"
cc
Subject Re: Upcoming Interview

Yes, tomorrow (Friday) at 2 PM. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---
wang@tcf.org
04/06/2006 05:05 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Upcoming Interviews-DOJ Info
That time is fine for me. Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov
To: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2006 9:35 AM
Subject: Upcoming Interviews-DOJ Info

Hi, Job and Tova:

Tony Sirvello (former election director for Harris County, TX and current Executive Director of the International Association of Clerks, Recorders, Election Officials and Treasurers) can make himself available for an interview next Wednesday morning (4/12). He is on CST. Is there a time that works well for the two of you? How about 10 AM CST/11 AM EST? I saw Kevin Kennedy at a meeting in our office this past Tuesday. We are trying to set up an interview with him next Tuesday (4/11).

I asked Donsanto about an updated version of his Prosecution of Election Offenses. He responded that it is at the printers and will not be available for a couple of months. In the interim, he referred me to the white paper he did for IFES, which I have attached. He said that the white paper includes the same information on the prosecution of election fraud that will be in the book. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
04/03/2006 03:12 PM
To Craig Donsanto
cc
Subject Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Craig:

I have 2 issues for you today.

First, I am trying to schedule a meeting of the project working group for EAC's Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. As a technical advisor on this project, your attendance is particularly important to me. Would you please look at your schedule and let me know if there are any days during the first 2 weeks of May that you would NOT be available?

Second, is it OK for our consultants to refer in their report to guidance provided in the DOJ training materials? I ask this because I understood that some materials in the materials are considered confidential and we do not want to violate your confidentiality provisions. If there is a compromise position, such as having you review that portion of the consultants' report, then let me know.

Thanks!

Peggy Sims
Thank you.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2006 11:02 AM
To: Kevin Kennedy
Subject: Re: Interview

I am trying to arrange the teleconference for 10:30 AM CST tomorrow, April 11. Will get back to you once confirmed.

Peggy

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: *Kennedy, Kevin* [Kevin.Kennedy@seb.state.wi.us]
Sent: 04/09/2006 11:13 AM
To: "'psims@eac.gov" <psims@eac.gov>
Subject: RE: Interview

That time is fine. A half hour earlier would be better. I also have a 12 CDT meeting.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 07, 2006 12:27 PM
To: Kevin Kennedy
Subject: Interview

Kevin:

I'm just following up on my request for your availability to be interviewed by our consultants for our voting fraud/voter intimidation project. Are you available Tuesday, April 11 at 11 AM CST?

Peggy Sims

--------------------------
Tova:
I just found the Lexis word search list used by Devon with all of the search terms crossed off. I have to assume that means she searched using each term. —— Peggy

No, I just meant catch him to set up a time with him in the future. However, I am having possible meetings on other business next week, so the sooner I could know if we have something with the Tanner the better for me. Thanks.

Shucks! I did not see your message until now. I spoke to him several times this morning at our public meeting, which was held at the Hyatt. How are you planning to bring Job into the interviews conducted during the NASS/NASED conference? Have you already scheduled interviews during the next four days of which I should be aware (so that I won't double book you)? —— Peg
Apparently he is at NASS. Peg, can we both try to catch him to set something up? Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---

February 24 at noon. Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ---
Hi all,

Here is the call in information for our discussion on Feb 17 at noon.

Dial in number 1-866-222-9044
Pass code

I'll try to remember to send out a reminder between now and then...

Thanks again

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

—— Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:58 PM ——

Nicole Mortellito/CONTRACTOR/E AC/GOV
04/11/2006 11:45 AM

To “Tova Wang”
cc psims@eac.gov
Subject conf call is up and running

all dial in info is the same!

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Research Assistant
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.2209 phone
Devon's response is attached. Guess I'll add this to the list of questions going to Donsanto. ---Peggy
Hi Peg,

I just wanted to check in on a few things:

Have we figured out how we are doing the Sandler interview?

Where are we at with getting the copies of the Donsanto materials?

Have you been able to touch base with Mike McCarthy, Kevin Kennedy, Connie McCormick, Sarah Ball Johnson or Tom Harrison at all?

Where do we stand with the local official for the working group?

Thank you!!! And I look forward to seeing you Friday.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
I told Peggy I was free at 11:00 your time. I need to check my afternoon schedule.

--- Tova Wang wrote:

> I'm free any time after noon. Tova

> -----Original Message-----
> From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
> Sent: Monday, March 13, 2006 1:24 PM
> To: serebrov@sbcglobal.net; wang@tcf.org
> Subject: Re: I'm BAAACK

> Any time on Thursday possible?
> --- Peggy

> "Job Serebrov"

> 03/13/2006 12:53 PM

> To
> psims@eac.gov
> cc
> Subject
> Re: I'm BAAACK

> Peggy:

> Good to hear from you. No, unfortunately this week is very bad for me. Today is covered, tomorrow from 1-2 your time is out, Wednesday and Friday are out. Pick a time between all, of this. I am in Nevada from March 25 to the 28.

> Job

> --- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job:

> I apologize for my unanticipated and lengthy absence. I am back in the
office, though I will have to work short days through Wednesday.

Are you two available for a teleconference this afternoon, say 3:00 PM EST, so that we can re-evaluate where we are and what needs to be done to schedule the working group?

---- Peggy
Hi, John:

I apologize that I will not be there this afternoon to introduce you to our consultants for EAC’s Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation project. Tova Wang will be at your office at 2 PM, today. She can call our other consultant, Job Serebrov, and put him on speaker phone. Please let me know if you need anything from me, or want to express any concerns about the project. Thanks.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov
Tova:
Please refresh my memory --- how many people will be on the conference call (including you and Job, but probably not me)? --- Peggy

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
We have an appointment with him for 11 AM February 16

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Job and Tova:

I'd like to suggest a moratorium on adding interviewees to the list until we complete interviews on the last list prepared. Frankly, in terms of the enforcement mechanics, I think you will get more out of your interviews with Donsanto, Tanner, and Joe Rich than you will get from an interview with Hans. Hans worked at DOJ for a relatively short time, compared to those folks. You also will have input from Barry Weinberg (former Deputy Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, DOJ) who has confirmed that he is available for the Working Group.

Regarding upcoming interviews that I schedule for you two, are there any times that you are NOT available next week or the week thereafter?

--- Peggy

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov] 
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2006 5:06 PM 
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: Teleconference Needed

Do you mean 11 AM EST on Thursday, March 16? Does that work for Job, too? --- Peggy
Peg, does 11 am work for you? If so, I'll try to reschedule my meeting that was that time. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2006 1:24 PM
To: 
Subject: Re: I'm BAAACK

Any time on Thursday possible?
-- Peggy

Peggy:

Good to hear from you. No, unfortunately this week is very bad for me. Today is covered, tomorrow from 1-2 your time is out, Wednesday and Friday are out. Pick a time between all, of this. I am in Nevada from March 25 to the 28.
--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job:
> > I apologize for my unanticipated and lengthy
> > absence. I am back in the
> > office, though I will have to work short days
> > through Wednesday.
> > > Are you two available for a teleconference this
> > afternoon, say 3:00 PM
> > EST, so that we can re-evaluate where we are and
> > what needs to be done to
> > schedule the working group?
> > > ---- Peggy
> > >

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM -----

Tamar Nedzar/EAC/GOV
01/06/2006 05:01 PM
To
cc Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject Fraud Search Wrap-Up

Tova and Job,

After I send the emails from home tonight or tomorrow, that should be all of the search terms you
requested. Given the problems with sending emails, if you have any questions, think you are missing
anything, or would like to review what I have sent, please feel free to call me. I will only be in the office on
Mondays and Fridays, but I check email regularly.

Have a great weekend!

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM -----

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
02/24/2006 02:27 PM
To Job Serebrov, Tova Andrea Wang
cc
Subject Updated Interview Schedule

012661
I forgot to include that I will provide a summary, as best I can, of the methodological suggestions I have gotten from political scientists.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

This is to confirm that we have rescheduled our teleconference (originally on for 11 AM today). It is now scheduled for 10 AM EST on Monday 3/20. As usual, I will call you both. — Peggy

I'm free any time after noon. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Any time on Thursday possible?
--- Peggy

Peggy:

Good to hear from you. No, unfortunately this week is very bad for me. Today is covered, tomorrow from 1-2 your time is out, Wednesday and Friday are out. Pick a time between all, of this. I am in Nevada from March 25 to the 28.

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job:
> >
> > I apologize for my unanticipated and lengthy absence. I am back in the office, though I will have to work short days through Wednesday.
> >
> > Are you two available for a teleconference this afternoon, say 3:00 PM EST, so that we can re-evaluate where we are and what needs to be done to schedule the working group?
> >
> > ---- Peggy
> >
> --- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---

"Tova Wang"
FYI, I'll be unavailable 3/28-29 and 4/6-7

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
4 PM EST on Monday 4-3-06 works for me if it works for both of you. What do you say, Job? — Peggy

Around 4 would work better for me if that is possible

---Original Message---
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 22, 2006 10:21 AM
To: wang@tcf.org; serebrov@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Rescheduling 4-3-06 Teleconference

I need to reschedule our 4-3-06 teleconference, currently scheduled for 10 AM. Are you two available in the afternoon, say 2 PM EST? — Peggy
Tanner would like to meet at a different address than the one I gave you. Please see attached message.
--- Peg

Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 02/22/2006 04:27 PM

"John.K.Tanner@usdoj.gov"
<John.K.Tanner@usdoj.gov>
To "psims@eac.gov" <psims@eac.gov>
cc
Subject RE: Upcoming Interview

Peggy

It will be easiest to meet in office, which is at 1800 G St NW, 7th floor. (You can call as you approach or when you get to the 7th floor.) I can patch anyone in by phone.

Much of the information you have requested is, as you can imagine, internal. I'll get you as much as we can, however, and look forward to talking with you.

John

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2006 1:14 PM
To: Tanner, John K (CRT)
Subject: Upcoming Interview

Dear John:

This is just to confirm the interview I set up with you this Friday at 2 PM. I'll bring Tova Wang, one of the two consultants on the project. Would it be possible to bring the other consultant into the conference via speaker phone? (He is in Little Rock, AR, so it would be a long distance call.)

I assume that we should go to the main entrance for 950 Pennsylvania Ave, NW and that Security will let you know when we've arrived. Is that correct?

Thanks, again, for time out for us.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

---- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ----

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
02/01/2006 02:11 PM
To "Tova Wang" AEXTERNAL
Subject: Re: Lori Minniten

Got it! Would you please send me an electronic copy of your updated list of interviewees. (You gave me a hard copy when we met in DC, but it helps to have an electronic copy for our computer files.) --- Peggy

---

Subject: Interview

Peggy & Tova:

We have an telephone interview with Douglas Webber from the Indiana Attorney General's Office on Feb 15 at 2 pm EST.

Job
Tova:
The articles I collected from 2000 to the time Devon completed the CD should be on the CD. I've found a few additional articles that I will add to a new CD, which I will either give you when you come to DC or FedEx to you. I have two bulging file folders of articles published prior to 2000 that are not on the CD. ---
Peggy
Hi again,

I'm just scanning over Devon's collection and do not believe she could have possibly searched all of the terms we gave her. I am aware of tons of articles that were written on many of these topics in 2004 that do not appear in the folder. I think someone is going to have to do it over again from scratch, and I'm thinking about doing at least some of it myself. We should discuss this in detail on Thursday. Thanks.

Tova

---

Hi Peg,
Happy Easter!

Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
04/17/2006 09:04 AM
To: [Redacted]
cc: GSAEXTERNAL, Job Serebrov
Subject: Re: Follow up Donsanto and KY Interviews

Tova and Job:

I've passed Tova's request on to Craig.

Also, Sarah Ball Johnson, KY, finally called back to say she would be available Wednesday through Friday this week and next week for the interview. Which day and time is best for you and Job?

--- Peggy

04/16/2006 11:39 AM
To: psims@eac.gov
cc: "Tova Wang"
Subject: donsanto again

Hi Peg,

Happy Easter!

Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---
"Tova Wang"
04/17/2006 01:34 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
cc: 
Subject: RE: Interviews
Actually, 11 EST would be better. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 10:49 AM
To: wang@tcf.org
Subject: Interviews

I know you preferred Friday, but Job is not available then. He also said he is not available next week. Do you have any time available this Wednesday? --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 04/17/2006 11:45 AM ----
"Job Serebrov"<mailto:job.serebrov@eac.gov>
04/17/2006 11:06 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Follow up Donsanto and KY Interviews

I can’t do it Friday but Wednesday is ok.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job:
> 
> I’ve passed Tova’s request on to Craig.
> 
> Also, Sarah Ball Johnson, KY, finally called back to say she would be available Wednesday through Friday this week and next week for the interview. Which day and time is best for you and Job?
> 
> --- Peggy
> 
> 
> wang@tcf.org
> 04/16/2006 11:39 AM
> 
> To psims@eac.gov
> cc
> "Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>
> Subject
donsanto again
Hi Peg,

Happy Easter!

Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm

---

Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---

"Tova Wang"
04/20/2006 10:58 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc DRomig@eac.gov
Subject wg meeting

Hi Peg,

I think I might have told you only that I am unavailable on the 5th. I'm actually unavailable on the 4th as well. Any news on this front? We should also arrange a conference call next week about preparing for the meeting, don't you think? Thanks Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

---

Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---

"Tova Wang"
04/21/2006 12:18 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject existing research summaries 3 (final)

Peg, I hope we will be able to review the binders you put together before they get sent out. Thanks. Just
one more research summary to come Monday. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang  
Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---
"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>  
04/17/2006 09:56 AM  
To: psims@eac.gov  
cc:  
Subject: RE: Announcement of FBI Election Crimes Initiative

Peg --

This is essentially FBI's equivalent of the Department's Ballot Access and Integrity Initiative. The news conference on Thursday announced that FBI was enhancing its prioritization of campaign financing offenses. The main feature of this initiative, aside from enhancing the priority these cases will get in the Bureau, is that each of the Bureau's 57 Field Divisions will have at least one "Election Coordinator Agent" who will be the equivalent of the District Election Officer AUSAs. We have been training these new FBI-types: the week before last we had roughly 75 of them in Denver in a very well received two-day session in election law enforcement at which several FEC people spoke. On Wednesday, I head out to Portland, Oregon for more of the same.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]  
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 9:00 AM  
To: Donsanto, Craig  
Subject: Fw: Announcement of FBI Election Crimes Initiative

Hi, Craig:

Tova noticed an article about an FBI initiative against election crimes (see attached email). Is this something new, or is it more of the same initiative that you addressed in your interview? If it is new, would you have time for a teleconference with Job and Tova to answer any questions they may have on the initiative?

Peggy Sims  
Election Research Specialist  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005
Hi Peg,

Happy Easter!

Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
04/17/2006 11:48 AM
To Tova Andrea Wang
cc
Subject Interviews

I know you preferred Friday, but Job is not available then. He also said he is not available next week. Do you have any time available this Wednesday? — Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 04/17/2006 11:45 AM -----
I can't do it Friday but Wednesday is ok.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job:
> 
> I've passed Tova's request on to Craig.
> 
> Also, Sarah Ball Johnson, KY, finally called back to say she would be available Wednesday through Friday this week and next week for the interview. Which day and time is best for you and Job?
> 
> --- Peggy

> 04/16/2006 11:39 AM

Hi Peg,

Happy Easter!

Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---

"Tova Wang"

04/21/2006 11:03 AM

To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov"

cc

Subject wg materials
I will now begin sending several emails with material for the working group meeting. Peg, we still have not heard back from you on whether you like the agenda. I have attached it again. With respect to the interview and research summaries, would you both please review them to make sure there are no glaring mistakes?

Are we going on a hiatus next week? I’m a little confused about what happens from here. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ----

"Tova Wang"
04/21/2006 11:10 AM
To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov"
cc
Subject Interview summaries 4 (final)

Please also double check that I have not left any out. Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ----

"Job Serebrov"
04/17/2006 10:45 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Interviews
That's what I am concerned about. I think we need to end all interviews with Sarah Ball Johnson. With the literature reviews I am finishing, the case write up and the Tova's Nexis research that I need to read, I will have about 45 hours left for the Working Group meeting and final write up.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> I have to check with Conny McCormack to see if things have settled down for her enough so that she would be available. I have had no response to my overtures to Colleen McAndrews' office. I can try again, but I have to be out of town again, from Wednesday through Friday this week, on another research contract and for EAC's public meeting in Seattle. Were you able to get through to Mike McCarthy?
>
> Please remember to watch your time. We'll need to reserve some of your time for the working group meeting and the subsequent reports. --- Peggy

> "Job Serebrov" 04/17/2006 10:17 AM
>
> To psims@eac.gov, wang@tcf.org
> cc
>
> Subject Re: Follow up Donsanto and KY Interviews
>
>
> Next week is out for me. I need to check my schedule this week. Is this the last interview that you were able to arrange?
>
> --- psims@eac.gov wrote:
>
> > Tova and Job:
> >
> > I've passed Tova's request on to Craig.
> >
> > Also, Sarah Ball Johnson, KY, finally called back to say she would be available Wednesday through Friday this week and next week for the interview. Which day and time is best for you and Job?
Hi Peg,

Happy Easter!

Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm
Is it possible to get the materials they are using for the trainings? Thanks Peg.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 9:08 AM
To: wang@tcf.org; serebrov@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Fw: Announcement of FBI Election Crimes Initiative

See Donsanto response below.--- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 04/17/2006 10:07 AM -----
"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

04/17/2006 09:56 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: Announcement of FBI Election Crimes Initiative

Peg - -

This is essentially FBI's equivalent of the Department's Ballot Access and Integrity Initiative. The news conference on Thursday announced that FBI was enhancing its prioritization of campaign financing offenses. The main feature of this initiative, aside from enhancing the priority these cases will get in the Bureau, is that each of the Bureau's 57 Field Divisions will have at least one "Election Coordinator Agent" who will be the equivalent of the District Election Officer AUSAs. We have been training these new FBI-types: the week before last we had roughly 75 of them in Denver in a very well received two-day session in election law enforcement at which several FEC people spoke. On Wednesday, I head out to Portland, Oregon for more of the same.
From: psims@eac.gov
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 9:00 AM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Fw: Announcement of FBI Election Crimes Initiative

Hi, Craig:

Tova noticed an article about an FBI initiative against election crimes (see attached email). Is this something new, or is it more of the same initiative that you addressed in your interview? If it is new, would you have time for a teleconference with Job and Tova to answer any questions they may have on the initiative?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 04/17/2006 08:56 AM ---

04/16/2006 11:39 AM

To psims@eac.gov
cc "Tova Wang"
Subject donsanto again

Hi Peg,

Happy Easter!

Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova
We could skim it

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 9:13 AM
To: Tova Wang; psims@eac.gov
Subject: RE: Announcement of FBI Election Crimes Initiative

Tova-Do we have time to review this?

--- Tova Wang wrote:

> Is it possible to get the materials they are using
> for the trainings?
> Thanks Peg.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
> Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 9:08 AM
> To: 
> Subject: Fw: Announcement of FBI Election Crimes Initiative
>
>
> See Donsanto response below.--- Peggy
>
> ----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on
> 04/17/2006 10:07 AM ----- 
> "Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
>
> 04/17/2006 09:56 AM
>
> To
> psims@eac.gov
>
> cc
>
> Subject
> RE: Announcement of FBI Election Crimes Initiative


This is essentially FBI's equivalent of the Department's Ballot Access and Integrity Initiative. The news conference on Thursday announced that FBI was enhancing its prioritization of campaign financing offenses. The main feature of this initiative, aside from enhancing the priority these cases will get in the Bureau, is that each of the Bureau's 57 Field Divisions will have at least one "Election Coordinator Agent" who will be the equivalent of the District Election Officer AUSAs. We have been training these new FBI-types: the week before last we had roughly 75 of them in Denver in a very well received two-day session in election law enforcement at which several FEC people spoke. On Wednesday, I head out to Portland, Oregon for more of the same.

Hi, Craig:

Tova noticed an article about an FBI initiative against election crimes (see attached email). Is this something new, or is it more of the same initiative that you addressed in your interview? If it is new, would you have time for a teleconference with Job and Tova to answer any questions they may have on the initiative?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 04/17/2006 08:56 AM -----
Hi Peg,

Happy Easter!

Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

<http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm>

http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm
Sarah:

Thank you. I have not reviewed this myself, so I really appreciate the link. Professor Campbell was among the people interviewed by our consultants.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

"Johnson, Sarah Ball (SBE)" <SarahBall.Johnson@ky.gov>

Peggy, 
I am attaching a link to a recent book published by a Kentucky History Professor, Tracy Campbell, which details voter fraud on state and national level. It is very interesting reading.

http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/078671591X/sr=8-1/qid=1145390029/ref=pd_bbs_1/103-8923253-6647806?%5Fencoding=UTF8

Sarah Ball Johnson
Executive Director
State Board of Elections
140 Walnut Street
Frankfort, KY 40601
(502) 573-7100
(502) 330-2734-cell
(502) 573-4369-fax

NOTICE: This electronic mail transmission is for the use of the named individual or entity to which it is directed and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. It is not to be transmitted to or received by anyone other than the named addressee (or a person authorized to deliver it to the named addressee). It is not to be copied or forwarded to any unauthorized persons. If you have received this electronic mail transmission in error, delete it from your system without copying or forwarding it, and notify the sender of the error by replying via email or by calling the Kentucky State Board of Elections at (502) 573-7100, so that our address record can be corrected.
Hi, Sarah:

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed on Wednesday, April 19, by the consultants for EAC's initial research on voting fraud and voter intimidation, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang. Our consultants are conducting interviews as part of preliminary research to determine how EAC may best meet the requirements of Section 241(b)6 and 7 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002. As you may recall, Section 241 requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues, including the development of:

- nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office; and
- methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation.

This is what I need you (and the Secretary, if he is available) to do:

- At approximately 11 AM EST on April 19, call 1-866-222-9044.
- At the prompt for the pass code, enter [redacted].

Tova and Job will join you on the line. We have arranged for the line to be open for an hour, with 10 minutes extra on the front end (for folks who have not synchronized their watches).

You mentioned that Secretary Grayson may be using a cell phone. Our teleconference provider has given us the following information regarding the use of cell phones during the teleconference:

- Signals are often in and out and the audio bridging equipment cannot compensate fast enough by adjusting the signal. This affects all participants connected. If participants must use a cell phone – they should be stationary in a location where they can pick up the other participants, moving while using a cell phone causes the signal to go in and out and often will pick up extraneous electrical signals that will cause heavy static on the call.
- The cell phone should be well charged and muted, if possible, until the individual is ready to speak.
- If there is a problem, anybody who dials into a conference can contact the operator/technicians by simply pressing *0 (star zero). This information is part of the recording when individuals are dialing in.

If you have any problems accessing the teleconference, please call Edgardo Cortés. You can reach him at 1-866-747-1471 (toll-free) or 202-566-3126. He can contact our service provider to correct any problems. (I will be on my way to Seattle and unable to help.)

Thanks, again!

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
I can't do it Friday but Wednesday is ok.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job:
> > I've passed Tova's request on to Craig.
> > Also, Sarah Ball Johnson, KY, finally called back
to say she would be available Wednesday through Friday this week and
next week for the
Hi Peg,

Happy Easter!

Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm

See Donsanto response below.--- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
04/17/2006 10:08 AM
To Tova Andrea Wang, Job Serebrov
cc
Subject Fw: Announcement of FBI Election Crimes Initiative

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 04/17/2006 10:07 AM ---
"Donsanto, Craig"
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: Announcement of FBI Election Crimes Initiative
This is essentially FBI's equivalent of the Department's Ballot Access and Integrity Initiative. The news conference on Thursday announced that FBI was enhancing its prioritization of campaign financing offenses. The main feature of this initiative, aside from enhancing the priority these cases will get in the Bureau, is that each of the Bureau's 57 Field Divisions will have at least one "Election Coordinator Agent" who will be the equivalent of the District Election Officer AUSAs. We have been training these new FBI-types: the week before last we had roughly 75 of them in Denver in a very well received two-day session in election law enforcement at which several FEC people spoke. On Wednesday, I head out to Portland, Oregon for more of the same.

Hi, Craig:

Tova noticed an article about an FBI initiative against election crimes (see attached email). Is this something new, or is it more of the same initiative that you addressed in your interview? If it is new, would you have time for a teleconference with Job and Tova to answer any questions they may have on the initiative?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 04/17/2006 08:56 AM -----

Hi Peg,
Happy Easter!

Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM -----

            Tova Wang
04/21/2006 12:16 PM
To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov"
cc
Subject existing research summaries 2

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

Donsanto IFES FINAL.doc Election Protection stories.doc fooled again review.doc GA litigation summary2.doc


Shattering the Myth.doc Steal this Vote Review final.doc stealing elections review.doc

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM -----

            Tova Wang
04/21/2006 11:05 AM
To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov"
cc
Subject summaries of interviews

Part 1. I'm going to try not to overload

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
Yes but it needs to go no longer then 30 mins

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Are you two still available for the conference call
> we had scheduled for
> this afternoon at 4 PM EST/3 PM CST? --- Peg

Any time Friday is fine for me. Thanks

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 8:05 AM
To: wang@tcf.org; serebrov@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Re: Follow up Donsanto and KY Interviews

Tova and Job:
I've passed Tova's request on to Craig.

Also, Sarah Ball Johnson, KY, finally called back to say she would be available Wednesday through Friday this week and next week for the interview. Which day and time is best for you and Job?

--- Peggy

Hi Peg,

Happy Easter!

Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---

yes

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 11:38 AM
To: psims@eac.gov, cc
Subject: Conference Call This Afternoon
Are you two still available for the conference call we had scheduled for this afternoon at 4 PM EST/3 PM CST? — Peg

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM -----

"Tova Wang"
04/21/2006 11:18 AM

To: psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov"
cc

Subject: case charts 2

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---

"Tova Wang"
04/21/2006 11:14 AM

To: psims@eac.gov
cc: "Job Serebrov"

Subject: nexis article charts and overview/analysis

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Tova Andrea Wang  
Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534  

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Tova-Do we have time to review this?

--- Tova Wang wrote:

> Is it possible to get the materials they are using  
> for the trainings?  
> Thanks Peg.  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
See Donsanto response below.--- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 04/17/2006 10:07 AM ------

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

04/17/2006 09:56 AM

To
psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject
RE: Announcement of FBI Election Crimes Initiative

Peg --

This is essentially FBI's equivalent of the Department's Ballot Access and Integrity Initiative. The news conference on Thursday announced that FBI was enhancing its prioritization of campaign financing offenses. The main feature of this initiative, aside from enhancing the priority these cases will get in the Bureau, is that each of the Bureau's 57 Field Divisions will have at least one "Election Coordinator Agent" who will be the equivalent of the District Election Officer AUSAs. We have been training these new FBI-types: the week before last we had roughly 75 of them in Denver in a very well received two-day session in election law enforcement at which several FEC people spoke. On Wednesday, I head out to Portland, Oregon for more of the same.
Hi, Craig:

Tova noticed an article about an FBI initiative against election crimes (see attached email). Is this something new, or is it more of the same initiative that you addressed in your interview? If it is new, would you have time for a teleconference with Job and Tova to answer any questions they may have on the initiative?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 04/17/2006 08:56 AM -----

04/16/2006 11:39 AM

To
psims@eac.gov

cc
"Tova Wang" <

Subject
donsanto again
Hi Peg,

Happy Easter!

Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

<http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm>

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ----

To psims@eac.gov, 
cc

Subject Re: Follow up Donsanto and KY Interviews

Next week is out for me. I need to check my schedule this week. Is this the last interview that you were able to arrange?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

Tova and Job:

I've passed Tova's request on to Craig.

Also, Sarah Ball Johnson, KY, finally called back to say she would be available Wednesday through Friday this week and next week for the interview. Which day and time is best for you and Job?

--- Peggy

04/16/2006 11:39 AM

To psims@eac.gov
cc
'Tova Wang'
Hi Peg,

Happy Easter!

Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
04/17/2006 10:33 AM
To "Job Serebrov"
cc 3SAEXTERNAL, Tova Andrea
Wang

Subject: Re: Interviews

I have to check with Conny McCormack to see if things have settled down for her enough so that she would be available. I have had no response to my overtures to Colleen McAndrews' office. I can try again, but I have to be out of town again, from Wednesday through Friday this week, on another research contract and for EAC's public meeting in Seattle. Were you able to get through to Mike McCarthy?

Please remember to watch your time. We'll need to reserve some of your time for the working group meeting and the subsequent reports. --- Peggy

"Job Serebrov"

"Job Serebrov"
04/17/2006 10:17 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc

Subject: Re: Follow up Donsanto and KY Interviews

Next week is out for me. I need to check my schedule this week. Is this the last interview that you were able to arrange?
--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job:
> I've passed Tova's request on to Craig.
> Also, Sarah Ball Johnson, KY, finally called back to say she would be available Wednesday through Friday this week and next week for the interview. Which day and time is best for you and Job?
> --- Peggy

> 04/16/2006 11:39 AM

> To psims@eac.gov
> cc "Tova Wang"
> Subject donsanto again

> Hi Peg,
> Happy Easter!
> Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ----

"Tova Wang"

To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov"
cc
Subject interview with Doug Webber – correct version

I sent the wrong version! Please use this one.
And there will be one more forthcoming next week.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---

"Tova Wang"
04/21/2006 12:13 PM
To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov"
cc
Subject existing literature summaries 1

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---

"Tova Wang"
04/21/2006 11:17 AM
To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov"
cc
Subject job's case charts 1
Good Morning Peg,

That works for me....I will stay off the phone and wait on the call.

Have A Great Weekend,

Tony

----- Original Message -----
From: psims@eac.gov
To: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2006 2:27 PM
Subject: Re: Fw: Nonpartisan Local Election Official Needed for Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Working Group

Tony:

How about scheduling the teleconference with our consultants for 10 AM CST/11 AM EST on Wednesday, April 12? --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM -----
Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

Interview with Heather Dawn Thompson.doc Interview with Jason Torchinsky final.doc Interview with Joe Rich.doc
Interview with Joe SandlerFINAL.doc Interview with John Ravitz.doc Interview with John Tanner.doc
Interview with Kevin Kennedy.doc

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---

"Tova Wang"
<wang@tcf.org> To psims@eac.gov cc
04/17/2006 12:28 PM Subject RE: Interviews

Noon EST

----Original Message----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 10:49 AM
To: wang@tcf.org
Subject: Interviews

I know you preferred Friday, but Job is not available then. He also said he is not available next week. Do you have any time available this Wednesday? -- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 04/17/2006 11:45 AM ---
"Job Serebrov"
I can't do it Friday but Wednesday is ok.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job:
> > I've passed Tova's request on to Craig.
> > Also, Sarah Ball Johnson, KY, finally called back to say she would be available Wednesday through Friday this week and next week for the interview. Which day and time is best for you and Job?
> > --- Peggy
>
> 04/16/2006 11:39 AM
>
> To
> psims@eac.gov
> cc
> "Tova Wang"
> Subject
donsanto again
>
> Hi Peg,
> Happy Easter!
> Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm
Hi, Craig:

Tova noticed an article about an FBI initiative against election crimes (see attached email). Is this something new, or is it more of the same initiative that you addressed in your interview? If it is new, would you have time for a teleconference with Job and Tova to answer any questions they may have on the initiative?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov
Hi Peg,

Happy Easter!

Would it be possible to talk to Mr. Donsanto about this latest initiative, or somehow get more information? Thanks. Tova

http://www.fbi.gov/page2/april06/electioncrime041406.htm

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM -----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
04/26/2006 08:04 PM
To "Tova Andrea Wang" cc
Subject Re: wg

Let me check with Devon early tomorrow. If she did not hear from him this afternoon, I'll have her contact you. Perhaps you will have more success than we have.

Peggy

----------------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Tova Wang" [wang@tcf.org]
Sent: 04/26/2006 05:46 PM
To: Margaret Sims
Subject: wg

Do you want me to call both Bob too?

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM -----

012704
We have heard from Bob Bauer regarding his availability, so we don't need to have you pursue the matter. Thanks for the offer, though. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM -----

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
04/27/2006 09:13 AM	To "Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Unfortunately, I have to get the Working Group together before then, so that my consultants can prepare the final report before June. (In June, I lose one of them to State employment.) I understand about the crammed schedule. This month and next are chock full.

Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

How about we meld this with the EAC Board of Advisors meeting? I just got tagged to be parliamentarian --

We could attend to your folks while I arbitrate a food fight!!!!
--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed Apr 26 20:30:24 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Craig:
Are you available any days in the third week of May?
Peggy
--- Original Message -----
From: "Donsanto, Craig" [Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov]
Sent: 04/03/2006 03:16 PM
To: Margaret Sims
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Hello Peg!

God willing, I will be here the first two weeks of May.

As for your second question, it is not possible for me to assess the level of public attribution that would be appropriate without seeing the substantive stuff in context. I do not foresee a problem. So, I recommend that you get me a draft text and I will review it to ensure we are not disclosing things we shouldn't disclose.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2006 3:13 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Craig:

I have 2 issues for you today.

First, I am trying to schedule a meeting of the project working group for EAC's Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. As a technical advisor on this project, your attendance is particularly important to me. Would you please look at your schedule and let me know if there are any days during the first 2 weeks of May that you would NOT be available?

Second, is it OK for our consultants to refer in their report to guidance provided in the DOJ training materials? I ask this because I understood that some materials in the materials are considered confidential and we do not want to violate your confidentiality provisions. If there is a compromise position, such as having you review that portion of the consultants' report, then let me know.

Thanks!
Peggy Sims  
Election Research Specialist  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)  
Fax: 202-566-3127  
email: psims@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ----

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>  
To psims@eac.gov  
cc  
04/26/2006 09:07 PM  
Subject Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Peg -- I'll have check. I am pretty well clogged next month.

What do you need Peg?

--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>  
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>  
Sent: Wed Apr 26 20:30:24 2006  
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Craig:
Are you available any days in the third week of May?
Peggy

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----  
From: "Donsanto, Craig" [Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov]  
Sent: 04/03/2006 03:16 PM  
To: Margaret Sims  
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Hello Peg!
God willing, I will be here the first two weeks of May.

As for your second question, it is not possible for me to assess the level of public attribution that would be appropriate without seeing the substantive stuff in context. I do not foresee a problem. So, I recommend that you get me a draft text and I will review it to ensure we are not disclosing things we shouldn't disclose.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2006 3:13 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Craig:

I have 2 issues for you today.

First, I am trying to schedule a meeting of the project working group for EAC's Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. As a technical advisor on this project, your attendance is particularly important to me. Would you please look at your schedule and let me know if there are any days during the first 2 weeks of May that you would NOT be available?

Second, is it OK for our consultants to refer in their report to guidance provided in the DOJ training materials? I ask this because I understood that some materials in the materials are considered confidential and we do not want to violate your confidentiality provisions. If there is a compromis position, such as having you review that portion of the consultants' report, then let me know.

Thanks!

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM -----

"Tony J. Sirvello III"
04/11/2006 03:40 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: Re: Fw: Nonpartisan Local Election Official Needed for Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Working Group
Good Afternoon Peg,

I will make the call as scheduled. I am still in shock about Ray.

Tony

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov 
To: Tony Sirvello 
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2006 6:04 PM 
Subject: Re: Fw: Nonpartisan Local Election Official Needed for Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Working Group

Tony:
We have set up your telephone interview with our 2 consultants (Job Serebrov and Tova Wang) as a teleconference. Please call 1-866-222-9044 (toll free) at around 10 AM CST on Wed 4/12. At the prompt for the passcode, enter [Redacted] Tova and Job will join you on the line. This works best if you use a land line, rather than a cell phone.

If you have trouble connecting, please call Nicole Mortellito at our office (866-747-7421. Thanks!

Peggy

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Tony J. Sirvello III" 
Sent: 04/07/2006 08:52 AM 
To: Margaret Sims 
Subject: Re: Fw: Nonpartisan Local Election Official Needed for Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Working Group

Good Morning Peg,

That works for me....I will stay off the phone and wait on the call.

Have A Great Weekend,

Tony

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov 
To: [Redacted] 
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2006 2:27 PM
Subject: Re: Fw: Nonpartisan Local Election Official Needed for Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Working Group

Tony:

How about scheduling the teleconference with our consultants for 10 AM CST/11 AM EST on Wednesday, April 12? --- Peggy

I think I can help you at least with respect to Barbara. I'll be speaking to her today!

Thanks. We are still trying to get through to Bauer and Arnwine. They have not responded, so their availability is not yet reflected on our spreadsheet. --- Peggy

Hi Peg,

Attached, to add to the collection, is a summary overview of the interviews. Do you have that spreadsheet you were telling me about reflecting the times WG participants are available? If so, maybe we can talk soon? Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Hi Peg,

Here is the last summary of existing research. Please let us know how to proceed from here. Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 03:57 PM ---

Thanks! I'll get back to you. --- Peggy

"Weinberg and Utrecht" <weinutr@verizon.net>
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Peggy:

You've hit the jackpot! I'm available, with 2 exceptions, every hour of every day from May 15 through May 19. I am not available Thursday morning, May 18, or Friday afternoon, May 19.

Barry

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov
To: Barry Weinberg
Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2006 8:28 PM
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Barry:

Are you available any days in the third week of May?

Peggy

----------------------------------------

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Weinberg and Utrecht"
Sent: 04/04/2006 08:14 AM
To: Margaret Sims
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Peggy:

May looks pretty good right now. I will not be available May 1, or in the morning (before 12:30) on May 4 or May 11, or in the afternoon on May 10.

Barry

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov
To: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2006 3:15 PM
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Hi, Barry:

I'm trying to arrange a meeting of the Working Group for EAC's Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation project. Would you please look at your schedule and let me know if there are any days during the first 2 weeks of May that you would NOT be available?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Hi Peg,

Attached please find our joint working definition of voter fraud and intimidation.

This is also to let you know that Job and I have agreed that I may speak with political and social scientists with expertise in methodology and data collection alone.

Finally, the types of expenses that we are incurring unrelated to travel include such items as long distance phone calls, particularly between Job and myself, but also between me and the political scientists mentioned above; and books such as John Fund's "Stealing Elections," Andrew Gumbel's "Stealing the Election," and "Deliver the Vote: A History of Election Fraud, an American Political Tradition-1742-2004" by Tracy Campbell, which cost in the $25 range each. I also ordered the 2005 National Directory of Prosecuting Attorneys for $50. Another potential expense might be shipping fees if we want to exchange material that cannot be emailed. Please let us know how you would like us to arrange for reimbursement for such expenses.

Thanks.
Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM -----

"Job Serebrov"
To: psims@eac.gov
cc:
Subject: Meetings

Peggy:

Just spoke with Tova. We would like to have a three way telephone conference with you this week if possible. The best dates for our face to face are Oct 24th or 28th. Please let me know what works for you.

Talk with you when you get answers to my questions.

Regards,

Job

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM -----

"Job Serebrov"
To: psims@eac.gov
cc:
Subject: Request

Peggy & Tova:

Can you send us the names of the members of the Working Group once they are finalized?

Tova how about discussing the interview list early
next week and at that time we can also discuss theme topics.

Job

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM ---

"Job Serebrov"

To psims@eac.gov
cc

Subject Re: Moving Along

Peggy:

Friday is best for me to teleconference.

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Dear Tova and Job:
> >
> > Rest assured that I have not ignored your emails. We have a lot going on around here, and have had to use a triage system to tackle all of the things that currently need our attention. I understand that Julie has responded to Tova's question about the September monthly report, indicating that the nomenclature refers to work done in September, not a monthly report due in September. Here are responses to other questions you have raised, and some concerns of mine:
> >
> > Teleconference - We do need a teleconference this week to discuss some procedural issues and any remaining concerns that you may have. At the moment, my schedule for the remainder of the week is flexible. When would a teleconference be convenient for you two?
> >
> > Working Group - I am circulating your lists of possible working group members to our Commissioners for review and comment. I will get back to you as soon as I have heard from everyone. This may take awhile, probably through the end of November, as one of our Commissioners is out of the office for an extended period due to a death in the family.
Revised Workplan - Due to political sensitivities regarding this project, it is more important than usual that you act as a team. I noticed several instances on the revised workplan where only one of you is scheduled to be involved. While it seems to me that it would be OK for one or the other to take the lead on a particular aspect of the work (e.g.; developing Westlaw search terms, drafting a research instrument, or setting up interviews), it is very important that both of you be involved in making final decisions on the information gathering process and in the resulting information gathering effort (e.g.; finalizing the Westlaw search terms and reviewing the search results; finalizing the proposed research instrument, administering the survey, and reviewing the survey responses; and conducting interviews).

DOJ Contact - I am working through the DOJ bureaucracy to obtain the input we need from the Election Crimes Branch. I have spoken to the career attorney I mentioned in previous teleconferences, Craig Donsanto. He is very interested in providing information and perspectives that will be useful to the project; but may have to obtain his superior's permission to participate. I will keep you posted on my efforts. Once we have access to him, it will be important to schedule an initial interview at the earliest time convenient for him and the two of you.

Contacting Other EAC Contractors - Questions for other EAC contractors need to be fielded through me. I realize this may seem cumbersome, but there are a number of reasons for this, some involving contractual issues, some procedural and policy issues. I will have to coordinate our activities on this project with the EAC project manager for the other EAC research project(s). Together, we will ascertain what the other contractors already have provided to EAC that may answer your questions, perhaps without an interview being necessary, or if the research is not far enough along to provide the information you seek.

Peggy Sims
Somehow I did not get the original email with the search results. Would someone please send them to me? Thanks. Tova

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Job Serebrov" <serebrov@sbcglobal.net>
To: <tnedzar@eac.gov>; <wang@tcf.org>
Cc: <psims@eac.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2005 8:15 PM
Subject: Re: Today's Searches

> Tamar:
> >
> > This looks real good. Thanks for the excellent effort.
> > I know this has not been the easiest assignment.
> >
> > Job
> >
> > --- tnedzar@eac.gov wrote:
> >
> > Tova and Job,
> >>
> >> Please find below today's results. I modified the
> >> searches in Lexis so
> >> that the files now include the case summaries as
> >> well as headnotes. I'll
> >> keep plugging away tomorrow. Please be in touch if
> >> you have any questions.
> >>
> >>
> >> Thank you,
> >>
> >> Tamar Nedzar
> >> Law Clerk
> >> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> >> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> >> Washington, DC 20005
> >> (202) 566-2377
> >> http://www.eac.gov
Job,

I was using Lexis because I don't have inter-semester access to Westlaw. In addition, Westlaw does not allow me to restrict to specific dates. However, I called the dean of my school this morning and he granted me access to Westlaw for the break on a limited basis, so I will start fresh with the terms.

In the student version of Westlaw, I can choose cases in the past 3 or 10 years, but cannot select a date range. I will use the 10 year limitation unless you write to tell me otherwise.

I'll send results tonight.

Thanks,

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov
"Job Serebrov" <serebrov@sbcglobal.net>

Tamar:

I received your first Zip File today and there is another major problem. These look like Lexis and not Westlaw searches. The way this material is presented it is impossible to tell what is going on. I stated in
my last e-mail that I wanted you to use Westlaw because you can pull up a short case evaluation for each case. These are no good to us without these evaluations. The evaluations list the parties, a short statement of facts and a short summary of the court's holding. I can only evaluate these cases with such a summary. Sorry to send you back to the drawing board but better now then after you substantially completed the assignment. If you can get these kind of evaluations with Lexis then go ahead but if not you need to use Westlaw.

Regards,

Job

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM ---

Hi Peg,

Hope you’re enjoying the holiday weekend. Job and I are having a bit of a disagreement about how we should be handling the existing research materials and would like to briefly discuss this with you. Are you available on Tuesday morning? We are both available until 11:30 am. Thanks so much.

Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM ---

Oops! I had an appointment Tuesday morning and did not see your message until after Noon. (When I have my Blackberry, I will be able to respond more promptly.) Are you two available any other time today? I will be out of the office Wednesday through Monday, but will be back in the office Tuesday afternoon. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM ---
Hi Peg,

Hope you're enjoying the holiday weekend. Job and I are having a bit of a disagreement about how we should be handling the existing research materials and would like to briefly discuss this with you. Are you available on Tuesday morning? We are both available until 11:30 am. Thanks so much.

Tova

The following file folders on the disc you sent me were empty:

Misleading Ex-felon Voting Right
Non-Citizen Voting
Wrongful Removal of Eligible Voters from Registration Lists

If they were blank file folders, why were they included?

Job

I would at least like to have input on the local election official. I also need a bit of time to think about the state official, because I'm not sure Cathy Cox will do it. So I need to consider a back-up. Thanks. Tova
That's great. I'll probably come by between 2 and 3 if that's OK. I look forward to seeing you, even if only briefly. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2005 5:23 PM
To: 
Subject: RE: Tuesday

Tova:

I should be available during the mid to late afternoon, provided we are not besieged with election-related calls. Regardless, I can provide the file with the news clippings for your review.

--- Peggy

"Tova Wang"
Hi Peg,

I will be down in DC next Tuesday for a meeting. I wonder if it would be useful for me to come by -- I think you mentioned at one point you had a big collection of articles. It would be great to be able to take a look at them. I'm available mid to late afternoon. Let me know.

Any word on the contract situation?

Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM ---

I'd be delighted! Will you be coming as well (I hope)?

Please refresh my recollection when this gets closer in time -- i.e. after New Years.

-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2005 4:27 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Voting Fraud-Preliminary Research

Craig:

The Chair gave me your response. I'm pleased, to say the least! Would you be available for an hour or so on January 13 (a Friday) to talk with our two
consultants when they are in town? If so, when would be most convenient for you? Would you prefer that I accompany them, or are you willing to take them on alone?

Also, would you prefer that our consultants forward any information requests through me (both before and after their meeting with you), or may I provide your contact information so that they can make their requests directly? Already, I have received a request for any related statistical data you may have. I have given them a copy of the January 1995 version of your Federal Prosecution of Election Offenses.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM ---

"Tova Wang"
11/29/2005 02:25 PM
To: psims@eac.gov,
cc:
Subject: RE: Teleconference With Legal Clerk and Intern

I am available any of those times. Remind us of their names again please? Tova

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2005 2:18 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Teleconference With Legal Clerk and Intern

Tova and Job:

Are you two available for a teleconference with our Law Clerk and Intern tomorrow at either of the times listed below?

Between 12 and 1 PM EST; or
Any time between 3:30 and 5:30 PM EST

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
The Law Clerk's name is Tamar Nedzar. She is very sharp. Our intern's name is Devon Romig.

Tamar has the most recent lists of search terms and may have questions about them. Devon will need to know how you want the press clippings sorted by type of voting fraud. I think we need to give her a specific list, that, I hope, will not overlap. For example, do you want her to sort using the term Absentee Ballot Fraud when that can involve voter intimidation/coercion/undue influence, vote buying, ballot tampering, and ballot box stuffing (by voting in the name of another or under a fictitious name).

We need to discuss this because I am concerned that we currently do not have a full written description of what does and does not constitute voting fraud and voter intimidation. The current written definition excludes voter registration shenanigans; yet, voter registration applications submitted with fictitious names or that falsely affirm eligibility to vote are considered election crimes that can have an impact on election results. Specifically, they are used in schemes to vote more than once or to have ineligible persons participate in voting. Also, an increasing number of States are including as an election crime the knowing and willful destruction of voter registration applications by voter registration drives and their failure to transmit such applications to the election office in a timely manner.

If we define voting fraud as any illegal act that has a clear and direct distorting impact on the election results, then administrative mistakes that violate federal or State law could be included. For federal elections, administrative mistakes definitely are not considered voting fraud. The examples provided for "de facto" fraud and "quasi" fraud also are not likely to be considered part of voting fraud and voter intimidation without evidence that there also is ballot box stuffing, vote buying, tampering with ballots or vote tallies, voter intimidation, etc. Although a number of things other than voting fraud and voter intimidation can (and do) distort election results, EAC is handling such issues under separate research efforts.

For your information, I have attached a speech presented by Craig Donsanto (complete with typos) that addresses the issue of defining voting fraud. Perhaps it will be of interest to you.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov
Job:

This is just to remind you that I will be calling today at 4:00 PM EST (3:00 PM CST). --- Peggy

Tova and Job,

It was good to talk to you today. Hope you are doing well. I've attached my African American search results below. It encompasses all of the terms you suggested having to do with African Americans.

The following is a search I used to truncate words and combine terms, but I still got a large number of results:

Vote! and deny and black or vote! and black and challenge or vote! and black and reject or vote! and black or vote! And deny and African w/s American or vote! And African w/s American and reject or challenge or vote! And African w/s American or election and black and deny or challenge or reject or election and black or election and African w/s American and deny or challenge or reject or election and African w/s American or ballot and security and black or ballot and security and African w/s American or black and vote! And suppress! Or African w/s American and vote! And suppress or African w/s and disenfranchis! or black and disenfranchis!

If this search yields useful cases for you, I can continue searching using the same strategy. If not, please provide me with additional guidelines and I will do my best!

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions or need additional information.

Thank you,
Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
Peggy:

We needed to schedule the face to face meeting for Oct 28. Talk with you on Weds.

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> I will initiate the calls to you two on Wednesday.
> The number I have for
> Tova is For Job, I have
> Let me know if I
> should use a different number for you on Wednesday.
> 
> Thanks, Tova, for the copy of the draft workplan you
> provided to Karen.
> I'll take a look at it and, hopefully, provide some
> feedback on Wednesday.
> I have not yet caught up to all the paperwork and
> emails that preceded my
> assignment to this project. Karen just handed me a
> folder full of
> documents that should help.
> 
> I think you may have received an email from Nicole
> Mortellito regarding an
> October 14 meeting. If you two cannot come in
> person but can attend via
> phone, just let me know. Nicole's message has
> information regarding hotel
> rates that conflicts with what I've just sent you.
> I've asked her to
> double check her information because I have another
> contractor that has
> had no problem obtaining government rate at hotels.
> 
> Yes, you will be paid on a monthly basis. You can
file your first invoice
on October 25, according to Diana Scott.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120
direct
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

"Tova Wang"
10/03/2005 05:04 PM

To
psims@eac.gov,
cc
ggilmour@eac.gov
Subject
RE: Voting Fraud Teleconference-Meeting-Work
Schedule

Peg, This all sounds good. Will you be calling us on Wednesday?
I should not need a hotel for the 28th. Just let me know what time. Are there expense forms we should have for reimbursement?
On the work product, we did send Karen a very preliminary draft of a work plan. I attach it again here and we can talk about it more on Wednesday.
My only money question is, are we being paid on a monthly basis? And if so, when does that begin? I assume this all is in the contracts we'll be getting...

Thanks.

Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 03, 2005 2:48 PM
To: 
Cc: ggilmour@eac.gov
Subject: Voting Fraud Teleconference-Meeting-Work Schedule
Tova and Job:

Teleconference -
Let's schedule the teleconference for 4:00 PM on Wednesday, October 5.
Gavin Gilmour will join us.

Meeting -
October 28 is fine for the face-to-face meeting in DC. We have allocated $5,000 to each of you to cover reasonable and necessary travel and other incidental expenses. Expenses claimed for reimbursement need to be itemized, with appropriate receipts provided. You should be able to obtain the Federal government rate at an area hotel (if you plan to stay overnight). If the hotel needs a letter from EAC (in lieu of showing them your signed contract), just let me know. Airlines apparently no longer honor government rates for government contractors. Rail carriers may provide government rates for government contractors. If you drive, the current government rate for a personally owned vehicle (POV) is 48.5 cents per mile.

Deliverables -
The first item on the list of deliverables is the draft project workplan, which is due ASAP after award. Would it be possible for the two of you to deliver a draft workplan to me via email by 10/11? That would be after we have had our teleconference to work out lingering questions.

Questions for Finance -
If you have questions for our Finance Officer, you can reach her via email at dscott@eac.gov. I would appreciate it if you would cc: me on such emails, so that I know to follow up with her.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov
In the course of compiling a list of search terms for the Nexis research, I thought of some major omissions to the WESTLAW list.

Everywhere we have a term such as African American and .... or Latino and .... we should also have the following:

- Asian American (and if possible, Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese)
- Native American
- Indian
- Indian Country

Moreover, everywhere we have poll worker or poll inspector we should also have the following:

- Poll judges
- Poll monitors
- Poll observers

Let me know if you want me to re-do the list.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Can you give us a better idea of the other EAC research projects that you think we might overlap with if we include these activities? Job and I had strong reasons for what we did and did not include and how we wanted to frame the term fraud, so we do indeed need to discuss this -- perhaps before or after the discussion with Tamar and Devon?

Thanks. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2005 3:18 PM
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Teleconference With Legal Clerk and Intern

The Law Clerk's name is Tamar Nedzar. She is very sharp. Our intern's name is Devon Romig.

Tamar has the most recent lists of search terms and may have questions about them. Devon will need to know how you want the press clippings sorted by type of voting fraud. I think we need to give her a specific list that I hope, will not overlap. For example, do you want her to sort using the term Absentee Ballot Fraud when that can involve voter intimidation/coercion/undue influence, vote buying, ballot tampering, and ballot box stuffing (by voting in the name of another or under a fictitious name).

We need to discuss this because I am concerned that we currently do not have a full written description of what does and does not constitute voting fraud and voter intimidation. The current written definition excludes voter registration shenanigans; yet, voter registration applications submitted with fictitious names or that falsely affirm eligibility to vote are considered election crimes that can have an impact on election results. Specifically, they are used in schemes to vote more than once or to have ineligible persons participate in voting. Also, an increasing number of States are including as an election crime the knowing and willful destruction of voter registration applications by voter registration drives and their failure to transmit such applications to the election office in a timely manner.

If we define voting fraud as any illegal act that has a clear and direct distorting impact on the election results, then administrative mistakes that violate federal or State law could be included. For federal elections, administrative mistakes definitely are not considered voting fraud. The examples provided for "de facto" fraud and "quasi" fraud also are not likely to be considered part of voting fraud and voter intimidation without evidence that there also is ballot box stuffing, vote buying, tampering with ballots or vote tallies, voter intimidation, etc. Although a number of things other than voting fraud and voter intimidation can (and do) distort such election results, EAC is handling such issues under separate research efforts.

For your information, I have attached a speech presented by Craig Donsanto (complete with typos) that addresses the issue of defining voting fraud. Perhaps it will be of interest to you.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Job:
Devon set up the folders before she completed her review of the articles. I saw that the folders were empty, but did not ask her to remove them. If you copy the CD contents to a file on your computer, you may yet use the empty folders to file relevant articles found subsequent to Devon's sorting. For example, I have a few recent articles that I will send via email. When we come across articles that belong in the empty folders, we can put them there. --- Peggy

"Job Serebrov" <serebrov@sbcglobal.net>

The following file folders on the disc you sent me were empty:

Misleading Ex-felon Voting Right
Non-Citizen Voting
Wrongful Removal of Eligible Voters from Registration Lists

If they were blank file folders, why were they included?

Job
Peggy:

Tova and I will need copies of your vote fraud literature file. Also, do you want a one liner on all of the people proposed for the working group or just the three that we are recommending for the final group?

Any work from Gavin?

Job

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM ---

Peggy:

I am requesting that we be able to have four instead of three from each side. I have four very good people who have a lot of experience in this area. I left you a telephone call on this matter. I know we have to watch the budget but one of my picks is in DC and will not cost much if anything to get to meetings. I know that Tova also had DC people that she could add as a fourth.

Job

Working Group One Line Info.doc
--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM ---

Tova and Job,
Please find below today's results. I modified the searches in Lexis so that the files now include the case summaries as well as headnotes. I'll keep plugging away tomorrow. Please be in touch if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM ---
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
11/30/2005 04:50 PM
To Tova Andrea Wang, Job Serebrov
cc
Subject Tamar and Devon Contact Information

Tova and Job:

This is to confirm the email addresses and best phone numbers to reach Tamar Nedzar and Devon Romig. I would appreciate it if you would cc: me on any emails to them. That way you can keep me in the loop without my serving as a road block or go-between. Thanks! --- Peggy

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
Phone (cell): 703-861-2055
Email: TNedzar@eac.gov

Devon Romig
Intern
Phone: 202-566-1707
Email: DRomig@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM ---
Job Serebrov
12/22/2005 04:45 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Interview List

Peggy:
Here is the interview list. Please make any recommendation that you feel is needed.

---

I am available. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2005 2:45 PM
To: serebrov@sbcglobal.net; wang@tcf.org
Subject: Teleconference Needed

Would both of you be available for a teleconference tomorrow at 2 PM EST concerning contract issues? The teleconference would include Julie Thompson, our General Counsel, and me. We would call you.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM -----

We are confirmed for a teleconference tomorrow at 2 PM EST. We will call you at the following phone numbers, unless you tell me otherwise:

Tova

Thanks!

--- Peggy
Tamar:

This looks real good. Thanks for the excellent effort. I know this has not been the easiest assignment.

Job

--- tnedzar@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job,
> 
> Please find below today's results. I modified the searches in Lexis so that the files now include the case summaries as well as headnotes. I'll keep plugging away tomorrow. Please be in touch if you have any questions.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Tamar Nedzar
> Law Clerk
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> (202) 566-2377
> http://www.eac.gov
> TNedzar@eac.gov
>

Peggy:

I sent the words search terms to Tova yesterday to
review. Unfortunately, she will not be able to do so until late today or tomorrow. Consequently, I need to wait to send them to you.

As far as a trip to DC goes, I gave Tova two possible dates---Friday December 16 or Monday December 19.

Regards,

Job

Since it seems unlikely that we are going to be able to talk this morning, I am available any time tomorrow. Tova

Peg --

Please have your Chair send me a letter spelling out what your Commission's mandate, how I can help it, and asking me to do so. I will take it from there.

--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed Nov 16 17:34:08 2005
Subject: Requesting Your Help-Preliminary Research on Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation

Hi, Craig:

As I mentioned in my telephone call earlier today, I have been assigned to manage the U.S. Election Assistance Commission's (EAC) preliminary research project on voting fraud and voter intimidation. I know these are subjects
with which you are intimately familiar and recognize that the project needs the information and insights that you can provide, so I am asking for your help.

As you know, section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the issues listed in the statute are:

* nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office [section 241(b)(6)]; and

* identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)].

EAC's Board of Advisors recommended that EAC make research on these topics a high priority. Subsequently, the Commission contracted with two consultants (Tova Wang and Job Serebrov) to:

* develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;

* perform background research (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;

* establish a project working group, in consultation with EAC, composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation;

* provide the description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation and the results of the background research to the working group;

* convene the working group to discuss potential avenues for future EAC research on this topic;

* produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future research, if any;

* draft the project scope and Statement of Work for future research on these topics, if EAC decides to pursue one or more recommendations for future research.

At minimum, I hope that you can serve as an information resource for the team of two EAC consultants hired to conduct the research and me. I also would like to explore the feasibility of your participation in meetings of the project working group.

If EAC needs to submit a more formal request for your help, please advise me how to do so. Also, it would help me to know if there are any restrictions on your participation, other than anticipated restrictions on the time you have available.
Let me know if you have any questions about this request or the research project. I look forward to hearing from you and hope you are doing well.

Regards,

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM -----

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
11/22/2005 04:50 PM To "Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL
c c
Subject Re: Requesting Your Help-Preliminary Research on Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation

Craig:

This is just to let you know that I have drafted a letter for the Chair's signature, but she may want to make some changes before she signs. Once it is signed, I'll fax a copy to you and send the original by mail. For planning purposes, can you tell me when you don't expect to be available during the next 3 months (Dec-Feb)?
Peggy Sims
Phone: 202-566-3120 (direct)
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM -----

"Job Serebrow" To psims@eac.gov
c
Subject Question

Peggy:

We need to have a conference call this week if possible. I will have the one liner bios to you today. Also, when do you think the Commission with make its choices?

Job

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM -----
I am available for a 3-way teleconference after Noon on Wednesday this week. My schedule on Thursday and Friday is flexible, as well. When would be best for you two? I can call the telephone numbers you prefer and set up the conference call from my desk.

Both the 24th or the 28th are fine with me for the face-to-face meeting. Which do you prefer? If you have no preference, I suggest we pick the earlier of the two.

Regarding your contracts, I understand that the contract will carry the date of 9/25/05. All contracts have to be signed by the Chair, who has been out of the office on Commission business. I have been told that she will sign off on your contracts, among others, today. Our financial officer will send it to you after that. I'll try to obtain copies and fax the appropriate one to you as soon as they have been signed.

Regarding your pay, the contract will state that you should submit a monthly invoice to EAC for payment of your fee for that month. The contract is for 6 months, so our Finance Officer, Diana Scott, wants you to submit an invoice to her each month for 1/6th of the total payment, beginning 10/25/05.

I look forward to talking again with the two of you.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

Peggy:

Just spoke with Tova. We would like to have a three way telephone conference with you this week if possible. The best dates for our face to face are Oct 24th or 28th. Please let me know what works for you.

Talk with you when you get answers to my questions.
Regards,
Job

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM -----

"Job Seretnyv"
To: [Redacted]
cc: [Redacted]
Subject: Revised Work Plan

Peggy:

Here is the revised work plan that Tova and I worked on today. Any word from the Chair on signing?

--

Tova and Job,

Now that my exams are over for the semester, I am able to spend more time on your project. I plan to send you an email with my results from the day. Please find the first batch below.

Thanks,

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov
Tova,

Please find below yesterday's search results. I'll send another email at the end of the day today.

If you do not receive the results again, please call me at the office. GSA will only allow us to send such large files after business hours, so it may be that your computer times out receipt after a certain amount of time.

12_20.ZIP

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
Somehow I did not get the original email with the search results. Would someone please send them to me? Thanks. Tova

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Job Serebrov" <tnedzar@eac.gov>
To: <tnedzar@eac.gov>; psims@eac.gov
Cc: <psims@eac.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2005 8:15 PM
Subject: Re: Today's Searches

> Tamar:
> 
> This looks real good. Thanks for the excellent effort.
> I know this has not been the easiest assignment.
> 
> Job

--- tnedzar@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job,
> 
> Please find below today's results. I modified the
> searches in Lexis so
> that the files now include the case summaries as
> well as headnotes. I'll
> keep plugging away tomorrow. Please be in touch if
> you have any questions.
> 
> Thank you,

> Tamar Nedzar
> Law Clerk
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> (202) 566-2377
> http://www.eac.gov

TNedzar@eac.gov

12/20/2005 08:52 PM
To: "Job Serebrov"
tnedzar@eac.gov
cc psims@eac.gov
Subject: Re: Today's Searches
Peggy:

Here is a list of what we are waiting for from you:

- approval of the final definition of voter fraud
- final working group list

Also, we are waiting on the law clerk's search results. We know this will take till next month.

Finally, we are waiting on money. Any word on what is going on since we spoke this morning?

Job

OK, but Peg, I think the timeline we originally proposed may have to be moved forward if we are not in a position to do the work we need to do yet. Will that be possible? Thanks.

----- Original Message -----  
From: "Job Serebrov" 
To: [Redacted] 
Cc: [Redacted] 
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2005 2:16 PM 
Subject: Re: Travel to DC and Proposed Working Group Members

> Tova:
> 
> I don't have travel booked yet and want to wait until everything is in order.
>
OK, but Peg, I think the timeline we originally proposed may have to be moved forward if we are not in a position to do the work we need to do yet. Will that be possible? Thanks.

----- Original Message -----
From: "Job Serebrov"
To: psims@eac.gov
Cc: psims@eac.gov
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2005 2:16 PM
Subject: Re: Travel to DC and Proposed Working Group Members

> Tova:
> I don't have travel booked yet and want to wait until everything is in order.
> Job
> --- wang@tcf.org wrote:
Would it be possible for Job and I just to use the EAC office as a meeting place since we already have the travel booked? He and I should meet. Thanks.

Tova

----- Original Message ----- 

From: psims@eac.gov
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2005 11:11 AM
Subject: Travel to DC and Proposed Working Group Members

Dear Tova and Job:

I have been advised by our Counsel that, since the contracts have not yet been signed, we will have to postpone our October 28th meeting. Tova, for future reference, the per diem rates for DC (the Greater Washington, DC area) can be accessed through that web site I provided by clicking on the District of Columbia link on the map.

I also have to ask you to hold any further efforts on the Working Group until further notice. We are going to have to limit the number in the group to no more than six. EAC has to pay for the travel for these folks out of FY 2006 dollars. The agency currently is operating under a continuing resolution, and may not have its FY 2006 budget until December 2005, or later. When you submit the names of possible Working Group members, I will need a summary of their work in studying or enforcing laws against voting fraud and voter intimidation. (It is not sufficient to have expressed an interest in these matters, we need experienced folks.) The working group can include nonpartisan members, so long as any partisan-leaning members are balanced (i.e.; 1 R for 1 D).

I am sorry for any inconvenience that this may cause. I wish I had the power to change the situation, but I don't.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM -----
I will initiate the calls to you two on Wednesday. The number I have for Tova is . For Job, I have . Let me know if I should use a different number for you on Wednesday.

Thanks, Tova, for the copy of the draft workplan you provided to Karen. I'll take a look at it and, hopefully, provide some feedback on Wednesday. I have not yet caught up to all the paperwork and emails that preceded my assignment to this project. Karen just handed me a folder full of documents that should help.

I think you may have received an email from Nicole Mortellito regarding an October 14 meeting. If you two cannot come in person but can attend via phone, just let me know. Nicole's message has information regarding hotel rates that conflicts with what I've just sent you. I've asked her to double check her information because I have another contractor that has had no problem obtaining government rate at hotels.

Yes, you will be paid on a monthly basis. You can file your first invoice on October 25, according to Diana Scott.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

Peg, This all sounds good. Will you be calling us on Wednesday?

I should not need a hotel for the 28th. Just let me know what time. Are there expense forms we should have for reimbursement?

On the work product, we did send Karen a very preliminary draft of a work plan. I attach it again here and we can talk about it more on Wednesday.

My only money question is, are we being paid on a monthly basis? And if so, when does that begin?
assume this all is in the contracts we'll be getting...

Thanks.

Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 03, 2005 2:48 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: ggilmour@eac.gov
Subject: Voting Fraud Teleconference-Meeting-Work Schedule

Tova and Job:

Teleconference -
Let's schedule the teleconference for 4:00 PM on Wednesday, October 5. Gavin Gilmour will join us.

Meeting -
October 28 is fine for the face-to-face meeting in DC. We have allocated $5,000 to each of you to cover reasonable and necessary travel and other incidental expenses. Expenses claimed for reimbursement need to be itemized, with appropriate receipts provided. You should be able to obtain the Federal government rate at an area hotel (if you plan to stay overnight). If the hotel needs a letter from EAC (in lieu of showing them your signed contract), just let me know. Airlines apparently no longer honor government rates for government contractors. Rail carriers may provide government rates for government contractors. If you drive, the current government rate for a personally owned vehicle (POV) is 48.5 cents per mile.

Deliverables -
The first item on the list of deliverables is the draft project workplan, which is due ASAP after award. Would it be possible for the two of you to deliver a draft workplan to me via email by 10/11? That would be after we have had our teleconference to work out lingering questions.

Questions for Finance -
If you have questions for our Finance Officer, you can reach her via email at dscott@eac.gov. I would appreciate it if you would cc: me on such emails, so that I know to follow up with her.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127

email: psims@eac.gov
Tova:
Look forward to seeing you between 2 and 3 PM next Tuesday. If you need to make it later, that's OK. --- Peggy

"Tova Wang"

That's great. I'll probably come by between 2 and 3 if that's ok. I look forward to seeing you, even if only briefly. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2005 5:23 PM
To: wang@tcf.org
Subject: Re: Tuesday

Tova:

I should be available during the mid to late afternoon, provided we are not besieged with election-related calls. Regardless, I can provide the file with the news clippings for your review.

--- Peggy
I probably could give two to three days in January.

--- Tova Wang wrote:

> As I mentioned to Job earlier, I think we need to
> meet as soon as possible
> in order to develop and pare down our lists of who
> we want to interview,
> determine how we are going to go about doing the
> interviews (in-person,
> phone, email), schedule such meetings, decide what
> themes we agree to
> discuss with them; go over existing research and how
> we will work on
> summarizing existing findings; hammer out what is
> within the scope of our
> research; meet with the intern and law clerk;
> discuss how we are going to do
> the case law research; etc. Up to now, we both
> agreed, we have been
> operating in a bit of a void. We've been trying to
> do this meeting for
> months.
>
> Is it that you think we can combine this meeting
> with a meeting with Craig?
> I actually think they need to be separate since I
> think both will be very
> laborious and very different in nature.
>
> However, I will defer to whatever you, Peg, think
> best. I don't fee so
> strongly about it that I will be extremely upset if
> we wait until January.
>
> Thanks.
>
> Tova
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
> Sent: Monday, November 21, 2005 5:09 PM
> To: 
> Subject: Re: In-Person Meeting
>
> Job and Tova:
>
> If you both agree, a meeting in early January in
> lieu of a December meeting
> would be fine with me. As it would be good for you
> two to pick Craig
> Donsanto's brain when you are here, I'll find out
> when he is not available
> so that we can avoid that time.
>
> Peggy Sims
> Research Specialist
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120
> (direct)
> Fax: 202-566-3127
> email: psims@eac.gov
What do you think about moving the meeting to January after all of the holidays?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Thanks for the update. I'll let Tamar know. ---
> Peggy

Peggy:

> I sent the words search terms to Tova yesterday to review. Unfortunately, she will not be able to do so until late today or tomorrow. Consequently, I need to wait to send them to you.
> As far as a trip to DC goes, I gave Tova two
Don't know if you saw this or not.

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

Tamar:

You are not going to be able to place all of these word searches together. We need you to take each term on the list and do a search on it. You can only merge terms when it will not add other terms and therefore affect the outcome. For instance, vote and voter could probably be merged. I know this creates much much more work but it can't be helped. I would like you to pull the first 50 cases for each set of terms and send them
to us with a short case summary (I know Westlaw lets you do a short case summary). From there we will have to read the cases and decide if we need any others in that search term.

Regards,

Job

--- tnedzar@eac.gov wrote:

--------------------------
Tova and Job,

It was good to talk to you today. Hope you are doing well. I've attached my African American search results below. It encompasses all of the terms you suggested having to do with African Americans.

The following is a search I used to truncate words and combine terms, but I still got a large number of results:

Vot! and deny and black or vot! and black and challenge or vot! and black and reject or vot! and black or vot! And deny and African w/s American or vot! And African w/s American and reject or challenge or vot! And African w/s American or election and black and deny or challenge or reject or election and black or election and African w/s American and deny or challenge or reject or election and African w/s American or ballot and security and black or ballot and security and African w/s American or black and vot! And suppress! Or African w/s American and vote! And suppress or African w/s and disenfranchis! or black and disenfranchis!

If this search yields useful cases for you, I can continue searching using the same strategy. If not, please provide me with additional guidelines and I will do my best!

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions or need additional information.

Thank you,

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM -----
My schedule is flexible on Thursday and Friday. I'll call you both at 4:30 PM EST tomorrow (Thursday), unless I hear that is not a good time for either of you. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM -----

Thanks Peg. Any success in talking to Gracia about Cathy Cox? Have a good weekend. Tova

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov 
To: [redacted]
Cc: 
Sent: Friday, December 16, 2005 11:55 AM 
Subject: Re: More Money Roulette or Double or Nothing Still Equals Zero

Thanks for letting me know. Julie and I will deal with this. This is just ridiculous! --- Peggy

"Job Serebrov" 

Dear Julie & Peggy:

I just checked my bank account and no money. That also means that Tova is also penniless. As I understood, there was actually a chance that we were getting all
back pay by today. But alas---double or nothing still equals zero in this case no matter how you spin it.

Please give those wonderful folks who are in charge of releasing your funds a call and find out if they are on the beach in Brazil.

Eternally Broke,

Job

Do you agree with this? Thanks. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:serebrov@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2005 11:05 AM
To: Tova Wang
Subject: RE: Commission Consensus on Working Group

I told Peggy a three way talk was not necessary. I will be picking my legal/advocacy people today after talking with one of my potential members.

--- Tova Wang <wang@tcf.org> wrote:

> I would like for any initial discussion of this be among all three of us at the same time. I also need to give some thought to it. I am available all day Monday.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Job Serebrov [mailto:serebrov@sbcglobal.net]
> Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2005 10:55 AM
> To: psims@eac.gov; wang@tcf.org
> Subject: Re: Commission Consensus on Working Group
>
> Tova:
>
> Why don't you pick the academic since I had none on my list. I am letting Peggy pick the DOJ person and I suggested that she find a Hispanic for the local election official.
>
> Job
Karen and Tom,

Thanks so much. I am looking forward to working with you and my co-consultants on what I think is an extremely important topic.

I am pretty much available any day that week except Monday the 12th, so whatever is most convenient for everyone else any other day is fine by me. Please let me know the contract specifics when possible so I can work out an arrangement with The Century Foundation (which will not be a problem). Thanks again.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 4:44 PM
To: twilkey@eac.gov; sda@mit.edu; psims@eac.gov
Cc: klynndyson@eac.gov
Subject: Kick off activities for the EAC Voting fraud/voter intimidation project

Greetings-

Tom Wilkey and I have just completed a series of very informative and productive conversations with each of you and are anxious to move to the next step of this process.

We hope to assemble our consultant team on this project, within the next three weeks and are presently awaiting final approval of your contracts from our Commissioners. We anticipate this will take place in the next week to ten days.

We would like to assemble the team- Steve Ansolabehere of MIT, Tova Wang from The New Century Foundation and Job Serebrov, who has worked extensively on these issues for the State
of Arkansas, during the week of September 11. Please get back to us with some tentative dates during that week that might work with your schedule.

We look forward to working with all of you and appreciate your efforts on behalf of the EAC.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM -----

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
11/30/2005 08:41 AM	To Job Serebrov, Tova Andrea Wang
cc
Subject Wednesday Teleconference

Based on your feedback, I would like to schedule a teleconference among the three of us at 3:30 PM EST today --- to discuss any remaining issues regarding what we mean by voting fraud and voter intimidation, and what we want in the search terms. Then, I can bring Tamar and Devon in to join us at 3:45. Does that work for you two?

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov
----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM -----

"Tova Wang"

12/06/2005 03:56 PM	To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: 2 quick questions

Thanks Peg. I would think we would want to meet with Craig for at least an hour. We could schedule it for an hour if he is OK with it running over if necessary. If we would like statistical data from him should we request that in advance or wait until we see him to discuss what he can provide us with?

Also, does the below mean I will be receiving all three payments at once?

Thanks again. Tova

-----Original Message-----
Hi, Tova;

How much time do you want to schedule for the meeting with Donsanto? An hour? We’ve just received his response to our request confirming that he is pleased to be of assistance, which means he has received the OK from his superiors. I also want to include him in any Working Group discussions, although he will not be named as a member of that group. He is a great resource because he is smart and organized, and has years of experience in this area as a career DOJ attorney. I find that he is not shy about identifying challenges and noting improvements that he thinks are needed.

I signed off on all 3 of your invoices.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

"Tova Wang"  
12/02/2005 02:22 PM
Hi Peg,

[Redacted text]

Also, will you be able to schedule a meeting with Craig Donsanto for us for January 13?

Thanks. Have a good weekend. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

---

Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM
---

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
12/07/2005 11:18 AM
To “Tova Wang” cc: Job Serebrov
Subject Donsanto Interview & Payments

Tova and Job:

Craig Donsanto would like to meet at his office at 2 PM on Friday, January 13. I can either meet you there, or escort you there after we meet at EAC. (His office is within walking distance of EAC.) Please remember to bring ID, as we have to show it when we sign in.

He would prefer that you send any requests for data through me, so just let me know in more detail what you want. I suggest that we submit requests for any information that you deem appropriate, before the interview, so that you can review it before we go in. We can always request more information after the interview, if something comes up during our discussion.

Regarding questions about pending payments, Job will receive two more payments (perhaps at the same time, perhaps on separate days) and Tova will receive 3 payments (possibly all at the same time).

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

“Tova Wang”
Thanks Peg. I would think we would want to meet with Craig for at least an hour. We could schedule it for an hour if he is OK with it running over if necessary. If we would like statistical data from him should we request that in advance or wait until we see him to discuss what he can provide us with?

Also, does the below mean I will be receiving all three payments at once?

Thanks again. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2005 3:06 PM
To: Tova.Wan
Subject: RE: 2 quick questions

Hi, Tova;

How much time do you want to schedule for the meeting with Donsanto? An hour? We’ve just received his response to our request confirming that he is pleased to be of assistance, which means he has received the OK from his superiors. I also want to include him in any Working Group discussions, although he will not be named as a member of that group. He is a great resource because he is smart and organized, and has years of experience in this area as a career DOJ attorney. I find that he is not shy about identifying challenges and noting improvements that he thinks are needed.

I signed off on all 3 of your invoices:

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov
Hi Peg,

Also, will you be able to schedule a meeting with Craig Donsanto for us for January 13? I will give my travel info for you within the next couple of days.

Thanks. Have a good weekend. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM ---

Sounds good. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2005 8:41 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Wednesday Teleconference

Based on your feedback, I would like to schedule a teleconference among the three of us at 3:30 PM EST today — to discuss any remaining issues regarding what we mean by voting fraud and voter intimidation, and what we want in the search terms. Then, I can bring Tamar and Devon in to join us at 3:45. Does that work for you two?

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

---- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM ----

"Job Serebrov"
10/31/2005 02:47 PM

To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Teleconference Needed

What's up now?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Would both of you be available for a teleconference tomorrow at 2 PM EST concerning contract issues? The teleconference would include Julie Thompson, our General Counsel, and me. We would call you.
>
> Peggy Sims
> Research Specialist
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
> Fax: 202-566-3127
> email: psims@eac.gov

---- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM ----

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
10/17/2005 03:08 PM
To [Redacted]
cc
Subject Re: talking
Tova:

Let's try talking tomorrow afternoon. Any time after 1 PM would be fine with me. Thanks! --- Peggy

wang@tcf.org

10/17/2005 12:05 PM

To psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject talking

Hi Peg, Sorry to bother you again. I just realized I will not have access to email for the rest of the day. If you happen to have time this afternoon to talk please leave me a message on my cell phone Otherwise, let me know what a good time would be tomorrow. Thanks again.

Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:39 PM ----

"Tova Wang"

10/19/2005 10:56 AM

To psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject

Hi Peg,

Attached is my list of proposed working group members. I have not yet spoken to most of these people -- I wanted to get the go-ahead first. Also, I must admit to you that some of these names were tacked on after seeing the type of people Job would be requesting, as we discussed yesterday. I leave the sorting out of all that to your wisdom! Thanks and let me know if you have any questions or would like to see bios.

Tova

PS -- I will be at an election reform conference in Estes Park, CO Thursday and Friday where there apparently is no cell phone service. I will, however, be checking email.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
Hi Peg,

As we discussed, attached is a list of my working group recommendations with just a couple of sentences on each one. Frankly, there are a number of people I could have included, it was very difficult to narrow it down. Anyway, let me know if this works for you. Thanks. Tova wg suggestions -- short version.doc

Peg --

It's a little early! Anything can happen in the next month. But let's tentatively set this for 2 at my offices. I will get a conference room. But please remind me a week before. And yes: I would prefer it if you were involved in all aspects of my interaction with this project. You and I go back a long way, Peg, and I am confident you will understand whatever I tell your contractors.

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
Sent: Tue Dec 06 17:15:18 2005
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Preliminary Research

Craig:
What time would you prefer on January 13? Would you prefer that our
consultants forward any information requests through me (both before and after their meeting with you), or may I provide your contact information so that they can make their requests directly? Already, I have received a request for any related statistical data you may have. I have given them a copy of the January 1995 version of your Federal Prosecution of Election Offenses. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM -----

"Tova Wang"

12/21/2005 12:45 PM

To psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject conference call

Hi Peg,

Job and I would like to talk to you about some research issues -- are you available late tomorrow afternoon or Friday morning to talk? Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-T704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM -----

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

11/17/2005 02:33 PM

To Wang, Serebrov

cc

Subject Teleconference

How about 2 PM EST tomorrow (Friday)? I'll call each of you and bring you into the conference. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM -----

"Tova Wang"

10/12/2005 02:25 PM

To psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject RE: Contract Issues-Government Per Diem Rates
Hi Peggy,

Thanks for getting all this information for us. We are also progressing on our work nicely already. One question: what is the per diem for trips to DC? That doesn't seem to be listed, I guess because there is a presumption people are travelling from DC. This is obviously not an urgent question, so whenever you can get around to it. Thanks. Talk to you soon.

Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2005 4:33 PM
To: 
Subject: Contract Issues-Government Per Diem Rates

Good Morning Job an Tova:

I still do not have copies of your signed contracts. I understand that they may have to be revised if the project is going to use an EAC intern and EAC Westlaw access. I've scheduled a meeting with one of our attorneys this week to discuss the matter and will get back to you with further information, when I have it.

By now, you should have heard that the October 14 contractor meeting has been cancelled. Instead, EAC has scheduled a couple of staff meetings to review requirements for invoices and requests for reimbursement. I should have more information for you on this front by next Monday.

Today, I am sending by Federal Express the most recent copy of the Department of Justice's Federal Prosecution of Election Offenses and the Federal Election Commission's Innovations in Election Administration 8: Election Document Retention in an Age of High Technology. Let me know if you do not have it within a couple of days.

New per diem rates for federal travelers are effective October 1, 2005. You can find these rates at http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/contentView.do?programId=9704&channelId=15943&ooid=16365&contentId=17943&pageTypeId=8203&contentType=GSA_BASIC&programPage=%2Fep%2Fprogram%2Fgsabasic.jsp&P=MITT.

Peggy Sims  
Research Specialist  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)  
Fax: 202-566-3127  
email: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM -----

"Tova Wang"  
11/17/2005 02:39 PM  
To psims@eac.gov,  
cc  
Subject RE: Teleconference
Fine by me. Thanks, Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2005 2:33 PM
To: wang@tcf.org; serebrov@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Teleconference

How about 2 PM EST tomorrow (Friday)? I'll call each of you and bring you into the conference.
--- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

Peggy:

I think that you have hit the major problem in voter fraud—the federal/state system. We are essentially operating under state laws that control federal elections. Administrative mistakes can amount to voter fraud because the state system controls voting procedure. I must strongly disagree with you as to whether de facto or quasi fraud needs anything else. In my 15 years of election practice and administration it needed nothing else.

We can discuss the rest of your additions to our definition at our conference call.

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> The Law Clerk's name is Tamar Nedzar. She is very sharp. Our intern's name is Devon Romig.
>
> Tamar has the most recent lists of search terms and may have questions about them. Devon will need to know how you want the press clippings sorted by type of voting fraud. I think we need to give her a specific list. That, I hope, will not overlap. For example, do you want her to sort using the term Absentee Ballot Fraud when that can involve voter intimidation/coercion/undue influence, vote buying, ballot tampering, and ballot box
stuffing (by voting in the name of another or under a fictitious name).

We need to discuss this because I am concerned that we currently do not have a full written description of what does and does not constitute voting fraud and voter intimidation. The current written definition excludes voter registration shenanigans; yet, voter registration applications submitted with fictitious names or that falsely affirm eligibility to vote are considered election crimes that can have an impact on election results. Specifically, they are used in schemes to vote more than once or to have ineligible persons participate in voting. Also, an increasing number of States are including as an election crime the knowing and willful destruction of voter registration applications by voter registration drives and their failure to transmit such applications to the election office in a timely manner.

If we define voting fraud as any illegal act that has a clear and direct distorting impact on the election results, then administrative mistakes that violate federal or State law could be included. For federal elections, administrative mistakes definitely are not considered voting fraud. The examples provided for "de facto" fraud and "quasi" fraud also are not likely to be considered part of voting fraud and voter intimidation without evidence that there also is ballot box stuffing, vote buying, tampering with ballots or vote tallies, voter intimidation, etc.

Although a number of things other than voting fraud and voter intimidation can (and do) distort election results, EAC is handling such issues under separate research efforts.

For your information, I have attached a speech presented by Craig Donsanto (complete with typos) that addresses the issue of defining voting fraud. Perhaps it will be of interest to you.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120
Hi, Craig:

As I mentioned in my telephone call earlier today, I have been assigned to manage the U.S. Election Assistance Commission's (EAC) preliminary research project on voting fraud and voter intimidation. I know these are subjects with which you are intimately familiar and recognize that the project needs the information and insights that you can provide, so I am asking for your help.

As you know, section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the issues listed in the statute are:

- nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office [section 241(b)(6)]; and
- identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)].

EAC's Board of Advisors recommended that EAC make research on these topics a high priority. Subsequently, the Commission contracted with two consultants (Tova Wang and Job Serebrov) to:

- develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;
- perform background research (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;
- establish a project working group, in consultation with EAC, composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation;
- provide the description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation and the results of the background research to the working group;
- convene the working group to discuss potential avenues for future EAC research on this topic;
- produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future research, if any;
- draft the project scope and Statement of Work for future research on these topics, if EAC decides to pursue one or more recommendations for future research.

At minimum, I hope that you can serve as an information resource for the team of two EAC consultants hired to conduct the research and me. I also would like to explore the feasibility of your participation in meetings of the project working group.

If EAC needs to submit a more formal request for your help, please advise me how to do so. Also, it would help me to know if there are any restrictions on your participation, other than anticipated restrictions on the time you have available.
Let me know if you have any questions about this request or the research project. I look forward to hearing from you and hope you are doing well.

Regards,

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

Do you know yet if we will be able to speak to them today or tomorrow? Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

Hi Job,

The Westlaw search took more than half an hour-I think because I can only download results into ASCII format. I did find a way to add a case summary to the Lexis output. I have attached the first search below. If this is useful to you, I would rather use Lexis because output into a PDF file is faster. If you'd still prefer me to use Westlaw, I'll have to figure out a way to shorten the search times.
Tamar:

Please use the 10 year range. The case summary is the most important item. In the US Courts version of Westlaw you can restrict by date.

Thanks,

Job

--- tnedzar@eac.gov wrote:

> Job,
> 
> I was using Lexis because I don't have inter-semester access to Westlaw.
> In addition, Westlaw does not allow me to restrict to specific dates.
> However, I called the dean of my school this morning and he granted me access to Westlaw for the break on a limited basis, so I will start fresh with the terms.
> In the student version of Westlaw, I can choose cases in the past 3 or 10 years, but cannot select a date range. I will use the 10 year limitation unless you write to tell me otherwise.
> I'll send results tonight.
> Thanks,
Job Serebrov <s>  
12/19/2005 09:30 PM  

To  
TNedzar@eac.gov  
CC:  

Subject: Cases  

Tamar:  

I received your first Zip File today and there is another major problem. These look like Lexis and not Westlaw searches. The way this material is presented it is impossible to tell what is going on. I stated in my last e-mail that I wanted you to use Westlaw because you can pull up a short case evaluation for each case. These are no good to us without these evaluations. The evaluations list the parties, a short statement of facts and a short summary of the court's holding. I can only evaluate these cases with such a summary. Sorry to send you back to the drawing board but better now then after you substantially completed the assignment. If you can get these kind of evaluations with Lexis then go ahead but if not you need to use Westlaw.  

Regards,  
 
Job  

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM -----
Peggy:

I just received an e-mail from Tova. She is also ok with the 28th which is better for me.

I am interested in your answer to her question about work product.

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> I am available for a 3-way teleconference after Noon on Wednesday this week. My schedule on Thursday and Friday is flexible, as well. When would be best for you two? I can call the telephone numbers you prefer and set up the conference call from my desk.

> Both the 24th or the 28th are fine with me for the face-to-face meeting. Which do you prefer? If you have no preference, I suggest we pick the earlier of the two.

> Regarding your contracts, I understand that the contract will carry the date of 9/25/05. All contracts have to be signed by the Chair, who has been out of the office on Commission business. I have been told that she will sign off on your contracts, among others, today. Our financial officer will send it to you after that. I'll try to obtain copies and fax the appropriate one to you as soon as they have been signed.

> Regarding your pay, the contract will state that you should submit a monthly invoice to EAC for payment of your fee for that month. The contract is for 6 months, so our Finance Officer, Diana Scott, wants you to submit an invoice to her each month for 1/6th of the total payment, beginning 10/25/05.

> I look forward to talking again with the two of you.
Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120
(direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

"Job Serebrov"<br>10/03/2005 10:08 AM
To<br>psims@eac.gov<br>cc
Subject<br>Meetings

Peggy:

Just spoke with Tova. We would like to have a three way telephone conference with you this week if possible. The best dates for our face to face are Oct 24th or 28th. Please let me know what works for you.

Talk with you when you get answers to my questions.

Regards,

Job

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM -----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
10/03/2005 03:48 PM
To Tova Andrea Wang, Job Serebrov
cc Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject Voting Fraud Teleconference-Meeting-Work Schedule

Tova and Job:
Teleconference -
Let's schedule the teleconference for 4:00 PM on Wednesday, October 5. Gavin Gilmour will join us.

Meeting -
October 28 is fine for the face-to-face meeting in DC. We have allocated $5,000 to each of you to cover reasonable and necessary travel and other incidental expenses. Expenses claimed for reimbursement need to be itemized, with appropriate receipts provided. You should be able to obtain the Federal government rate at an area hotel (if you plan to stay overnight). If the hotel needs a letter from EAC (in lieu of showing them your signed contract), just let me know. Airlines apparently no longer honor government rates for government contractors. Rail carriers may provide government rates for government contractors. If you drive, the current government rate for a personally owned vehicle (POV) is 48.5 cents per mile.

Deliverables -
The first item on the list of deliverables is the draft project workplan, which is due ASAP after award. Would it be possible for the two of you to deliver a draft workplan to me via email by 10/11? That would be after we have had our teleconference to work out lingering questions.

Questions for Finance -
If you have questions for our Finance Officer, you can reach her via email at dscott@eac.gov. I would appreciate it if you would cc: me on such emails, so that I know to follow up with her.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

"Job Serebrow"
12/09/2005 12:50 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Fax

Peggy:
Mari's fax is
Job

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

"Tova Wang"
10/03/2005 04:50 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: Voting Fraud Teleconference-Meeting-Work Schedule
That's the right number. On the 14th I do want to be on by phone. I probably will only be able to be on for the beginning though. I may be able to rejoin again at the end. Will someone be taking notes?

Thanks for everything. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 03, 2005 3:42 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud Teleconference-Meeting-Work Schedule

I will initiate the calls to you two on Wednesday. The number I have for Tova is [redacted]. For Job, I have [redacted]. Let me know if I should use a different number for you on Wednesday.

Thanks, Tova, for the copy of the draft workplan you provided to Karen. I'll take a look at it and, hopefully, provide some feedback on Wednesday. I have not yet caught up to all the paperwork and emails that preceded my assignment to this project. Karen just handed me a folder full of documents that should help.

I think you may have received an email from Nicole Mortellito regarding an October 14 meeting. If you two cannot come in person but can attend via phone, just let me know. Nicole's message has information regarding hotel rates that conflicts with what I've just sent you. I've asked her to double check her information because I have another contractor that has had no problem obtaining government rate at hotels.

Yes, you will be paid on a monthly basis. You can file your first invoice on October 25, according to Diana Scott.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

"Tova Wang" [redacted]
10/03/2005 03:54 PM
Peg, This all sounds good. Will you be calling us on Wednesday?

I should not need a hotel for the 28th. Just let me know what time. Are there expense forms we should have for reimbursement?

On the work product, we did send Karen a very preliminary draft of a work plan. I attach it again here and we can talk about it more on Wednesday.

My only money question is, are we being paid on a monthly basis? And if so, when does that begin? I assume this all is in the contracts we'll be getting...

Thanks.

Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 03, 2005 2:48 PM
To: 
Cc: ggilmour@eac.gov
Subject: Voting Fraud Teleconference-Meeting-Work Schedule

Tova and Job:

Teleconference -
Let's schedule the teleconference for 4:00 PM on Wednesday, October 5. Gavin Gilmour will join us.

Meeting -
October 28 is fine for the face-to-face meeting in DC. We have allocated $5,000 to each of you to cover reasonable and necessary travel and other incidental expenses. Expenses claimed for reimbursement need to be itemized, with appropriate receipts provided. You should be able to obtain the Federal government rate at an area hotel (if you plan to stay overnight). If the hotel needs a letter from EAC (in lieu of showing them your signed contract), just let me know. Airlines apparently no longer honor government rates for government contractors. Rail carriers may provide government rates for government contractors. If you drive, the current government rate for a personally owned vehicle (POV) is 48.5 cents per mile.

Deliverables -
The first item on the list of deliverables is the draft project workplan, which is due ASAP after award. Would it be possible for the two of you to deliver a draft workplan to me via email by 10/11? That would be after we have had our teleconference to work out lingering questions.

Questions for Finance -
If you have questions for our Finance Officer, you can reach her via email at dscott@eac.gov. I would appreciate it if you would cc: me on such emails, so that I know to follow up with her.
Hi Peg,

Attached are our Nexis word search terms to be used for looking for news articles. A revised westlaw list is forthcoming. As we discussed, we need to talk to the people doing these before they can begin.

Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

Craig:

The Chair gave me your response. I'm pleased, to say the least! Would you be available for an hour or so on January 13 (a Friday) to talk with our two consultants when they are in town? If so, when would be most convenient for you? Would you prefer that I accompany them, or are you willing to take them on alone?

Also, would you prefer that our consultants forward any information requests through me (both before and after their meeting with you), or may I provide your contact information so that they can make their
requests directly? Already, I have received a request for any related statistical data you may have. I have given them a copy of the January 1995 version of your *Federal Prosecution of Election Offenses*.

Peggy Sims  
Research Specialist  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)  
Fax: 202-566-3127  
email: psims@eac.gov  

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

Peggy:  
Attached are the word search terms.  

Job  

Tova:  
I placed the few words that you added in the middle of my list into my existing file so some terms are out of order from the last list that you sent me.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

Hi Peg,  
I would like to talk to Thad Hall about the methodology of our research and about the threat assessment survey he is doing with Electionline and Caltech [http://www.vote.caltech.edu/media/threat_risk.pdf](http://www.vote.caltech.edu/media/threat_risk.pdf). Can you please facilitate that? Thanks.  

Tova Andrea Wang
Thanks Peg. I have some thoughts too and will have my final recommendations for you by Monday. It would be great if you could pass by me possible local election officials before we definitely go forward with them. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2005 4:03 PM
To:
Subject: RE: FW: Commission Consensus on Working Group

I understand your predicament if Cathy Cox is not available. So many of the State election officials are Republican. You could try Peter Harvey, Attorney General (and chief election official) for New Jersey. His contact information follows:

Peter C. Harvey (Appointed, D)
Attorney General of New Jersey
Department of Law and Public Safety
25 Market Street, P.O. Box 080
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0080
URL http://www.njpublicsafety.com
609/292-4925 FAX 609/292-3508

I would be happy to share information on any nonpartisan local election officials I am able locate who are familiar with voting fraud and voter intimidation issues.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Hi Peg,

What was the last date Devon included an article? I've collected some from the past couple of months too, but don't have most of them saved electronically. I guess we should all be collecting between now and when we very hopefully get Tamar to take it over. Thanks. Tova

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov
To: serebrov@sbcglobal.net
Cc: wang@tcf.org
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2005 5:10 PM
Subject: Re: FYI

---

Job:
Devon set up the folders before she completed her review of the articles. I saw that the folders were empty, but did not ask her to remove them. If you copy the CD contents to a file on your computer, you may yet use the empty folders to file relevant articles found subsequent to Devon's sorting. For example, I have a few recent articles that I will send via email. When we come across articles that belong in the empty folders, we can put them there. --- Peggy

"Job Serebrov"

The following file folders on the disc you sent me were empty:

Misleading Ex-felon Voting Right
Non-Citizen Voting
Wrongful Removal of Eligible Voters from Registration Lists

If they were blank file folders, why were they included?

Job

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---
Tamar Nedzar /EAC/GOV
12/05/2005 10:24 AM
To "Tova Wang"
cc Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject RE: Search Results Example

Tova and Job,

Thank you for your feedback. There are two factors that went into my decision to perform the search in the manner I indicated which may have a bearing on whether you want me to do each search individually.

First, I checked with the Lexis representative at my school, who suggested the search methodology used. She indicated that I would get the same results if I did the searches separately or together.

Second, as I am in the midst of finals, as you can imagine, I have limited time to devote to work. I will only be in the office two days in the next two weeks and will not be able to do much work from home. As a result, I probably won't be able to do the majority of the searches until just after Christmas if I am to do the each term separately. If not, I should be able to get you results by the week before Christmas.

I will do whatever you and Peggy decide given your timelines, but wanted to let you know the factors that went into my decision.

Thank you,

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
T Nedzar@eac.gov
"Tova Wang"
And thank you for your work on this. Let us know if you have any questions.

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:
Sent: Friday, December 02, 2005 5:19 PM
To: tnedzar@eac.gov
Cc: 
Subject: Re: Search Results Example

Tamar:

You are not going to be able to place all of these word searches together. We need you to take each term on the list and do a search on it. You can only merge terms when it will not add other terms and therefore affect the outcome. For instance, vote and voter could probable be merged. I know this creates much much more work but it can't be helped. I would like you to pull the first 50 cases for each set of terms and send them to us with a short case summary (I know Westlaw lets you do a short case summary). From there we will have to read the cases and decide if we need any others in that search term.

Regards,

Job

--- tnedzar@eac.gov wrote:

---------------------------------
Tova and Job,

It was good to talk to you today. Hope you are doing well. I've attached my African American search results below. It encompasses all of the terms you suggested having to do with African Americans.

The following is a search I used to truncate words and combine terms, but I still got a large number of results:

Vot! and deny and black or vot! and black and challenge or vot! and black and reject or vot! and black or vot! And deny and African w/s American or vot! And African w/s American and reject or challenge or vot! And African w/s American or election and black and deny or challenge or reject or election and black or election and African w/s American and deny or challenge or reject or election and African w/s American or ballot and security and black or ballot and security and African w/s American or black and
vot! And suppress! Or African w/s American and vot!
And suppress or African w/s and disenfranchis! or
black and disenfranchis!

If this search yields useful cases for you, I can
continue searching using the same strategy. If not,
please provide me with additional guidelines and I
will do my best!

Please feel free to contact me should you have any
questions or need additional information.
Thank you,

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov
Hi Peg,

Hope you're enjoying the holiday weekend. Job and I are having a bit of a disagreement about how we should be handling the existing research materials and would like to briefly discuss this with you. Are you available on Tuesday morning? We are both available until 11:30 am. Thanks so much.

Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

Hi Devon

I hope you are enjoying the holidays and thanks so much for your work. Just a couple of preliminary questions: The folders that are empty — did you not get to them or did you not find anything in those categories? How far along in the list of search terms did you get — were you able to do the whole list? If not, where did you leave off? And finally, what was the last date upon which you conducted a search?

Thanks so much.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
Hi Peg,

Do you want the information on the proposed working group members you requested (their backgrounds on this issue) now or should I wait until the contract situation is clear? I understand more information on that is forthcoming imminently.

Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret 'Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

Hi Peg,

I will be down in DC next Tuesday for a meeting. I wonder if it would be useful for me to come by -- I think you mentioned at one point you had a big collection of articles. It would be great to be able to take a look at them. I'm available mid to late afternoon. Let me know.

Any word on the contract situation?
Tova:  
I should be available during the mid to late afternoon, provided we are not besieged with election-related calls. Regardless, I can provide the file with the news clippings for your review.

--- Peggy

Hi Peg,

I will be down in DC next Tuesday for a meeting. I wonder if it would be useful for me to come by -- I think you mentioned at one point you had a big collection of articles. It would be great to be able to take a look at them. I'm available mid to late afternoon. Let me know.

Any word on the contract situation?

Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
Devon:

In preparation for this afternoon's teleconference, you may want to review the attached list of Nexis search terms. If you have any questions, we can discuss them before the teleconference or, if I can't provide answers, we can ask our consultants who prepared the list. --- Peggy

--- nexis word search 1128.doc

Hi Peg,

I'd like to talk to you briefly about the development of the working group when you have a moment. I understand you are in a meeting right now -- is there a good time for me to give you a buzz today and/or tomorrow? Thanks so much. Tova

--- Teleconference Needed

Would both of you be available for a teleconference tomorrow at 2 PM EST concerning contract issues? The teleconference would include Julie Thompson, our General Counsel, and me. We would call you.
Only between 3:30 and 5:30

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova and Job:
> > Are you two available for a teleconference with our
> > Law Clerk and Intern
> > tomorrow at either of the times listed below?
> > > Between 12 and 1 PM EST; or
> > > Any time between 3:30 and 5:30 PM EST
> > >
> > Peggy Sims
> > Research Specialist
> > U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
> > Washington, DC 20005
> > Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120
> > (direct)
> > Fax: 202-566-3127
> > email: psims@eac.gov

What do you think about moving the meeting to January
after all of the holidays?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:
Thanks for the update. I'll let Tamar know. ---
Peggy

"Job Serebrov"
11/21/2005 12:07 PM

To
psims@eac.gov
cc

Subject
Word Search Terms

---
Peggy:

I sent the words search terms to Tova yesterday to
review. Unfortunately, she will not be able to do so
until late today or tomorrow. Consequently, I need
to
wait to send them to you.

As far as a trip to DC goes, I gave Tova two
possible
dates---Friday December 16 or Monday December 19.

Regards,

Job

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
11/21/2005 05:08 PM

To  "Job Serebrov"
Wang
cc

Subject  Re: In-Person Meeting

Job and Tova:

If you both agree, a meeting in early January in lieu of a December meeting would be fine with me. As it
would be good for you two to pick Craig Donsanto's brain when you are here, I'll find out when he is not
available so that we can avoid that time.
What do you think about moving the meeting to January after all of the holidays?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Thanks for the update. I'll let Tamar know. ---
> Peggy

---

"Job Serebrov"

11/21/2005 12:07 PM

To psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject Word Search Terms

Peggy:

I sent the words search terms to Tova yesterday to review. Unfortunately, she will not be able to do so until late today or tomorrow. Consequently, I need to wait to send them to you.

As far as a trip to DC goes, I gave Tova two possible
dates---Friday December 16 or Monday December 19.

Regards,

Job
Hi Tova and Job,

Hope you're still finding the results helpful. Attached is today's installment. More to come tomorrow...

Hi Peggy,

I hope you are feeling better!

I am free 4-6 on Wednesday, 10:30-1:00 on Thursday and all day Friday for a call. The 24th is fine for me, so just tell us what time is works.

On the contracts, I'm a little confused by the start date being 9/25 when we have not been able to start the work yet. What will the implications of this be for the work product delivery?

Thanks, and I look forward to speaking with you and seeing you soon.

Tova
I am available for a 3-way teleconference after Noon on Wednesday this week. My schedule on Thursday and Friday is flexible, as well. When would be best for you two? I can call the telephone numbers you prefer and set up the conference call from my desk.

Both the 24th or the 28th are fine with me for the face-to-face meeting. Which do you prefer? If you have no preference, I suggest we pick the earlier of the two.

Regarding your contracts, I understand that the contract will carry the date of 9/25/05. All contracts have to be signed by the Chair, who has been out of the office on Commission business. I have been told that she will sign off on your contracts, among others, today. Our financial officer will send it to you after that. I'll try to obtain copies and fax the appropriate one to you as soon as they have been signed.

Regarding your pay, the contract will state that you should submit a monthly invoice to EAC for payment of your fee for that month. The contract is for 6 months, so our Finance Officer, Diana Scott, wants you to submit an invoice to her each month for 1/6th of the total payment, beginning 10/25/05.

I look forward to talking again with the two of you.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

Peggy:

Just spoke with Tova. We would like to have a three way telephone conference with you this week if possible. The best dates for our face to face are Oct 24th or 28th. Please let me know what works for you.

Talk with you when you get answers to my questions.
Job:

I found Gavin. He said that the Chair has the letters that have to accompany the contracts for you and Tova. Once she signs them, the finance folks will fax a copy to you and send the original by mail.

After we have the signed contracts:

- **Adjusted Workplan** - You and Tova should look at the workplan to determine what should be revised due to the contract issues.

- **Working Group** - I will ask for a one or two sentences for each person you have on the list of potential working group members. The sentences should summarize why you think the person would be perfect for this particular project. What in their particular experience qualifies them to help develop recommendations for future avenues of EAC research on voting fraud and voter intimidation? (Remember, other research efforts already are underway to address items such as provisional voting, voter ID issues, and contested elections and recounts.) If you want to put an asterisk next to the names that you especially recommend, that would be fine. I have to discuss the potential working group members with our Commissioners, only one of which is in the office now. Others are in the field and I can speak with them as they return. I'll bet that this will take some time, probably through next week.

- **Westlaw Search** - You and Tova can provide more information about the Westlaw search. I spoke with our Executive Director and he authorized me to use a part-time legal intern to conduct the search and provide the results to you and Tova.

- **Meetings** - The three of us should probably decide a time for a teleconference and a tentative in-person meeting date in the not-to-distant future.

Regarding the election fraud newsclips, Tova was in town this morning for a non-EAC meeting. While here, she took the opportunity to look over the newsclips in one of my files. (I have another file that I have yet to unearth from my FEC boxes.) I mentioned to Tova that one of our EAC interns could sort the clips, put them in pdf, and drop them on a CD for each of you. Tova thinks that it would be most useful to have the clips organized by type of voting fraud (e.g., absentee ballot, voter registration, etc.) and, within that sorting, by State. Does this work for you, or would you prefer a different organization?

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Peggy:

Tova and I will need copies of your vote fraud literature file. Also, do you want a one liner on all of the people proposed for the working group or just the three that we are recommending for the final group?

Any work from Gavin?

Job

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

"Tova Wang"

11/21/2005 05:39 PM

To psims@eac.gov, 

cc

Subject RE: In-Person Meeting

As I mentioned to Job earlier, I think we need to meet as soon as possible in order to develop and pare down our lists of who we want to interview, determine how we are going to go about doing the interviews (in-person, phone, email), schedule such meetings, decide what themes we agree to discuss with them; go over existing research and how we will work on summarizing existing findings; hammer out what is within the scope of our research; meet with the intern and law clerk; discuss how we are going to do the case law research; etc. Up to now, we both agreed, we have been operating in a bit of a void. We've been trying to do this meeting for months.

Is it that you think we can combine this meeting with a meeting with Craig? I actually think they need to be separate since I think both will be very laborious and very different in nature.
However, I will defer to whatever you, Peg, think best. I don't feel so strongly about it that I will be extremely upset if we wait until January.

Thanks.

Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2005 5:09 PM
To: 
Subject: Re: In-Person Meeting

Job and Tova:

If you both agree, a meeting in early January in lieu of a December meeting would be fine with me. As it would be good for you two to pick Craig Donsanto's brain when you are here, I'll find out when he is not available so that we can avoid that time.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

"Job Serebrov*

11/21/2005 04:02 PM

To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Word Search Terms

What do you think about moving the meeting to January after all of the holidays?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Thanks for the update. I'll let Tamar know. ---
> Peggy
> 
>
Peggy:

I sent the words search terms to Tova yesterday to review. Unfortunately, she will not be able to do so until late today or tomorrow. Consequently, I need to wait to send them to you.

As far as a trip to DC goes, I gave Tova two possible dates—Friday December 16 or Monday December 19.

Regards,

Job

Peggy:

I will have a list of Republicans for the working group in the next few days. I am still speaking with people. However, having discussed this with a number of people who deal with election fraud, I am convinced that we need a ten member panel and not eight (five Republicans and five Democrats). My list will present six to seven people for the Commission's vetting. If all agree to serve, culling down to five will be challenging.
I believe that is correct. What I think you might also be concerned about is the timelines for completion. If you, Job and Peggy need to work out a revised completion schedule, then I would encourage you to do that. We recognize that our delays have impacted the original schedule and that adjustments should be noted accordingly.

Juliet E. Thompson  
General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3100  
"Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>

I guess for getting paid purposes it doesn't matter, it just matters with respect to the timeline for completion of the project. If that's right, I will sign and send the letter acknowledging receipt as is. Thanks so much.

Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: jthompson@eac.gov [mailto:jthompson@eac.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2005 6:14 PM  
To:  
Cc: psims@eac.gov  
Subject: Re: contract

The invoice that you have submitted at this point is for work conducted in September, September 1 - 30.

The invoice that you will submit shortly, if you have not already is for work performed in October,
1-31.

I am not sure if we are semantically calling these by different names (i.e., you submitted the September invoice in October, and October's work in November).

Let me know if this clarifies the point or confuses it.

Juliet E. Thompson
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

"Tova Wang"  
11/15/2005 01:33 PM 
To: psims@eac.gov, jthompson@eac.gov
cc: 
Subject: contract

Just one question on the receipt of contract -- it says that the first invoice was for September, but it actually was for October when we really got started, right? Should this be adjusted to say October 1 to October 31?

Thanks.

Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2005 3:28 PM
To: 
Subject: Letters Were Signed

Job and Tova:

The Chair signed your letters this afternoon. Diana Scott has them and plans to fax everything to you. Have a good weekend!

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100

012301
Peggy & Tova:

Here is the updated case law word search list.

[File attachment: Job Word Search Terms.doc]

Tova and Job,

Please find below what I have completed since we last spoke. I will send you another email or two next week with the rest of the results.

Happy New Year!

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

[File attachment: 12_27.zip]
Hi Peggy,

Just an FYI – Job and I have developed our own draft of a definition of fraud and intimidation and are working on compiling existing research. With respect to the working group, I have sent him the names and bios of my first choices, most of whom I have not yet spoken to. My thought was that I would have you vet them before asking them if they could do it, so I wouldn’t have to turn around and say no. I have plenty of “plan B” people should some of my first choices not work out. Job has gone ahead and inquired as to people’s availability before putting them on his list, which he expects to send me today.

Hope you had a great weekend.

Tova

-----Original Message-----

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2005 4:33 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Contract Issues-Government Per Diem Rates

Good Morning Job an Tova:

I still do not have copies of your signed contracts. I understand that they may have to be revised if the project is going to use an EAC intern and EAC Westlaw access. I’ve scheduled a meeting with one of our attorneys this week to discuss the matter and will get back to you with further information, when I have it.

By now, you should have heard that the October 14 contractor meeting has been cancelled. Instead, EAC has scheduled a couple of staff meetings to review requirements for invoices and requests for reimbursement. I should have more information for you on this front by next Monday.

Today, I am sending by Federal Express the most recent copy of the Department of Justice's
Federal Prosecution of Election Offenses and the Federal Election Commission's Innovations in Election Administration 8: Election Document Retention in an Age of High Technology. Let me know if you do not have it within a couple of days.

New per diem rates for federal travelers are effective October 1, 2005. You can find these rates at http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/contentView.do?programId=9704&channelId=-15943&oid=16365&contentId=17943&pageTypeId=8203&contentType=GSA BASIC&programPage=%2Fep%2Fprogram%2FgsaBasic.jsp&P=MTT.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov
--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

Margaret Sims/EAC GOV
11/29/2005 02:18 PM
To Tova Andrea Wang, Job Serebrov
cc
Subject Teleconference with Legal Clerk and Intern

Tova and Job:

Are you two available for a teleconference with our Law Clerk and Intern tomorrow at either of the times listed below?

Between 12 and 1 PM EST; or
Any time between 3:30 and 5:30 PM EST

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov
--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

Karen
Lynn-Dyson/EAC GOV
08/23/2005 05:44 PM
To Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC GOV@EAC, sda@mit.edu, cc Margaret Sims/EAC GOV@EAC
Subject Kick off activities for the EAC Voting fraud/voter intimidation project

Greetings-
Tom Wilkey and I have just completed a series of very informative and productive conversations with each of you and are anxious to move to the next step of this process.

We hope to assemble our consultant team on this project, within the next three weeks and are presently awaiting final approval of your contracts from our Commissioners. We anticipate this will take place in the next week to ten days.

We would like to assemble the team- Steve Ansolabehere of MIT, Tova Wang from The New Century Foundation and Job Serebrov, who has worked extensively on these issues for the State of Arkansas, during the week of September 11. Please get back to us with some tentative dates during that week that might work with your schedule.

We look forward to working with all of you and appreciate your efforts on behalf of the EAC.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM -----
Tova:

You should have received Devon's disk today. We won't have a replacement for her anytime soon. I'm still working on confirming your choice for State election official. I'm also trolling for further information on possible nonpartisan local election officials that might serve. At the moment, I am seeking feedback on nonpartisan county Election Administrators in Texas, many of whom are Hispanic.

Now that Tamar has finished her exams, you should be receiving regular emails with search results. I still need to provide feedback on the definition of vote fraud.

I have asked Diana Scott to find out exactly where GSA is in the process of paying you and Job. Julie Thompson and I are discussing ways we might expedite things in the future.

--- Peggy

Let me add the assistance you were going to give me on the statewide election administrator and the discs with the work Devon did. Are we getting a replacement for her?
The money issue has become the most important matter at this point. I have already laid out money for this project, so I'm running a deficit after three and a half months.

Thanks. Tova
----- Original Message -----
From: "Job Serebrov" To: <psims@eac.gov>
Cc:  
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2005 3:31 PM
Subject: List

> Peggy:
> Here is a list of what we are waiting for from you:
> approval of the final definition of voter fraud
> final working group list
> Also, we are waiting on the law clerk's search results. We know this will take till next month.
> Finally, we are waiting on money. Any word on what is going on since we spoke this morning?
> Job
>

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM -----  
"Job Serebrov" To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject meeting

Peg:

Tova and I talked about the voter fraud project last evening and we believe that a face to face DC meeting is needed in the next few weeks. If you are in today, I hope to hear from you.

Regards,

Job

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM -----  
"Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov"
Hello Peg and greetings from Mexico City.

Interesting way you put that question!! When will I NOT be available!!!

Peg -- I have a speech to deliver to the Illinois Association of Election Commissioners December 7-8. After that, my wife says she will arise in protest if I don't stay put for the next couple months!!!

So I guess anytime after December 8 will work.

I hope I can help you and the EAC on this.

--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
Sent: Tue Nov 22 15:50:20 2005
Subject: Re: Requesting Your Help-Preliminary Research on Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation

Craig:

This is just to let you know that I have drafted a letter for the Chair's signature, but she may want to make some changes before she signs. Once it is signed, I'll fax a copy to you and send the original by mail. For planning purposes, can you tell me when you don't expect to be available during the next 3 months (Dec-Feb)?

Peggy Sims
Phone: 202-566-3120 (direct)
email: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM -----
Hi Job,

I anticipate sending 8-10 more emails. I can get through approximately 30 terms per day. If you would prefer that I hold on to a few days' worth of searches and send fewer emails, I am more than happy to do so.

I will not be sending another search email until the 27th as I will be working from home until then and do not have the means to send such large files when I am not at work. I can give you a better idea of how much longer it will take me at that point.

Happy Holidays!

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue; NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov
"Job Serebrov" <serebrov@sbcglobal.net>

--- tnedzar@eac.gov wrote:

> Hi Tova and Job,
> >
> > Hope you're still finding the results helpful.
> > Attached is today's
> > installment. More to come tomorrow...
> >
> >
> > Tamar Nedzar
> > Law Clerk
> > U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> > Washington, DC 20005
Attached is a list of requests for material/information for Mr. Donsanto in advance of our meeting. They are purely requests for data and hard materials, not necessarily the extent of the questions I will want to ask (and I'm sure, Job, you'll want to ask) which may well be of a more procedural nature.

I'm off for a few days without the ability to communicate with the outside world, so, if it is necessary, we can talk about this on Tuesday afternoon as well as our other topics.

Have a wonderful new year!

Tova:

Thad's research on threat assessment is not being conducted under an EAC contract. The requirement to work through EAC only applies to contact with EAC contractors about EAC research. Thad's EAC contract is for Vote Counts/Contested Elections and Recounts. At this time, the contractor is analyzing State laws and procedures and contacting appropriate federal agencies regarding any pertinent consent agreements. Currently, there are no plans to do a survey that would be subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act requirements.

If your interest in Thad involves his non-EAC research, I would have no problem with you contacting him directly. If you think he will not respond unless I forward your request to him, I will see what I can do.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Hi Peg,

I would like to talk to Thad Hall about the methodology of our research and about the threat assessment survey he is doing with Electionline and Caltech [http://www.vote.caltech.edu/media/threat_risk.pdf]. Can you please facilitate that? Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

What do you think of this as a revised work plan? Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 2005 6:25 PM
To: serebrov@sbcglobal.net
Cc: wang@tcf.org
Subject: Re: Various
Job:

I found Gavin. He said that the Chair has the letters that have to accompany the contracts for you and Tova. Once she signs them, the finance folks will fax a copy to you and send the original by mail.

After we have the signed contracts:

- **Adjusted Workplan** - You and Tova should look at the workplan to determine what should be revised due to the contract issues.
- **Working Group** - I will ask for a one or two sentences for each person you have on the list of potential working group members. The sentences should summarize why you think the person would be perfect for this particular project. What in their particular experience qualifies them to help develop recommendations for future avenues of EAC research on voting fraud and voter intimidation? (Remember, other research efforts already are underway to address items such as provisional voting, voter ID issues, and contested elections and recounts.) If you want to put an asterisk next to the names that you especially recommend, that would be fine. I have to discuss the potential working group members with our Commissioners, only one of which is in the office now. Others are in the field and I can speak with them as they return. I'll bet that this will take some time, probably through next week.
- **Westlaw Search** - You and Tova can provide more information about the Westlaw search. I spoke with our Executive Director and he authorized me to use a part-time legal intern to conduct the search and provide the results to you and Tova.
- **Meetings** - The three of us should probably decide a time for a teleconference and a tentative in-person meeting date in the not-to-distant future.

Regarding the election fraud newscips, Tova was in town this morning for a non-EAC meeting. While here, she took the opportunity to look over the newscips in one of my files. (I have another file that I have yet to unearth from my FEC boxes.) I mentioned to Tova that one of our EAC interns could sort the clips, put them in pdf, and drop them on a CD for each of you. Tova thinks that it would be most useful to have the clips organized by type of voting fraud (e.g.; absentee ballot, voter registration, etc.) and, within that sorting, by State. Does this work for you, or would you prefer a different organization?

Peggy Sims  
Research Specialist  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)  
Fax: 202-566-3127  
email: psims@eac.gov

"Job Serebrov" <serebrov@sbcglobal.net>
Peggy:

Tova and I will need copies of your vote fraud literature file. Also, do you want a one liner on all of the people proposed for the working group or just the three that we are recommending for the final group?
Any work from Gavin?

Job

[woplan1107.doc]

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
12/07/2005 09:23 AM
To: "Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Preliminary Research

Craig;
Thanks! I've got 2 PM January 13 on our schedule and a note to myself to remind you a week in advance. I'll keep you posted on any pre-interview information requests. Really look forward to having your input on this project!

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
cemail: psims@eac.gov
--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 04:38 PM ---

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
12/06/2005 03:05 PM
To: "Tova Wang"@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject: Re: 2 quick questions
Hi, Tova;

How much time do you want to schedule for the meeting with Donsanto? An hour? We've just received his response to our request confirming that he is pleased to be of assistance, which means he has received the OK from his superiors. I also want to include him in any Working Group discussions, although he will not be named as a member of that group. He is a great resource because he is smart and organized, and has years of experience in this area as a career DOJ attorney. I find that he is not shy about identifying challenges and noting improvements that he thinks are needed.

I signed off on all 3 of your invoices. I understand that they are going through the rest of the process required to get your payments to you. You turned in your revised invoices for September and October work a little after Job, and there was a short hiatus while I figured out what to do for the September invoice (I multiplied the hours you claimed by the $111 hourly rate cited in the contract). We also had to wait until our Chair was available to sign off on everything. (This has to happen before anything is submitted to GSA.) My estimate is that you should receive your payments no later than the end of next week (and maybe earlier).

I'll keep my eyes open for your receipts. I will fax the completed travel voucher form (aka request for reimbursement) to you. You will need to sign it and return it to me by mail (with the original signature). Then, I can put it in the pipeline for reimbursement.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

Hi Peg,

Can you please inquire as to why I still have not been paid? Also, will you be able to schedule a meeting with Craig Donsanto for us for January 13? I will have my travel info for you within the next couple of days. My cab fares amounted to $31 yesterday. Keep an eye out for the receipts in the mail. Do you need anything else? (I guess that makes it three questions)

Thanks. Have a good weekend. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
Attached are emails back to 5/1/06 that are related to the voter fraud report. I'll send earlier ones separately. I tried to avoid including emails re: payment vouchers, travel arrangements, and travel reimbursements. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM ---

"Job Serebrov" To psims@eac.gov
05/11/2006 12:09 PM
cc
Subject Re: Court Case Charts

All. They are not duplicates. There are some cases repeated and some not. It is a slight variant of the word search.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Job
> In preparing the CDs, we have run across the following files that appear to be duplicates. Which ones should go on the CD?
> --- Peggy
> >
> >
> >

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM -----

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV To "Job Serebrov"
05/11/2006 02:36 PM
cc
Subject Re: Court Case Charts

OK, I will include all on the CD. Thanks. --- Peggy

"Job Serebrov"

"Job Serebrov" To psims@eac.gov
05/11/2006 12:09 PM
cc
Subject: Re: Court Case Charts

All. They are not duplicates. There are some cases repeated and some not. It is a slight variant of the word search.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Job
> In preparing the CDs, we have run across the following files that appear to be duplicates. Which ones should go on the CD?
> --- Peggy

-----

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM -----

"Tova Wang"
05/11/2006 12:06 PM

To: psims@eac.gov
cc: dromig@eac.gov
Subject: list of interviewees

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

List of Experts Interviewed.doc

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM -----

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
05/11/2006 10:06 AM

To: Tova Andrea Wang, Job Serebrov
cc:

Subject: Today's Teleconference
I assume that we are still on for today's teleconference at 11 AM EST. I will call you. I have attached a draft agenda for your review and comment. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM ---

"Job Serebroy" To psims@eac.gov,  
05/12/2006 12:52 PM 
cc:  
Subject: Re: Fraud Definition

This is ok, given the fact that the WG may have suggestions. Will you be sending us the same packets that you are sending the WG? Also, I figure with Tova's response we will need to have a teleconference on the report once I return to Little Rock. We will need to do it that following Monday or Tuesday.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Would you please take a look at the attached? I combined both of your definitions, reformatted the list, removed a reference to the fraud having to have an actual impact on the election results (because fraud can be prosecuted without proving that it actually changed the results of the election), and taken out a couple of vague examples (e.g.; reference to failing to enforce state laws --- because there may be legitimate reasons for not doing so).
> I have made contact with Ben Ginsberg's office and am waiting to hear if he accepts our invitation to join the working group. --- Peggy
>

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM ---

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov> To psims@eac.gov  
05/04/2006 06:08 PM 
cc:
Peggy -- they don't have anything to do with the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights do they?

I ask only because the Justice Department is currently engaged in a very acrimonious FOIA litigation with LCCR that focuses precisely on our efforts to combat voter "intimidationm"

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Thu May 04 17:20:39 2006
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

It is just the Working Group for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project. I am asking you to attend as Technical Advisor for the project. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/04/2006 03:26 PM
To
cc
Subject

Peg -- what is the name of the group?

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 3:13 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

This meeting is being held to obtain input from our eight-member Working Group for the project. The group is composed of election lawyers, election
officials, and a representative of an advocacy group, all of whom have an interest and some expertise in the identification and/or prosecution of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The group was chosen so that we would have an equal number of folks on each side of the political spectrum, plus some nonpartisan members.

After our consultants review the results of their preliminary research (interviews, literature review, case law), we will ask the Working Group to brainstorm possible next steps for EAC. Our consultants will write a report summarizing the proposals that come out of this meeting. The report will go to the Commissioners, who will decide what they want to do, funds available, and what priority to assigned to the effort(s).

Your participation in this part of the process is extremely important, so I am very happy that you can find time for us that afternoon. I'll get an agenda and other information to you next week. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/04/2006 02:32 PM

To
psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject
RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Okay, Peg -- I will mark off the entire afternoon and try to be there. What is the agenda? I was not aware that this was anything beyond having your contractors spend another session with me. Also, if they will be needing stats and stuff like that I need to know as I will bring my state-people with me.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 2:28 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Right now, we are planning to meet in EAC's large conference room between 1 PM
and 5 PM. If you cannot be there for the whole afternoon, we will appreciate whatever time you can spare. I'll get back to you with more information (agenda, list of Working Group members, etc.). --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/03/2006 05:59 PM

To psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Afternoon of May 18 -- 2:30 okay? How long will they need??

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 16:59:09 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

I am looking at the afternoon of 5/18 for the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts of Working Group members. There remain two members from whom we have not yet received confirmations of their schedule (with some, it is like pulling teeth), but right now 5/18 still looks like the best day. We may have to hold the meeting over here to make it easier for Commissioners to drop in. --- Peg

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/03/2006 12:53 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Okay -- you are on for May 18th! Can we do it over here at 10?

-----------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 12:40:19 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.

Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/03/2006 11:56 AM
To: psims@eac.gov
cc: psims@eac.gov
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Hi Peg. I am sitting here with Cameron Quinn putting together this year's ballot conference for AUSAs. She send her best!

I am available on 5/18. But I am also going to the Board of Advisors Meeting the following week. I would rather do this then.

-----------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 11:39:50 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

We are continuing our efforts to hone in on a date for the Working Group meeting. Are you available the afternoon of Thursday, May 18?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM ---

"Tova Wang" To psims@eac.gov
05/09/2006 11:45 AM
cc
Subject RE: Case Summaries

yes

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2006 10:38 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Fw: Case Summaries

Had you seen this? --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 05/09/2006 11:38 AM -----

"Job Serebrov" [Redacted]
05/08/2006 09:30 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Case Summaries
Peggy:

Please add this to the packet.

Job

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM -----

"Job Serebrov"

To psims@eac.gov

05/12/2006 03:45 PM

Subject Re: Good News

I'm thankful it all worked out.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Ginsberg has accepted our invitation! --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM -----

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV

05/11/2006 02:35 PM

To Craig Donsanto

cc

Subject Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

Craig:

I think we have resolved the issue of Barbara Arnwine's absence from the upcoming meeting by having one of her staff represent her (and her organization). Please review the attached rough summary of DOJ Cases ASAP and let me know if I need to delete reference to the open investigations. Hopefully, we won't have to remove this information as it does not specify the defendants or States involved. --- Peg

Rough Summary of Department of Justice, Public Integrity Section Activities, October 2002-January 2006

Prosecutions and Convictions-- Individuals
Noncitizen voting: 20
Vote buying: 49
Double voting: 12
Registration fraud: 13
Civil Rights: 4
Voter Intimidation: 2
Unclear: 1
**Open Investigations** (note: a few cases overlap with prosecutions and convictions)
Noncitizen voting: 3
Vote buying: 25
Double voting: 15
Registration fraud: 29
Absentee ballot fraud: 9
Official: 8
Ineligibles: 4
Deceptive Practices: 1
Civil Rights: 14
Intimidation: 6
Other: 2

**Cases and Investigations Closed for Lack of Evidence**

Civil Rights: 8
Official: 12
Registration Fraud: 12
Absentee Ballot Fraud: 14
Ineligible Voting: 3
Intimidation: 8
Double Voting: 5
Ballot Box Stuffing: 1
Vote Buying: 14
Ballot/machine tampering: 2
Other: 8
Unclear: 3

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM ---

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/03/2006 12:40 PM
To: "Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.

Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
Hi Peg. I am sitting here with Cameron Quinn putting together this year's ballt conference for AUSAs. She send her best!

I am available on 5/18. But I am also going to the Board of Advisors Meeting the following week. I would rather do this then.

--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 11:39:50 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

We are continuing our efforts to hone in on a date for the Working Group meeting. Are you available the afternoon of Thursday, May 18?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM ----
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/11/2006 02:08 PM
To: Job Serebrov
cc
Subject: Literature Summary

Tova just sent me the summary you prepared of The Federal Crime of Election Fraud by Craig Donsanto. There is something wrong in the fourth paragraph (odd characters and missing text). Can you please send a replacement fourth paragraph? You can send it in an email and I will place it in the document. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM ----
"Tova Wang"
05/11/2006 05:32 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: RE: new working group representative
I'm up for a short meeting afterward and a teleconference on Monday. And maybe when all of this is over, you and I can have dinner! Have I told you that I am moving down to DC this summer?

I suspect you have put up with much more than I have and I really appreciate everything you have done.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 4:27 PM
To: 
Subject: RE: new working group representative

Tova:

I understood Job to say that he could only find a hotel room with the right bed in Roanoke (hours away). He will drive in Thursday morning for the meeting and return to that hotel Thursday night. He won't drive back into DC for a Friday morning meeting.

We don't have to do dinner. I recognize that you have spent a lot of time and energy to make this project work, and I don't want to put you out. (You have done a lot under difficult circumstances.) Though we will be bushed, we may want to have a short meeting right after the Working Group disperses — or we could do a teleconference the following Monday afternoon (before I head into three more days of meetings). — Peggy

"Tova Wang" 
05/11/2006 04:54 PM

To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: new working group representative

It would not be my first preference to do this right after the meeting, and I sort of had tentative plans. They can be changed if necessary of course, but what happened to meeting on Friday morning?

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 3:47 PM
To: 
Subject: Re: new working group representative

Dinner sounds like a great idea. Do either of you have any dietary restrictions of preferences? (I
seem to recall that Tova would prefer a place that has vegetarian options). I'll try to locate a nearby place that won't bust the budget. --- Peggy
I have the feeling we didn't include these in the original batch I sent you. Could you double check and if not, would you please include them in the existing research materials? Sorry and thanks. I'm kind of doing all of this on my own in case you couldn't tell. List is coming...

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

Brennan Analysis Voter Fraud Report FINAL.doc Fed Crime Election Fraud (JS).doc
----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM -----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
05/11/2006 01:56 PM
To "Tova Wang"
cc
Subject Re: research summaries

Something is wrong in the fourth paragraph of the Federal Election Crime summary. Do you know what it is supposed to say there?

"Tova Wang"

05/11/2006 01:30 PM
To psims@eac.gov, dromig@eac.gov
cc
Subject research summaries

I have the feeling we didn't include these in the original batch I sent you. Could you double check and if not, would you please include them in the existing research materials? Sorry and thanks. I'm kind of doing all of this on my own in case you couldn't tell. List is coming...

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
Job, please double check to make sure I haven't missed anything

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
It would not be my first preference to do this right after the meeting, and I sort of had tentative plans. They can be changed if necessary of course, but what happened to meeting on Friday morning?

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 3:47 PM
To: 
Subject: Re: new working group representative

Dinner sounds like a great idea. Do either of you have any dietary restrictions of preferences? (I seem to recall that Tova would prefer a place that has vegetarian options). I'll try to locate a nearby place that won't bust the budget. --- Peggy

On another note entirely, since traffic will be bad going to Roanoke, do you want to have a dinner meeting with Tova and me after the group meeting to discuss the final report? As long as we are out by 7 or so I am ok with it. Also, my wife would have to be there as she will be meeting me after the WG.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:
> According to the Commissioners, you and Tova each
Would you please take a look at the attached? I combined both of your definitions, reformatted
the list, removed a reference to the fraud having to have an actual impact on the election results
(because fraud can be prosecuted without proving that it actually changed the results of the
election), and taken out a couple of vague examples (e.g.; reference to failing to enforce state
laws --- because there may be legitimate reasons for not doing so).

I have made contact with Ben Ginsberg's office and am waiting to hear if he accepts our invitation
to join the working group. --- Peggy

Peg,

Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think I omitted sending you these specific summaries that are based on
complex cases that could not be adequately described within the confines of the nexis article excel
spreadsheets. If we can, these should be included, probably on the disc. Sorry.
--- "Patrick J. Rogers" wrote:

Subject: RE: Working Group meeting
Date: Tue, 9 May 2006 07:42:44 -0600
From: "Patrick J. Rogers"
To: "Job Serebrov"

Job---maybe. I will call you and/or Ms. Sims tomorrow. Depositions all
day today. Thanks, Pat

What's the best number to call you tomorrow?

Patrick J. Rogers
Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris & Sisk, P.A.
P.O. Box 2168
Albuquerque, NM 87103-2168
Tel: 505-848-1849
Fax: 505-848-1891

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2006 9:41 PM
To: Patrick J. Rogers
Subject: Working Group meeting

Pat:

The working group meeting for the voter fraud project is scheduled for May 18th in DC but David Norcross can't attend. Could you come? If so, we need to arrange travel and a hotel for you.

Regards,

Job

--------------------------------------------------------------------
Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris & Sisk, P.A.
--------------------------------------------------------------------

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you
Barbara says that you have been working it out with her assistant Valerie, that they have spoken to you several times.

-----Original Message-----
From: dromig@eac.gov [mailto:dromig@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2006 8:46 AM
To: 
Cc: psims@eac.gov
Subject: Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Project Working Group

Dear Tova,

I am working with Peggy Sims in order to set a date for the Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Project Working Group. I have been trying to reach Barbara Amwine in order to find out which days in May she is potentially available to attend this meeting but all of my attempts have been unsuccessful.

I would appreciate any help that you could provide in this matter.

Sincerely,

Devon Romig
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite #1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
I will hear from him tomorrow but that still does not solve all of my issues—see my longer e-mail.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> I had a voice mail message from him on Monday. I called him back but had to leave a voice mail message (telephone tag). If you hear from him and he is willing and able to come, I need to know this. We need to have him call our travel service to make travel arrangements ASAP. Thanks. ---
> Peggy

> "Job Serebrov" 05/09/2006 10:46 AM

> To: psims@eac.gov
> cc

> Subject: Fwd: RE: Working Group meeting

> FYI
Barry:

It appears that the afternoon of Thursday, May 18 is best for a meeting of the working group. I know you said you would not be available in the morning that day. If we started at 1 PM, would that be too soon for you?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov
Monday afternoon I have a commission meeting.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Job and Tova:
> > As of now, the afternoon of Thursday, May 18 appears to be the best possible date for the meeting. Norcross is not available to attend in person that day (he is available only 2 days during...
I hope to have a better idea tomorrow, if Rokita's office responds. If not, we'd better have a teleconference to discuss our options. --- Peggy
Can you please give me an idea where we are at with all this? I'd like to be able to figure out my schedule. Thanks -- and thanks for all your assistance on this. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: dromig@eac.gov [mailto:dromig@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2006 3:54 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Project Working Group

Yes, I have spoken to her assistant several times but today has been the first time that I have ever spoken to her assistant. We did get the information that we needed. Thanks for your help!

Devon Romig
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite #1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)566-2377

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM -----
As of now, the afternoon of Thursday, May 18 appears to be the best possible date for the meeting. Norcross is not available to attend in person that day (he is available only 2 days during the first three weeks of May). We won't have confirmation of the availability of Secretary Rokita until tomorrow -- but I am hopeful.

I'll give you an update tomorrow. Maybe we can schedule a teleconference on Monday afternoon. --- Peggy

-----
Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

Job found it. I'm assuming its too late to include so as I said I'll just present it if thats OK. Thanks again Job. T

----- Original Message -----
From: *Job Serebrov* <serebrov@sbcglobal.net>
To: <wang@tcf.org>
Sent: Saturday, May 13, 2006 10:12 AM
Subject: Re: research summary

> T~
> 
> Are you talking about this?
> 
> J~
>
> --- wrote:
>
> >> In the middle of the night I got the feeling that >> you may be right, that I did do a summary of the >> existing literature review (that Job, you approved) >> I'll have to look for it on Monday (unless I go >> into the office over the weekend, which is >> possible). I may be hallucinating, but if not, I'll >> just present it at the meeting rather than try to >> get it to them ahead of time. Tova

-----
Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

"Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
To: psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

Peggy ---
I have Cynthia Mitchell in here with me now.

She says that the figures you listed in your attachment are your analysis of our product, and that therefore we cannot re-evaluate them.

I do not see anything in these raw numbers that impacts adversely any privacy or privilege issues.

We can update the public list and send that to you, if you'd prefer. That would allow you to represent that the numbers are current up through now. But if you would prefer, you can use what you have as long as it is represented as complete only through January, 2006.

Let us know your desires.

From: psims@eac.gov
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 2:35 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group
Importance: High

Craig:

I think we have resolved the issue of Barbara Arnwine's absence from the upcoming meeting by having one of her staff represent her (and her organization). Please review the attached rough summary of DOJ Cases ASAP and let me know if I need to delete reference to the open investigations. Hopefully, we won't have to remove this information as it does not specify the defendants or States involved. --- Peg

Rough Summary of Department of Justice, Public Integrity Section Activities, October 2002-January 2006

Prosecutions and Convictions—Individuals
Noncitizen voting: 20
Vote buying: 49
Double voting: 12
Registration fraud: 13
Civil Rights: 4
Voter Intimidation: 2
Unclear: 1

Open Investigations (note: a few cases overlap with prosecutions and convictions)
Noncitizen voting: 3
Vote buying: 25
Double voting: 15
Registration fraud: 29
Absentee ballot fraud: 9
Official: 8
Ineligibles: 4
Deceptive Practices: 1
Civil Rights: 14
Intimidation: 6
Other: 2

Cases and Investigations Closed for Lack of Evidence

Civil Rights: 8
Official: 12
Registration Fraud: 12
Absentee Ballot Fraud: 14
Ineligible Voting: 3
Intimidation: 8
Double Voting: 5
Ballot Box Stuffing: 1
Vote Buying: 14
Ballot/machine tampering: 2
Other: 8
Unclear: 3

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/11/2006 03:33 PM
To: "Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

Craig:

I would love to have an updated list for our research files. For purposes of getting this information out to our participants, I will note that the consultants' summary is based upon information provided as of January 2006. Thanks.

Do you expect to be at your office tomorrow afternoon? I can walk over with the information packet we will have put together for the Working Group. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
Peggy -

I have Cynthia Mitchell in here with me now.

She says that the figures you listed in your attachment are your analysis of our product, and that therefore we cannot re-evaluate them.

I do not see anything in these raw numbers that impacts adversely any privacy or privilege issues.

We can update the public list and send that to you, if you'd prefer. That would allow you to represent that the numbers are current up through now. But if you would prefer, you can use what you have as long as it is represented as complete only through January, 2006.

Let us know your desires - - -

---

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 2:35 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group
Importance: High

Craig:

I think we have resolved the issue of Barbara Arnwine's absence from the upcoming meeting by having one of her staff represent her (and her organization). Please review the attached rough summary of DOJ Cases ASAP and let me know if I need to delete reference to the open investigations. Hopefully, we won't have to remove this information as it does not specify the defendants or States involved. --- Peg

Rough Summary of Department of Justice, Public Integrity Section Activities, October 2002-January 2006

Prosecutions and Convictions-- Individuals
Noncitizen voting: 20
Vote buying: 49
Double voting: 12
Registration fraud: 13
Civil Rights: 4
Voter Intimidation: 2
Unclear: 1

Open Investigations (note: a few cases overlap with prosecutions and convictions)
Noncitizen voting: 3
Vote buying: 25
Double voting: 15
Registration fraud: 29
Absentee ballot fraud: 9
Official: 8  
Ineligibles: 4  
Deceptive Practices: 1  
Civil Rights: 14  
Intimidation: 6  
Other: 2  

Cases and Investigations Closed for Lack of Evidence

Civil Rights: 8  
Official: 12  
Registration Fraud: 12  
Absentee Ballot Fraud: 14  
Ineligible Voting: 3  
Intimidation: 8  
Double Voting: 5  
Ballot Box Stuffing: 1  
Vote Buying: 14  
Ballot/machine tampering: 2  
Other: 8  
Unclear: 3

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

Tova Wang  
05/11/2006 01:10 PM

To psims@eac.gov  
cc  
Subject new working group representative

is Jon Greenbaum

Here's his info in full:  
http://www.lawyerscommittee.org/2005website/aboutus/staff/staffgreenbaum.html

He is the Director of the Voting Rights Project for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights. He will be representing Barbara Arnwine, the Executive Director of the Lawyers Committee.

His contact and mailing info is:

jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org  
202-662-8315  
1401 New York Avenue, NW  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20005
Peggy:

Pat just e-mailed me. He has something he can't move on the 18th. So I am now down one person and still no good hotel situation. Devon's suggestion is not workable.

Job

Okay -- you are on for May 18th! Can we do it over here at 10?

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 12:40:19 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.

Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/03/2006 11:56 AM
To
psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject
Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Hi Peg. I am sitting here with Cameron Quinn putting together this year's ballt conference for AUSAs. She send her best!

I am available on 5/18. But I am also going to the Board of Advisors Meeting the following week. I would rather do this then.
--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 11:39:50 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

We are continuing our efforts to hone in on a date for the Working Group meeting. Are you available the afternoon of Thursday, May 18?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
I am looking at the afternoon of 5/18 for the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts of Working Group members. There remain two members from whom we have not yet received confirmations of their schedule (with some, it is like pulling teeth), but right now 5/18 still looks like the best day. We may have to hold the meeting over here to make it easier for Commissioners to drop in. --- Peg

--- Original Message ---
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 12:40:19 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.

Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.
Hi Peg. I am sitting here with Cameron Quinn putting together this year's ballt conference for AUSAs. She send her best!

I am available on 5/18. But I am also going to the Board of Advisors Meeting the following week. I would rather do this then.

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 11:39:50 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

We are continuing our efforts to hone in on a date for the Working Group meeting. Are you available the afternoon of Thursday, May 18?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 16:59:09 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

I am looking at the afternoon of 5/18 for the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts of Working Group members. There remain two members from whom we have not yet received confirmations of their schedule (with some, it is like pulling teeth), but right now 5/18 still looks like the best day. We may have to hold the meeting over here to make it easier for Commissioners to drop in. --- Peg

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/03/2006 12:53 PM
To
psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject
Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Okay -- you are on for May 18th! Can we do it over here at 10?
-----------------------------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 12:40:19 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.

Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/03/2006 11:56 AM
To
Hi Peg. I am sitting here with Cameron Quinn putting together this year's ballt conference for AUSAs. She send her best!

I am available on 5/18. But I am also going to the Board of Advisors Meeting the following week. I would rather do this then.

--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 11:39:50 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

We are continuing our efforts to hone in on a date for the Working Group meeting. Are you available the afternoon of Thursday, May 18?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
Afternoon of May 18 -- 2:30 okay? How long will they need??

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Craig:

This meeting is being held to obtain input from our eight-member Working Group for the project. The group is composed of election lawyers, election officials, and a representative of an advocacy group, all of whom have an interest and some expertise in the identification and/or prosecution of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The group was chosen so that we would have an equal number of folks on each side of the political spectrum, plus some nonpartisan members.

After our consultants review the results of their preliminary research (interviews, literature review, case law), we will ask the Working Group to brainstorm possible next steps for EAC. Our consultants will write a report summarizing the proposals that come out of this meeting. The report will go to the Commissioners, who will decide what they want to do, funds available, and what priority to assigned to the effort(s).

Your participation in this part of the process is extremely important, so I am very happy that you can find time for us that afternoon. I'll get an agenda and other information to you next week. --- Peggy

*Donsanto, Craig* <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/04/2006 02:32 PM
It is just the Working Group for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project. I am asking you to attend as Technical Advisor for the project. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/04/2006 03:26 PM

Peg - - what is the name of the group?
Okay, Peg -- I will mark off the entire afternoon and try to be there. What is the agenda? I was not aware that this was anything beyond having your contractors spend another session with me. Also, if they will be needing stats and stuff like that I need to know as I will bring my state-people with me.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 2:28 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Right now, we are planning to meet in EAC's large conference room between 1 PM and 5 PM. If you cannot be there for the whole afternoon, we will appreciate whatever time you can spare. I'll get back to you with more information (agenda, list of Working Group members, etc.). --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/03/2006 05:59 PM

topsims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Afternoon of May 18 -- 2:30 okay? How long will they need??
-----------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 16:59:09 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

I am looking at the afternoon of 5/18 for the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts of Working Group members. There remain two members from whom we have not yet received confirmations of their schedule (with some, it is like pulling teeth), but right now 5/18 still looks like the best day. We may have to hold the meeting over here to make it easier for Commissioners to drop in.
--- Peg

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/03/2006 12:53 PM
To 
psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject
Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Okay -- you are on for May 18th! Can we do it over here at 10?
-----------------------------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 12:40:19 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.

Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
To psims@eac.gov

Subject Re: Literature Summary

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

Tova just sent me the summary you prepared of "The Federal Crime of Election Fraud" by Craig Donsanto. There is something wrong in the fourth paragraph (odd characters and missing text). Can you please send a replacement fourth paragraph? You can send it in an email and I will place it in the document. --- Peggy

Thanks, J.R. Great to have you on board! We will get back to you shortly regarding travel arrangements. The meeting materials will be sent by Federal Express next week.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

"J. R. Perez" psims@eac.gov
Hi Peggy, it was nice talking with you today and I would be glad to try and add to the discussion. I am attaching a brief bio and will await your instructions for the travel arrangements. I look forward to receiving the current information on panel issues.

J.R. Perez
Elections Administrator
Guadalupe County

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

5201 Roosevelt St.
Bethesda, MD 20814

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov
To: "Weinberg and Utrecht"

Barry:

Would you please provide an address to which we can Federal Express materials before the meeting? --- Peg

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----
that would be fine

----- Original Message ----- 

From: psims@eac.gov
To: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 1:08 PM
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Barry:

It appears that the afternoon of Thursday, May 18 is best for a meeting of the working group. I know you said you would not be available in the morning that day. If we started at 1 PM, would that be too soon for you?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ----

To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Working Group List

List a vacancy---to be filled. If we don't hear from Ginsberg by late afternoon please call Braden.

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Job:
> 
> What do you suggest I do with the list of Working Group members. I need
to get the Fed Ex packages out by the end of the day, and have not heard
back from Ginsberg. Do you want me to list a
> vacancy, or list Norcross
> with a note that he cannot attend? If we find a
> substitute, we can always
> provide an updated list next Thursday. --- Peggy

In the middle of the night I got the feeling that you may be right, that I did do a summary of the existing
literature review (that Job, you approved). I'll have to look for it on Monday (unless I go into the office over
the weekend, which is possible). I may be hallucinating, but if not, I'll just present it at the meeting rather
than try to get it to them ahead of time. Tova
I have an objection to Greenbaum. While I realize he comes from an advocacy group, he is not a minority attorney and we already have a rep who worked with DOJ. If it is to be Greenbaum, I would rather not fill that position since I am one down.

--- Tova Wang wrote:

> is Jon Greenbaum

> Here's his info in full:

http://www.lawyerscommittee.org/2005website/aboutus/staff/staffgreenbaum.htm

> 1

> He is the Director of the Voting Rights Project for

> the Lawyers Committee

> for Civil Rights. He will be representing Barbara Arnwine, the Executive Director of the Lawyers Committee.

> His contact and mailing info is:

> jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org

> 202-662-8315

> 1401 New York Avenue, NW

> Suite 400

> Washington, DC 20005

> Tova Andrea Wang

> Democracy Fellow
Cindy - -

Can you please check the accuracy of these figures - - which you recall we gave to the EAC a month or so ago - - to ensure that they are up-to-date?

I believe we have had several public events that have taken place since we gave them the Public Fraud List a few weeks ago.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 2:35 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group
Importance: High

Craig:

I think we have resolved the issue of Barbara Arnwine’s absence from the upcoming meeting by having one of her staff represent her (and her organization). Please review the attached rough summary of DOJ
Cases ASAP and let me know if I need to delete reference to the open investigations. Hopefully, we won't have to remove this information as it does not specify the defendants or States involved. --- Peg

*Rough Summary of Department of Justice, Public Integrity Section Activities, October 2002-January 2006*

**Prosecutions and Convictions-- Individuals**
- Noncitizen voting: 20
- Vote buying: 49
- Double voting: 12
- Registration fraud: 13
- Civil Rights: 4
- Voter Intimidation: 2
- Unclear: 1

**Open Investigations** (note: a few cases overlap with prosecutions and convictions)
- Noncitizen voting: 3
- Vote buying: 25
- Double voting: 15
- Registration fraud: 29
- Absentee ballot fraud: 9
- Official: 8
- Ineligibles: 4
- Deceptive Practices: 1
- Civil Rights: 14
- Intimidation: 6
- Other: 2

**Cases and Investigations Closed for Lack of Evidence**
- Civil Rights: 8
- Official: 12
- Registration Fraud: 12
- Absentee Ballot Fraud: 14
- Ineligible Voting: 3
- Intimidation: 8
- Double Voting: 5
- Ballot Box Stuffing: 1
- Vote Buying: 14
- Ballot/machine tampering: 2
- Other: 8
- Unclear: 3

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

"Job Serebrov"
FYI

--- "Patrick J. Rogers" wrote:

> Subject: RE: Working Group meeting
> Date: Tue, 9 May 2006 07:42:44 -0600
> From: "Patrick J. Rogers"
> To: "Job Serebrov"
>
> Job---maybe. I will call you and/or Ms. Sims tomorrow. Depositions all day today. Thanks, Pat

> What's the best number to call you tomorrow?

> Patrick J. Rogers
> Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris & Sisk, P.A.
> P.O. Box 2168
> Albuquerque, NM 87103-2168
> Tel:
> Fax:
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Job Serebrov [mailto:serebrov@sbcglobal.net]
> Sent: Monday, May 08, 2006 9:41 PM
> To: Patrick J. Rogers
> Subject: Working Group meeting
>
> Pat:
>
> The working group meeting for the voter fraud project is scheduled for May 18th in DC but David Norcross can't attend. Could you come? If so, we need to arrange travel and a hotel for you.

> Regards,

> Job

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
> Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris & Sisk, P.A.
> http://www.modrall.com

> THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER
APPLICABLE LAW. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please delete it from your system without copying it, and notify the sender by reply e-mail or by calling 505.848.1800, so that our address record can be corrected. Thank you.

I had a voice mail message from him on Monday. I called him back but had to leave a voice mail message (telephone tag). If you hear from him and he is willing and able to come, I need to know this. We need to have him call our travel service to make travel arrangements ASAP. Thanks. --- Peggy

FYI

--- "Patrick J. Rogers" wrote:

- Subject: RE: Working Group meeting
- Date: Tue, 9 May 2006 07:42:44 -0600
- From: "Patrick J. Rogers"
- To: "Job Serebrov"

- Job---maybe. I will call you and/or Ms. Sims tomorrow. Depositions all day today. Thanks, Pat
What's the best number to call you tomorrow?

Patrick J. Rogers
Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris & Sisk, P.A.
P.O. Box 2168
Albuquerque, NM 87103-2168

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:serebrov@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2006 9:41 PM
To: Patrick J. Rogers
Subject: Working Group meeting

Pat:

The working group meeting for the voter fraud project is scheduled for May 18th in DC but David Norcross can't attend. Could you come? If so, we need to arrange travel and a hotel for you.

Regards,

Job

-----------------------------------------------

Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris & Sisk, P.A.

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please delete it from your system without copying it, and notify the sender by reply e-mail or by calling 505.848.1800, so that our address record can be corrected. Thank you.
Had you seen this? --- Peggy

Peggy:

Please add this to the packet.
The teleconference is on. However, I am still one person down for the meeting and I am not comfortable. This will have to be discussed since from the start it was agreed that the WG would be equal and if I lost a person Tova would have to lose one. Further and most importantly, I don't yet have a hotel so my attendance is still up in the air. Finally, the agenda is not what we discussed and gives far too much time for areas that can be covered in a short time. Not listed are all of the questions that Tova's proposed agenda had. All in all, it needs to be redone.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> I assume that we are still on for today's
teleconference at 11 AM EST. I
> will call you. I have attached a draft agenda for
> your review and
> comment. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

"Tova Wang"
I am more than happy to attend in person

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2006 9:15 AM
To: psims@eac.gov;
Subject: Re: Working Group

Peggy:

4:00 eastern on Tuesday is fine however, given the financial restrictions that you indicated would be in place for use of my car (I would actually loose money coming to DC) and given the cost of hotels at this time (I can't afford to front these costs and wait for months to be repaid), etc, it would take a miracle for this working group meeting to take place in person. It is looking like the only way it will get done is by teleconference. I also share Tova's concern about the unknown nature of Mr. Perez.

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Hi, Folks:
> >
> > Teleconference
> > Are both of you available for a teleconference next Tuesday afternoon at about 4 PM EST? If this does not work for you, please suggest another date and/or time. I would like to discuss our preparations for the Working Group meeting.
> >
> > Working Group Members
> > We have a very good person to fill the slot for the nonpartisan local election official: J.R. Perez, Elections Administrator for Guadalupe County, TX. Attached is his bio. Hope you have no objections to him. He is available on May 18. I have place 2 calls to Pat Rogers office, but have not yet received a reply. Job, if you have any pull with him, you may want to contact him, too.
> >
> > Travel Arrangements
> > You should make your own travel arrangements, including hotel. Travel time cannot be billed to the contract, except for hours actually worked on the contract (i.e.; reviewing materials in preparation for the meeting, and the like). Current Federal rates follow:
Maximum Lodging = $180 per day - does not include hotel taxes (if you cannot get this rate, we have covered reasonable rates that are a little higher)
Meals & Incidentals = $64 per day (except that it is $48 on the first and last day of travel)
Mileage for Personally Owned Vehicle = $ .445 per mile

Under the new contract, I do not have to fill out a travel authorization for you. I can approve your trip via email. Afterwords, when you turn in your next pay voucher, you can attach the airline receipt (or mileage documentation), hotel receipt(s), and ground transportation receipts and a copy of any printed itineraries. Calculate the total travel expenses due you, including applicable per diem. I do not need meal receipts.

Job, under Federal travel regulations, deviations for personal reasons are not normally accommodated. What you can do, however, is to give me a comparison of the cost of roundtrip mileage, hotel, and per diem of doing it your way against the cost of a roundtrip flight, ground transportation, hotel, and per diem. If your way costs less, it should be no problem to cover the full cost. If your way is more expensive, we may only pay up to the amount of traditional travel. (The same rules apply to me when I travel.) If you can tell me where, other than DC, you will spend the night, I can check on applicable per diem rates.

Peggy
She definitely cannot do it. Would you please find out if Wade Henderson would be possible? Now it's my turn to be upset!!! Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/12/2006 02:46 PM
To: Job Serebrov
cc:
Subject: Working Group List

Job:

What do you suggest I do with the list of Working Group members. I need to get the Fed Ex packages out by the end of the day, and have not heard back from Ginsberg. Do you want me to list a vacancy, or list Norcross with a note that he cannot attend? If we find a substitute, we can always provide an updated list next Thursday. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---
"Tova Wang"
05/11/2006 04:25 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
cc:
Subject: RE: Material I may not have included

news article review

---Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 3:23 PM
To: wang@tcf.org
Subject: Re: Material I may not have included

Would these go under literature review or news article review? --- Peggy
Peg,

Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think I omitted sending you these specific summaries that are based on complex cases that could not be adequately described within the confines of the nexis article excel spreadsheets. If we can, these should be included, probably on the disc. Sorry.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -------
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
05/11/2006 11:45 AM
To Job Serebrov
cc
Subject Court Case Charts

Job
In preparing the CDs, we have run across the following files that appear to be duplicates. Which ones should go on the CD? --- Peggy

Chart Election Accessible.doc Chart Vote Inaccessible.doc
Chart Denial Voter Registrat.doc Chart Denial Voter Registrat2.doc
Chart Provisional Ballot Den.doc Chart Provisional Ballot Den2.doc

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -------
"Job Serebrov."
Job did this one

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 12:56 PM
To: 
Subject: Re: research summaries

Something is wrong in the fourth paragraph of the Federal Election Crime summary. Do you know
I have the feeling we didn't include these in the original batch I sent you. Could you double check and if not, would you please include them in the existing research materials? Sorry and thanks. I'm kind of doing all of this on my own in case you couldn't tell. List is coming...

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
When I opened the attachment, I still had problems with the 4th paragraph. Would you please just send me that paragraph within the text of your email so that I can paste it into the document? --- Peggy

I resent the review as you see at the bottom. When I opened it and sent it there was no corrupted text.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Do you have text to replace the corrupted text in paragraph 4? --- Peggy

> "Job Serebrov"
Subject
Re: Literature Summary

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova just sent me the summary you prepared of The Federal Crime of Election Fraud by Craig Donsanto. There is something wrong in the fourth paragraph (odd characters and missing text). Can you please send a replacement fourth paragraph? You can send it in an email and I will place it in the document. --- Peggy

---- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ----
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/05/2006 12:53 PM	 To "Donsanto, Craig"
Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov@GSAEXTERNAL
c
Subject RE: Please remind me of time and place for Voter Intimidation project meeting

The meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 18, 1-5:30 PM (though we may finish earlier). It will be held in EAC's large conference room (the one we use for public meetings, located off our lobby). --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/05/2006 12:43 PM	 To psims@eac.gov
c
Subject RE: Please remind me of time and place for Voter Intimidation project meeting

If you tell me now I will put it into my calendar here, which in turn will remind me!

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2006 12:42 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Please remind me of time and place for Voter Intimidation project meeting

How many days in advance do you need the reminder? --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/09/2006 02:51 PM
To "Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc Adam Ambrogi/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject RE: Working Group-Perez

We are still on for 4 PM. Ray is out of the office due to a family emergency, so I suggest you NOT contact him. You may contact his Special Assistant, Adam Ambrogi (aambrogi@eac.gov or 202-566-3105), who also hails from Texas. --- Peggy

"Tova Wang"
Peggy:

What political party is Perez with? How political is he? Is the position in Texas neutral or political? Who appointed Perez?

As to Pat I will contact him but I can't promise anything. If Pat can't come, who is getting knocked off Tova's list?

Job
Dear Mr. Ginsberg:

This is to confirm my call to your office this morning inviting you to be a member of and attend the upcoming meeting of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission's (EAC) Working Group on Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation. The meeting is scheduled to take place from 1:00 PM to 5:30 PM on Thursday, May 18th, 2006 at the offices of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), 1225 New York Avenue, NW, 11th Floor, Washington, DC.

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the tasks listed in the statute are the development of:

- nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office [section 241(b)(6)]; and
- methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)].

EAC's Board of Advisors recommended that the agency make research on these matters a high priority. Subsequently, the Commission contracted with two consultants (Job Serebrov and Tova Wang) to:

- develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;
- perform background research (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;
- establish a project working group, in consultation with EAC, composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation;
- provide the description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation, and the results of the preliminary research to the working group, and convene the working group to discuss potential avenues for future EAC research on this topic; and
- produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future research, if any;

We strive to include bipartisan representation on the Working Group associated with this project. You were recommended for this project by our Republican consultant, Job Serebrov. Your ideas for possible EAC activities related to this topic will help the agency as it plans future actions to meet its HAVA responsibilities.

If you can find the time in your busy schedule to participate, I will have an information packet delivered to your office by COB, Monday, May 15. Please let me know if you are available. Thank you.

Regards,

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
I'm checking on this. Will get back to you as soon as I have more info. --- Peggy

She definitely cannot do it. Would you please find out if Wade Henderson would be possible? Now its my turn to be upset!!!  Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

OK, I get it. The text in the attachment follows:
§ 31.032. APPOINTMENT OF ADMINISTRATOR; COUNTY ELECTION COMMISSION.

(a) The position of county elections administrator is filled by appointment of the county election commission, which consists of:

1. the county judge, as chair;
2. the county clerk, as vice chair;
3. the county tax assessor-collector, as secretary; and
4. the county chair of each political party that made nominations by primary election for the last general election for state and county officers preceding the date of the meeting at which the appointment is made.

(b) The affirmative vote of a majority of the commission's membership is necessary for the appointment of an administrator.

(c) Each appointment must be evidenced by a written resolution or order signed by the number of commission members necessary to make the appointment. Not later than the third day after the date an administrator is appointed, the officer who presided at the meeting shall file a signed copy of the resolution or order with the county clerk. Not later than the third day after the date the copy is filed, the county clerk shall deliver a certified copy of the resolution or order to the secretary of state.

(d) The initial appointment may be made at any time after the adoption of the order creating the position.

§ 31.035. RESTRICTIONS ON POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.

(a) A county elections administrator may not be a candidate for a public office or an office of a political party, hold a public office, or hold an office of or position in a political party. At the time an administrator becomes a candidate or accepts an office or position in violation of this subsection, the administrator vacates the position of administrator.

(b) A county elections administrator commits an offense if the administrator makes a political contribution or political expenditure, as defined by the law regulating political funds and campaigns, or publicly supports or opposes a candidate for public office or a measure to be voted on at an election. An offense under this subsection is a Class A misdemeanor. On a final conviction, the administrator's employment is terminated, and the person convicted is ineligible for future appointment as county elections administrator.
Do you have text to replace the corrupted text in paragraph 4? --- Peggy

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova just sent me the summary you prepared of The Federal Crime of Election Fraud by Craig Donsanto. There is something wrong in the fourth paragraph (odd characters and missing text). Can you please send a replacement fourth paragraph? You can send it in an email and I will place it in the document. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/05/2006 09:15 AM
To "Donsanto, Craig"
cc
"Donsanto, Craig"
05/05/2006 09:15 AM
To <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
The non-election officials on the Working Group currently include:

- Barry Weinberg, whom you know
- Barbara Arnwine, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law (organization associated with the Voting Rights Project and Election Protection)
- Bob Bauer, Perkins Cole, DC (Democrat attorney)
- Mark "Thor" Hearne, Lathrop & Gage, St Louis, MO (Republican attorney)

I am trying to recruit one other Republican attorney, Patrick Rogers, Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris and Sisk, NM, who was recommended by our Republican consultant. He would replace an original member who is no longer available.

I know that Barbara has associated at conferences and in legislative efforts with Wade Henderson, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. Also, the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights is listed as on of many members of the Executive Committee for the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (see http://www.civilrights.org/about/lccr/executive_committee.html).

Does this information help? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/04/2006 06:08 PM

Peggy -- they don't have anything to do with the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights do they?

I ask only because the Justice Department is currently engaged in a very acrimonous FOIA litigation with LCCR that focuses precisely on our efforts to combat voter "intimidationm"

--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Thu May 04 17:20:39 2006
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

It is just the Working Group for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project. I am asking you to attend as Technical Advisor for the project. --- Peggy
Peg - - what is the name of the group?

Craig:

This meeting is being held to obtain input from our eight-member Working Group for the project. The group is composed of election lawyers, election officials, and a representative of an advocacy group, all of whom have an interest and some expertise in the identification and/or prosecution of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The group was chosen so that we would have an equal number of folks on each side of the political spectrum, plus some nonpartisan members.

After our consultants review the results of their preliminary research (interviews, literature review, case law), we will ask the Working Group to brainstorm possible next steps for EAC. Our consultants will write a report summarizing the proposals that come out of this meeting. The report will go to the Commissioners, who will decide what they want to do, funds available, and what priority to assigned to the effort(s).

Your participation in this part of the process is extremely important, so I am very happy that you can find time for us that afternoon. I'll get an agenda and other information to you next week. --- Peggy
Okay, Peg -- I will mark off the entire afternoon and try to be there. What is the agenda? I was not aware that this was anything beyond having your contractors spend another session with me. Also, if they will be needing stats and stuff like that I need to know as I will bring my state-people with me.
Okay, Peg -- I will mark off the entire afternoon and try to be there. What is the agenda? I was not aware that this was anything beyond having your contractors spend another session with me. Also, if they will be needing stats and stuff like that I need to know as I will bring my state-people with me.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 2:28 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Right now, we are planning to meet in EAC's large conference room between 1 PM and 5 PM. If you cannot be there for the whole afternoon, we will appreciate whatever time you can spare. I'll get back to you with more information (agenda, list of Working Group members, etc.). --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/03/2006 05:59 PM

To

psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject

Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation
Afternoon of May 18 -- 2:30 okay? How long will they need?

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 16:59:09 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

I am looking at the afternoon of 5/18 for the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts of Working Group members. There remain two members from whom we have not yet received confirmations of their schedule (with some, it is like pulling teeth), but right now 5/18 still looks like the best day. We may have to hold the meeting over here to make it easier for Commissioners to drop in.

--- Peg

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/03/2006 12:53 PM
To
cc
Subject

Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Okay -- you are on for May 18th! Can we do it over here at 10?

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 12:40:19 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.
Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/03/2006 11:56 AM
To          psims@eac.gov
cc          
Subject     Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Hi Peg. I am sitting here with Cameron Quinn putting together this year’s ballt conference for AUSAs. She send her best!

I am available on 5/18. But I am also going to the Board of Advisors Meeting the following week. I would rather do this then.

Sent from Dr. D’s Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 11:39:50 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

We are continuing our efforts to hone in on a date for the Working Group meeting. Are you available the afternoon of Thursday, May 18?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
No problem. I've got the conference room reserved from Noon to 6 PM, so you can come earlier. —
Peggy

Is it OK if I come around 12:30 or so to make sure I have all my materials arranged properly for presentation? Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Peg, I'm sorry, but this is really not helpful. Its another outline. I guess we have to wait for the transcript. I wish now I had taken notes myself! Thanks anyway. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2006 12:31 PM
To:
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Working Group Notes

Sorry. We have had so much going on, I did not have time to send the attached to you last week. This is Devon's compilation of notes taken by EAC staff at the working group meeting. --- Peggy

Hi Peg,

How are you? I was wondering, whatever happened to getting the collective notes of the EAC staff? Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Hi Peg,

How are you? I was wondering, whatever happened to getting the collective notes of the EAC staff?
Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
05/31/2006 01:30 PM
To "Tova Wang"
cc
Subject Re: Working Group Notes

Sorry. We have had so much going on, I did not have time to send the attached to you last week. This is Devon's compilation of notes taken by EAC staff at the working group meeting. — Peggy

VFVI Meeting Summary.doc

"Tova Wang"

05/31/2006 11:26 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject notes

Hi Peg,

How are you? I was wondering, whatever happened to getting the collective notes of the EAC staff?
Thanks. Tova
Hi Peg,

Do you have an ETA for the transcript? Seems like it should be around now. Thanks and have a great weekend. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
06/08/2006 09:35 AM
To
cc
Subject Re:

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:15 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc "Job Serebrov"
Subject

Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

06/14/2006 08:56 PM
To "Job Serebrov" psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: teleconference

Let's try to do that. Peg, you will call us 5 pm EST?
----- Original Message -----
From: "Job Serebrov"
To: "Tova Wang"
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 6:29 PM
Subject: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 6:29 PM

> Wednesday next week? It would have to be 6 pm.
> --- Tova Wang wrote:
> >> Hi Job,
> >> >> Peg tells me that we should now be getting the
> >> transcript early next week.
> >> Regardless, we should talk about the organization
Hi Peg,

How do you recommend dealing with this? I have this feeling like he's trying to create a situation where I will have to write it myself. Thanks, Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:42 PM
To: psims@eac.gov;
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

Peggy:

I can't predict when I get home but it is between 5:30
and 6:30 my time. I know that is generally too late to have a teleconference.

I plan to review Tova's recommendations this weekend and work on my own as well as expanding the explanation of the case section.

Please see what your financial officer did with regards to my travel.

Thank you,

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> What time do you arrive home from work? Perhaps we could talk then?
> 
> Re your question on the mileage, I have approached our Financial Officer with a request that you receive full reimbursement on the grounds that your actual total travel costs are less than the estimated total travel costs if you had flown to DC, stayed in our more expensive hotels, and received the higher per diem for 3 days (instead of 1). I have not yet received a response from her and she has been out of the office much of this week, so I don't know what she decided to do.
> --- Peggy

> "Job Serebrov"
> 06/08/2006 01:10 PM
> 
> To
> psims@eac.gov,
> cc
> Subject
> Re: Transcript & Teleconference
> 
> Peg:
> 
> I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take time during the work day for telephone conferences.
> As I told you I will need to finish this project after daily working hours. I am still getting things done from being out for ten days. I will review Tova's recommendations and expand on mine this weekend.
Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the mileage portion of my travel voucher?

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job.

---

Peggy

06/08/2006 10:10 AM

To
psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject
Re: Transcript & Teleconference

Can we make it 4 est? I have another meeting at 3.

----- Original Message -----  
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: psims@eac.gov
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:55 AM
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you.

How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before them because of other commitments. --- Peggy
Afternoon of May 18 -- 2:30 okay? How long will they need??

Sent from Dr. D’s Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 16:59:09 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

I am looking at the afternoon of 5/18 for the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts of Working Group members. There remain two members from whom we have not yet received confirmations of their schedule (with some, it is like pulling teeth), but right now 5/18 still looks like the best day. We may have to hold the meeting over here to make it easier for Commissioners to drop in.

--- Peg

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/03/2006 12:53 PM
To
   psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject
   Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Okay -- you are on for May 18th! Can we do it over here at 10?

Sent from Dr. D’s Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 12:40:19 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC’s public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I’m trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.
06/08/2006 09:42 To
psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject

Re: Re:

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be
something you can email?
And
can we set up a call for some time in the next
days? Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: [Redacted]
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM 
Subject: Re:

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program
activities and
preparations
for today’s testimony before House Admin. We
have not yet received the
transcript of the Working Group session. Devon
checked with the court
reporter, who said it will be delivered today.
--- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:15 To
psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject

"Job"
Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova
Hi Peg,

How do you recommend dealing with this? I have this feeling like he's trying to create a situation where I will have to write it myself. Thanks. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:42 PM
To: psims@eac.gov;
Subject: Re: Transcript & teleconference

Peggy:

I can't predict when I get home but it is between 5:30 and 6:30 my time. I know that is generally too late to have a teleconference.

I plan to review Tova's recommendations this weekend and work on my own as well as expanding the explanation of the case section.

Please see what your financial officer did with regards to my travel.

Thank you,

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> What time do you arrive home from work? Perhaps we could talk then?
> Re your question on the mileage, I have approached our Financial Officer with a request that you receive full reimbursement on the grounds that your actual total travel costs are less than the estimated total travel costs if you had flown to DC, stayed in our more expensive hotels, and received the higher per diem for 3 days (instead of 1). I have not yet received a response from her and she has been out of the office much of this week, so I don't know what she decided to do.
> --- Peggy

> "Job Serebrov"
> 06/08/2006 01:10 PM
> To
> psims@eac.gov,
Peg:

I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take time during the work day for telephone conferences. As I told you I will need to finish this project after daily working hours. I am still getting things done from being out for ten days. I will review Tova's recommendations and expand on mine this weekend.

Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the mileage portion of my travel voucher?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job.

---

> Peggy

> 06/08/2006 10:10 AM

> To
> psims@eac.gov
> cc
> 
> Subject
> Re: Transcript & Teleconference

> Can we make it 4 est? I have another meeting at 3.

> ----- Original Message -----
> > To:
> > From: <psims@eac.gov>
> > Cc:
> > Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:55 AM
> > Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

012900
I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can PDF it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before them because of other commitments. --- Peggy

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

--- Original Message ----- From: <psims@eac.gov> To: <psims@eac.gov> Cc: Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM Subject: Re: Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court
reporter, who said it will be delivered today.
--- Peggy

---

06/08/2006 09:15 To AM
psims@eac.gov
cc
"Job Serebrov"
Subject

Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---
How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message -----
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM
Subject: Re:

> Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy

> Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

> Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
06/08/2006 09:55 AM
I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before them because of other commitments. --- Peggy

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

------ Original Message ------
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM
Subject: Re: Re:

> Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy

psims@eac.gov
"Job Serebrov"
Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

"Tova Wang"
06/09/2006 12:49 PM
To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov"
cc
Subject more gao

Sorry, its 500 pages -- it also includes data on absentee fraud and voter intimidation

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

"Tova Wang"
05/12/2006 04:46 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: Will Call Later

Either between 9 and 10 or between 12 and 1:30 would be ideal, but I should be around most of the afternoon. Thanks Peg. Tova

----- Original Message -----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 12, 2006 2:39 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Will Call Later

I'll try to call you Wednesday. Is there a time that is best for you? Today has been too hectic.
Tomorrow is primary election day in VA. Still no transcript. I have taken a look at the recommendations that you sent me, but have not yet heard from Job. --- Peg

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
06/12/2006 05:09 PM
To "Tova Wang"
cc
Subject RE: Will Call Later

How about 9:30 AM EST, Wednesday morning (6/14/06)?

"Tova Wang"
06/12/2006 04:46 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: Will Call Later

Either between 9 and 10 or between 12 and 1:30 would be ideal, but I should be around most of the afternoon. Thanks Peg. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 12, 2006 2:39 PM
To: wang@tcf.org
Subject: Will Call Later

I'll try to call you Wednesday. Is there a time that is best for you? Today has been too hectic. Tomorrow is primary election day in VA. Still no transcript. I have taken a look at the recommendations that you sent me, but have not yet heard from Job. --- Peg

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
"Tova Wang"
06/14/2006 09:40 AM
To "Job Serebrov"
cc psims@eac.gov
Subject teleconference

Hi Job,

Peg tells me that we should now be getting the transcript early next week. Regardless, we should talk about the organization and distribution of work on the final report and try to finally get it done. Would it be possible for you to do a call before you leave for work in the morning, say 8 am your time, on Wednesday? If not, could you do 6 pm your time on Wednesday? Thanks.
Perfect. Thanks.

--Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 12, 2006 4:09 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Will Call Later

How about 9:30 AM EST, Wednesday morning (6/14/06)?

"Tova Wang" [REDACTED]
06/12/2006 04:46 PM

To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: Will Call Later

Either between 9 and 10 or between 12 and 1:30 would be ideal, but I should be around most of the afternoon. Thanks Peg. Tova

--Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Monday, June 12, 2006 2:39 PM  
To: wang@tcf.org  
Subject: Will Call Later

I'll try to call you Wednesday. Is there a time that is best for you? Today has been too hectic. Tomorrow is primary election day in VA. Still no transcript. I have taken a look at the recommendations that you sent me, but have not yet heard from Job. --- Peg

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

Here are my recommendations with the last one now included. Please let me know about the transcript and when you all want to talk about getting the final report done. Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang  
Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

What about during a lunch hour?

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto: Job Serebrov]  
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:42 PM  
To: psims@eac.gov;  
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

Peggy:
I can't predict when I get home but it is between 5:30 and 6:30 my time. I know that is generally too late to have a teleconference.

I plan to review Tova's recommendations this weekend and work on my own as well as expanding the explanation of the case section.

Please see what your financial officer did with regards to my travel.

Thank you,

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> What time do you arrive home from work? Perhaps we could talk then?
> Re your question on the mileage, I have approached our Financial Officer with a request that you receive full reimbursement on the grounds that your actual total travel costs are less than the estimated total travel costs if you had flown to DC, stayed in our more expensive hotels, and received the higher per diem for 3 days (instead of 1). I have not yet received a response from her and she has been out of the office much of this week, so I don't know what she decided to do.
> --- Peggy

> "Job Serebrov" 06/08/2006 01:10 PM
>
>
> To psims@eac.gov, serebrov@sbcglobal.net
> cc
> Subject Re: Transcript & Teleconference
>
>

> Peg:
>
> I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take time during the work day for telephone conferences. As I told you I will need to finish this project after daily working hours. I am still getting things done from being out for ten days. I will review Tova's recommendations and
expand on mine this weekend.

Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the mileage portion of my travel voucher?

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job.

---

Peggy

---

06/08/2006 10:10 AM

To psims@eac.gov

Re: Transcript & Teleconference

Can we make it 4 est? I have another meeting at 3.

----- Original Message ----- From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: cc:
Cc:
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:55 AM
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you.

How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before then because of other commitments. --- Peggy
How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov> 
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM 
Subject: Re: 

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:15 To 
psims@eac.gov 
cc 
'Serebrov* 

Subject
Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can.

Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

---

Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

"Job Serebrov"  
To: psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: Transcripts, Etc.

Peggy:

Any sign of the transcript? Will the other members of the working group get a copy? I have had questions from several about it.

If you want to talk I can do so this Friday at 6 pm your time.

Job

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---
What time do you suggest talking?

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Job Serebrov" <psims@eac.gov>
To: <psims@eac.gov>; 
Cc:  
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 1:10 PM
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

> Peg:
> 
> I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take
> time during the work day for telephone conferences. As
> I told you I will need to finish this project after
> daily working hours. I am still getting things done
> from being out for ten days. I will review Tova's
> recommendations and expand on mine this weekend.
> 
> Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the
> mileage portion of my travel voucher?
> 
> Job
> 
> --- psims@eac.gov wrote:
> 
> >> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job. ---
> >> Peggy
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> 06/08/2006 10:10 AM
> >>
> >> To
> >> psims@eac.gov
> >> cc
> >> Subject
> >> Re: Transcript & Teleconference
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> Can we make it 4 est? I have another meeting at 3.
> >> ----- Original Message ----- 
> >> From: <psims@eac.gov>
I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before then because of other commitments. --- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:42 To
psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject

Re: Re:

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM
Subject: Re:

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the
transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:15 To psims@eac.gov cc "Job Serebrov" Subject

Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

6/8/2006 10:10 AM To psims@eac.gov cc Subject Re: Transcript & Teleconference
Can we make it 4 EST? I have another meeting at 3.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:55 AM 
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

> I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we 
> only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. 
> How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I 
> really can't do it before them because of other commitments. --- Peggy

> 06/08/2006 09:42 AM 
> psims@eac.gov 
> 
> How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? 
> And 
> 
> can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks. 
> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: <psims@eac.gov>
> To: 
> Cc: 
> Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM 
> Subject: Re:

>> Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and 
>> preparations 
>> for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the 
>> transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court 
>> reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy

>>
Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

---

4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job. --- Peggy

Can we make it 4 est? I have another meeting at 3.
----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To:  
Cc:  
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:55 AM
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

> I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before then because of other commitments. --- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:42 AM
psims@eac.gov
To

cc
Re: Re:

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM
Subject: Re:

>> Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy

>
Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

I can't do that time, I'll be at an event in DC.

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2006 8:10 AM
To: psims@eac.gov; Peggy:
Subject: Transcripts, Etc.

Any sign of the transcript? Will the other members of the working group get a copy? I have had questions from several about it.

If you want to talk I can do so this Friday at 6 pm your time.
Peggy:

I can't predict when I get home but it is between 5:30 and 6:30 my time. I know that is generally too late to have a teleconference.

I plan to review Tova's recommendations this weekend and work on my own as well as expanding the explanation of the case section.

Please see what your financial officer did with regards to my travel.

Thank you,

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> What time do you arrive home from work? Perhaps we could talk then?
> 
> > Re your question on the mileage, I have approached our Financial Officer with a request that you receive full reimbursement on the grounds that your actual total travel costs are less than the estimated total travel costs if you had flown to DC, stayed in our more expensive hotels, and received the higher per diem for 3 days (instead of 1). I have not yet received a response from her and she has been out of the office much of this week, so I don't know what she decided to do.
> > --- Peggy
> >
> >
> > "Job Serebrov"
To psims@eac.gov,
cc
Subject Re: Transcript & Teleconference

Peg:

I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take time during the work day for telephone conferences.

As I told you I will need to finish this project after daily working hours. I am still getting things done from being out for ten days. I will review Tova's recommendations and expand on mine this weekend.

Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the mileage portion of my travel voucher?

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job.

---
Peggy

Can we make it 4 est? I have another meeting at 3.

----- Original Message -----
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:55 AM
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you.

How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before then because of other commitments. --- Peggy

---

06/08/2006 09:42 To AM
psims@eac.gov
c

Subject: Re: Re:

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message -----
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: <psims@eac.gov>
Cc:
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM
Subject: Re:

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the
transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:15 To AM
psims@eac.gov cc
"Job Serebrov"
Subject

Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

"Tova Wang"
08/09/2006 12:09 PM
To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov"
cc
Subject gao report
This has information on many of our topics, but they also surveyed jurisdictions on voter reg fraud coming up with a rate of 5%


Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
06/12/2006 03:39 PM To Tova Andrea Wang
cc
Subject Will Call Later

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---
06/14/2006 10:46 PM To "Job Serebrov" psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: teleconference

Could you do Friday in the morning?
----- Original Message ----- From: "Job Serebrov" psims@eac.gov
To: <psims@eac.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 10:17 PM
Subject: Re: teleconference

> Tova:
> 
> 5 pm EST is 4 pm Central. Peg would have to call at 7
Let's try to do that. Peg, you will call us 5 pm EST?

--- Original Message ----
From: "Job Serebrov" >
To: "Tova Wang"
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 6:29 PM
Subject: Re: teleconference

Wednesday next week? It would have to be 6 pm.

--- Tova Wang wrote:
Hi Job,

Peg tells me that we should now be getting the transcript early next week.
Regardless, we should talk about the organization and distribution of work on the final report and try to finally get it done.

Would it be possible for you to do a call before you leave for work in the morning, say 8 am your time, on Wednesday? If not, could you do 6 pm your time on Wednesday?

Thanks.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

<mailto:join-tcfmain@mailhost.groundspring.org>
Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Peg:

I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take time during the work day for telephone conferences. As I told you I will need to finish this project after daily working hours. I am still getting things done from being out for ten days. I will review Tova's recommendations and expand on mine this weekend.

Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the mileage portion of my travel voucher?

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job. ---
> Peggy

--- Original Message ---
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: <psims@eac.gov>
Cc: 
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

> Can we make it 4 est? I have another meeting at 3.
> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: <psims@eac.gov>
> To: [redacted]
> Cc: [redacted]
> Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:55 AM
> Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference
I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before them because of other commitments. --- Peggy

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM 
Subject: Re: 

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy
Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

What time do you arrive home from work? Perhaps we could talk then?

Re your question on the mileage, I have approached our Financial Officer with a request that you receive
full reimbursement on the grounds that your actual total travel costs are less than the estimated total travel costs if you had flown to DC, stayed in our more expensive hotels, and received the higher per diem for 3 days (instead of 1). I have not yet received a response from her and she has been out of the office much of this week, so I don't know what she decided to do. --- Peggy

"Job Serebrov"

06/08/2006 01:10 PM

To: psims@eac.gov

cc: 

Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

---

Peg:

I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take time during the work day for telephone conferences. As I told you I will need to finish this project after daily working hours. I am still getting things done from being out for ten days. I will review Tova's recommendations and expand on mine this weekend.

Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the mileage portion of my travel voucher?

Job

---

psims@eac.gov wrote:

> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job. ---
> Peggy
> 
> 
> 
> 
> 
> 06/08/2006 10:10 AM
> 
> To: psims@eac.gov
> 
> cc: 
> 
> Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference
> 
> Can we make it 4 est? I have another meeting at 3.
> 
> ---- Original Message ----
> 
> From: <psims@eac.gov>
> 
> To: 

012929
I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before them because of other commitments. --- Peggy

---

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM
Subject: Re:

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon
> checked with the court
> >> reporter, who said it will be delivered today.
> --- Pegy

06/08/2006 09:15 To
psims@eac.gov
cc
"Job  
Serebrov"
Subject

Hi, What's going on? I have not received
responses from either one of
you
in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next
two weeks if we can.
Did
you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---
"Tova Wang"
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject FW: Transcript & Teleconference

012931
-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:serebrov@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, June 09, 2006 8:17 AM
To: Tova Wang
Subject: RE: Transcript & Teleconference

Normally I am not home for lunch.

--- Tova Wang wrote:
> What about during a lunch hour?

--- Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:serebrov@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:42 PM
To: psims@eac.gov;
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

Peggy:
I can't predict when I get home but it is between 5:30 and 6:30 my time. I know that is generally too late to have a teleconference.

I plan to review Tova's recommendations this weekend and work on my own as well as expanding the explanation of the case section.

Please see what your financial officer did with regards to my travel.

Thank you,

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:
> What time do you arrive home from work? Perhaps we could talk then?
> Re your question on the mileage, I have approached our Financial Officer with a request that you receive full reimbursement on the grounds that your actual total travel costs are less than the estimated total travel costs if you had flown to DC, stayed in our more expensive hotels, and received the higher per diem for 3 days (instead of 1). I have not yet received a response from her and she has been out of town.

012932
the office much of this week, so I don't know what she decided to do.
--- Peggy

--- Job Serebrov* 
06/08/2006 01:10 PM

To psims@eac.gov,
cc
Subject
Re: Transcript & Teleconference

Peg:

I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take time during the work day for telephone conferences.
As I told you I will need to finish this project after daily working hours. I am still getting things done from being out for ten days. I will review Tova's recommendations and expand on mine this weekend.
Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the mileage portion of my travel voucher?

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job.

> ---

> Peggy

> 06/08/2006 10:10 AM

> To

> cc
Subject

Re: Transcript & Teleconference

Can we make it 4 EST? I have another meeting at 3.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: [Redacted Address]
Cc: [Redacted Address]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:55 AM
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before then because of other commitments. --- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:42 To AM
psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And
can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

--- Original Message ---
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To:
Cc:
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM
Subject: Re:

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session.

Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today.

--- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:15 To AM

--- message truncated ---

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

"Job Serobrov"

To: psims@eac.gov
cc: 
Subject: Re: teleconference

Tova:

5 pm EST is 4 pm Central. Peg would have to call at 7 pm EST to be 6 pm Central.

Job

--- wrote:

> Let's try to do that. Peg, you will call us 5 pm
Wednesday next week? It would have to be 6 pm.

--- Tova Wang wrote:

Hi Job,

Peg tells me that we should now be getting the transcript early next week. Regardless, we should talk about the organization and distribution of work on the final report and try to finally get it done.

Would it be possible for you to do a call before you leave for work in the morning, say 8 am your time, on Wednesday? If not, could you do 6 pm your time on Wednesday?

Thanks.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

<mailto:join-tcfmain@mailhost.groundspring.org>
Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Hi Peg and Job,

I don't know how we might be able to use these but here, finally, are the super-refined versions of the nexis charts. Can we include them? Thanks. Tova absentee nexis chart [.xls]

'dead' voters and multiple voting nexis chart [.xls]

voter registration fraud nexis chart [.xls]

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

-- Original Message --
From: "Job Serebrov" <psims@eac.gov>
To: <psims@eac.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 10:17 PM
Subject: Re: teleconference

> Tova:
> 5 pm EST is 4 pm Central. Peg would have to call at 7 pm EST to be 6 pm Central.
> Job
> --- wang@tcf.org wrote:
> >> Let's try to do that. Peg, you will call us 5 pm EST?
> >> ----- Original Message ----- 
> >> From: "Job Serebrov"
> >> To: "Tova Wang"
> >> Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 6:29 PM
> >> Subject: Re: teleconference
> >>
> >> > Wednesday next week? It would have to be 6 pm.
> >> >
> >> > --- Tova Wang wrote:
Hi Job,

Peg tells me that we should now be getting the transcript early next week. Regardless, we should talk about the organization and distribution of work on the final report and try to finally get it done.

Would it be possible for you to do a call before you leave for work in the morning, say 8 am your time, on Wednesday? If not, could you do 6 pm your time on Wednesday?

Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

-----

How about Monday at 6:30 or 7 est?

Subject: Re: Teleconference

From: "Job Serebrov"
To: <psims@eac.gov>; Tova Andrea Wang
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 6:21 PM
Subject: Re: Teleconference

> It will need to be early next week. What news of the
> transcript?
>
> --- psims@eac.gov wrote:
>
> I am sorry, but I have to postpone the
> teleconference originally scheduled
> for this evening. Is another day this week or early
> next week good for you
> two?
> Peggy
>
> Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---
Devon E. Romig/EAC/GOV 06/22/2006 03:44 PM
To Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Fw: May 18, 2006 Meeting

Good news!!! The transcript is finally here.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

"Carol J. Thomas Reporting "
<carolthomasreporting @cox .net>
To dromig@eac.gov
cc jwilson@eac.gov
Subject May 18, 2006 Meeting

Dear EAC,
Attached please note the ASCII file for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Meeting taken on Wednesday, May 18, 2006. Your transcript has been shipped to you.

ASCII file name: 051806.txt

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Timothy Brischler, Office Manager, 703.273.9221

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

It will need to be early next week. What news of the transcript?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> I am sorry, but I have to postpone the teleconference originally scheduled for this evening. Is another day this week or early next week good for you two?
> Peggy
> 
> Can I also get an answer on whether we can speak about the project publicly?

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---
OK. I have marked my calendar for a 7 PM EST/6 PM CST teleconference for this Wednesday. Still no transcript. --- Peggy

fine

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Job Serebrov" <psims@eac.gov>
To: <psims@eac.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 10:17 PM
Subject: Re: teleconference

> Tova:
> 
> 5 pm EST is 4 pm Central. Peg would have to call at 7 pm EST to be 6 pm Central.
> 
> Job
> 
> --- wang@tcf.org wrote:
> 
> >> Let's try to do that. Peg, you will call us 5 pm EST?
> >>
> >> ----- Original Message ----- 
> >> From: "Job Serebrov" <psims@eac.gov>
> >> To: "Tova Wang"
> >> Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 6:29 PM
> >> Subject: Re: teleconference
> >>
> >>
> >> > Wednesday next week? It would have to be 6 pm.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > --- Tova Wang wrote:
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > > Hi Job,
> >> > >
> >> > > Peg tells me that we should now be getting the transcript early next week.
> >> > > Regardless, we should talk about the organization
and distribution of work
on the final report and try to finally get it
done.
Would it be possible
for you to do a call before you leave for work in
the morning, say 8 a.m. your
time on Wednesday? If not, could you do 6 p.m.
your
time on Wednesday?
Thanks.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534
www.tcf.org, for the latest news,
analysis, opinions, and events.

<mailto:join-tcfmain@mailhost.groundspring.org>
Click here to receive our
weekly e-mail updates.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

"Job Serebrov"  To  sims@eac.gov
06/21/2006 09:34 PM  cc
Subject  Re: Teleconference

Monday at 7 EST is ok with me. What about you Peg?
Job

---wrote:
> How about Monday at 6:30 or 7 est?
> ----- Original Message -----  
> From: "Job Serebrov"
To: <psims@eac.gov>; "Tova Andrea Wang"

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 6:21 PM
Subject: Re: Teleconference

It will need to be early next week. What news of the transcript?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

I am sorry, but I have to postpone the teleconference originally scheduled for this evening. Is another day this week or early next week good for you two?
Peggy

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
06/22/2006 10:30 AM
To: "Job Serebrov", "Tova Andrea Wang"
cc
Subject: Re: Teleconference

OK. Next Monday (6-26) at 7 PM EST. I’ll call you.
Peggy

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Job Serebrov"
Sent: 06/21/2006 09:34 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
Subject: Re: Teleconference
Monday at 7 EST is ok with me. What about you Peg?

Job

--- wang@tcf.org wrote:

> How about Monday at 6:30 or 7 est?
> ---- Original Message ----
> From: *Job Serebrov* [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
> To: *Tova Andrea Wang*
> Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 6:21 PM
> Subject: Re: Teleconference
> 
> > It will need to be early next week. What news of the transcript?
> >
> > --- psims@eac.gov wrote:
> >
> > > I am sorry, but I have to postpone the teleconference originally scheduled for this evening. Is another day this week or early next week good for you?
> > > two?
> > > Peggy
> > >
> > >
> > > Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
> >
> >
> >
>
>

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

"Tova Wang"
06/21/2006 12:25 PM

To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov"  
cc Subject RE: Teleconference

Anyday anytime except tomorrow is OK by me. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 11:15 AM
To: Tova Andrea Wang; Job Serebrov
Subject: Teleconference

I am sorry, but I have to postpone the teleconference originally scheduled for this evening. Is another day this week or early next week good for you two? Peggy

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
"Job Serebrov" To psims@eac.gov
06/22/2006 09:27 PM cc
Subject Suggestions

Peggy:

When Tova sent me her suggestions I made some changes and additions. Tova later wrote to me and said she expected me to come up with my own list. Due to time constraints and at risk of duplication I rather go with the corrected suggestions.

Job RECOMMENDATIONS.doc
----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
"Job Serebrov" To "Tova Wang" psims@eac.gov
06/21/2006 06:25 PM cc
Subject Re: nexis

I have no objection to amending the official findings/CD to add these.

--- Tova Wang wrote:
Hi Peg and Job,

I don't know how we might be able to use these but here, finally, are the super-refined versions of the nexis charts. Can we
> include them? Thanks.
> Tova
>

Fine by me.
Peggy

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Job Serebrov"  
Sent: 06/21/2006 06:25 PM  
To: "Tova Wang"  
psims@eac.gov  
Subject: Re: nexis

I have no objection to amending the official findings/CD to add these.

--- Tova Wang wrote:
> Hi Peg and Job,
> I don't know how we might be able to use these but
> here, finally, are the
> super-refined versions of the nexis charts. Can we
> include them? Thanks.
> Tova
>

Am I correct in assuming that I still cannot discuss the findings of our report? Thanks.
Peggy:

In the transcript, there is one serious mistake that must be changed immediately. On page 5 it indicates that I helped review and draft changes to the election code of Libya. It should be Namibia not Libya. The reason this is so serious if it stands is that at the time I reviewed Namibia’s Code it was illegal for Americans to deal with Libya. I need to know that this has been corrected any ALL parties who have seen the transcript notified.

Job

Wow, there are a lot of errors in this. But at least it gets at the substance. Will this be circulated to the commissioners?

-----Original Message-----
From: dromlg@eac.gov [mailto:dromlg@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2006 2:45 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
Cc:
Subject: Fw: May 18, 2006 Meeting

Good news!!! The transcript is finally here.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Devon E. Romig/EAC/GOV on 06/22/2006 03:44 PM -----
*Carol J. Thomas Reporting* <carolthomasreporting@cox.net>

Dear EAC,

Attached please note the ASCII file for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Meeting taken on Wednesday, May 18, 2006. Your transcript has been shipped to you.

ASCII file name: 051806.txt

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Timothy Brischler, Office Manager, 703.273.9221

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

"Tova Wang"

08/27/2006 12:26 PM

To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov"
cc
Subject outline of final report

Does this work for you?

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
I wasn't planning on circulating the transcript to the Commissioners. Most of them probably don't have the time to go through the whole thing. I will let them know it is available, if they are interested in reviewing it.

--- Peggy

Wow, there are a lot of errors in this. But at least it gets at the substance. Will this be circulated to the commissioners?

-----Original Message-----
From: dromig@eac.gov [mailto:dromig@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2006 2:45 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
Cc: 
Subject: Fw: May 18, 2006 Meeting

Good news!!! The transcript is finally here.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Devon E. Romig/EAC/GOV on 06/22/2006 03:44 PM -----
*Carol J. Thomas Reporting* <carolthomasreporting@cox.net>
Dear EAC,

Attached please note the ASCII file for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Meeting taken on Wednesday, May 18, 2006. Your transcript has been shipped to you.

ASCII file name: 051806.txt

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Timothy Brischler, Office Manager, 703.273.9221

I am ok with it.

--- Tova Wang wrote:

> Is this OK now?
> Tova Andrea Wang
> Democracy Fellow
> The Century Foundation
> 41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
> phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
> www.tcf.org, for the latest news,
> analysis, opinions, and events.
> <mailto:join-tcfmain@mailhost.groundspring.org>
> Click here to receive our
> weekly e-mail updates.
>
Sure. But where is the resistance coming from? The notes were not accurate. As you know, I have to be very concerned about that.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 12:34 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

Craig:

I am getting some resistance from my consultants to correcting the summary of the interview prior to the meeting. Would you mind noting the corrections at the meeting? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
Peggy,

Here is the summary that you requested. Let me know if this works.

Thanks!

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

VFVI Meeting Summary.doc

I think they are panicking because they are preparing to travel tomorrow and may not have time to submit a revised version. They also are resisting changes to their interview summaries because the summaries represent what they think they heard. I was there at the interview and I heard what you said. I'm not sure that either of them heard everything (including the nuances) because so much of the information was new to them and it was one of their earlier interviews. I'm sorry I did not catch the defects before the summary went out.

My first concern is ensuring that the Working Group has the correct information. Then, we can deal with what version, if any, goes in the final report. Do you want me to excerpt the corrections from your email and submit them to the Working Group? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
Sure. But where is the resistance coming from? The notes were not accurate. As you know, I have to be very concerned about that.

---

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 12:34 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

Craig:

I am getting some resistance from my consultants to correcting the summary of the interview prior to the meeting. Would you mind noting the corrections at the meeting? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/16/2006 12:06 PM

Topsims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: RE: Your Materials

---

Thank you, Peg. This stuff is very interesting.

---

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 11:27 AM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Your Materials

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 11:27 AM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Your Materials

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 10:46 AM

To: psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: Your Materials

Peg - -

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request - - or routinely receive - - audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.
Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double
voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to
corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in
Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in
New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/16/2006 03:14 PM
To “Donsanto, Craig”
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL.
cc
Subject RE: Your Materials

I fully understand. Do you want me to prepare a correction sheet for the Working Group, placing your
second and more important point first, or do you want to handle this verbally at the meeting? --- Peggy

“Donsanto, Craig” <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

The first item is not as big a deal as the second one: the processes under which subjects of investigations
come to Jesus is not as important as the overall assessment of our law enforcement achievements. But
stressing the isolated test cases we brought - - and will continue to being - - to deter things like felon
voting, alien voting and double voting, which not mentioning such significant achievements as the five
case PROJECTS mentioned in my last e-mail - - misrepresents what we are doing and the deterrent
message we are trying to communicate.

I appreciate that these two young people may have found themselves in a Brave New World when they
came over here. It showed in their questioning. But the fact that criminal law enforcement is not at all
similar to preventative legal relief (as under the Voting Rights Act) or civil relief (as election contest
litigation) is I guess more of a problem than I at first foresaw. My real concerns is that the civil rights
groups - - with whom we over here have an amazing amount of common grounds - - will take the singling
out of the felon and alien voter cases as evincing a malevolent aggression on their constituencies. That is
not the case. We are only enforcing the law.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 2:47 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

I think they are panicking because they are preparing to travel tomorrow and may not have time to submit
a revised version. They also are resisting changes to their interview summaries because the summaries
represent what they think they heard. I was there at the interview and I heard what you said. I'm not sure
that either of them heard everything (including the nuances) because so much of the information was new
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to them and it was one of their earlier interviews. I'm sorry I did not catch the defects before the summary went out.

My first concern is ensuring that the Working Group has the correct information. Then, we can deal with what version, if any, goes in the final report. Do you want me to excerpt the corrections from your email and submit them to the Working Group? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 01:41 PM

Sure. But where is the resistance coming from? The notes were not accurate. As you know, I have to be very concerned about that.

--- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 12:06 PM

Craig:

I am getting some resistance from my consultants to correcting the summary of the interview prior to the meeting. Would you mind noting the corrections at the meeting? --- Peggy
Thank you, Peg. This stuff is very interesting.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 11:27 AM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Your Materials

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 10:46 AM
Peg -

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request - or routinely receive - audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

Peg --

At the Advisory Board meeting we had last week, your two contractors asked to interview the over-100 AUSAs who are serving as District Election Officers in connection with the Fraud study.

This request needs to be addressed to Natalie Voris of EOUSA per the message from here that follows.

If the contractors require additional information in connection with the Fraud Study, and should EOUSA not be able to satisfy their needs then they can communicate with me on criminal issues and Cameron Quinn on Civil Rights issues.

I will be here when you arrive later today at the Board of Advisors meeting
when you arrive to talk to us at 4:30.

Ms. Voris' message follows:

Per the USAM, all requests for interviews/surveys/research projects that involve USAOs must be approved by EOUSA. I am pasting the provision below - the contact name needs to be updated. Requests should come to me, as the Acting Counsel to the Director.

Thanks,

Natalie

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Hi Peg,

Just wanted to give you the heads up that I did an interview with a reporter from The Hill today on fraud. As far as I know he is simply referring to me as a fellow at TCF and I did not discuss the project in any way.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

Thanks for the "heads up". — Peggy

"Tova Wang"
Craig:

This is what I was working on for the upcoming meetings of the EAC Board of Advisors and EAC Standards Board. — Peggy

Cases were from 2000 to the present.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Would you please refresh my memory about the date ranges used for the Nexis article research and the case law research?
> I'm drawing a blank and I don't see it in the summaries. I need it for this mornings Commissioner briefing. Thanks! --- Peggy
Is it OK if I come around 12:30 or so to make sure I have all my materials arranged properly for presentation? Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang  
Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534  

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events. 
Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

Peg --

This is a complicated issue largely because of two things: 1) there is a lot of ambiguity out there as to what constitutes "intimidation." To the civil rights community, "intimidation" means anything that makes voting uncomfortable or less than automatic. To us in the criminal law enforcement "intimidation" means threats of economic or physical nature made to force or prevent voting. Only the latter involve aggravating factors that warrant putting offenders in jail, and the statutes that address "intimidation" from a criminal perspective are thus limited. We have never had many "intimidation" criminal cases. For one thing, in this modern post voting rights era, there is not a lot of physical/economic duress out there in the voting context - - at least not that I have seen. For another, where it does occur it is very hard to investigate and detect as victims who have been physically or economically intimidated are not likely to come to the FBI.

The bottom line is that we take matters that do present predication for physical or economically based "intimidation" very seriously, AND that we are being extremely proactive in trying to find ways to prosecute matters involving voter suppression as in the Tobin cases in New Hampshire where the local GOP tried to jam telephone lines for a GOTV effort run by the Dems. But even there - - the usual "suppression" matter involves flyers that are passed around giving out misleading information about an election, and we have investigated every one of those that came to our attention last election cycle. We were not able to identify the person(s) responsible for printing the misleading flyers in any of these. But we sure as heck tried.
Craig:

I'm putting the finishing touches on a status report to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors on our Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. For the most part, I am using our consultants summaries for the report, but one bullet under the interview summaries is giving me heartburn. It is the bullet that references the decrease in DOJ voter intimidation actions. It is one of the places in which our consultants had indicated that your office is focusing on prosecuting individuals. I have reworded it and would like your feedback on the revision:

Several people indicate - including representatives from DOJ -- that for various reasons, the Department of Justice is bringing fewer voter intimidation and suppression cases now, and has increased its focus on matters such as noncitizen voting, double voting, and felon voting. While the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division focuses on systemic patterns of malfeasance, the Election Crimes Branch of the Public Integrity Section has increased prosecutions of individual instances of felon, alien, and double voting while also maintaining an aggressive pursuit of systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process.

Please suggest any changes that you think would further clarify the current approach. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---
Would you please refresh my memory about the date ranges used for the Nexis article research and the case law research? I'm drawing a blank and I don't see it in the summaries. I need it for this morning's Commissioner briefing. Thanks! --- Peggy

-----
Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
05/15/2006 06:41 PM
To: "Craig Donsanto" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
cc
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

---

It could be a Berry problem. (I occasionally have that problem with attachments I try to retrieve through my Blackberry.)

The attachment is a pdf file, but I have access to a Word version that I can use to insert text in an email tomorrow. I don't have access to the attachment from my Berry.

Peggy

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----:
From: "Donsanto, Craig" [Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov]
Sent: 05/15/2006 04:53 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

Peggy --

I am currently on train in transit back from a day in Newark. I tried to recover your attachment on Blackberry but got a message telling me the "file is empty."

Can you paste it to an e-mail perhaps?

--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: barnwine@lawyerscommittee.org <barnwine@lawyerscommittee.org>; Rbauer@perkinscoie.com <Rbauer@perkinscoie.com>; bginsberg@pattonboggs.com <bginsberg@pattonboggs.com>; mhearne@lathropgage.com <mhearne@lathropgage.com>; jrperez50@sbcglobal.net <jrperez50@sbcglobal.net>; krogers@sos.state.ga.us <krogers@sos.state.ga.us>; assistant@sos.in.gov <assistant@sos.in.gov>; weinutr@verizon.net <weinutr@verizon.net>
CC: jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org <jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org>;
Dear Working Group Members and Participants:

You should receive a packet of information today, either by Federal Express or hand delivery, concerning Thursday's meeting of the project Working Group for EAC's Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. Attached is an analysis of the consultants' research into relevant literature and reports. This summary was not available when we prepared the information packets last Friday, but may be of interest to you. Our consultants and I look forward to having a productive discussion with you.

Regards,

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov
Hi Peg, Have you tried to send me the presentation? I haven't gotten it, but I think we may be having email problems. Let me know. I'd need to look at it today since I'll be tied up tomorrow. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang  
Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

"Donsanto, Craig"  
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>  
To psims@eac.gov  
cc  
05/16/2006 03:17 PM  
Subject RE: Your Materials

Let me try to do it, Peg. Again what I do not want to see occur is for the LCCR to start attacking us. We have more in common with them than I had originally assumed, thanks to the write-ups of their interviews. We need to promote what we have in common not try to score political points. But I will try to correct the records as long as you will agree you heard what I said the way I know I said it!

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 3:14 PM  
To: Donsanto, Craig  
Subject: RE: Your Materials

I fully understand. Do you want me to prepare a correction sheet for the Working Group, placing your second and more important point first, or do you want to handle this verbally at the meeting? — Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>  
05/16/2006 02:55 PM  
Top:psims@eac.gov  
cc  
Subject: RE: Your Materials
The first item is not as big a deal as the second one: the processes under which subjects of investigations come to Jesus is not as important as the overall assessment of our law enforcement achievements. But stressing the isolated test cases we brought - and will continue to being - to deter things like felon voting, alien voting and double voting, which not mentioning such significant achievements as the five case PROJECTS mentioned in my last e-mail - misrepresents what we are doing and the deterrent message we are trying to communicate.

I appreciate that these two young people may have found themselves in a Brave New World when they came over here. It showed in their questioning. But the fact that criminal law enforcement is not at all similar to preventative legal relief (as under the Voting Rights Act) or civil relief (as election contest litigation) is I guess more of a problem than I at first foresaw. My real concerns is that the civil rights groups - with whom we over here have an amazing amount of common grounds - will take the singling out of the felon and alien voter cases as evincing a malevolent aggression on their constituencies. That is not the case. We are only enforcing the law.

---

From: psims@eac.gov
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 2:47 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

I think they are panicking because they are preparing to travel tomorrow and may not have time to submit a revised version. They also are resisting changes to their interview summaries because the summaries represent what they think they heard. I was there at the interview and I heard what you said. I'm not sure that either of them heard everything (including the nuances) because so much of the information was new to them and it was one of their earlier interviews. I'm sorry I did not catch the defects before the summary went out.

My first concern is ensuring that the Working Group has the correct information. Then, we can deal with what version, if any, goes in the final report. Do you want me to excerpt the corrections from your email and submit them to the Working Group? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 01:41 PM

Topsims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: RE: Your Materials
Sure. But where is the resistance coming from? The notes were not accurate. As you know, I have to be very concerned about that.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 12:34 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

Craig:

I am getting some resistance from my consultants to correcting the summary of the interview prior to the meeting. Would you mind noting the corrections at the meeting? --- Peggy

*Craig, Craig* <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 12:06 PM

Topsims@eac.gov
cc:
SubjectRE: Your Materials
Thank you, Peg. This stuff is very interesting.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 11:27 AM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Your Materials

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 10:46 AM
I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request - - or routinely receive - - audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get0-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2006 9:30 AM
To: Tova Andrea Wang; Job Serebrov
Subject: Fw: Request to interview AUSAs

Below is Craig's response to the request to interview AUSAs. It does not appear that this avenue is likely because the AUSAs are so busy.

Also, he asked about permission for other folks to attend the election crimes training session, and the answer was "no". (I can't even get in, and I'm a federal employee.). I understand that a good part of the reason is practical -- they are having enough trouble accommodating the folks that are required to come.

Peggy

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Donsanto, Craig" [Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov]
Sent: 05/23/2006 02:49 PM
To: psims@eac.gov; "Voris, Natalie (USAEO)" <Natalie.Voris@usdoj.gov>; "Hillman, Noel" <Noel.Hillman@usdoj.gov>; "Simmons, Nancy" <Nancy.Simmons@usdoj.gov>
Subject: Request to interview AUSAs

Peg --

At the Advisory Board meeting we had last week, your two contractors asked to interview the over-100 AUSAs who are serving as District Election Officers in connection with the Fraud study.

This request needs to be addressed to Natalie Voris of EOUSA per the message from here that follows.

If the contractors require additional information in connection with the Fraud Study, and should EOUSA not be able to satisfy their needs they can communicate with me on criminal issues and Cameron Quinn on Civil Rights issues.

I will be here when you arrive later today at the Board of Advisors meeting when you arrive to talk to us at 4:30.

Ms. Voris' message follows:

Per the USAM, all requests for interviews/surveys/research projects that involve USAOs must be approved by EOUSA. I am pasting the provision below - the contact name needs to be updated. Requests should come to me, as the Acting Counsel to the Director.

Thanks,
Natalie

--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
I haven't sent it yet. If you need to leave early, you can look at what I have so far, which does not have the intro or the text regarding the final report. --- Peggy

Hi Peg, Have you tried to send me the presentation? I haven't gotten it, but I think we may be having email problems. Let me know. I'd need to look at it today since I'll be tied up tomorrow. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Thank you, Peg. This is at least more accurate than what I read this morning. Thank you for taking the time to discuss this with me. I shall see you tomorrow.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2006 3:04 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Status Report on Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Craig:

This is what I was working on for the upcoming meetings of the EAC Board of Advisors and EAC Standards Board. --- Peggy

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Report on Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Research

Craig:

I'm putting the finishing touches on a status report to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors on our Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. For the most part, I am using our consultants summaries for the report, but one bullet under the interview summaries is giving me heartburn. It is the bullet that references the decrease in DOJ voter intimidation actions. It is one of the places in which our consultants had indicated that your office is focusing on prosecuting individuals. I have reworded it and would like your feedback on the revision:

Several people indicate - including representatives from DOJ -- that for various reasons, the Department of Justice is bringing fewer voter intimidation and suppression cases now, and has increased its focus on matters such as noncitizen voting, double voting, and felon voting. While the Voting
Section of the Civil Rights Division focuses on systemic patterns of malfeasance, the Election Crimes Branch of the Public Integrity Section has increased prosecutions of individual instances of felon, alien, and double voting while also maintaining an aggressive pursuit of systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process.

Please suggest any changes that you think would further clarify the current approach. --- Peggy
How did it go? Were you able to verbally correct that discrepancy we talked about the other day? Thanks. Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/16/2006 08:41 AM
To Tova Andrea Wang, Job Serebrov
cc
Subject Date Ranges for Research

Would you please refresh my memory about the date ranges used for the Nexis article research and the case law research? I'm drawing a blank and I don't see it in the summaries. I need it for this mornings Commissioner briefing. Thanks! --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

I still think its sufficient for him to raise the points verbally. All of the interview summaries reflect what Job and I both understood the interviewees to say. This really opens to the door to people making, as Job says, "corrections"

----- Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 10:47 AM

--- End of Forwarded Message ---
How did it go? Were you able to verbally correct that discrepancy we talked about the other day? Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

---
---

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

"Tova Wang"

To psims@eac.gov
cc

Subject RE: board of advisers presentation

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 2:51 PM
To: 
Subject: Re: board of advisers presentation

I haven't sent it yet. If you need to leave early, you can look at what I have so far, which does not have the intro or the text regarding the final report. --- Peggy

-----

"Tova Wang"

To psims@eac.gov
cc

Subject board of advisers presentation

Hi Peg, Have you tried to send me the presentation? I haven't gotten it, but I think we may be having email problems. Let me know. I'd need to look at it today since I'll be tied up tomorrow. Tova
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Thank you, Peg. This stuff is very interesting.

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy
I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who re3ceive target letters routinely request - - or routinely receive - -
audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an
election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into
plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a
subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But
again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double
voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to
corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in
Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in
New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

Craig:

I am getting some resistance from my consultants to correcting the summary of the interview prior to the
meeting. Would you mind noting the corrections at the meeting? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 12:06 PM

Subject RE: Your Materials

Thank you, Peg. This stuff is very interesting.

From: psims@eac.gov
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 11:27 AM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Your Materials

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution
at the WG meeting. --- Peggy
Peg -

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request - or routinely receive - audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged, that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

I don't think anyone should be given the opportunity to correct mistakes.
OK. Weather is not going to be great in DC Thursday. I hope that does not delay me.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> We don't need a castle key, but we have to wait until the Chairman returns to the office tomorrow to confirm availability of the parking pass. I expect you will be on the road, then. Try calling me our toll-free line (1-866-747-1471) tomorrow afternoon, say after 2 PM EST, so that we can talk about this. --- Peg
Did you find out whether I can use the Chairman's parking spot?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> You will need to submit hotel and parking receipts.
> You don't need to submit meal receipts. You don't need to submit gas receipts because use of a personally owned vehicle (POV) is reimbursed based on mileage. I think I emailed the mileage rate to you. If you need it again, I'll look it up when I am at the office (this afternoon).

Peg

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Job Serebrov"  
Sent: 05/12/2006 09:05 PM  
To: psims@eac.gov  
Subject: Question

Peg:

Since I am driving to DC, besides hotel receipts, do you want me to keep my gas receipts or how will my car use be compensated? Also, I assume I don't have to retain food receipts.

Job

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ----- 
"Tova Wang"  
05/15/2006 09:07 AM  
To: psims@eac.gov  
cc: dromig@eac.gov  
Subject: I'm sorry
Subject: Re: New Working Group Member

Ben Ginsberg is one of the most respected election law attorneys in the country. Great choice.

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Margaret Sims
Sent: 05/12/2006 04:04 PM
To: pdegregorio@eac.gov
Cc: CN=Amie J. Sherrill/OU=EAC/O=GOV@EAC
Subject: New Working Group Member

FYI - The person I mentioned as a replacement for David Norcross, who was unavailable, could not attend or Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group meeting. Our consultant, Job Serebrov, suggested Benjamin Ginsberg, who is willing. I'm sorry I could not check with you on this beforehand

--- things happened so fast! --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
05/22/2006 04:55 PM
To Tova Andrea Wang, Job Serebrov
cc
Subject PowerPoint Presentation to EAC Boards

FYI - Attached is a copy of the PowerPoint presentation on the voting fraud-voter intimidation research project for tomorrow's meetings of the EAC Standards Board (110 state and local election officials) and the EAC Advisory Board (37 representatives from national associations and government agencies who play a role in HAVA implementation and from science and technology-related professions appointed by Congressional members). I used your summaries as the primary source of information for the presentation. --- Peggy

VF-VI Project Presentation.ppt
----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ----
Tamar Nedzar/EAC/GOV
05/18/2006 04:36 PM
To cdonsanto@usdoj.gov, weinutr@verizon.net, assistant@sos.in.gov, krogers@sos.state.ga.us, jrperez50@sbcglobal.net, mhearme@lathroppage.com, bginsberg@pattonboggs.com, Rbauer@perkinscole.com, barnwine@lawyerscommittee.org, serebrov@sbcglobal.net, wang@tcf.org
cc Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC, Edgardo Cortes/EAC/GOV@EAC, Juliet E.
All,

As discussed in the meeting today, please find attached the House and Senate Conference Reports associated with the passage of HAVA. In each document, the word "fraud" is capitalized, bolded, and highlighted.

Kind Regards,

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

OK, thanks

--- Original Message ---
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2006 7:46 AM
To: wang@tcf.org
Subject: RE: PowerPoint Presentation to EAC Boards

I know --- I'll have to cover that in my oral presentation, along with some other points. The audience will have a copy of the paper I put together using Job's and your summaries and findings. The paper provides a lot more detail. We did not plan to provide a copy of the PowerPoint presentation, which is just meant to keep me on track and them interested in the presentation. --- Peggy
Peggy:
The package came today. Thanks. See you Thursday.
Barry

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/15/2006 01:56 PM
To "Weinberg and Utrecht"
cc
Subject Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Barry:

Would you please take a moment to review the draft definition of election fraud? One of our consultants is concerned that it does not sufficiently cover violations of the Voting Rights Act that would qualify. Thanks!
--- Peggy

"Weinberg and Utrecht"
Peggy:

The package came today. Thanks. See you Thursday.

Barry

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
05/16/2006 11:27 AM
To: "Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject: Re: Your Materials

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/16/2006 10:46 AM
To: psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: Your Materials

Peg - -

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request -- or routinely receive -- audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in
New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get0-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

"Tova Wang" To psims@eac.gov
05/16/2006 03:53 PM cc
Subject RE: board of advisers presentation

I'll be here for a while, I just wanted to make sure. If you send it to me anytime before 5 I can look at it in time. If not, I'll try my best to look at it en route tomorrow.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 2:51 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
Subject: Re: board of advisers presentation

I haven't sent it yet. If you need to leave early, you can look at what I have so far, which does not have the intro or the text regarding the final report. --- Peggy

"Tova Wang"
05/16/2006 03:47 PM

To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject board of advisers presentation

Hi Peg. Have you tried to send me the presentation? I haven't gotten it, but I think we may be having email problems. Let me know. I'd need to look at it today since I'll be tied up tomorrow.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request or routinely receive audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.
This article is on the CD, it is located in the "Nexis Article Charts" folder.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

Thats good. I'm probably just getting crazy, trying to make sure everything is perfect. Devon, maybe you can check? Otherwise I'll check it when it comes. Thanks. And be well Peg.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2006 8:23 AM
To: Tova Andrea Wang
Subject: Re: I'm sorry

Tova:
I think you did send this --- or is this a revised version of one you sent earlier? It should be on the CD in the packet you should receive today.. (Can't check that right now as I am at the clinic.) If I put anything on the CD that you want to highlight at the meeting, let me know and we'll make copies for those attending.
Peggy

-----------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----
I don't think I sent this to you either. Can we hand it out at the meeting as an addendum? Its another summary that would have gone in the news article section. I'm usually so organized, I'm very embarrassed. Too many things! Thanks

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

**Existing Research Analysis**

There are many reports and books that describe anecdotes and draw broad conclusions from a large array of incidents. There is little research that is truly systematic or scientific. The most systematic look at fraud is the report written by Lori Minnite. The most systematic look at voter intimidation is the report by Laughlin McDonald. Books written about this subject seem to all have a political bias and a pre-existing agenda that makes them somewhat less valuable.

Researchers agree that measuring something like the incidence of fraud and intimidation in a scientifically legitimate way is extremely difficult from a methodological perspective and would require resources beyond the means of most social and political scientists. As a result, there is much more written on this topic by advocacy groups than social scientists. It is hoped that this gap will be filled in the "second phase" of this EAC project.

Moreover, reports and books make allegations but, perhaps by their nature, have little follow up. As a result, it is difficult to know when something has remained in the stage
of being an allegation and gone no further, or progressed to the point of being investigated or prosecuted or in any other way proven to be valid by an independent, neutral entity. This is true, for example, with respect to allegations of voter intimidation by civil rights organizations, and, with respect to fraud, John Fund’s frequently cited book. Again, this is something that it is hoped will be addressed in the “second phase” of this EAC project by doing follow up research on allegations made in reports, books and newspaper articles.

Other items of note:

- There is as much evidence, and as much concern, about structural forms of disenfranchisement as about intentional abuse of the system. These include felon disenfranchisement, poor maintenance of databases and identification requirements.

- There is tremendous disagreement about the extent to which polling place fraud, e.g. double voting, intentional felon voting, noncitizen voting, is a serious problem. On balance, more researchers find it to be less of a problem than is commonly described in the political debate, but some reports say it is a major problem, albeit hard to identify.

- There is substantial concern across the board about absentee balloting and the opportunity it presents for fraud.

- Federal law governing election fraud and intimidation is varied and complex and yet may nonetheless be insufficient or subject to too many limitations to be as effective as it might be.

- Deceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004.

- Voter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities, although the American Center for Voting Rights uniquely alleges it is focused on Republicans.

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

To psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

Peggy --

I am currently on train in transit back from a day in Newark. I tried to recover your attachment on Blackberry but got a message telling me the "file is empty."
Can you paste it to an e-mail perhaps?
--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: barnwine@lawyerscommittee.org <barnwine@lawyerscommittee.org>; 
Rbauer@perkinscoie.com <Rbauer@perkinscoie.com>; bginsberg@pattonboggs.com <bginsberg@pattonboggs.com>; mhearn@lathropgage.com <mhearn@lathropgage.com>; jrperez50@sbcglobal.net <jrperez50@sbcglobal.net>; 
krogers@sos.state.ga.us <krogers@sos.state.ga.us>; assistant@sos.in.gov <assistant@sos.in.gov>; weinutr@verizon.net <weinutr@verizon.net> 
CC: jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org <jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org>; 
vjohnson@lawyerscommittee.org <vjohnson@lawyerscommittee.org>; 
dlovechio@perkinscoie.com <dlovechio@perkinscoie.com>; 
bschuler@lathropgage.com <bschuler@lathropgage.com>; Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov> 
Sent: Mon May 15 16:37:48 2006 
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

Dear Working Group Members and Participants:

You should receive a packet of information today, either by Federal Express or 
hand delivery, concerning Thursday's meeting of the project Working Group for 
EAC's Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. Attached is an 
analysis of the consultants' research into relevant literature and reports. 
This summary was not available when we prepared the information packets last 
Friday, but may be of interest to you. Our consultants and I look forward to 
having a productive discussion with you.

Regards,

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV 05/19/2006 02:51 PM 
To Craig Donsanto
cc
Subject Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project-Nexis Word Search

Craig;
You asked about the Nexis search terms used by our consultants. The list follows. --- Peggy.

Election and fraud
Voter and fraud
Vote and fraud
Voter and challenge
Vote and challenge
Election and challenge
Election and irregularity
Election and irregularities
Election and violation
Election and stealing
Ballot box and tampering
Ballot box and theft
Ballot box and stealing
Election and officers
Election and Sheriff
Miscount and votes
Election and crime
Election and criminal
Vote and crime
Vote and criminal
Double voting
Multiple voting
Dead and voting
Election and counting and violation
Election and counting and error
Vote and counting and violation
Vote and counting and error
Voter and intimidation
Voter and intimidating
Vote and intimidation
Denial and voter and registration
Voter identification
Vote and identification
Voter and racial profiling
Vote and racial profiling
Voter and racial
Vote and racial
Voter and racial and challenge
Vote and racial and challenge
Voter and deny and racial
Vote and deny and racial
Voter and deny and challenge
Vote and deny and challenge
Voter and deny and black
Vote and deny and black
Voter and black and challenge
Vote and black and challenge
Voter and deny and African American
Vote and deny and African American
Voter and African American and challenge
Vote and African American and challenge
Election and black and challenge
Election and African American and challenge
Vote and deny and Hispanic
Voter and deny and Latino
Vote and deny and Hispanic
Vote and deny and Latino
Voter and Hispanic and challenge
Voter and Latino and challenge
Vote and Hispanic and challenge
Vote and Latino and challenge
Election and Hispanic and challenge
Election and Latino and challenge
Voter and deny and Native American
Vote and deny and Native American
Voter and Native American and challenge
Vote and Native American and challenge
Election and Native American and challenge
Voter and deny and Asian American
Vote and deny and Asian American
Voter and Asian American and challenge
Vote and Asian American and challenge
Vote and Asian American and challenge
Election and Asian American and challenge
Voter and deny and Indian
Vote and deny and Indian
Voter and Indian and challenge
Vote and Indian and challenge
Election and Indian and challenge
Poll tax
Voting and test
Absentee ballot and deny
Absentee ballot and reject
Absentee ballot and challenge
Vote and challenge
Voter and challenge
Election and challenge
Vote and police
Voter and police
Poll and police
Vote and law enforcement
Voter and law enforcement
Poll and law enforcement
Vote and deceptive practices
Voter and deceptive practices
Election and deceptive practices
Voter and deceive
Voter and false information
Dirty tricks
Vote and felon
Vote and ex-felon
Disenfranchisement
Disenfranchise
Law and election and manipulation
Vote and purging
Vote and purge
Registration and removal
Registration and purging
Registration and purge
Vote buying
Vote and noncitizen
Voter and noncitizen
Vote and selective enforcement
Identification and selective
Election and misinformation
Registration and restrictions
Election and administrator and fraud
Election and official and fraud
Provisional ballot and deny
Provisional ballot and denial
Affidavit ballot and deny
Affidavit ballot and denial
Absentee ballot and coerce
Absentee ballot and coercion
Registration and destruction
Voter and deter
Vote and deterrence
Voter and deterrence
Ballot integrity
Ballot security
Ballot security and minority
Ballot security and black
Ballot security and African American
Ballot security and Latino
Ballot security and Hispanic
Ballot security and Native American
Ballot security and Indian
Vote and suppression
Minority and vote and suppression
Black and vote and suppression
African American and vote and suppression
Latino and vote and suppression
Hispanic and vote and suppression
Native American and vote and suppression
Vote and suppress
Minority and vote and suppress
African American and vote and suppress
Latino and vote and suppress
Native American and vote and suppress
Vote and depress
Jim Crow
Literacy test
Voter and harass
Voter and harassment
Vote and mail and fraud
Poll and guards
Election and consent decree
Vote and barrier
Voting and barrier
Voter and barrier
Election and long line
Voter and long line

Poll worker and challenge
Poll worker and intimidate
Poll worker and intimidation
Poll worker and intimidating
Poll worker and threatening
Poll worker and abusive
Election official and challenge
Election official and intimidate
Election official and intimidation
Election official and intimidating
Election official and threatening
Election official and abusive
Poll watcher and challenge
Poll watcher and intimidate
Poll watcher and intimidating
Poll watcher and intimidation
Poll watcher and abusive
Poll watcher and threatening
Poll inspector and challenge
Poll inspector and intimidate
Poll inspector and intimidating
Poll inspector and intimidation
Poll inspector and abusive
Poll inspector and threatening
Poll judge and challenge
Poll judge and intimidate
Poll judge and intimidating
Poll judge and intimidation
Poll judge and abusive
Poll judge and threatening
Poll monitor and challenge
Poll monitor and intimidate
Poll monitor and intimidating
Poll monitor and intimidation
Poll monitor and abusive
Poll monitor and threatening
Election judge and challenge
Election judge and intimidate
Election judge and intimidating
Election judge and intimidation
Election judge and abusive
Election judge and threatening
Election monitor and challenge
Election monitor and intimidate
Election monitor and intimidating
Election monitor and intimidation
Election monitor and abusive
Election monitor and threatening
Election observer and challenge
Election observer and intimidate
Election observer and intimidating
Election observer and intimidation
Election observer and abusive
Election observer and threatening

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/16/2006 03:37 PM

To  "Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc

Subject  RE: Your Materials
OK. --- Peg

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

Let me try to do it, Peg. Again what I do not want to see occur is for the LCCR to start attacking us. We have more in common with them than I had originally assumed, thanks to the write-ups of their interviews. We need to promote what we have in common not try to score political points. But I will try to correct the records as long as you will agree you heard what I said the way I know I said it!

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 3:14 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

I fully understand. Do you want me to prepare a correction sheet for the Working Group, placing your second and more important point first, or do you want to handle this verbally at the meeting? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

The first item is not as big a deal as the second one: the processes under which subjects of investigations come to Jesus is not as important as the overall assessment of our law enforcement achievements. But stressing the isolated test cases we brought - - and will continue to bring - - to deter things like felon voting, alien voting and double voting, which not mentioning such significant achievements as the five case PROJECTS mentioned in my last e-mail - - misrepresents what we are doing and the deterrent message we are trying to communicate.
I appreciate that these two young people may have found themselves in a Brave New World when they came over here. It showed in their questioning. But the fact that criminal law enforcement is not at all similar to preventative legal relief (as under the Voting Rights Act) or civil relief (as election contest litigation) is I guess more of a problem than I at first foresaw. My real concerns is that the civil rights groups - - with whom we over here have an amazing amount of common grounds - - will take the singling out of the felon and alien voter cases as evincing a malevolent aggression on their constituencies. That is not the case. We are only enforcing the law.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 2:47 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

I think they are panicking because they are preparing to travel tomorrow and may not have time to submit a revised version. They also are resisting changes to their interview summaries because the summaries represent what they think they heard. I was there at the interview and I heard what you said. I'm not sure that either of them heard everything (including the nuances) because so much of the information was new to them and it was one of their earlier interviews. I'm sorry I did not catch the defects before the summary went out.

My first concern is ensuring that the Working Group has the correct information. Then, we can deal with what version, if any, goes in the final report. Do you want me to excerpt the corrections from your email and submit them to the Working Group? — Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 01:41 PM

Topsims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: RE: Your Materials
Sure. But where is the resistance coming from? The notes were not accurate. As you know, I have to be very concerned about that.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 12:34 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

Craig:

I am getting some resistance from my consultants to correcting the summary of the interview prior to the meeting. Would you mind noting the corrections at the meeting? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 12:06 PM

Topsims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: RE: Your Materials

Thank you, Peg. This stuff is very interesting.
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 11:27 AM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Your Materials

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy

*Donsanto, Craig* <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 10:46 AM

Peg --

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.
I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request - - or routinely receive - - audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get0-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
*Tova Wang* 05/16/2006 11:03 AM
To psims@eac.gov, serebrov@sbcglobal.net
cc
Subject RE: Your Materials

I think he can just raise these points at the meeting, no? I'm sure many we interviewed would say we misquoted them on something. This is what both Job and I remember him saying. I think it would be unfair for him to change/amend his interview without giving the same opportunity to the other interviewees.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 9:59
To:
Subject: Fw: Your Materials

See corrections from Donsanto at DOJ. We should probably provide corrected versions to the Working Group. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 05/16/2006 10:58 AM -----
"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/16/2006 10:46 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Your Materials
I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request - - or routinely receive - - audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of getout-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

Peg - -

---

"Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/19/2006 03:17 PM

To: psims@eac.gov

Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project-Nexis Word Search

Peggy --

I was just thinking of you!

Great session yesterday. I really enjoyed it. Robust discussion.

On another subject, Nancy Simmons needs the e-mail address of NASED. Can you give her both that and the website address for them? Her e-mail is nancy.simmons@usdoj.gov.

Peg - -

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request - - or routinely receive - - audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of getout-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

---

"Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/19/2006 03:17 PM

To: psims@eac.gov

Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project-Nexis Word Search

Peggy --

I was just thinking of you!

Great session yesterday. I really enjoyed it. Robust discussion.

On another subject, Nancy Simmons needs the e-mail address of NASED. Can you give her both that and the website address for them? Her e-mail is nancy.simmons@usdoj.gov.

Peg - -

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request - - or routinely receive - - audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of getout-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

---

"Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/19/2006 03:17 PM

To: psims@eac.gov

Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project-Nexis Word Search

Peggy --

I was just thinking of you!

Great session yesterday. I really enjoyed it. Robust discussion.

On another subject, Nancy Simmons needs the e-mail address of NASED. Can you give her both that and the website address for them? Her e-mail is nancy.simmons@usdoj.gov.

--------------------------

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Fri May 19 14:51:21 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project-Nexis Word Search

Craig;

You asked about the Nexis search terms used by our consultants. The list
follows. --- Peggy.

Election and fraud
Voter and fraud
Vote and fraud
Voter and challenge
Vote and challenge
Election and challenge
Election and irregularity
Election and irregularities
Election and violation
Election and stealing
Ballot box and tampering
Ballot box and theft
Ballot box and stealing
Election and officers
Election and Sheriff
Miscount and votes
Election and crime
Election and criminal
Vote and crime
Vote and criminal
Double voting
Multiple voting
Dead and voting
Election and counting and violation
Election and counting and error
Vote and counting and violation
Vote and counting and error
Voter and intimidation
Voter and intimidating
Vote and intimidation
Denial and voter and registration
Voter identification
Vote and identification
Voter and racial profiling
Vote and racial profiling
Voter and racial
Vote and racial
Voter and racial and challenge
Vote and racial and challenge
Voter and deny and racial
Vote and deny and racial
Voter and deny and challenge
Vote and deny and challenge
Voter and deny and black
Vote and deny and black
Voter and black and challenge
Vote and black and challenge
Voter and deny and African American
Vote and deny and African American
Voter and African American and challenge
Vote and African American and challenge
Election and black and challenge
Election and African American and challenge
Voter and deny and Hispanic
Voter and deny and Latino
Vote and deny and Hispanic
Vote and deny and Latino
Voter and Hispanic and challenge
Voter and Latino and challenge
Vote and Hispanic and challenge
Vote and Latino and challenge
Election and Hispanic and challenge
Election and Latino and challenge
Voter and deny and Native American
Vote and deny and Native American
Voter and Native American and challenge
Voter and Native American and challenge
Election and Native American and challenge
Voter and deny and Asian American
Vote and deny and Asian American
Voter and Asian American and challenge
Vote and Asian American and challenge
Voter and Asian American and challenge
Election and Asian American and challenge
Voter and deny and Indian
Vote and deny and Indian
Voter and Indian and challenge
Vote and Indian and challenge
Election and Indian and challenge
Poll tax
Voting and test
Absentee ballot and deny
Absentee ballot and reject
Absentee ballot and challenge
Vote and challenge
Voter and challenge
Election and challenge
Vote and police
Voter and police
Poll and police
Vote and law enforcement
Voter and law enforcement
Poll and law enforcement
Vote and deceptive practices
Voter and deceptive practices
Election and deceptive practices
Voter and deceive
Voter and false information
Dirty tricks
Vote and felon
Vote and ex-felon
Disenfranchisement
Disenfranchise
Law and election and manipulation
Vote and purging
Vote and purge
Registration and removal
Registration and purging
Registration and purge
Vote buying
Vote and noncitizen
Voter and noncitizen
Vote and selective enforcement
Identification and selective
Election and misinformation
Registration and restrictions
Election and administrator and fraud
Election and official and fraud
Provisional ballot and deny
Provisional ballot and denial
Affidavit ballot and deny
Affidavit ballot and denial
Absentee ballot and coerce
Absentee ballot and coercion
Registration and destruction
Voter and deter
Vote and deterrence
Voter and deterrence
Ballot integrity
Ballot security
Ballot security and minority
Ballot security and black
Ballot security and African American
Ballot security and Latino
Ballot security and Hispanic
Ballot security and Native American
Ballot security and Indian
Vote and suppression
Minority and vote and suppression
Black and vote and suppression
African American and vote and suppression
Latino and vote and suppression
Hispanic and vote and suppression
Native American and vote and suppression
Vote and suppress
Minority and vote and suppress
African American and vote and suppress
Latino and vote and suppress
Native American and vote and suppress
Vote and depress
Jim Crow
Literacy test
Voter and harass
Voter and harassment
Vote and mail and fraud
Poll and guards
Election and consent decree
Vote and barrier
Voting and barrier
Voter and barrier
Election and long line
Voter and long line

Poll worker and challenge
Poll worker and intimidate
Poll worker and intimidation
Poll worker and intimidating
Poll worker and threatening
Poll worker and abusive
Election official and challenge
Election official and intimidate
Election official and intimidation
Election official and intimidating
Election official and threatening
Election official and abusive
Poll watcher and challenge
Poll watcher and intimidate
Poll watcher and intimidating
Poll watcher and intimidation
Poll watcher and abusive
Poll watcher and threatening
Poll inspector and challenge
Poll inspector and intimidate
Poll inspector and intimidating
Poll inspector and intimidation
Poll inspector and abusive
Poll inspector and threatening
Poll judge and challenge
Poll judge and intimidate
Poll judge and intimidating
Poll judge and intimidation
Poll judge and abusive
Poll judge and threatening
Poll monitor and challenge
Poll monitor and intimidate
Poll monitor and intimidating
Poll monitor and intimidation
Poll monitor and abusive
Poll monitor and threatening
Election judge and challenge
Election judge and intimidate
Election judge and intimidating
Election judge and intimidation
Election judge and abusive
Election judge and threatening
Election monitor and challenge
Election monitor and intimidate
Election monitor and intimidating
Election monitor and intimidation
Election monitor and abusive
Election monitor and threatening
Election observer and challenge
Election observer and intimidate
Election observer and intimidating
Election observer and intimidation
Election observer and abusive
Election observer and threatening

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

"Tova Wang"
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: Fraud Definition

Sounds good. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2006 4:03 PM
To: Tova
Subject: Re: Fraud Definition

Tova:
It would be great if someone there could work on cleaning it up. Let us know. Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, June 30, 2006 5:25 PM
Subject: Re: FW: methodology

The attached is the text extracted from pages 8-19 and the Attachment C referenced within the text. The formatting is still a little weird. Can you work with this, or do I need to play with it some more? --- Peggy

Will it be possible for you to extract the excerpt for inclusion in the report? Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Wednesday, June 28, 2006 5:40 PM
To: Tova Wang; psims@eac.gov
Subject: Re: methodology

Agreed

--- Tova Wang [redacted] wrote:
Once is enough. You don't need to resend. --- Peggy

Peg, We don't need to re-send you all of the material that we gave you to provide to the working group for the final report, eg the individual interviews, research summaries, nexis and case charts, right? Thanks. Happy 4th. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
The excess returns would be a great start, and then I can do the rest. Thanks a lot.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 03, 2006 10:14 AM
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: Re: FW: methodology

Do you just need to have the excess returns removed, or do you think it needs other clean up as well? --- Peggy
Yes, I have the list of Working Group members. --- Peggy

appendices attached, except Peg I think you put together the list of the working group members? In any case, I can't find one at the moment, but it would be easy enough to put together. Perhaps even Devon or someone could do that, especially since I don't think I have any hours left, and probably shouldn't even be writing this email. I don't remember the conversation about adding to the list of interviewees, but we can talk about that later.

-----Original Message-----

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, Jul 17, 2006 9:13 AM
To: 
Cc: Job Serebrov
Subject: Re: final report

Thanks. I probably won't be able to start getting into this until tomorrow AM. I noticed that the appendices weren't attached. I think we discussed earlier that the list of interviewees needed to have more information for the final report, and the list of books and documents should be presented in the same manner as a bibliography for the final report. We can talk more about this tonight during our teleconference at 7 PM EST. --- Peggy

"Tova Wang"
Yes, I have the list of Working Group members. --- Peggy

appendices attached, except Peg I think you put together the list of the working group members? In any case, I can't find one at the moment, but it would be easy enough to put together. Perhaps even Devon or someone could do that, especially since I don't think I have any hours left, and probably shouldn't even be writing this email. I don't remember the conversation about adding to the list of interviewees, but we can talk about that later.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov (mailto:psims@eac.gov)
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2006 9:13 AM
To: 
Cc: 'Job Serebrov'; 
Subject: Re: final report

Thanks. I probably won't be able to start getting into this until tomorrow AM. I noticed that the appendices weren't attached. I think we discussed earlier that the list of interviewees needed to have more information for the final report, and the list of books and documents should be presented in the same manner as a bibliography for the final report. We can talk more about this tonight during our teleconference at 7 PM EST. --- Peggy

"Tova Wang" 
07/17/2006 09:33 AM

To psims@eac.gov
Cc "Job Serebrov" 
Subject final report

013012
Can you send it over? As I recall, it includes bios, right? I'm assuming on the interviewees you think we should have very short biographical information? Also, Peg, I'm not sure if I'll still be at work at 7 or home. Is it ok if I email you late in the day as to where I am? My home phone (for only two more weeks!) is 212-362-5223. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2006 11:26 AM
To: 
Cc: Job Serebrov
Subject: RE: final report

Yes, I have the list of Working Group members. --- Peggy

appendices attached, except Peg I think you put together the list of the working group members? In any case, I can't find one at the moment, but it would be easy enough to put together. Perhaps even Devon or someone could do that, especially since I don't think I have any hours left, and probably shouldn't even be writing this email. I don't remember the conversation about adding to the list of interviewees, but we can talk about that later.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2006 9:13 AM
To: 
Cc: Job Serebrov
Subject: Re: final report

Thanks. I probably won't be able to start getting into this until tomorrow AM. I noticed that the appendices weren't attached. I think we discussed earlier that the list of interviewees needed to have more information for the final report, and the list of books and documents should be presented in the same manner as a bibliography for the final report. We can talk more about this tonight during our teleconference at 7 PM EST. --- Peggy
Hi Peg, Here is the list of literature reviewed in bibliographic form. Please let us know if you have been able to look over any of the materials. Starting this afternoon, I will be pretty unavailable for the next two weeks.

Thanks

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Hi Peg, I left you a voice message last week -- you might have been at NCSL. Anyway, would you give me a call when you have a moment? Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20037

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Peggy and Tova:

I know that we had been looking for a state survey of election fraud and intimidation statutes—as you may have seen, Doug Chapin recently released a report on this info-attached here. I hope all is well with both of you.

Best regards,
Adam

Adam D. Ambrogi
Democratic Professional Staff Member
Thanks Adam. As the current project moves forward and then proceeds to phase 2, this will be a great resource I'm sure. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

I know that we had been looking for a state survey of election fraud and intimidation statutes—as you may have seen, Doug Chapin recently released a report on this info-attached here. I hope all is well with both of you.

Best regards,
Adam
Tova and Job:

I am home recuperating, but see that in my absence, a USA Today article has gotten everyone stirred up. The report to which the article refers is only the status report on the voting fraud-voter intimidation research project that was delivered to our Standards Board and Board of Advisors last spring. I provided a copy of this document to both of you, but have attached another copy for your information. This document is subject to public release because it was presented at a public meeting.

Due to internal resource allocation problems, your final report has not yet been reviewed by the Commissioners. It is considered a working document (not subject to public release) until it has completed the review process and the Commissioners have agreed to release it. There has been no attempt by the Commission to hold up the report. I bear responsibility for any delays in moving it along. Please be reassured that we would not release your report without letting you know.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

VF-VI Study Status 5-17-06.pdf

Peg:

We saw both the USA Today article and a similar thing was reported on Rush Limbaugh's show naming both of us. I had a talk this morning with folks at the EAC. I told them at this point there needs to be a press release sent out by the Chairman saying just what you stated. This is the only
way to rehabilitate the work we did, the Chairman's credibility, and our reputations. I also fear that if this is not done the EAC will begin to receive calls from Congressman and Senators regarding the "report" and its effect on voter ID requirements.

Peg, up to now Tova and I have refused to speak with the press at all out of respect for the EAC and its mission. We both stand by our work and its conclusions. We both also feel that if a statement (as well phrased as you did in this e-mail clarifying the issue) is not forthcoming from the Chairman then I will have to correct this error with the Press. I explained this in my conversation this morning with the EAC.

Tova and I worked hard to produce a correct, accurate and truthful report. I could care less that the results are not what the more conservative members of my Party wanted. Neither one of us was willing to conform results for political expediency. I think it important for me to note that I was very impressed with Tova's members of the Working Group and I can't say enough about Tova's partnership effort in this endeavor. While neither one of us really care about outside opinions, we do care that the Chairman was quoted or misquoted in a way that would disparage our year-long effort and all of the tax payer money that went into it. For this reason, we believe that a press release clarifying the situation is necessary from either the Chairman or from me.

Regards,

Job

psims@eac.gov wrote:

Tova and Job:

I am home recuperating, but see that in my absence, a USA Today article has gotten everyone stirred up. The report to which the article refers is only the status report on the voting fraud-voter intimidation research project that was delivered to our Standards Board and Board of Advisors last spring. I provided a copy of this document to both of you, but have attached another copy for your information. This document is subject to public release because it was presented at a public meeting.

Due to internal resource allocation problems, your final report has not yet been reviewed by the Commissioners. It is considered a working document (not subject to public release) until it has completed the review process and the Commissioners have agreed to release it. There has been no attempt by the Commission to hold up the report. I bear responsibility for any delays in moving it along. Please be reassured that we would not release your report without letting you know.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov
Julie recalls you asking her how to send your work papers for the voting fraud study to EAC. She asked if I had received them. I was not sure what papers you were referencing, so I could not adequately respond. Can you shed some light on this matter?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

Yes. I asked her if she wanted me to delete the Voter Fraud Project files on my computer or whether I should keep them. She said to download them to a disk and send them to her at the EAC. These files are just duplicates of what you have plus the text of some of the articles. What do you want me to do? I will not be able to do anything until after the election on Tuesday in any case because I am so involved in Asa Hutchinson's campaign.

Hope you are feeling better.

Regards,

Job

psims@eac.gov wrote:

Job:

Julie recalls you asking her how to send your work papers for the voting fraud study to EAC. She asked if I had received them. I was not sure what papers you were referencing, so I could not adequately
respond. Can you shed some light on this matter?

Peggy Sims  
Election Research Specialist  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)  
Fax: 202-566-3127  
email: psims@eac.gov
It is just the Working Group for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project. I am asking you to attend as Technical Advisor for the project. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>

05/04/2006 03:26 PM
To
   psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject    RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Peg -- what is the name of the group?

From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 3:13 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

This meeting is being held to obtain input from our eight-member Working Group for the project. The group is composed of election lawyers, election
officials, and a representative of an advocacy group, all of whom have an interest and some expertise in the identification and/or prosecution of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The group was chosen so that we would have an equal number of folks on each side of the political spectrum, plus some nonpartisan members.

After our consultants review the results of their preliminary research (interviews, literature review, case law), we will ask the Working Group to brainstorm possible next steps for EAC. Our consultants will write a report summarizing the proposals that come out of this meeting. The report will go to the Commissioners, who will decide what they want to do, funds available, and what priority to assigned to the effort(s).

Your participation in this part of the process is extremely important, so I am very happy that you can find time for us that afternoon. I'll get an agenda and other information to you next week. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/04/2006 02:32 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc psims@eac.gov
Subject RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Okay, Peg -- I will mark off the entire afternoon and try to be there. What is the agenda? I was not aware that this was anything beyond having your contractors spend another session with me. Also, if they will be needing stats and stuff like that I need to know as I will bring my state-people with me.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 2:28 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Right now, we are planning to meet in EAC's large conference room between 1 PM
and 5 PM. If you cannot be there for the whole afternoon, we will appreciate whatever time you can spare. I'll get back to you with more information (agenda, list of Working Group members, etc.). --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/03/2006 05:59 PM

To
psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject
Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Afternoon of May 18 -- 2:30 okay? How long will they need??
-----------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 16:59:09 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

I am looking at the afternoon of 5/18 for the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts of Working Group members. There remain two members from whom we have not yet received confirmations of their schedule (with some, it is like pulling teeth), but right now 5/18 still looks like the best day. We may have to hold the meeting over here to make it easier for Commissioners to drop in. --- Peg

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/03/2006 12:53 PM
To
psims@eac.gov
cc
Okay -- you are on for May 18th! Can we do it over here at 10?

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 12:40:19 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.

Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/03/2006 11:56 AM
To
psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject
Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Hi Peg. I am sitting here with Cameron Quinn putting together this year's ballt conference for AUSAs. She send her best!

I am available on 5/18. But I am also going to the Board of Advisors Meeting the following week. I would rather do this then.

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 11:39:50 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

We are continuing our efforts to hone in on a date for the Working Group meeting. Are you available the afternoon of Thursday, May 18?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM -----
"Tova Wang"  
05/09/2006 11:45 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: Case Summaries

yes-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2006 10:38 AM
To: wang@tcf.org
Subject: Fw: Case Summaries

Had you seen this? --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 05/09/2006 11:38 AM -----
"Job Serebrov"  
05/08/2006 09:30 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Case Summaries
Peggy:

Please add this to the packet.

Job

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM ----

"Job Serebrov"  To psims@eac.gov
05/12/2006 05:45 PM  cc
Subject Re: Good News

I'm thankful it all worked out.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Ginsberg has accepted our invitation! --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM ----

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV  To Craig Donsanto
05/11/2006 02:35 PM  cc
Subject Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

Craig:

I think we have resolved the issue of Barbara Arnwine's absence from the upcoming meeting by having one of her staff represent her (and her organization). Please review the attached rough summary of DOJ Cases ASAP and let me know if I need to delete reference to the open investigations. Hopefully, we won't have to remove this information as it does not specify the defendants or States involved. --- Peg

Rough Summary of Department of Justice, Public Integrity Section Activities, October 2002-January 2006

Prosecutions and Convictions-- Individuals
Noncitizen voting: 20
Vote buying: 49
Double voting: 12
Registration fraud: 13
Civil Rights: 4
Voter Intimidation: 2
Unclear: 1
Open Investigations (note: a few cases overlap with prosecutions and convictions)
Noncitizen voting: 3
Vote buying: 25
Double voting: 15
Registration fraud: 29
Absentee ballot fraud: 9
Official: 8
Ineligibles: 4
Deceptive Practices: 1
Civil Rights: 14
Intimidation: 6
Other: 2

Cases and Investigations Closed for Lack of Evidence

Civil Rights: 8
Official: 12
Registration Fraud: 12
Absentee Ballot Fraud: 14
Ineligible Voting: 3
Intimidation: 8
Double Voting: 5
Ballot Box Stuffing: 1
Vote Buying: 14
Ballot/machine tampering: 2
Other: 8
Unclear: 3

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are
taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the
Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants
in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of
May.

Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
Hi Peg. I am sitting here with Cameron Quinn putting together this year's ballit conference for AUSAs. She send her best!

I am available on 5/18. But I am also going to the Board of Advisors Meeting the following week. I would rather do this then.

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 11:39:50 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

We are continuing our efforts to hone in on a date for the Working Group meeting. Are you available the afternoon of Thursday, May 18?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

---- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM ----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
05/11/2006 02:08 PM
To: Job Serebrov
cc:
Subject: Literature Summary

Tova just sent me the summary you prepared of The Federal Crime of Election Fraud by Craig Donsanto. There is something wrong in the fourth paragraph (odd characters and missing text). Can you please send a replacement fourth paragraph? You can send it in an email and I will place it in the document. ---

Peggy

---- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM ----
"Tova Wang"
05/11/2006 05:32 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
cc:
Subject: RE: new working group representative

013028
I'm up for a short meeting afterward and a teleconference on Monday. And maybe when all of this is over, you and I can have dinner! Have I told you that I am moving down to DC this summer?

I suspect you have put up with much more than I have and I really appreciate everything you have done.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 4:27 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: new working group representative

Tova:

I understood Job to say that he could only find a hotel room with the right bed in Roanoke (hours away). He will drive in Thursday morning for the meeting and return to that hotel Thursday night. He won't drive back into DC for a Friday morning meeting.

We don't have to do dinner. I recognize that you have spent a lot of time and energy to make this project work, and I don't want to put you out. (You have done a lot under difficult circumstances.) Though we will be bushed, we may want to have a short meeting right after the Working Group disperses --- or we could do a teleconference the following Monday afternoon (before I head into three more days of meetings). --- Peggy

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 3:47 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: Re: new working group representative

Dinner sounds like a great idea. Do either of you have any dietary restrictions of preferences?
seem to recall that Tova would prefer a place that has vegetarian options). I'll try to locate a nearby place that won't bust the budget. --- Peggy
I have the feeling we didn't include these in the original batch I sent you. Could you double check and if not, would you please include them in the existing research materials? Sorry and thanks. I'm kind of doing all of this on my own in case you couldn't tell. List is coming...

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

---

Something is wrong in the fourth paragraph of the Federal Election Crime summary. Do you know what it is supposed to say there?

"Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>

---

I have the feeling we didn't include these in the original batch I sent you. Could you double check and if not, would you please include them in the existing research materials? Sorry and thanks. I'm kind of doing all of this on my own in case you couldn't tell. List is coming...

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
Job, please double check to make sure I haven't missed anything

Tova Andrea Wang  
Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534  

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.  
Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
It would not be my first preference to do this right after the meeting, and I sort of had tentative plans. They can be changed if necessary of course, but what happened to meeting on Friday morning?

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 3:47 PM
To: 
Subject: Re: new working group representative

Dinner sounds like a great idea. Do either of you have any dietary restrictions of preferences? (I seem to recall that Tova would prefer a place that has vegetarian options). I'll try to locate a nearby place that won't bust the budget. --- Peggy
I will hear from him tomorrow but that still does not solve all of my issues---see my longer e-mail.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> I had a voice mail message from him on Monday. I called him back but had to leave a voice mail message (telephone tag). If you hear from him and he is willing and able to come, I need to know this. We need to have him call our travel service to make travel arrangements ASAP. Thanks. ---
>
Peggy
>
>
>
> "Job Serebrov" 05/09/2006 10:46 AM
>
>
> To
>
> psims@eac.gov
>
> cc
>

> Subject
>
> Fwd: RE: Working Group meeting
>

>

> FYI
Patrick J. Rogers wrote:

Subject: RE: Working Group meeting
Date: Tue, 9 May 2006 07:42:44 -0600
From: "Patrick J. Rogers"
To: "Job Serebrov"

Job---maybe. I will call you and/or Ms. Sims tomorrow. Depositions all day today. Thanks, Pat

What's the best number to call you tomorrow?

Patrick J. Rogers
Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris & Sisk, P.A.

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2006 9:41 PM
To: Patrick J. Rogers
Subject: Working Group meeting

Pat:

The working group meeting for the voter fraud project is scheduled for May 18th in DC but David Norcross can't attend. Could you come? If so, we need to arrange travel and a hotel for you.

Regards,

Job

Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris & Sisk, P.A.

-- THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you
Barbara says that you have been working it out with her assistant Valerie, that they have spoken to you several times.

---- Original Message ----
From: dromig@eac.gov
To: dromig@eac.gov
Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2006 8:46 AM
To: 
Cc: psims@eac.gov
Subject: Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Project Working Group

Dear Tova,

I am working with Peggy Sims in order to set a date for the Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Project Working Group. I have been trying to reach Barbara Arnwine in order to find out which days in May she is potentially available to attend this meeting but all of my attempts have been unsuccessful.

I would appreciate any help that you could provide in this matter.

Sincerely,

Devon Romig
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite #1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
OK, thanks. I'll get back to you with more information. --- Peggy

that would be fine

----- Original Message -----  
From: psims@eac.gov
To:  
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 1:08 PM
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Barry:

It appears that the afternoon of Thursday, May 18 is best for a meeting of the working group. I know you said you would not be available in the morning that day. If we started at 1 PM, would that be too soon for you?

Peggy Sims  
Election Research Specialist  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)  
Fax: 202-566-3127  
email: psims@eac.gov
Can you please give me an idea where we are at with all this? I'd like to be able to figure out my schedule. Thanks -- and thanks for all your assistance on this. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: dromig@eac.gov [mailto:dromig@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2006 3:54 PM
To: 
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Project Working Group

Yes, I have spoken to her assistant several times but today has been the first time that I have ever spoken to her assistant. We did get the information that we needed. Thanks for your help!

Devon Romig
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite #1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)566-2377

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:49 PM ---

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov 
To: 
Cc: dromig@eac.gov
Sent: Wednesday, May 03, 2006 1:44 PM
Subject: Working Group Meeting

Job and Tova:
As of now, the afternoon of Thursday, May 18 appears to be the best possible date for the meeting. Norcross is not available to attend in person that day (he is available only 2 days during the first three weeks of May). We won’t have confirmation of the availability of Secretary Rokita until tomorrow --- but I am hopeful.

I’ll give you an update tomorrow. Maybe we can schedule a teleconference on Monday afternoon. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ----- 

Job found it. I'm assuming its too late to include so as I said I'll just present it if that's OK. Thanks again Job. T

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Job Serebrow" 
To: 
Sent: Saturday, May 13, 2006 10:12 AM 
Subject: Re: research summary

> T-
> 
> Are you talking about this?
> 
> J-
> 
> --- 
>
> > 
> >> In the middle of the night I got the feeling that 
> >> you may be right, that I did do a summary of the 
> >> existing literature review (that Job, you approved) 
> >> . I'll have to look for it on Monday (unless I go 
> >> into the office over the weekend, which is 
> >> possible). I may be hallucinating, but if not, I'll 
> >> just present it at the meeting rather than try to 
> >> get it to them ahead of time. Tova

Existing_research_thoughts.doc

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ----- 

"Donsanto, Craig" 
To psims@eac.gov 
cc 
Subject RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group 

Peggy --
I have Cynthia Mitchell in here with me now.

She says that the figures you listed in your attachment are your analysis of our product, and that therefore we cannot re-evaluate them.

I do not see anything in these raw numbers that impacts adversely any privacy or privilege issues.

We can update the public list and send that to you, if you'd prefer. That would allow you to represent that the numbers are current up through now. But if you would prefer, you can use what you have as long as it is represented as complete only through January, 2006.

Let us know your desires - - -

---

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 2:35 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group
Importance: High

Craig:

I think we have resolved the issue of Barbara Arnwine's absence from the upcoming meeting by having one of her staff represent her (and her organization). Please review the attached rough summary of DOJ Cases ASAP and let me know if I need to delete reference to the open investigations. Hopefully, we won't have to remove this information as it does not specify the defendants or States involved. --- Peg

**Rough Summary of Department of Justice, Public Integrity Section Activities, October 2002-January 2006**

**Prosecutions and Convictions-- Individuals**
- Noncitizen voting: 20
- Vote buying: 49
- Double voting: 12
- Registration fraud: 13
- Civil Rights: 4
- Voter Intimidation: 2
- Unclear: 1

**Open Investigations (note: a few cases overlap with prosecutions and convictions)**
- Noncitizen voting: 3
- Vote buying: 25
- Double voting: 15
- Registration fraud: 29
- Absentee ballot fraud: 9
- Official: 8
Ineligibles: 4
Deceptive Practices: 1
Civil Rights: 14
Intimidation: 6
Other: 2

Cases and Investigations Closed for Lack of Evidence

Civil Rights: 8
Official: 12
Registration Fraud: 12
Absentee Ballot Fraud: 14
Ineligible Voting: 3
Intimidation: 8
Double Voting: 5
Ballot Box Stuffing: 1
Vote Buying: 14
Ballot/machine tampering: 2
Other: 8
Unclear: 3

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/11/2006 03:33 PM
To: "Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL.
cc
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

Craig:

I would love to have an updated list for our research files. For purposes of getting this information out to our participants, I will note that the consultants' summary is based upon information provided as of January 2006. Thanks.

Do you expect to be at your office tomorrow afternoon? I can walk over with the information packet we will have put together for the Working Group. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/11/2006 02:55 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group
Peggy - -

I have Cynthia Mitchell in here with me now.

She says that the figures you listed in your attachment are your analysis of our product, and that therefore we cannot re-evaluate them.

I do not see anything in these raw numbers that impacts adversely any privacy or privilege issues.

We can update the public list and send that to you, if you'd prefer. That would allow you to represent that the numbers are current up through now. But if you would prefer, you can use what you have as long as it is represented as complete only through January, 2006.

Let us know your desires - - -

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 2:35 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group
Importance: High

Craig:

I think we have resolved the issue of Barbara Arwine's absence from the upcoming meeting by having one of her staff represent her (and her organization). Please review the attached rough summary of DOJ Cases ASAP and let me know if I need to delete reference to the open investigations. Hopefully, we won't have to remove this information as it does not specify the defendants or States involved. --- Peg

Rough Summary of Department of Justice, Public Integrity Section Activities, October 2002-January 2006

Prosecutions and Convictions-- Individuals
Noncitizen voting: 20
Vote buying: 49
Double voting: 12
Registration fraud: 13
Civil Rights: 4
Voter Intimidation: 2
Unclear: 1

Open Investigations (note: a few cases overlap with prosecutions and convictions)
Noncitizen voting: 3
Vote buying: 25
Double voting: 15
Registration fraud: 29
Absentee ballot fraud: 9
Official: 8
Ineligibles: 4
Deceptive Practices: 1
Civil Rights: 14
Intimidation: 6
Other: 2

**Cases and Investigations Closed for Lack of Evidence**

Civil Rights: 8
Official: 12
Registration Fraud: 12
Absentee Ballot Fraud: 14
Ineligible Voting: 3
Intimidation: 8
Double Voting: 5
Ballot Box Stuffing: 1
Vote Buying: 14
Ballot/machine tampering: 2
Other: 8
Unclear: 3
Job:

I don't think we can put you on teleconference for 41/2 hours. We really need to have you here in person if you are to help conduct the Working Group meeting. You should make your travel arrangements ASAP.

--- Peggy

"Job Serebrov"

Peggy:

4:00 eastern on Tuesday is fine however, given the financial restrictions that you indicated would be in place for use of my car (I would actually lose money coming to DC) and given the cost of hotels at this time (I can’t afford to front these costs and wait for months to be repaid), etc, it would take a miracle for this working group meeting to take place in person. It is looking like the only way it will get done is by teleconference. I also share Tova's concern about the unknown nature of Mr. Perez.

Job
My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.

Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.
I am looking at the afternoon of 5/18 for the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts of Working Group members. There remain two members from whom we have not yet received confirmations of their schedule (with some, it is like pulling teeth), but right now 5/18 still looks like the best day. We may have to hold the meeting over here to make it easier for Commissioners to drop in. --- Peg

Okay -- you are on for May 18th! Can we do it over here at 10?

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.

Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.
Peggy -- they don't have anything to do with the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights do they?

I ask only because the Justice Department is currently engaged in a very acrimonious FOIA litigation with LCCR that focuses precisely on our efforts to combat voter "intimidationm"

--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Thu May 04 17:20:39 2006
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

It is just the Working Group for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project. I am asking you to attend as Technical Advisor for the project. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
Peg -- what is the name of the group?

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 3:13 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

This meeting is being held to obtain input from our eight-member Working Group for the project. The group is composed of election lawyers, election officials, and a representative of an advocacy group, all of whom have an interest and some expertise in the identification and/or prosecution of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The group was chosen so that we would have an equal number of folks on each side of the political spectrum, plus some nonpartisan members.

After our consultants review the results of their preliminary research (interviews, literature review, case law), we will ask the Working Group to brainstorm possible next steps for EAC. Our consultants will write a report summarizing the proposals that come out of this meeting. The report will go to the Commissioners, who will decide what they want to do, funds available, and what priority to assign to the effort(s).

Your participation in this part of the process is extremely important, so I am very happy that you can find time for us that afternoon. I'll get an agenda and other information to you next week. --- Peggy
Okay, Peg - - I will mark off the entire afternoon and try to be there. What is the agenda? I was not aware that this was anything beyond having your contractors spend another session with me. Also, if they will be needing stats and stuff like that I need to know as I will bring my state-people with me.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 2:28 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Right now, we are planning to meet in EAC's large conference room between 1 PM and 5 PM. If you cannot be there for the whole afternoon, we will appreciate whatever time you can spare. I'll get back to you with more information (agenda, list of Working Group members, etc.). --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/03/2006 05:59 PM

To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Afternoon of May 18 -- 2:30 okay? How long will they need??
-----------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
I am looking at the afternoon of 5/18 for the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts of Working Group members. There remain two members from whom we have not yet received confirmations of their schedule (with some, it is like pulling teeth), but right now 5/18 still looks like the best day. We may have to hold the meeting over here to make it easier for Commissioners to drop in.

--- Peg

Okay -- you are on for May 18th! Can we do it over here at 10?

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.

Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.
Hi Peg. I am sitting here with Cameron Quinn putting together this year's ballt conference for AUSAs. She send her best!

I am available on 5/18. But I am also going to the Board of Advisors Meeting the following week. I would rather do this then.

--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 11:39:50 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

We are continuing our efforts to hone in on a date for the Working Group meeting. Are you available the afternoon of Thursday, May 18?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
Afternoon of May 18 -- 2:30 okay? How long will they need??

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
I am looking at the afternoon of 5/18 for the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts of Working Group members. There remain two members from whom we have not yet received confirmations of their schedule (with some, it is like pulling teeth), but right now 5/18 still looks like the best day. We may have to hold the meeting over here to make it easier for Commissioners to drop in.
--- Peg


Okay -- you are on for May 18th! Can we do it over here at 10?
--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.

Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.
To  
psims@eac.gov  
cc  
Subject  
Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Hi Peg. I am sitting here with Cameron Quinn putting together this year's ballt conference for AUSAs. She send her best!

I am available on 5/18. But I am also going to the Board of Advisors Meeting the following week. I would rather do this then.

--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 11:39:50 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

We are continuing our efforts to hone in on a date for the Working Group meeting. Are you available the afternoon of Thursday, May 18?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV  
05/04/2006 02:28 PM  
To: "Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL  
cc  
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Right now, we are planning to meet in EAC's large conference room between 1 PM and 5 PM. If you cannot be there for the whole afternoon, we will appreciate whatever time you can spare. I'll get back to you with more information (agenda, list of Working Group members, etc.). --- Peggy
Afternoon of May 18 -- 2:30 okay? How long will they need??

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 16:59:09 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

I am looking at the afternoon of 5/18 for the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts of Working Group members. There remain two members from whom we have not yet received confirmations of their schedule (with some, it is like pulling teeth), but right now 5/18 still looks like the best day. We may have to hold the meeting over here to make it easier for Commissioners to drop in.

--- Peg

Okay -- you are on for May 18th! Can we do it over here at 10?

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 12:40:19 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.

Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/03/2006 11:56 AM
To
cc
Subject

Hi Peg. I am sitting here with Cameron Quinn putting together this year's ballot conference for AUSAs. She send her best!

I am available on 5/18. But I am also going to the Board of Advisors Meeting the following week. I would rather do this then.

--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 11:39:50 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

We are continuing our efforts to hone in on a date for the Working Group meeting. Are you available the afternoon of Thursday, May 18?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
Hi, Folks:

Teleconference
Are both of you available for a teleconference next Tuesday afternoon at about 4 PM EST? If this does not work for you, please suggest another date and/or time. I would like to discuss our preparations for the Working Group meeting.

Working Group Members
We have a very good person to fill the slot for the nonpartisan local election official: J.R. Perez, Elections Administrator for Guadalupe County, TX. Attached is his bio. Hope you have no objections to him. He is available on May 18. I have place 2 calls to Pat Rogers office, but have not yet received a reply. Job, if you have any pull with him, you may want to contact him, too.

Travel Arrangements
You should make your own travel arrangements, including hotel. Travel time cannot be billed to the contract, except for hours actually worked on the contract (i.e.; reviewing materials in preparation for the meeting, and the like). Current Federal rates follow:

Maximum Lodging = $180 per day- does not include hotel taxes (if you cannot get this rate, we have covered reasonable rates that are a little higher)
Meals & Incidental = $64 per day (except that it is $48 on the first and last day of travel)
Mileage for Personally Owned Vehicle = $ .445 per mile

Under the new contract, I do not have to fill out a travel authorization for you. I can approve your trip via email. Afterwords, when you turn in your next pay voucher, you can attach the airline receipt (or mileage documentation), hotel receipt(s), and ground transportation receipts and a copy of any printed itineraries. Calculate the total travel expenses due you, including applicable per diem. I do not need meal receipts.

Job, under Federal travel regulations, deviations for personal reasons are not normally accommodated. What you can do, however, is to give me a comparison of the cost of roundtrip mileage, hotel, and per diem of doing it your way against the cost of a roundtrip flight, ground transportation, hotel, and per diem. If your way costs less, it should be no problem to cover the full cost. If your way is more expensive, we may only pay up to the amount of traditional travel. (The same rules apply to me when I travel.) If you can tell me where, other than DC, you will spend the night, I can check on applicable per diem rates.

Peggy
I have placed another call to his office (after one previous call to his assistant and an email to him). I, too, am concerned about our dwindling chances. --- Peggy

"Job Serebrov" <serebrov@sbcglobal.net>

Given the short time period, you may want to give Ginsberg a deadline. The longer we wait, the poorer our chances are of getting Braden.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> I am reluctant to invite Braden until after I have received a "No" from Ginsberg. --- Peg

> This is ok, given the fact that the WG may have suggestions. Will you be sending us the same packets that you are sending the WG? Also, I figure with Tova's response we will need to have a teleconference on the report once I return to Little Rock. We will need to do it that following Monday or Tuesday.

013058
--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

Would you please take a look at the attached? I combined both of your definitions, reformatted the list, removed a reference to the fraud having to have an actual impact on the election results (because fraud can be prosecuted without proving that it actually changed the results of the election), and taken out a couple of vague examples (e.g., reference to failing to enforce state laws --- because there may be legitimate reasons for not doing so). I have made contact with Ben Ginsberg’s office and am waiting to hear if he accepts our invitation to join the working group.

--- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

The bio for JR Perez tells us very little about him and there is pretty much nothing about him on the web. Can you tell us more about him and how you decided on him? Thanks. Tova

----- Original Message ----- 

From: psims@eac.gov
To: psims@eac.gov
Cc: dromig@eac.gov
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2006 2:32 PM
Subject: Working Group

Hi, Folks:

Teleconference
Are both of you available for a teleconference next Tuesday afternoon at about 4 PM EST? If this does not work for you, please suggest another date and/or time. I would like to discuss our preparations for the Working Group meeting.

Working Group Members
We have a very good person to fill the slot for the nonpartisan local election official: J.R. Perez, Elections Administrator for Guadalupe County, TX. Attached is his bio. Hope you have no objections to him. He is available on May 18. I have placed 2 calls to Pat Rogers' office, but have not yet received a reply. Job, if you have any pull with him, you may want to contact him, too.

Travel Arrangements
You should make your own travel arrangements, including hotel. Travel time cannot be billed to the contract, except for hours actually worked on the contract (i.e.; reviewing materials in preparation for the meeting, and the like). Current Federal rates follow:

- Maximum Lodging = $180 per day- does not include hotel taxes (if you cannot get this rate, we have covered reasonable rates that are a little higher)
- Meals & Incidentals = $64 per day (except that it is $48 on the first and last day of travel)
- Mileage for Personel Owned Vehicle = $.445 per mile

Under the new contract, I do not have to fill out a travel authorization for you. I can approve your trip via email. Afterwards, when you turn in your next pay voucher, you can attach the airline receipt (or mileage documentation), hotel receipt(s), and ground transportation receipts and a copy of any printed itineraries. Calculate the total travel expenses due you, including applicable per diem. I do not need meal receipts.

Job, under Federal travel regulations, deviations for personal reasons are not normally accommodated. What you can do, however, is to give me a comparison of the cost of roundtrip mileage, hotel, and per diem of doing it your way against the cost of a roundtrip flight, ground transportation, hotel, and per diem. If your way costs less, it should be no problem to cover the full cost. If your way is more expensive, we may only pay up to the amount of traditional travel. (The same rules apply to me when I travel.) If you can tell me where, other than DC, you will spend the night, I can check on applicable per diem rates.

Peggy

------ Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ------
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/11/2006 04:23 PM	To "Tova Wang"
cc
Subject Re: Material I may not have included

Would these go under literature review or news article review? --- Peggy
Peg,

Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think I omitted sending you these specific summaries that are based on complex cases that could not be adequately described within the confines of the nexis article excel spreadsheets. If we can, these should be included, probably on the disc. Sorry.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM

Job:
Secretary Rokita is available May 18. I'm going to talk with the Chairman today about substituting Rogers for Norcross. Do you have contact information for Rogers? --- Peggy

Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----
It is just the Working Group for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project. I am asking you to attend as Technical Advisor for the project. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

Peg - - what is the name of the group?

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 3:13 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

This meeting is being held to obtain input from our eight-member Working Group for the project. The group is composed of election lawyers, election officials, and a representative of an advocacy group, all of whom have an interest and some expertise in the identification and/or prosecution of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The group was chosen so that we would have an equal number of folks on each side of the political spectrum, plus some nonpartisan members.

After our consultants review the results of their preliminary research (interviews, literature review, case law), we will ask the Working Group to brainstorm possible next steps for EAC. Our consultants will write a report summarizing the proposals that come out of this meeting. The report will go to the Commissioners, who will decide what they want to do, funds available, and what priority to assigned to the effort(s).

Your participation in this part of the process is extremely important, so I am very happy that you can find time for us that afternoon. I'll get an agenda and other information to you next week. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/04/2006 02:32 PM

To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

013062
Okay, Peg - - I will mark off the entire afternoon and try to be there. What is the agenda? I was not aware that this was anything beyond having your contractors spend another session with me. Also, if they will be needing stats and stuff like that I need to know as I will bring my state-people with me.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 2:28 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Right now, we are planning to meet in EAC's large conference room between 1 PM and 5 PM. If you cannot be there for the whole afternoon, we will appreciate whatever time you can spare. I'll get back to you with more information (agenda, list of Working Group members, etc.). --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoJ.gov>
05/03/2006 05:59 PM

Topsims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Afternoon of May 18 -- 2:30 okay? How long will they need??

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 16:59:09 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

I am looking at the afternoon of 5/18 for the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts of Working Group members. There remain two members from whom we have not yet received confirmations of their schedule (with some, it is like pulling teeth), but right now 5/18 still looks like the best day. We may have to hold the meeting over here to make it easier for Commissioners to drop in.
--- Peg

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/03/2006 12:53 PM
To
psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject
Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Okay -- you are on for May 18th! Can we do it over here at 10?
--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 12:40:19 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.

Say "Hi" to Cameron for me.

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
Hi Peg. I am sitting here with Cameron Quinn putting together this year's ballt conference for AUSAs. She send her best!

I am available on 5/18. But I am also going to the Board of Advisors Meeting the following week. I would rather do this then.

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 11:39:50 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

We are continuing our efforts to hone in on a date for the Working Group meeting. Are you available the afternoon of Thursday, May 18?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Lets raise this issue at the meeting. (I'll add "DRAFT" to the current document.) My concern is that there are a number of requirements in the Voting Rights Act. Not all of them are considered election fraud, when violated. For example, failure to preclear changes in election procedures is not treated as election fraud, though it is actionable. --- Peggy
I resent the review as you see at the bottom. When I opened it and sent it there was no corrupted text.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Do you have text to replace the corrupted text in paragraph 4? --- Peggy
Peggy:

I expect that since Norcross can't make it either you will try to get Rogers or cut one of Tova's folks.

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:
Job and Tova:

As of now, the afternoon of Thursday, May 18 appears to be the best possible date for the meeting. Norcross is not available to attend in person that day (he is available only 2 days during the first three weeks of May). We won't have confirmation of the availability of Secretary Rokita until tomorrow --- but I am hopeful.

I'll give you an update tomorrow. Maybe we can schedule a teleconference on Monday afternoon. --- Peggy

Peggy:

What political party is Perez with? How political is he? Is the position in Texas neutral or political? Who appointed Perez?

As to Pat I will contact him but I can't promise anything. If Pat can't come, who is getting knocked off Tova's list?

Job
We accidentally left it out when we emailed all the summaries

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 1:09 PM
To: serebrov@sbcglobal.net
Cc: wang@tcf.org
Subject: Literature Summary

Tova just sent me the summary you prepared of The Federal Crime of Election Fraud by Craig Donsanto. There is something wrong in the fourth paragraph (odd characters and missing text). Can you please send a replacement fourth paragraph? You can send it in an email and I will place it in the document. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

To: "Job Serebrov"
cc: psims@eac.gov
Subject RE: new working group representative

He is representing Barbara Arnwine, and we have already established we are not disinviting anyone. We still don't know about Ginsburg yet anyway, right?

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 2:36 PM
To: Tova Wang; psims@eac.gov
Cc: 
Subject: Re: new working group representative

I have an objection to Greenbaum. While I realize he comes from an advocacy group, he is not a minority attorney and we already have a rep who worked with DOJ. If it is to be Greenbaum, I would rather not fill that position since I am one down.

--- Tova Wang wrote:

> is Jon Greenbaum
> > Here's his info in full:
> > http://www.lawyerscommittee.org/2005website/aboutus/staff/staffgreenbaum.htm
> > 1
> > He is the Director of the Voting Rights Project for
> the Lawyers Committee
for Civil Rights. He will be representing Barbara
Arnwine, the Executive
Director of the Lawyers Committee.

His contact and mailing info is:

jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org
202-662-8315
1401 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

www.tcf.org, for the latest news,
analysis, opinions, and events.

<mailto:join-tcfmain@mailhost.groundspring.org>
Click here to receive our
weekly e-mail updates.

I resent the review as you see at the bottom. When I
opened it and sent it there was no corrupted text.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

Do you have text to replace the corrupted text in
paragraph 4? --- Peggy

---

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---
--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

Tova just sent me the summary you prepared of The Federal Crime of Election Fraud by Craig Donsanto. There is something wrong in the fourth paragraph (odd characters and missing text). Can you please send a replacement fourth paragraph? You can send it in an email and I will place it in the document. --- Peggy

Thanks, J.R. Great to have you on board! We will get back to you shortly regarding travel arrangements. The meeting materials will be sent by Federal Express next week.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

"J. R. Perez"
Hi Peggy, it was nice talking with you today and I would be glad to try and add to the discussion. I am attaching a brief bio and will await your instructions for the travel arrangements. I look forward to receiving the current information on panel issues.

J.R. Perez
Elections Administrator
Guadalupe County

---

5201 Roosevelt St.
Bethesda, MD 20814

--- Original Message ---
From: psims@eac.gov
To: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2006 10:56 AM
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Barry:

Would you please provide an address to which we can Federal Express materials before the meeting? ---

Peg
that would be fine

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov
To: 
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 1:08 PM
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Barry:

It appears that the afternoon of Thursday, May 18 is best for a meeting of the working group. I know you said you would not be available in the morning that day. If we started at 1 PM, would that be too soon for you?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

List a vacancy---to be filled. If we don't hear from Ginsberg by late afternoon please call Braden.

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Job:
> >
> > What do you suggest I do with the list of Working Group members. I need
to get the Fed Ex packages out by the end of the day, and have not heard
back from Ginsberg. Do you want me to list a
> vacancy, or list Norcross
> with a note that he cannot attend? If we find a
> substitute, we can always
> provide an updated list next Thursday. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

In the middle of the night I got the feeling that you may be right, that I did do a summary of the existing literature review (that Job, you approved). I'll have to look for it on Monday (unless I go into the office over the weekend, which is possible). I may be hallucinating, but if not, I'll just present it at the meeting rather than try to get it to them ahead of time. Tova
----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/04/2006 05:47 PM
To wang@tcf.org@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject Re: wg

Tova:

Rokita is available --- so the afternoon of May 18 it is. I will not disinvite anyone. I am trying to get Job's next choice (Pat Rogers) as a replacement for Norcross.

Monday appears to be out for a teleconference because Job will be unavailable that afternoon and I am scheduled for something else that morning. I'll check my schedule tomorrow and send a message to you and Job regarding other possible days and times. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/04/2006 05:47 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject wg

Hi Peg,

Just wondering if you had any word from Rokita. Also, I wanted to let you know that I think disinviting members of the working group would be a very unwise and frankly embarrassing way of dealing with the
problem of getting 100% attendance. I'm sure we'll talk before any decisions are made. As I said, I'm free on Monday. Thanks. Tova

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Fraud Definition

I would give him until Monday morning but I would also call Braden today and tell him there may be an opening for him on the WG and find out whether he is free.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> I have placed another call to his office (after one previous call to his assistant and an email to him). I, too, am concerned about our dwindling chances. --- Peggy

> "Job Serebrov" 05/12/2006 03:06 PM

> To psims@eac.gov
> cc
> Subject Re: Fraud Definition

> Given the short time period, you may want to give Ginsberg a deadline. The longer we wait, the poorer our chances are of getting Braden.

> --- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> I am reluctant to invite Braden until after I have received a "No" from Ginsberg. --- Peg

> "Job Serebrov" 05/12/2006 02:33 PM
Cindy --

Can you please check the accuracy of these figures -- which you recall we gave to the EAC a month or so ago -- to endure that they are up-to-date?

I believe we have had several public events that have taken place since we gave them the Public Fraud List a few weeks ago.

---

Craig:

I think we have resolved the issue of Barbara Arnwine's absence from the upcoming meeting by having one of her staff represent her (and her organization). Please review the attached rough summary of DOJ
Cases ASAP and let me know if I need to delete reference to the open investigations. Hopefully, we won't have to remove this information as it does not specify the defendants or States involved. — Peg

**Rough Summary of Department of Justice, Public Integrity Section Activities, October 2002-January 2006**

**Prosecutions and Convictions**— Individuals
- Noncitizen voting: 20
- Vote buying: 49
- Double voting: 12
- Registration fraud: 13
- Civil Rights: 4
- Voter Intimidation: 2
- Unclear: 1

**Open Investigations** (note: a few cases overlap with prosecutions and convictions)
- Noncitizen voting: 3
- Vote buying: 25
- Double voting: 15
- Registration fraud: 29
- Absentee ballot fraud: 9
- Official: 8
- Ineligibles: 4
- Deceptive Practices: 1
- Civil Rights: 14
- Intimidation: 6
- Other: 2

**Cases and Investigations Closed for Lack of Evidence**
- Civil Rights: 8
- Official: 12
- Registration Fraud: 12
- Absentee Ballot Fraud: 14
- Ineligible Voting: 3
- Intimidation: 8
- Double Voting: 5
- Ballot Box Stuffing: 1
- Vote Buying: 14
- Ballot/machine tampering: 2
- Other: 8
- Unclear: 3

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

"Job Serebrov"
FYI

--- "Patrick J. Rogers" wrote:

> Subject: RE: Working Group meeting
> Date: Tue, 9 May 2006 07:42:44 -0600
> From: "Patrick J. Rogers"
> To: "Job Serebrov"
> Job---maybe. I will call you and/or Ms. Sims tomorrow. Depositions all
day today. Thanks, Pat
> What's the best number to call you tomorrow?
> Patrick J. Rogers
> Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris & Sisk, P.A.
P.O. Box 2168
Albuquerque, NM 87103-2168
Tel: 505-848-1849
Fax: 505-848-1891

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:serebrov@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2006 9:41 PM
To: Patrick J. Rogers
Subject: Working Group meeting
Pat:
The working group meeting for the voter fraud
project is scheduled for
May 18th in DC but David Norcross can't attend.
Could you come? If so,
we need to arrange travel and a hotel for you.
Regards,
Job

--------------------------------------------------------------------
Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris & Sisk, P.A.
--------------------------------------------------------------------
THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE
INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO
WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION
THAT IS PRIVILEGED,
CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER
APPLICABLE LAW. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please delete it from your system without copying it, and notify the sender by reply e-mail or by calling 505.848.1800, so that our address record can be corrected. Thank you.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/09/2006 11:16 AM

To: "Job Serebrov"
cc
Subject: Re: Fwd: RE: Working Group meeting

I had a voice mail message from him on Monday. I called him back but had to leave a voice mail message (telephone tag). If you hear from him and he is willing and able to come, I need to know this. We need to have him call our travel service to make travel arrangements ASAP. Thanks. --- Peggy

"Job Serebrov"

"Job Serebrov"
05/09/2006 10:46 AM
To: psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: Fwd: RE: Working Group meeting

FYI

--- "Patrick J. Rogers" wrote:

> Subject: RE: Working Group meeting
> Date: Tue, 9 May 2006 07:42:44 -0600
> From: "Patrick J. Rogers" <patrogers@modrall.com>
> To: "Job Serebrov" <serebrov@sbcglobal.net>
> 
> Job---maybe. I will call you and/or Ms. Sims tomorrow. Depositions all
day today. Thanks, Pat
What's the best number to call you tomorrow?

Patrick J. Rogers
Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris & Sisk, P.A.
P.O. Box 2168
Albuquerque, NM 87103-2168
Tel: 505-848-1849
Fax: 505-848-1891

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2006 9:41 PM
To: Patrick J. Rogers
Subject: Working Group meeting

Pat:

The working group meeting for the voter fraud project is scheduled for May 18th in DC but David Norcross can't attend. Could you come? If so, we need to arrange travel and a hotel for you.

Regards,

Job

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please delete it from your system without copying it, and notify the sender by reply e-mail or by calling 505.848.1800, so that our address record can be corrected. Thank you.
Peggy:

Please add this to the packet.
Ginsberg has accepted our invitation! --- Peggy

The teleconference is on. However, I am still one person down for the meeting and I am not comfortable. This will have to be discussed since from the start it was agreed that the WG would be equal and if I lost a person Tova would have to loose one. Further and most importantly, I don't yet have a hotel so my attendance is still up in the air. Finally, the agenda is not what we discussed and gives far too much time for areas that can be covered in a short time. Not listed are all of the questions that Tova's proposed agenda had. All in all, it needs to be redone.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> I assume that we are still on for today's
teleconference at 11 AM EST. I
> will call you. I have attached a draft agenda for
> your review and
> comment. --- Peggy
>

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

"Tova Wang"
I am more than happy to attend in person

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2006 9:15 AM
To: psims@eac.gov;
Subject: Re: Working Group

Peggy:

4:00 eastern on Tuesday is fine however, given the financial restrictions that you indicated would be in place for use of my car (I would actually lose money coming to DC) and given the cost of hotels at this time (I can't afford to front these costs and wait for months to be repaid), etc, it would take a miracle for this working group meeting to take place in person. It is looking like the only way it will get done is by teleconference. I also share Tova's concern about the unknown nature of Mr. Perez.

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Hi, Folks:
> 
> > Teleconference
> > Are both of you available for a teleconference next Tuesday afternoon at about 4 PM EST? If this does not work for you, please suggest another date and/or time. I would like to discuss our preparations for the Working Group meeting.
> 
> > Working Group Members
> > We have a very good person to fill the slot for the nonpartisan local election official: J.R. Perez, Elections Administrator for Guadalupe County, TX. Attached is his bio. Hope you have no objections to him. He is available on May 18. I have place 2 calls to Pat Rogers office, but have not yet received a reply. Job, if you have any pull with him, you may want to contact him, too.
> 
> > Travel Arrangements
> > You should make your own travel arrangements, including hotel. Travel time cannot be billed to the contract, except for hours actually worked on the contract (i.e.; reviewing materials in preparation for the meeting, and the like). Current Federal rates follow:
> Maximum Lodging = $180 per day- does not include
> hotel taxes (if you
> cannot get this rate, we have covered reasonable
> rates that are a little
> higher)
> Meals & Incidents = $64 per day (except that it is
> $48 on the first and
> last day of travel)
> Mileage for Personally Owned Vehicle = $ .445 per
> mile
> Under the new contract, I do not have to fill out a
> travel authorization
> for you. I can approve your trip via email.
> Afterwords, when you turn in
> your next pay voucher, you can attach the airline
> receipt (or mileage
> documentation), hotel receipt(s), and ground
> transportation receipts and a
> copy of any printed itineraries. Calculate the
> total travel expenses due
> you, including applicable per diem. I do not need
> meal receipts.
> Job, under Federal travel regulations, deviations
> for personal reasons are
> not normally accommodated. What you can do,
> however, is to give me a
> comparison of the cost of roundtrip mileage, hotel,
> and per diem of doing
> it your way against the cost of a roundtrip flight,
> ground transportation,
> hotel, and per diem. If your way costs less, it
> should be no problem to
> cover the full cost. If your way is more expensive,
> we may only pay up to
> the amount of traditional travel. (The same rules
> apply to me when I
> travel.) If you can tell me where, other than DC,
> you will spend the
> night, I can check on applicable per diem rates.
>
Peggy
>

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

"Tova Wang"
05/09/2006 05:28 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject armwine
She definitely cannot do it. Would you please find out if Wade Henderson would be possible? Now its my turn to be upset!!! Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
05/12/2006 02:46 PM
To Job Serebrov
cc
Subject Working Group List

Job:

What do you suggest I do with the list of Working Group members. I need to get the Fed Ex packages out by the end of the day, and have not heard back from Ginsberg. Do you want me to list a vacancy, or list Norcross with a note that he cannot attend? If we find a substitute, we can always provide an updated list next Thursday. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

"Tova Wang"
05/11/2006 04:25 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: Material I may not have included

news article review
-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 3:23 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Material I may not have included

Would these go under literature review or news article review? --- Peggy

"Tova Wang"
I have the feeling we didn't include these in the original batch I sent you. Could you double check and if not, would you please include them in the existing research materials? Sorry and thanks. I'm kind of doing all of this on my own in case you couldn't tell. List is coming...

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
When I opened the attachment, I still had problems with the 4th paragraph. Would you please just send me that paragraph within the text of your email so that I can paste it into the document? — Peggy

I resent the review as you see at the bottom. When I opened it and sent it there was no corrupted text.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Do you have text to replace the corrupted text in paragraph 4? — Peggy
Subject
Re: Literature Summary

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova just sent me the summary you prepared of The Federal Crime of Election Fraud by Craig Donsanto. There is something wrong in the fourth paragraph (odd characters and missing text). Can you please send a replacement fourth paragraph? You can send it in an email and I will place it in the document. --- Peggy

---- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
05/05/2006 12:53 PM
To "Donsanto, Craig"
Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject RE: Please remind me of time and place for Voter Intimidation project meeting

The meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 18, 1-5:30 PM (though we may finish earlier). It will be held in EAC's large conference room (the one we use for public meetings, located off our lobby). --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

"Donsanto, Craig"
Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov
05/05/2006 12:43 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: Please remind me of time and place for Voter Intimidation project meeting

If you tell me now I will put it into my calendar here, which in turn will remind me!

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2006 12:42 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig  
Subject: Re: Please remind me of time and place for Voter Intimidation project meeting

How many days in advance do you need the reminder? --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV  
05/09/2006 02:51 PM  
To "Tova Wang"  
cc Adam Ambrogi/EAC/GOV@EAC  
Subject RE: Working Group-Perez

We are still on for 4 PM. Ray is out of the office due to a family emergency, so I suggest you NOT contact him. You may contact his Special Assistant, Adam Ambrogi (aambrogi@eac.gov or 202-566-3105), who also hails from Texas. --- Peggy

"Tova Wang"
05/09/2006 12:08 PM  
To psims@eac.gov,  
cc  
Subject RE: Working Group-Perez

We are still doing the 4 pm call, right? We can discuss it more then. Would it be OK if I see if Ray knows this person? Thanks. Tova
Dear Mr. Ginsberg:

This is to confirm my call to your office this morning inviting you to be a member of and attend the upcoming meeting of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission's (EAC) Working Group on Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation. The meeting is scheduled to take place from 1:00 PM to 5:30 PM on Thursday, May 18th, 2006 at the offices of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), 1225 New York Avenue, NW, 11th Floor, Washington, DC.

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the tasks listed in the statute are the development of:

- nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office [section 241(b)(6)]; and
- methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)].

EAC's Board of Advisors recommended that the agency make research on these matters a high priority. Subsequently, the Commission contracted with two consultants (Job Serebrov and Tova Wang) to:

- develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;
- perform background research (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;
- establish a project working group, in consultation with EAC, composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation;
- provide the description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation, and the results of the preliminary research to the working group, and convene the working group to discuss potential avenues for future EAC research on this topic; and
- produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future research, if any;

We strive to include bipartisan representation on the Working Group associated with this project. You were recommended for this project by our Republican consultant, Job Serebrov. Your ideas for possible EAC activities related to this topic will help the agency as it plans future actions to meet its HAVA responsibilities.

If you can find the time in your busy schedule to participate, I will have an information packet delivered to your office by COB, Monday, May 15. Please let me know if you are available. Thank you.

Regards,

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
I'm checking on this. Will get back to you as soon as I have more info. --- Peggy

She definitely cannot do it. Would you please find out if Wade Henderson would be possible? Now its my turn to be upset!!! Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

OK, I get it. The text in the attachment follows:
§ 31.032. APPOINTMENT OF ADMINISTRATOR; COUNTY ELECTION COMMISSION.

(a) The position of county elections administrator is filled by appointment of the county election commission, which consists of:
   (1) the county judge, as chair;
   (2) the county clerk, as vice chair;
   (3) the county tax assessor-collector, as secretary; and
   (4) the county chair of each political party that made nominations by primary election for the last general election for state and county officers preceding the date of the meeting at which the appointment is made.

(b) The affirmative vote of a majority of the commission's membership is necessary for the appointment of an administrator.

(c) Each appointment must be evidenced by a written resolution or order signed by the number of commission members necessary to make the appointment. Not later than the third day after the date an administrator is appointed, the officer who presided at the meeting shall file a signed copy of the resolution or order with the county clerk. Not later than the third day after the date the copy is filed, the county clerk shall deliver a certified copy of the resolution or order to the secretary of state.

(d) The initial appointment may be made at any time after the adoption of the order creating the position.

§ 31.035. RESTRICTIONS ON POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.

(a) A county elections administrator may not be a candidate for a public office or an office of a political party, hold a public office, or hold an office of or position in a political party. At the time an administrator becomes a candidate or accepts an office or position in violation of this subsection, the administrator vacates the position of administrator.

(b) A county elections administrator commits an offense if the administrator makes a political contribution or political expenditure, as defined by the law regulating political funds and campaigns, or publicly supports or opposes a candidate for public office or a measure to be voted on at an election. An offense under this subsection is a Class A misdemeanor. On a final conviction, the administrator's employment is terminated, and the person convicted is ineligible for future appointment as county elections administrator.
Do you have text to replace the corrupted text in paragraph 4? --- Peggy

"Job Serebrov"

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova just sent me the summary you prepared of The Federal Crime of Election Fraud by Craig Donsanto. There is something wrong in the fourth paragraph (odd characters and missing text). Can you please send a replacement fourth paragraph? You can send it in an email and I will place it in the document. --- Peggy Fed Crime Election Fraud.doc
The non-election officials on the Working Group currently include:

- Barry Weinberg, whom you know
- Barbara Arnwine, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law (organization associated with the Voting Rights Project and Election Protection)
- Bob Bauer, Perkins Coie, DC (Democrat attorney)
- Mark "Thor" Hearne, Lathrop & Gage, St Louis, MO (Republican attorney)

I am trying to recruit one other Republican attorney, Patrick Rogers, Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris and Sisk, NM, who was recommended by our Republican consultant. He would replace an original member who is no longer available.

I know that Barbara has associated at conferences and in legislative efforts with Wade Henderson, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. Also, the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights is listed as on of many members of the Executive Committee for the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (see http://www.civilrights.org/about/lccr/executive_committee.html).

Does this information help? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

Peggy -- they don't have anything to do with the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights do they?

I ask only because the Justice Department is currently engaged in a very acrimonious FOIA litigation with LCCR that focuses precisely on our efforts to combat voter "intimidationm"

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Thu May 04 17:20:39 2006
Subject: RE: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

It is just the Working Group for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project. I am asking you to attend as Technical Advisor for the project. --- Peggy
Craig:

This meeting is being held to obtain input from our eight-member Working Group for the project. The group is composed of election lawyers, election officials, and a representative of an advocacy group, all of whom have an interest and some expertise in the identification and/or prosecution of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The group was chosen so that we would have an equal number of folks on each side of the political spectrum, plus some nonpartisan members.

After our consultants review the results of their preliminary research (interviews, literature review, case law), we will ask the Working Group to brainstorm possible next steps for EAC. Our consultants will write a report summarizing the proposals that come out of this meeting. The report will go to the Commissioners, who will decide what they want to do, funds available, and what priority to assign to the effort(s).

Your participation in this part of the process is extremely important, so I am very happy that you can find time for us that afternoon. I'll get an agenda and other information to you next week. --- Peggy
Okay, Peg -- I will mark off the entire afternoon and try to be there. What is the agenda? I was not aware that this was anything beyond having your contractors spend another session with me. Also, if they will be needing stats and stuff like that I need to know as I will bring my state-people with me.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 2:28 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Right now, we are planning to meet in EAC's large conference room between 1 PM and 5 PM. If you cannot be there for the whole afternoon, we will appreciate whatever time you can spare. I'll get back to you with more information (agenda, list of Working Group members, etc.). --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/03/2006 05:59 PM

To
psims@eac.gov

cc
psims@eac.gov

Subject
Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation
Afternoon of May 18 -- 2:30 okay? How long will they need??
--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 16:59:09 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

I am looking at the afternoon of 5/18 for the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts of Working Group members. There remain two members from whom we have not yet received confirmations of their schedule (with some, it is like pulling teeth), but right now 5/18 still looks like the best day. We may have to hold the meeting over here to make it easier for Commissioners to drop in.
--- Peg

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/03/2006 12:53 PM
To
    psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject
    Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Okay -- you are on for May 18th! Can we do it over here at 10?
--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 12:40:19 2006
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

My problem is that agency staff is booked most of the week of 5/21. Monday through Wednesday are taken up with meetings of the Standards Board Executive Committee, the full Standards Board, and the Board of Advisors. Thursday, we have EAC's public meeting. Also, I will lose one of my two consultants in June, so I'm trying to wrap up this project (and get the final report from the consultants) by the end of May.
"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/03/2006 11:56 AM
To
psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject
Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Hi Peg. I am sitting here with Cameron Quinn putting together this year's ballt conference for AUSAs. She send her best!

I am available on 5/18. But I am also going to the Board of Advisors Meeting the following week. I would rather do this then.

---
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wed May 03 11:39:50 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Craig:

We are continuing our efforts to hone in on a date for the Working Group meeting. Are you available the afternoon of Thursday, May 18?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---
Dear Tova,

I am working with Peggy Sims in order to set a date for the Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Project Working Group. I have been trying to reach Barbara Arnwine in order to find out which days in May she is potentially available to attend this meeting but all of my attempts have been unsuccessful.

I would appreciate any help that you could provide in this matter.

Sincerely,

Devon Romig
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite #1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)566-2377
Sure. But where is the resistance coming from? The notes were not accurate. As you know, I have to be very concerned about that.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ----
"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
To: psims@eac.gov
cc: topsims@eac.gov
Subject: RE: Your Materials

Craig:

I am getting some resistance from my consultants to correcting the summary of the interview prior to the meeting. Would you mind noting the corrections at the meeting? --- Peggy
Thank you, Peg. This stuff is very interesting.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 11:27 AM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Your Materials

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/16/2006 10:46 AM

topsims@eac.gov
cc
Subject: Your Materials

Peg - -

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request - - or routinely receive - - audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double
voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

How did it go? Were you able to verbally correct that discrepancy we talked about the other day? Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Original Message ---
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2006 3:56 PM
To: 
Subject: PowerPoint Presentation to EAC Boards

FYI - Attached is a copy of the PowerPoint presentation on the voting fraud-voter intimidation research project for tomorrow's meetings of the EAC Standards Board (110 state and local election officials) and the EAC Advisory Board (37 representatives from national associations and government agencies who play a role in HAVA implementation and from science and technology-related professions appointed by Congressional members). I used your summaries as the primary source of information for the presentation. --- Peggy
Peggy,

Here is the summary that you requested. Let me know if this works.

Thanks!

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

I think they are panicking because they are preparing to travel tomorrow and may not have time to submit a revised version. They also are resisting changes to their interview summaries because the summaries represent what they think they heard. I was there at the interview and I heard what you said. I'm not sure that either of them heard everything (including the nuances) because so much of the information was new to them and it was one of their earlier interviews. I'm sorry I did not catch the defects before the summary went out.

My first concern is ensuring that the Working Group has the correct information. Then, we can deal with what version, if any, goes in the final report. Do you want me to excerpt the corrections from your email and submit them to the Working Group? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
Sure. But where is the resistance coming from? The notes were not accurate. As you know, I have to be very concerned about that.

---

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 12:34 PM  
To: Donsanto, Craig  
Subject: RE: Your Materials

Craig:

I am getting some resistance from my consultants to correcting the summary of the interview prior to the meeting. Would you mind noting the corrections at the meeting? --- Peggy

*"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>*

05/16/2006 12:06 PM

---

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 11:27 AM  
To: Donsanto, Craig  
Subject: Re: Your Materials

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy

---

Thank you, Peg. This stuff is very interesting.
Peg --

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request or routinely receive audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of getout-the-vote phone bank lines attest.
The first item is not as big a deal as the second one: the processes under which subjects of investigations come to Jesus is not as important as the overall assessment of our law enforcement achievements. But stressing the isolated test cases we brought - - and will continue to being - - to deter things like felon voting, alien voting and double voting, which not mentioning such significant achievements as the five case PROJECTS mentioned in my last e-mail - - misrepresents what we are doing and the deterrent message we are trying to communicate.

I appreciate that these two young people may have found themselves in a Brave New World when they came over here. It showed in their questioning. But the fact that criminal law enforcement is not at all similar to preventative legal relief (as under the Voting Rights Act) or civil relief (as election contest litigation) is I guess more of a problem than I at first foresaw. My real concerns is that the civil rights groups - - with whom we over here have an amazing amount of common grounds - - will take the singling out of the felon and alien voter cases as evincing a malevolent aggression on their constituencies. That is not the case. We are only enforcing the law.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May. 16, 2006 2:47 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

I think they are panicking because they are preparing to travel tomorrow and may not have time to submit a revised version. They also are resisting changes to their interview summaries because the summaries represent what they think they heard. I was there at the interview and I heard what you said. I'm not sure that either of them heard everything (including the nuances) because so much of the information was new to them and it was one of their earlier interviews. I'm sorry I did not catch the defects before the summary went out.

My first concern is ensuring that the Working Group has the correct information. Then, we can deal with what version, if any, goes in the final report. Do you want me to excerpt the corrections from your email and submit them to the Working Group? --- Peggy
Sure. But where is the resistance coming from? The notes were not accurate. As you know, I have to be very concerned about that.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 12:34 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

Craig:

I am getting some resistance from my consultants to correcting the summary of the interview prior to the meeting. Would you mind noting the corrections at the meeting? --- Peggy

*Donsanto, Craig* <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 12:06 PM

Topsims@eac.gov

cc
Subject: RE: Your Materials

Thank you, Peg. This stuff is very interesting.
I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 10:46 AM

Peg --

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request -- or routinely receive -- audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.
Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/16/2006 03:14 PM
To "Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject RE: Your Materials

I fully understand. Do you want me to prepare a correction sheet for the Working Group, placing your second and more important point first, or do you want to handle this verbally at the meeting? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

"Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/16/2006 02:55 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: Your Materials

The first item is not as big a deal as the second one: the processes under which subjects of investigations come to Jesus is not as important as the overall assessment of our law enforcement achievements. But stressing the isolated test cases we brought - - and will continue to being - - to deter things like felon voting, alien voting and double voting, which not mentioning such significant achievements as the five case PROJECTS mentioned in my last e-mail - - misrepresents what we are doing and the deterrent message we are trying to communicate.

I appreciate that these two young people may have found themselves in a Brave New World when they came over here. It showed in their questioning. But the fact that criminal law enforcement is not at all similar to preventative legal relief (as under the Voting Rights Act) or civil relief (as election contest litigation) is I guess more of a problem than I at first foresaw. My real concerns is that the civil rights groups - - with whom we over here have an amazing amount of common grounds - - will take the singling out of the felon and alien voter cases as evincing a malevolent aggression on their constituencies. That is not the case. We are only enforcing the law.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 2:47 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

I think they are panicking because they are preparing to travel tomorrow and may not have time to submit a revised version. They also are resisting changes to their interview summaries because the summaries represent what they think they heard. I was there at the interview and I heard what you said. I'm not sure that either of them heard everything (including the nuances) because so much of the information was new
to them and it was one of their earlier interviews. I'm sorry I did not catch the defects before the summary went out.

My first concern is ensuring that the Working Group has the correct information. Then, we can deal with what version, if any, goes in the final report. Do you want me to excerpt the corrections from your email and submit them to the Working Group? --- Peggy

---

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 01:41 PM

Topsims@eac.gov

cc

Subject: RE: Your Materials

Sure. But where is the resistance coming from? The notes were not accurate. As you know, I have to be very concerned about that.

---

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 12:34 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

Craig:

I am getting some resistance from my consultants to correcting the summary of the interview prior to the meeting. Would you mind noting the corrections at the meeting? --- Peggy

---

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 12:06 PM

Topsims@eac.gov

cc

Subject: RE: Your Materials
Thank you, Peg. This stuff is very interesting.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 11:27 AM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Your Materials

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy

*Donsanto, Craig* <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 10:46 AM
Peg --

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request - - or routinely receive - - audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

"Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>  To psims@eac.gov, "Voris, Natalie (USAEO)"
< Natalie.Voris@usdoj.gov>, "Hillman, Noel"
<Noel.Hillman@usdoj.gov>, "Simmons, Nancy"
<Nancy.Simmons@usdoj.gov>
cc
Subject Request to interview AUSAs

Peg --

At the Advisory Board meeting we had last week, your two contractors asked to interview the over-100 AUSAs who are serving as District Election Officers in connection with the Fraud study.

This request needs to be addressed to Natalie Voris of EOUSA per the message from here that follows.

If the contractors require additional information in connection with the Fraud Study, and should EOUSA not be able to satisfy their needs n they can communicate with me on criminal issues and Cameron Quinn on Civil Rights issues.

I will be here when you arrive later today at the Board of Advisors meeting
when you arrive to talk to us at 4:30.

Ms. Voris' message follows:

Per the USAM, all requests for interviews/surveys/research projects that involve USAOs must be approved by EOUSA. I am pasting the provision below - the contact name needs to be updated. Requests should come to me, as the Acting Counsel to the Director.

Thanks,
Natalie

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

Hi Peg,

Just wanted to give you the heads up that I did an interview with a reporter from The Hill today on fraud. As far as I know he is simply referring to me as a fellow at TCF and I did not discuss the project in any way

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

Thanks for the "heads up". --- Peggy

"Tova Wang"
Hi Peg,

Just wanted to give you the heads up that I did an interview with a reporter from The Hill today on fraud. As far as I know he is simply referring to me as a fellow at TCF and I did not discuss the project in any way.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

Thank you for this, Peg.

The third bullet point is one I embrace fully. We lack the statutory tool to do the job. Hopefully, that can be remedied through legislation. But as things stand today, there are large loopholes in the federal legal matrix addressing electoral abuse and fraud exist—particularly when such abuses occur in elections where there were no federal candidates on the ballot.

From: psims@eac.gov
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 8:44 AM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group
Here is the content of the email attachment:

**Existing Research Analysis**

There are many reports and books that describe anecdotes and draw broad conclusions from a large array of incidents. There is little research that is truly systematic or scientific. The most systematic look at fraud is the report written by Lori Minnite. The most systematic look at voter intimidation is the report by Laughlin McDonald. Books written about this subject seem to all have a political bias and a pre-existing agenda that makes them somewhat less valuable.

Researchers agree that measuring something like the incidence of fraud and intimidation in a scientifically legitimate way is extremely difficult from a methodological perspective and would require resources beyond the means of most social and political scientists. As a result, there is much more written on this topic by advocacy groups than social scientists. It is hoped that this gap will be filled in the “second phase” of this EAC project.

Moreover, reports and books make allegations but, perhaps by their nature, have little follow up. As a result, it is difficult to know when something has remained in the stage of being an allegation and gone no further, or progressed to the point of being investigated or prosecuted or in any other way proven to be valid by an independent, neutral entity. This is true, for example, with respect to allegations of voter intimidation by civil rights organizations, and, with respect to fraud, John Fund’s frequently cited book. Again, this is something that it is hoped will be addressed in the “second phase” of this EAC project by doing follow up research on allegations made in reports, books and newspaper articles.

Other items of note:

- There is as much evidence, and as much concern, about structural forms of disenfranchisement as about intentional abuse of the system. These include felon disenfranchisement, poor maintenance of databases and identification requirements.

- There is tremendous disagreement about the extent to which polling place fraud, e.g. double voting, intentional felon voting, noncitizen voting, is a serious problem. On balance, more researchers find it to be less of problem than is commonly described in the political debate, but some reports say it is a major problem, albeit hard to identify.

- There is substantial concern across the board about absentee balloting and the opportunity it presents for fraud.

- Federal law governing election fraud and intimidation is varied and complex and yet may nonetheless be insufficient or subject to too many limitations to be as effective as it might be.

- Deceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004.
• Voter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities, although the American Center for Voting Rights uniquely alleges it is focused on Republicans.

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/15/2006 04:53 PM

Peggy --

I am currently on train in transit back from a day in Newark. I tried to recover your attachment on Blackberry but got a message telling me the "file is empty."

Can you paste it to an e-mail perhaps?

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: barnwine@lawyerscommittee.org <barnwine@lawyerscommittee.org>; Rbauer@perkinscoie.com <Rbauer@perkinscoie.com>; bginsberg@pattonboggs.com <bginsberg@pattonboggs.com>; mhearne@lathropgage.com <mhearne@lathropgage.com>; jrperez50@sbcglobal.net <jrperez50@sbcglobal.net>; krogers@sos.state.ga.us <krogers@sos.state.ga.us>; assistant@sos.in.gov <assistant@sos.in.gov>; weinutr@verizon.net <weinutr@verizon.net>
CC: jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org <jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org>; vjohnson@lawyerscommittee.org <vjohnson@lawyerscommittee.org>; dlovechio@perkinscoie.com <dlovechio@perkinscoie.com>; bschuler@lathropgage.com <bschuler@lathropgage.com>; Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Mon May 15 16:37:48 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

Dear Working Group Members and Participants:

You should receive a packet of information today, either by Federal Express or hand delivery, concerning Thursday’s meeting of the project Working Group for EAC’s Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. Attached is an analysis of the consultants’ research into relevant literature and reports.
This summary was not available when we prepared the information packets last Friday, but may be of interest to you. Our consultants and I look forward to having a productive discussion with you.

Regards,

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

Craig:

This is what I was working on for the upcoming meetings of the EAC Board of Advisors and EAC Standards Board. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
05/17/2006 03:03 PM
To Craig Donsanto
cc
Subject Status Report on Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Cases were from 2000 to the present.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> Would you please refresh my memory about the date ranges used for the Nexis article research and the case law research? I'm drawing a blank and I don't see it in the summaries. I need it for this mornings Commissioner briefing. Thanks! --- Peggy
Is it OK if I come around 12:30 or so to make sure I have all my materials arranged properly for presentation? Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

---

Peg --

This is a complicated issue largely because of two things: 1) there is a lot of ambiguity out there as to what constitutes "intimidation." To the civil rights community, "intimidation" means anything that makes voting uncomfortable or less than automatic. To us in the criminal law enforcement "intimidation" means threats of economic or physical nature made to force or prevent voting. Only the latter involve aggravating factors that warrant putting offenders in jail, and the statutes that address "intimidation" from a criminal perspective are thus limited. We have never had many "intimidation" criminal cases. For one thing, in this modern post voting rights era, there is not a lot of physical/economic duress out there in the voting context -- at least not that I have seen. For another, where it does occur it is very hard to investigate and detect as victims who have been physically or economically intimidated are not likely to come to the FBI.

The bottom line is that we take matters that do present predication for physical or economically based "intimidation" very seriously, AND that we are being extremely proactive in trying to find ways to prosecute matters involving voter suppression as in the Tobin cases in New Hampshire where the local GOP tried to jam telephone lines for a GOTV effort run by the Dems. But even there -- the usual "suppression" matter involves flyers that are passed around giving out misleading information about an election, and we have investigated every one of those that came to our attention last election cycle. We were not able to identify the person(s) responsible for printing the misleading flyers in any of these. But we sure as heck tried.
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2006 9:57 AM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Report on Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Research

Craig:

I'm putting the finishing touches on a status report to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors on our Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. For the most part, I am using our consultants summaries for the report, but one bullet under the interview summaries is giving me heartburn. It is the bullet that references the decrease in DOJ voter intimidation actions. It is one of the places in which our consultants had indicated that your office is focusing on prosecuting individuals. I have reworded it and would like your feedback on the revision:

Several people indicate - including representatives from DOJ -- that for various reasons, the Department of Justice is bringing fewer voter intimidation and suppression cases now, and has increased its focus on matters such as noncitizen voting, double voting, and felon voting. While the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division focuses on systemic patterns of malfeasance, the Election Crimes Branch of the Public Integrity Section has increased prosecutions of individual instances of felon, alien, and double voting while also maintaining an aggressive pursuit of systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process.

Please suggest any changes that you think would further clarify the current approach. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/15/2006 04:37 PM
To: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group
cc: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

Dear Working Group Members and Participants:

You should receive a packet of information today, either by Federal Express or hand delivery, concerning Thursday's meeting of the project Working Group for EAC's Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. Attached is an analysis of the consultants' research into relevant literature and reports. This summary was not available when we prepared the information packets last Friday, but may be of interest to you. Our consultants and I look forward to having a productive discussion with you.

Regards,

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

013119
I have to have a little time to focus on these issues and to check with our Finance Officer. Today and tomorrow, most of my time is scheduled for the EAC Standards Board and Board of Advisors meetings. --- Peggy

"Job Serebrov"

How did you deal with the issue of mileage v. airline costs for my travel?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> I signed and submitted your personal services payment vouchers this morning. --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

"Tova Wang"

January 1, 2001 - January 1, 2006

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Would you please refresh my memory about the date ranges used for the Nexis article research and the case law research? I’m drawing a blank and I don’t see it in the summaries. I need it for this morning’s Commissioner briefing. Thanks! --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/15/2006 06:41 PM
To: "Craig Donsanto" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
cc
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

It could be a Berry problem. (I occasionally have that problem with attachments I try to retrieve through my Blackberry.)

The attachment is a PDF file, but I have access to a Word version that I can use to insert text in an email tomorrow. I don't have access to the attachment from my Berry.

Peggy

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Donsanto, Craig" [Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov]
Sent: 05/15/2006 04:53 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

Peggy --

I am currently on train in transit back from a day in Newark. I tried to recover your attachment on Blackberry but got a message telling me the 'file is empty.'

Can you paste it to an e-mail perhaps?

--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: D.
Dear Working Group Members and Participants:

You should receive a packet of information today, either by Federal Express or hand delivery, concerning Thursday's meeting of the project Working Group for EAC's Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. Attached is an analysis of the consultants' research into relevant literature and reports. This summary was not available when we prepared the information packets last Friday, but may be of interest to you. Our consultants and I look forward to having a productive discussion with you.

Regards,

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov
Tova:

We can certainly discuss this at the Working Group meeting. (The draft definition had already been sent out by the time I read your message.) There may be other VRA provisions that should be considered as well, such as the prohibition on removing the names of certain registrants, who were registered by federal examiners, without obtaining prior approval of the Justice Department.

After I received your email, I asked Barry Weinberg to review the draft definition and consider if we have left off examples of Voting Rights Act violations that would qualify as election fraud. Barry, during his 25 years with DOJ, led aggressive action against attempts to place police at the polls to intimidate voters, challenges targeting minorities, failure to provide election materials and assistance in languages other than English (in covered jurisdictions), etc. His input should prove helpful. --- Peggy

How about specifying Section 2 and 203 of the VRA?

----- Original Message -----
Upon first reading, my only comment would be that I would like to restore "failing to follow the requirements of the Voting Rights Act"

-----Original Message-----

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 12, 2006 9:20 AM
To:
Subject: Fraud Definition

Would you please take a look at the attached? I combined both of your definitions, reformatted the list, removed a reference to the fraud having to have an actual impact on the election results (because fraud can be prosecuted without proving that it actually changed the results of the election), and taken out a couple of vague examples (e.g., reference to failing to enforce state laws --- because there may be legitimate reasons for not doing so).

I have made contact with Ben Ginsberg's office and am waiting to hear if he accepts our invitation to join the working group. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----
Hi Peg, Have you tried to send me the presentation? I haven’t gotten it, but I think we may be having email problems. Let me know. I’d need to look at it today since I’ll be tied up tomorrow. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ----

"Donsanto, Craig"
To psims@eac.gov
cc 05/16/2006 03:17 PM
Subject RE: Your Materials

Let me try to do it, Peg. Again what I do not want to see occur is for the LCCR to start attacking us. We have more in common with them than I had originally assumed, thanks to the write-ups of their interviews. We need to promote what we have in common not try to score political points. But I will try to correct the records as long as you will agree you heard what I said the way I know I said it!

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 3:14 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

I fully understand. Do you want me to prepare a correction sheet for the Working Group, placing your second and more important point first, or do you want to handle this verbally at the meeting? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/16/2006 02:55 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc 05/16/2006 02:55 PM
Subject RE: Your Materials
The first item is not as big a deal as the second one: the processes under which subjects of investigations come to Jesus is not as important as the overall assessment of our law enforcement achievements. But stressing the isolated test cases we brought - - and will continue to being - - to deter things like felon voting, alien voting and double voting, which not mentioning such significant achievements as the five case PROJECTS mentioned in my last e-mail - - misrepresents what we are doing and the deterrent message we are trying to communicate.

I appreciate that these two young people may have found themselves in a Brave New World when they came over here. It showed in their questioning. But the fact that criminal law enforcement is not at all similar to preventative legal relief (as under the Voting Rights Act) or civil relief (as election contest litigation) is I guess more of a problem than I at first foresaw. My real concerns is that the civil rights groups - - with whom we over here have an amazing amount of common grounds - - will take the singling out of the felon and alien voter cases as evincing a malevolent aggression on their constituencies. That is not the case. We are only enforcing the law.

---

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 2:47 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

I think they are panicking because they are preparing to travel tomorrow and may not have time to submit a revised version. They also are resisting changes to their interview summaries because the summaries represent what they think they heard. I was there at the interview and I heard what you said. I'm not sure that either of them heard everything (including the nuances) because so much of the information was new to them and it was one of their earlier interviews. I'm sorry I did not catch the defects before the summary went out.

My first concern is ensuring that the Working Group has the correct information. Then, we can deal with what version, if any, goes in the final report. Do you want me to excerpt the corrections from your email and submit them to the Working Group? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 01:41 PM
Sure. But where is the resistance coming from? The notes were not accurate. As you know, I have to be very concerned about that.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 12:34 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

Craig:

I am getting some resistance from my consultants to correcting the summary of the interview prior to the meeting. Would you mind noting the corrections at the meeting? —— Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 12:06 PM
Thank you, Peg. This stuff is very interesting.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 11:27 AM  
To: Donsanto, Craig  
Subject: Re: Your Materials

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 10:46 AM
Peg -

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request or routinely receive audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM ---

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/23/2006 08:45 AM	To "Tova Wang"
cc
Subject RE: PowerPoint Presentation to EAC Boards

I know --- I'll have to cover that in my oral presentation, along with some other points. The audience will have a copy of the paper I put together using Job's and your summaries and findings. The paper provides a lot more detail. We did not plan to provide a copy of the PowerPoint presentation, which is just meant to keep me on track and them interested in the presentation. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----

"Tova Wang"
05/26/2006 10:41 AM	To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov"
cc
Subject RE: Request to interview AUSAs

I still think we should include the recommendations in the report

----- Original Message -----
I haven't sent it yet. If you need to leave early, you can look at what I have so far, which does not have the intro or the text regarding the final report. --- Peggy

Hi Peg, Have you tried to send me the presentation? I haven't gotten it, but I think we may be having email problems. Let me know. I'd need to look at it today since I'll be tied up tomorrow. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Thank you, Peg. This is at least more accurate than what I read this morning. Thank you for taking the time to discuss this with me. I shall see you tomorrow.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2006 3:04 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Status Report on Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project

Craig:

This is what I was working on for the upcoming meetings of the EAC Board of Advisors and EAC Standards Board. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----
"Donsanto, Craig"
To psims@eac.gov
cc
05/17/2006 01:23 PM
Subject Re: Report on Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Research

Peggy -- can you call me about this in about an hour?
202-514-1421.
--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Report on Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Research

Craig:

I'm putting the finishing touches on a status report to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors on our Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. For the most part, I am using our consultants summaries for the report, but one bullet under the interview summaries is giving me heartburn. It is the bullet that references the decrease in DOJ voter intimidation actions. It is one of the places in which our consultants had indicated that your office is focusing on prosecuting individuals. I have reworded it and would like your feedback on the revision:

Several people indicate - including representatives from DOJ -- that for various reasons, the Department of Justice is bringing fewer voter intimidation and suppression cases now, and has increased its focus on matters such as noncitizen voting, double voting, and felon voting. While the Voting
Section of the Civil Rights Division focuses on systemic patterns of malfeasance, the Election Crimes Branch of the Public Integrity Section has increased prosecutions of individual instances of felon, alien, and double voting while also maintaining an aggressive pursuit of systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process.

Please suggest any changes that you think would further clarify the current approach. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:48 PM -----
How did it go? Were you able to verbally correct that discrepancy we talked about the other day? Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

"Tova Wang"                      To psims@eac.gov
05/16/2006 05:08 PM
        cc
Subject  RE: board of advisers presentation

This looks fine otherwise, but I'm not sure I understand why you included the attachments you did. They are not really representative of what we did for the project as a whole. The summaries are just meant to supplement the nexis excel charts.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 2:51 PM
To: Tova Wang
Subject: Re: board of advisers presentation

I haven't sent it yet. If you need to leave early, you can look at what I have so far, which does not have the intro or the text regarding the final report. --- Peggy

"Tova Wang"

05/16/2006 03:47 PM
        To psims@eac.gov
        cc
Subject board of advisers presentation

Hi Peg. Have you tried to send me the presentation? I haven't gotten it, but I think we may be having email problems. Let me know. I'd need to look at it today since I'll be tied up tomorrow.
Tova
Thank you, Peg. This stuff is very interesting.

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy

Peg - -

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.
I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request - or routinely receive - audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
05/16/2006 12:34 PM
To "Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject RE: Your Materials

Craig:

I am getting some resistance from my consultants to correcting the summary of the interview prior to the meeting. Would you mind noting the corrections at the meeting? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 12:06 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: Your Materials

Thank you, Peg. This stuff is very interesting.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 11:27 AM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: Re: Your Materials

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy
"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 10:46 AM

Topsims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Your Materials

Peg --

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request -- or routinely receive -- audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

"Job Serebrov" 05/16/2006 11:13 AM

To "Tova Wang" 05/16/2006 11:13 AM

psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Corrections

I don't think anyone should be given the opportunity to correct mistakes.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Should we send all of the interview summaries to the people we interviewed for review then?

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 10:30 AM
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: Re: Corrections

It wasn't his mistake. I was there at the interview. I just did not have time to review all of the interview summaries. --- Peggy

I don't think anyone should be given the opportunity to correct mistakes.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/16/2006 11:30 AM
To: "Job Serebrov"
Cc: 
Subject: Re: Corrections

It wasn't his mistake. I was there at the interview. I just did not have time to review all of the interview summaries. --- Peggy
I don't think anyone should be given the opportunity to correct mistakes.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

OK. Weather is not going to be great in DC Thursday. I hope that does not delay me.

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> We don't need a castle key, but we have to wait until the Chairman returns to the office tomorrow to confirm availability of the parking pass. I expect you will be on the road, then. Try calling me our toll-free line (1-866-747-1471) tomorrow afternoon, say after 2 PM EST, so that we can talk about this. --- Peg

> "Job Serebrov" 51'
> 05/15/2006 09:56 AM
> 
> To psims@eac.gov
> cc
> 
> Subject Re: Question
> 
>
Did you find out whether I can use the Chairman's parking spot?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> You will need to submit hotel and parking receipts.
> You don't need to submit meal receipts. You don't need to submit gas receipts because use of a personally owned vehicle (POV) is reimbursed based on mileage. I think I emailed the mileage rate to you. If you need it again, I'll look it up when I am at the office (this afternoon).

> Peg

> --------------------------
> Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Job Serebrov" 
Sent: 05/12/2006 09:05 PM 
To: psims@eac.gov 
Subject: Question

Peg:

Since I am driving to DC, besides hotel receipts, do you want me to keep my gas receipts or how will my car use be compensated? Also, I assume I don't have to retain food receipts.

Job

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

"Tova Wang"

05/15/2006 09:07 AM 
To psims@eac.gov 
cc dromig@eac.gov 
Subject I'm sorry
I don't think I sent this to you either. Can we hand it out at the meeting as an addendum? It's another summary that would have gone in the news article section. I'm usually so organized, I'm very embarrassed. Too many things! Thanks

Tova Andrea Wang  
Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

What is the information you need when you say: The consultants jointly selected experts from ???

We chose the interviewees by first coming up with a list of the categories of types of people we wanted to interview. Then we each filled those categories with a certain number of people, equally. The ultimate categories were academics, advocates, elections officials, lawyers and judges.

Is that what you need?

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 2:51 PM
To: 
Subject: Re: board of advisers presentation

I haven't sent it yet. If you need to leave early, you can look at what I have so far, which does not have the intro or the text regarding the final report. --- Peggy
Hi Peg, Have you tried to send me the presentation? I haven't gotten it, but I think we may be having email problems. Let me know. I'd need to look at it today since I'll be tied up tomorrow.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

Excellent!
FYI - Attached is a copy of the PowerPoint presentation on the voting fraud-voter intimidation research project for tomorrow’s meetings of the EAC Standards Board (110 state and local election officials) and the EAC Advisory Board (37 representatives from national associations and government agencies who play a role in HAVA implementation and from science and technology-related professions appointed by Congressional members). I used your summaries as the primary source of information for the presentation. --- Peggy
OK, thanks

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2006 7:46 AM
To: wang@tcf.org
Subject: RE: PowerPoint Presentation to EAC Boards

I know --- I'll have to cover that in my oral presentation, along with some other points. The audience will have a copy of the paper I put together using Job's and your summaries and findings. The paper provides a lot more detail. We did not plan to provide a copy of the PowerPoint presentation, which is just meant to keep me on track and them interested in the presentation. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

"Tova Wang"
To psims@eac.gov
05/15/2006 01:53 PM
Subject Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation

Peggy:
The package came today. Thanks. See you Thursday.
Barry

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/16/2006 11:27 AM
To "Donsanto, Craig"<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject Re: Your Materials

I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request - or routinely receive - audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in
New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

"Tova Wang" To psims@eac.gov
05/16/2006 03:53 PM cc
Subject RE: board of advisers presentation

I'll be here for a while, I just wanted to make sure. If you send it to me anytime before 5 I can look at it in time. If not, I'll try my best to look at it en route tomorrow.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 2:51 PM
To: Subject: Re: board of advisers presentation

I haven't sent it yet. If you need to leave early, you can look at what I have so far, which does not have the intro or the text regarding the final report. --- Peggy

"Tova Wang" To psims@eac.gov
05/16/2006 03:47 PM cc
Subject board of advisers presentation

Hi Peg, Have you tried to send me the presentation? I haven't gotten it, but I think we may be having email problems. Let me know. I'd need to look at it today since I'll be tied up tomorrow.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
I agree!

--- Tova Wang wrote:

> I still think it's sufficient for him to raise the points verbally. All of
> the interview summaries reflect what Job and I both understood the
> interviewees to say. This really opens the door to people making, as Job
> says, "corrections"
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
> Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 10:47 AM
> To: wang@tcf.org
> Cc: serebrov@sbcglobal.net
> Subject: RE: Corrections
>
> Might not be a bad idea before the final report is prepared, but I would not
> worry about it for Thursday's meeting. I'm only concerned with the Donsanto
> interview summary because he will be attending the meeting. --- Peggy

Might not be a bad idea before the final report is prepared, but I would not worry about it for Thursday's.
meeting. I'm only concerned with the Donsanto interview summary because he will be attending the meeting. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
05/16/2006 10:59 AM
To Tova Andrea Wang, Job Serebrov
cc
Subject Fw: Your Materials

See corrections from Donsanto at DOJ. We should probably provide corrected versions to the Working Group. --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 05/16/2006 10:58 AM -----

"Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>
05/16/2006 10:46 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Your Materials

Peg --

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who re3ceive target letters routinely request - - or routinely receive - - audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get0-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

----- Original Message -----
This article is on the CD, it is located in the "Nexis Article Charts" folder.

Thats good. I'm probably just getting crazy, trying to make sure everything is perfect. Devon, maybe you can check? Otherwise I'll check it when it comes. Thanks. And be well Peg.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2006 8:23 AM
To: Tova Andrea Wang
Subject: Re: I'm sorry

Tova:
I think you did send this --- or is this a revised version of one you sent earlier? It should be on the CD in the packet you should receive today. (Can't check that right now as I am at the clinic.) If I put anything on the CD that you want to highlight at the meeting, let me know and we'll make copies for those attending.
Peggy

------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Tova Wang" [wang@tcf.org]
Subject: I'm sorry

I don't think I sent this to you either. Can we hand it out at the meeting as an addendum? Its another summary that would have gone in the news article section. I'm usually so organized, I'm very embarrassed. Too many things! Thanks

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

Here is the content of the email attachment:

**Existing Research Analysis**

There are many reports and books that describe anecdotes and draw broad conclusions from a large array of incidents. There is little research that is truly systematic or scientific. The most systematic look at fraud is the report written by Lori Minnite. The most systematic look at voter intimidation is the report by Laughlin McDonald. Books written about this subject seem to all have a political bias and a pre-existing agenda that makes them somewhat less valuable.

Researchers agree that measuring something like the incidence of fraud and intimidation in a scientifically legitimate way is extremely difficult from a methodological perspective and would require resources beyond the means of most social and political scientists. As a result, there is much more written on this topic by advocacy groups than social scientists. It is hoped that this gap will be filled in the “second phase” of this EAC project.

Moreover, reports and books make allegations but, perhaps by their nature, have little follow up. As a result, it is difficult to know when something has remained in the stage
of being an allegation and gone no further, or progressed to the point of being investigated or prosecuted or in any other way proven to be valid by an independent, neutral entity. This is true, for example, with respect to allegations of voter intimidation by civil rights organizations, and, with respect to fraud, John Fund's frequently cited book. Again, this is something that it is hoped will be addressed in the "second phase" of this EAC project by doing follow up research on allegations made in reports, books and newspaper articles.

Other items of note:

- There is as much evidence, and as much concern, about structural forms of disenfranchisement as about intentional abuse of the system. These include felon disenfranchisement, poor maintenance of databases and identification requirements.

- There is tremendous disagreement about the extent to which polling place fraud, e.g. double voting, intentional felon voting, noncitizen voting, is a serious problem. On balance, more researchers find it to be less of a problem than is commonly described in the political debate, but some reports say it is a major problem, albeit hard to identify.

- There is substantial concern across the board about absentee balloting and the opportunity it presents for fraud.

- Federal law governing election fraud and intimidation is varied and complex and yet may nonetheless be insufficient or subject to too many limitations to be as effective as it might be.

- Deceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004.

- Voter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities, although the American Center for Voting Rights uniquely alleges it is focused on Republicans.

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov> To psims@eac.gov

05/15/2006 04:53 PM

Subject Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

Peggy --

I am currently on train in transit back from a day in Newark. I tried to recover your attachment on Blackberry but got a message telling me the "file is empty."
Can you paste it to an e-mail perhaps?

--------------------------
Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: 
Sent: Mon May 15 16:37:48 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group

Dear Working Group Members and Participants:

You should receive a packet of information today, either by Federal Express or hand delivery, concerning Thursday's meeting of the project Working Group for EAC's Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. Attached is an analysis of the consultants' research into relevant literature and reports. This summary was not available when we prepared the information packets last Friday, but may be of interest to you. Our consultants and I look forward to having a productive discussion with you.

Regards,

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/19/2006 02:51 PM
To Craig Donsanto
cc
Subject Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project-Nexis Word Search

Craig;
You asked about the Nexis search terms used by our consultants. The list follows. --- Peggy.

- Election and fraud
- Voter and fraud
- Vote and fraud
- Voter and challenge
- Vote and challenge
- Election and challenge
- Election and irregularity
- Election and irregularities
- Election and violation
- Election and stealing
- Ballot box and tampering
- Ballot box and theft
- Ballot box and stealing
- Election and officers
- Election and Sheriff
- Miscount and votes
- Election and crime
- Election and criminal
- Vote and crime
- Vote and criminal
- Double voting
- Multiple voting
- Dead and voting
- Election and counting and violation
- Election and counting and error
- Vote and counting and violation
- Vote and counting and error
- Voter and intimidation
- Voter and intimidating
- Vote and intimidation
- Denial and voter and registration
- Voter identification
- Vote and identification
- Voter and racial profiling
- Vote and racial profiling
- Voter and racial
- Vote and racial
- Voter and racial and challenge
- Vote and racial and challenge
- Voter and deny and racial
- Vote and deny and racial
- Voter and deny and challenge
- Vote and deny and challenge
Voter and deny and black
Vote and deny and black
Voter and black and challenge
Vote and black and challenge
Voter and deny and African American
Vote and deny and African American
Voter and African American and challenge
Vote and African American and challenge
Election and black and challenge
Election and African American and challenge
Voter and deny and Hispanic
Voter and deny and Latino
Vote and deny and Hispanic
Vote and deny and Latino
Voter and Hispanic and challenge
Voter and Latino and challenge
Vote and Hispanic and challenge
Vote and Latino and challenge
Election and Hispanic and challenge
Election and Latino and challenge
Voter and deny and Native American
Vote and deny and Native American
Voter and Native American and challenge
Vote and Native American and challenge
Election and Native American and challenge
Voter and deny and Asian American
Vote and deny and Asian American
Voter and Asian American and challenge
Vote and Asian American and challenge
Voter and Asian American and challenge
Election and Asian American and challenge
Voter and deny and Indian
Vote and deny and Indian
Voter and Indian and challenge
Vote and Indian and challenge
Election and Indian and challenge
Poll tax
Voting and test
Absentee ballot and deny
Absentee ballot and reject
Absentee ballot and challenge
Vote and challenge
Voter and challenge
Election and challenge
Vote and police
Voter and police
Poll and police
Vote and law enforcement
Voter and law enforcement
Poll and law enforcement
Vote and deceptive practices
Voter and deceptive practices
Election and deceptive practices
Voter and deceive
Voter and false information
Dirty tricks
Vote and felon
Vote and ex-felon
Disenfranchisement
Disenfranchise
Law and election and manipulation
Vote and purging
Vote and purge
Registration and removal
Registration and purging
Registration and purge
Vote buying
Vote and noncitizen
Voter and noncitizen
Vote and selective enforcement
Identification and selective
Election and misinformation
Registration and restrictions
Election and administrator and fraud
Election and official and fraud
Provisional ballot and deny
Provisional ballot and denial
Affidavit ballot and deny
Affidavit ballot and denial
Absentee ballot and coerce
Absentee ballot and coercion
Registration and destruction
Voter and deter
Vote and deterrence
Voter and deterrence
Ballot integrity
Ballot security
Ballot security and minority
Ballot security and black
Ballot security and African American
Ballot security and Latino
Ballot security and Hispanic
Ballot security and Native American
Ballot security and Indian
Vote and suppression
Minority and vote and suppression
Black and vote and suppression
African American and vote and suppression
Latino and vote and suppression
Hispanic and vote and suppression
Native American and vote and suppression
Vote and suppress
Minority and vote and suppress
African American and vote and suppress
Latino and vote and suppress
Native American and vote and suppress
Vote and depress
Jim Crow
Literacy test
Voter and harass
Voter and harassment
Vote and mail and fraud
Poll and guards
Election and consent decree
Vote and barrier
Voting and barrier
Voter and barrier
Election and long line
Voter and long line

Poll worker and challenge
Poll worker and intimidate
Poll worker and intimidation
Poll worker and intimidating
Poll worker and threatening
Poll worker and abusive
Election official and challenge
Election official and intimidate
Election official and intimidation
Election official and intimidating
Election official and threatening
Election official and abusive
Poll watcher and challenge
Poll watcher and intimidate
Poll watcher and intimidating
Poll watcher and intimidation
Poll watcher and abusive
Poll watcher and threatening
Poll inspector and challenge
Poll inspector and intimidate
Poll inspector and intimidating
Poll inspector and intimidation
Poll inspector and abusive
Poll inspector and threatening
Poll judge and challenge
Poll judge and intimidate
Poll judge and intimidating
Poll judge and intimidation
Poll judge and abusive
Poll judge and threatening
Poll monitor and challenge
Poll monitor and intimidate
Poll monitor and intimidating
Poll monitor and intimidation
Poll monitor and abusive
Poll monitor and threatening
Election judge and challenge
Election judge and intimidate
Election judge and intimidating
Election judge and intimidation
Election judge and abusive
Election judge and threatening
Election monitor and challenge
Election monitor and intimidate
Election monitor and intimidating
Election monitor and intimidation
Election monitor and abusive
Election monitor and threatening
Election observer and challenge
Election observer and intimidate
Election observer and intimidating
Election observer and intimidation
Election observer and abusive
Election observer and threatening

---- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ----
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/16/2006 03:37 PM
To "Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject RE: Your Materials
Let me try to do it, Peg. Again what I do not want to see occur is for the LCCR to start attacking us. We have more in common with them than I had originally assumed, thanks to the write-ups of their interviews. We need to promote what we have in common not try to score political points. But I will try to correct the records as long as you will agree you heard what I said the way I know I said it!

I fully understand. Do you want me to prepare a correction sheet for the Working Group, placing your second and more important point first, or do you want to handle this verbally at the meeting? --- Peggy

The first item is not as big a deal as the second one: the processes under which subjects of investigations come to Jesus is not as important as the overall assessment of our law enforcement achievements. But stressing the isolated test cases we brought - - and will continue to being - - to deter things like felon voting, alien voting and double voting, which not mentioning such significant achievements as the five case PROJECTS mentioned in my last e-mail - - misrepresents what we are doing and the deterrent message we are trying to communicate.
I appreciate that these two young people may have found themselves in a Brave New World when they came over here. It showed in their questioning. But the fact that criminal law enforcement is not at all similar to preventative legal relief (as under the Voting Rights Act) or civil relief (as election contest litigation) is I guess more of a problem than I at first foresaw. My real concerns is that the civil rights groups - - with whom we over here have an amazing amount of common grounds - - will take the singling out of the felon and alien voter cases as evincing a malevolent aggression on their constituencies. That is not the case. We are only enforcing the law.

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 2:47 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

I think they are panicking because they are preparing to travel tomorrow and may not have time to submit a revised version. They also are resisting changes to their interview summaries because the summaries represent what they think they heard. I was there at the interview and I heard what you said. I'm not sure that either of them heard everything (including the nuances) because so much of the information was new to them and it was one of their earlier interviews. I'm sorry I did not catch the defects before the summary went out.

My first concern is ensuring that the Working Group has the correct information. Then, we can deal with what version, if any, goes in the final report. Do you want me to excerpt the corrections from your email and submit them to the Working Group? --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 01:41 PM
Sure. But where is the resistance coming from? The notes were not accurate. As you know, I have to be very concerned about that.

---

From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 12:34 PM
To: Donsanto, Craig
Subject: RE: Your Materials

Craig:

I am getting some resistance from my consultants to correcting the summary of the interview prior to the meeting. Would you mind noting the corrections at the meeting? --- Peggy

*Donsanto, Craig* <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 12:06 PM

---

Thank you, Peg. This stuff is very interesting.
I have forwarded your message to our consultants and have requested a corrected version for distribution at the WG meeting. --- Peggy

"Donsanto, Craig* <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

05/16/2006 10:46 AM

Peg --

I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.
I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request or routinely receive audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.
I have read over the materials you sent to me and viewed the pieces on the CD.

I have only one correction:

I did not say that offenders who receive target letters routinely request or routinely receive audiences here at DOJHQ. That is very rare. Instead, what usually happens is that once a subject for an election fraud investigation is advised that he or she is going to be charged that person usually enters into plea negotiations and ultimately pleads guilty. Very few federal election fraud cases go to trial. When a subject does request a HQ interview or a HW hearing, it would be held in the first instance by myself. But again, Peg, that is rare.

Also, while the occurrences of prosecutions of isolated instances of felons and alien voters and double voters has increased, we still aggressively and I believe quite successfully pursue systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process, as the cases we brought recently out of Knott and Pike Counties in Kentucky, those we brought out of Lincoln and Logan Counties in West Virginia, and those we brought in New Hampshire growing out of the jamming of get-out-the-vote phone bank lines attest.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

"Donsanto, Craig"
<Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>

To: psims@eac.gov
cc: "Simmons, Nancy" <Nancy.Simmons@usdoj.gov>
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project-Nexis Word Search

Peggy --

I was just thinking of you!

Great session yesterday. I really enjoyed it. Robust discussion.

On another subject, Nancy Simmons needs the e-mail address of NASED. Can you give her both that and the website address for them? Her e-mail is nancy.simmons@usdoj.gov.

------ Original Message ------
From: psims@eac.gov <psims@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Fri May 19 14:51:21 2006
Subject: Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project-Nexis Word Search

Craig;

You asked about the Nexis search terms used by our consultants. The list
follows. --- Peggy.

Election and fraud
Voter and fraud
Vote and fraud
Voter and challenge
Vote and challenge
Election and challenge
Election and irregularity
Election and irregularities
Election and violation
Election and stealing
Ballot box and tampering
Ballot box and theft
Ballot box and stealing
Election and officers
Election and Sheriff
Miscount and votes
Election and crime
Election and criminal
Vote and crime
Vote and criminal
Double voting
Multiple voting
Dead and voting
Election and counting and violation
Election and counting and error
Vote and counting and violation
Vote and counting and error
Voter and intimidation
Voter and intimidating
Vote and intimidation
Denial and voter and registration
Voter identification
Vote and identification
Voter and racial profiling
Vote and racial profiling
Voter and racial
Vote and racial
Voter and racial and challenge
Vote and racial and challenge
Voter and deny and racial
Vote and deny and racial
Voter and deny and challenge
Vote and deny and challenge
Voter and deny and black
Vote and deny and black
Voter and black and challenge
Vote and black and challenge
Voter and deny and African American
Vote and deny and African American
Voter and African American and challenge
Vote and African American and challenge
Election and black and challenge
Election and African American and challenge
Voter and deny and Hispanic
Voter and deny and Latino
Vote and deny and Hispanic
Vote and deny and Latino
Voter and Hispanic and challenge
Voter and Latino and challenge
Vote and Hispanic and challenge
Vote and Latino and challenge
Election and Hispanic and challenge
Election and Latino and challenge
Voter and deny and Native American
Vote and deny and Native American
Voter and Native American and challenge
Vote and Native American and challenge
Election and Native American and challenge
Voter and deny and Asian American
Vote and deny and Asian American
Voter and Asian American and challenge
Vote and Asian American and challenge
Election and Asian American and challenge
Voter and deny and Indian
Vote and deny and Indian
Voter and Indian and challenge
Vote and Indian and challenge
Election and Indian and challenge
Poll tax
Voting and test
Absentee ballot and deny
Absentee ballot and reject
Absentee ballot and challenge
Vote and challenge
Voter and challenge
Election and challenge
Vote and police
Voter and police
Poll and police
Vote and law enforcement
Voter and law enforcement
Poll and law enforcement
Vote and deceptive practices
Voter and deceptive practices
Election and deceptive practices
Voter and deceive
Voter and false information
Dirty tricks
Vote and felon
Vote and ex-felon
Disenfranchisement
Disenfranchise
Law and election and manipulation
Vote and purging
Vote and purge
Registration and removal
Registration and purging
Registration and purge
Vote buying
Vote and noncitizen
Voter and noncitizen
Vote and selective enforcement
Identification and selective
Election and misinformation
Registration and restrictions
Election and administrator and fraud
Election and official and fraud
Provisional ballot and deny
Provisional ballot and denial
Affidavit ballot and deny
Affidavit ballot and denial
Absentee ballot and coerce
Absentee ballot and coercion
Registration and destruction
Voter and deter
Vote and deterrence
Voter and deterrence
Ballot integrity
Ballot security
Ballot security and minority
Ballot security and black
Ballot security and African American
Ballot security and Latino
Ballot security and Hispanic
Ballot security and Native American
Ballot security and Indian
Vote and suppression
Minority and vote and suppression
Black and vote and suppression
African American and vote and suppression
Latino and vote and suppression
Hispanic and vote and suppression
Native American and vote and suppression
Vote and suppress
Minority and vote and suppress
African American and vote and suppress
Latino and vote and suppress
Native American and vote and suppress
Vote and depress
Jim Crow
Literacy test
Voter and harass
Voter and harassment
Vote and mail and fraud
Poll and guards
Election and consent decree
Vote and barrier
Voting and barrier
Voter and barrier
Election and long line
Voter and long line
Poll worker and challenge
Poll worker and intimidate
Poll worker and intimidation
Poll worker and intimidating
Poll worker and threatening
Poll worker and abusive
Election official and challenge
Election official and intimidate
Election official and intimidation
Election official and intimidating
Election official and threatening
Election official and abusive
Poll watcher and challenge
Poll watcher and intimidate
Poll watcher and intimidating
Poll watcher and intimidation
Poll watcher and abusive
Poll watcher and threatening
Poll inspector and challenge
Poll inspector and intimidate
Poll inspector and intimidating
Poll inspector and intimidation
Poll inspector and abusive
Poll inspector and threatening
Poll judge and challenge
Poll judge and intimidate
Poll judge and intimidating
Poll judge and intimidation
Poll judge and abusive
Poll judge and threatening
Poll monitor and challenge
Poll monitor and intimidate
Poll monitor and intimidating
Poll monitor and intimidation
Poll monitor and abusive
Poll monitor and threatening
Election judge and challenge
Election judge and intimidate
Election judge and intimidating
Election judge and intimidation
Election judge and abusive
Election judge and threatening
Election monitor and challenge
Election monitor and intimidate
Election monitor and intimidating
Election monitor and intimidation
Election monitor and abusive
Election monitor and threatening
Election observer and challenge
Election observer and intimidate
Election observer and intimidating
Election observer and intimidation
Election observer and abusive
Election observer and threatening
Craig:

I'm putting the finishing touches on a status report to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors on our Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. For the most part, I am using our consultants summaries for the report, but one bullet under the interview summaries is giving me heartburn. It is the bullet that references the decrease in DOJ voter intimidation actions. It is one of the places in which our consultants had indicated that your office is focusing on prosecuting individuals. I have reworded it and would like your feedback on the revision:

Several people indicate - including representatives from DOJ -- that for various reasons, the Department of Justice is bringing fewer voter intimidation and suppression cases now, and has
increased its focus on matters such as noncitizen voting, double voting, and felon voting. While the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division focuses on systemic patterns of malfeasance, the Election Crimes Branch of the Public Integrity Section has increased prosecutions of individual instances of felon, alien, and double voting while also maintaining an aggressive pursuit of systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process.

Please suggest any changes that you think would further clarify the current approach. --- Peggy

No problem. I've got the conference room reserved from Noon to 6 PM, so you can come earlier. --- Peggy

Is it OK if I come around 12:30 or so to make sure I have all my materials arranged properly for presentation? Thanks.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Peg, I'm sorry, but this is really not helpful. It's another outline. I guess we have to wait for the transcript. I wish now I had taken notes myself! Thanks anyway. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2006 12:31 PM
To: serébróv@sbcglobal.net
Cc: 
Subject: Re: Working Group Notes

Sorry. We have had so much going on, I did not have time to send the attached to you last week. This is Devon's compilation of notes taken by EAC staff at the working group meeting. --- Peggy

"Tova Wang"

05/31/2006 11:26 AM

To psims@eac.gov
Cc
Subject notes

Hi Peg,

How are you? I was wondering, whatever happened to getting the collective notes of the EAC staff? Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Hi Peg,

How are you? I was wondering, whatever happened to getting the collective notes of the EAC staff?

Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/31/2006 01:30 PM	To "Tova Wang" cc
Subject Re: Working Group Notes

Sorry. We have had so much going on, I did not have time to send the attached to you last week. This is Devon's compilation of notes taken by EAC staff at the working group meeting. --- Peggy

VFVI Meeting Summary.doc

"Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>

"Tova Wang" 05/31/2006 11:26 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject notes

Hi Peg,

How are you? I was wondering, whatever happened to getting the collective notes of the EAC staff?

Thanks. Tova
Hi Peg,

Do you have an ETA for the transcript? Seems like it should be around now. Thanks and have a great weekend. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---
Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy

Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

Let's try to do that. Peg, you will call us 5 pm EST?

From: "Job Serebrov" To: "Tova Wang"
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 6:29 PM
Subject: Re: teleconference

> Wednesday next week? It would have to be 6 pm.
> --- Tova Wang wrote:
> >> Hi Job,
> >> Peg tells me that we should now be getting the transcript early next week.
> >> Regardless, we should talk about the organization...
Hi Peg,

How do you recommend dealing with this? I have this feeling like he's trying to create a situation where I will have to write it myself. Thanks. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:42 PM
To: psims@eac.gov;
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

Peggy:

I can't predict when I get home but it is between 5:30
and 6:30 my time. I know that is generally too late to have a teleconference.

I plan to review Tova's recommendations this weekend and work on my own as well as expanding the explanation of the case section.

Please see what your financial officer did with regards to my travel.

Thank you,

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> What time do you arrive home from work? Perhaps we could talk then?
> 
> Re your question on the mileage, I have approached our Financial Officer with a request that you receive full reimbursement on the grounds that your actual total travel costs are less than the estimated total travel costs if you had flown to DC, stayed in our more expensive hotels, and received the higher per diem for 3 days (instead of 1). I have not yet received a response from her and she has been out of the office much of this week, so I don't know what she decided to do. 
> --- Peggy

> 
> 
> "Job Serebrov" < 
> 06/08/2006 01:10 PM
> 
> To
> psims@eac.gov,
> cc
> serebrov@sbcglobal.net
> Subject
> Re: Transcript & Teleconference
> 
> Peg:
> 
> I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take time during the work day for telephone conferences. As I told you I will need to finish this project after daily working hours. I am still getting things done from being out for ten days. I will review Tova's recommendations and expand on mine this weekend.
Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the mileage portion of my travel voucher?

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job.

---

> Peggy

---

06/08/2006 10:10 AM

To

psims@eac.gov

Can we make it 4 est? I have another meeting at 3.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:55 AM 
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference 

I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before then because of other commitments. --- Peggy
06/08/2006 09:42 To
AM
psims@eac.gov
cc

Subject

06/08/2006 09:42 To
AM
psims@eac.gov
cc

Subject

Re: Re:

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 

From: psims@eac.gov
To:
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM
Subject: Re:

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:15 To
AM
psims@eac.gov
cc

Subject

"Job
Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
06/09/2006 09:09 AM
To "Tova Wang"
cc
Subject Re: FW: Transcript & Teleconference

I sent him an email to find out when he is home from work. Perhaps lunch time or early evening will work for him. I plan to include him in all correspondence regarding the final report and do expect him to contribute. He has already responded that he might be able to add to the draft recommendations you submitted (which would have to be reviewed by you), so let's see. As of this morning, I still don't have the transcript. --- Peggy

"Tova Wang"

"Tova Wang"
06/09/2006 08:53 AM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject FW: Transcript & Teleconference
Hi Peg,

How do you recommend dealing with this? I have this feeling like he's trying to create a situation where I will have to write it myself. Thanks. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:42 PM
To: psims@eac.gov;
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

Peggy:

I can’t predict when I get home but it is between 5:30 and 6:30 my time. I know that is generally too late to have a teleconference.

I plan to review Tova’s recommendations this weekend and work on my own as well as expanding the explanation of the case section.

Please see what your financial officer did with regards to my travel.

Thank you,

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> What time do you arrive home from work? Perhaps we could talk then?
> > Re your question on the mileage, I have approached our Financial Officer with a request that you receive full reimbursement on the grounds that your actual total travel costs are less than the estimated total travel costs if you had flown to DC, stayed in our more expensive hotels, and received the higher per diem for 3 days (instead of 1). I have not yet received a response from her and she has been out of the office much of this week, so I don’t know what she decided to do.
> > --- Peggy
> > > "Job Serebrov" <
> > 06/08/2006 01:10 PM
> > > To
> > psims@eac.gov, wang@tcf.org
Peg:

I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take time during the work day for telephone conferences. As I told you I will need to finish this project after daily working hours. I am still getting things done from being out for ten days. I will review Tova's recommendations and expand on mine this weekend.

Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the mileage portion of my travel voucher?

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job.
---
> Peggy

---

06/08/2006 10:10 AM

To: psims@eac.gov
Cc:

Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

Can we make it 4 est? I have another meeting at 3.

----- Original Message ----- From: <psims@eac.gov> To: [redacted] Cc: [redacted] Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:55 AM Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference
I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you.

How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before then because of other commitments. --- Peggy

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email?

And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message -----
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM
Subject: Re:

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court
Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can.

Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova
Subject Re: Re:

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM 
Subject: Re:

> Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy

Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
06/08/2006 09:55 AM 
To: 
cc: 
I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before then because of other commitments. --- Peggy

---

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: <j
Cc: <
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM
Subject: Re:

> Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy

---

06/08/2006 09:15 AM
to psims@eac.gov
cc *Job Serebrov*
subject
Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova
Tomorrow is primary election day in VA. Still no transcript. I have taken a look at the recommendations that you sent me, but have not yet heard from Job. --- Peg

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
06/12/2006 05:09 PM
To "Tova Wang" [GSAEXTERNAL]
cc
Subject RE: Will Call Later

How about 9:30 AM EST, Wednesday morning (6/14/06)?

"Tova Wang"
06/12/2006 04:46 PM
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject RE: Will Call Later

Either between 9 and 10 or between 12 and 1:30 would be ideal, but I should be around most of the afternoon. Thanks Peg. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 12, 2006 2:39 PM
To: "Tova Wang"
Subject: Will Call Later

I'll try to call you Wednesday. Is there a time that is best for you? Today has been too hectic. Tomorrow is primary election day in VA. Still no transcript. I have taken a look at the recommendations that you sent me, but have not yet heard from Job. --- Peg

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
"Tova Wang"
06/14/2006 09:40 AM
To "Job Serebrov"
cc psims@eac.gov
Subject teleconference

Hi Job,

Peg tells me that we should now be getting the transcript early next week. Regardless, we should talk about the organization and distribution of work on the final report and try to finally get it done. Would it be possible for you to do a call before you leave for work in the morning, say 8 am your time, on Wednesday? If not, could you do 6 pm your time on Wednesday? Thanks.
Perfect. Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 12, 2006 4:09 PM
To:...
Subject: RE: Will Call Later

How about 9:30 AM EST, Wednesday morning (6/14/06)?

----- Original Message ----- 
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 12, 2006 4:09 PM
To:...
Subject: RE: Will Call Later

Either between 9 and 10 or between 12 and 1:30 would be ideal, but I should be around most of the afternoon. Thanks Peg. Tova
I’ll try to call you Wednesday. Is there a time that is best for you? Today has been too hectic. Tomorrow is primary election day in VA. Still no transcript. I have taken a look at the recommendations that you sent me, but have not yet heard from Job. --- Peg

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

Tova Wang
06/05/2006 04:30 PM
To psims@eac.gov, [redacted]
cc
Subject recommendations

Here are my recommendations with the last one now included. Please let me know about the transcript and when you all want to talk about getting the final report done. Thanks. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

What about during a lunch hour?

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:serebrov@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:42 PM
To: psims@eac.gov; wang@tcf.org
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

Peggy:
I can't predict when I get home but it is between 5:30 and 6:30 my time. I know that is generally too late to have a teleconference.

I plan to review Tova's recommendations this weekend and work on my own as well as expanding the explanation of the case section.

Please see what your financial officer did with regards to my travel.

Thank you,

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> What time do you arrive home from work? Perhaps we could talk then?
> 
> Re your question on the mileage, I have approached our Financial Officer with a request that you receive full reimbursement on the grounds that your actual total travel costs are less than the estimated total travel costs if you had flown to DC, stayed in our more expensive hotels, and received the higher per diem for 3 days (instead of 1). I have not yet received a response from her and she has been out of the office much of this week, so I don't know what she decided to do.
> --- Peggy

> "Job Serebrov" 06/08/2006 01:10 PM
> 
> To
> psims@eac.gov, w
> cc
> serebrov@sbcglobal.net
> Subject
> Re: Transcript & Teleconference
> 
> Peg:
> 
> I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take time during the work day for telephone conferences. As I told you I will need to finish this project after daily working hours. I am still getting things done from being out for ten days. I will review Tova's recommendations and
expand on mine this weekend.

Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the mileage portion of my travel voucher?

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job.

---

Peggy

---

06/08/2006 10:10 AM

To:
psims@eac.gov
CC:

Subject:
Re: Transcript & Teleconference

Can we make it 4 EST? I have another meeting at 3.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:55 AM
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference 

I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before them because of other commitments. --- Peggy
How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email?
And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM
Subject: Re:

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy
Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks. Tova

---

Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

"Job Serebrov"

06/13/2006 09:10 AM

To: psims@eac.gov, wang@tcf.org

cc: Transcripts, Etc.

Peggy:

Any sign of the transcript? Will the other members of the working group get a copy? I have had questions from several about it.

If you want to talk I can do so this Friday at 6 pm your time.

Job

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

013192
What time do you suggest talking?

----- Original Message -----
From: "Job Serebrov" <serebrov@sbcglobal.net>
To: <psims@eac.gov>; <wang@tcf.org>
Cc: <serebrov@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 1:10 PM
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

> Peg:
> I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take
> time during the work day for telephone conferences. As
> I told you I will need to finish this project after
> daily working hours. I am still getting things done
> from being out for ten days. I will review Tova's
> recommendations and expand on mine this weekend.
>
> Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the
> mileage portion of my travel voucher?
>
> Job
>
> --- psims@eac.gov wrote:
> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job. ---
> Peggy
> 6 B
> To
> psims@eac.gov
> cc
> Subject
> Re: Transcript & Teleconference
> Can we make it 4 est? I have another meeting at 3.
> ----- Original Message -----  
> From: <psims@eac.gov>
I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can PDF it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before then because of other commitments. --- Peggy

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the
transcript of the Working Group session. Devon
checked with the court
reporter, who said it will be delivered today.
--- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:15 To
psims@eac.gov
cc
"Job Serebrov"

Subject

Hi, What's going on? I have not received
responses from either one of
you
in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next
two weeks if we can.
Did
you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ---

06/08/2006 10:10 AM  To psims@eac.gov
cc 
Subject Re: Transcript & Teleconference
Can we make it 4 EST? I have another meeting at 3.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:55 AM
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

> I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we
> only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you.
> How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I
> really can't do it before then because of other commitments. --- Peggy

> 06/08/2006 09:42 AM
> psims@eac.gov
> cc
> Re: Re:

> How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email?
> And
> can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

> Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and
> preparations
> for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the
> transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court
> reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy
Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
06/08/2006 11:07 AM

To: wang@tcf.org@GSAEXTERNAL
cc: 
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference

4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job. --- Peggy

Can we make it 4 EST? I have another meeting at 3.
> I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before them because of other commitments. --- Peggy

> I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before them because of other commitments. --- Peggy

> How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

> Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. --- Peggy
Hi, what's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can. Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

----- Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto:]
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2006 8:10 AM
To: psims@eac.gov;
Subject: Transcripts, Etc.

Peggy:

Any sign of the transcript? Will the other members of the working group get a copy? I have had questions from several about it.

If you want to talk I can do so this Friday at 6 pm your time.
Peggy:

I can't predict when I get home but it is between 5:30 and 6:30 my time. I know that is generally too late to have a teleconference.

I plan to review Tova's recommendations this weekend and work on my own as well as expanding the explanation of the case section.

Please see what your financial officer did with regards to my travel.

Thank you,

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> What time do you arrive home from work? Perhaps we could talk then?
> > Re your question on the mileage, I have approached our Financial Officer with a request that you receive full reimbursement on the grounds that your actual total travel costs are less than the estimated total travel costs if you had flown to DC, stayed in our more expensive hotels, and received the higher per diem for 3 days (instead of 1). I have not yet received a response from her and she has been out of the office much of this week, so I don't know what she decided to do. --- Peggy
> >
> > "Job Serebrov" 06/08/2006 01:10 PM
I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take time during the work day for telephone conferences. As I told you I will need to finish this project after daily working hours. I am still getting things done from being out for ten days. I will review Tova’s recommendations and expand on mine this weekend.

Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the mileage portion of my travel voucher?

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job.

Peggy

06/08/2006 10:10 AM
I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before them because of other commitments. --- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:42 To AM
psims@eac.gov
cc

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

--- Original Message ---
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM
Subject: Re:

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the
transcript of the Working Group session. Devon
checked with the court
reporter, who said it will be delivered today.
--- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:15 To
psims@eac.gov
cc
e "Job
Subject
Hi, What's going on? I have not received
responses from either one of
you
in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next
two weeks if we can.
Did
you get my recommendations? Thanks.
Tova
I'll try to call you Wednesday. Is there a time that is best for you? Today has been too hectic. Tomorrow is primary election day in VA. Still no transcript. I have taken a look at the recommendations that you sent me, but have not yet heard from Job. --- Peg

Could you do Friday in the morning?

--- Original Message ---
From: "Job Serebrov" <psims@eac.gov>
To: psims@eac.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 10:17 PM
Subject: Re: teleconference

> Tova:
> 
> 5 pm EST is 4 pm Central. Peg would have to call at 7
Let's try to do that. Peg, you will call us 5 pm EST?

Wednesday next week? It would have to be 6 pm.

Hi Job,

Peg tells me that we should now be getting the transcript early next week.

Regardless, we should talk about the organization and distribution of work on the final report and try to finally get it done.

Would it be possible for you to do a call before you leave for work in the morning, say 8 am your time, on Wednesday? If not, could you do 6 pm your time on Wednesday?

Thanks.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

<mailto:join-tcfmain@mailhost.groundspring.org>
Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Peg:

I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take time during the work day for telephone conferences. As I told you I will need to finish this project after daily working hours. I am still getting things done from being out for ten days. I will review Tova's recommendations and expand on mine this weekend.

Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the mileage portion of my travel voucher?

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job. ---
> Peggy
> 
> Can we make it 4 est? I have another meeting at 3.
> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: <psims@eac.gov> 
> To: 
> Cc: 
> Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:55 AM 
> Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference
I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before then because of other commitments. --- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:42 To AM
psims@eac.gov cc

Subject Re: Re:

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email?
And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message -----
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: psims@eac.gov
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM
Subject: Re:

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today.
--- Peggy
Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can.

Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

Tova

What time do you arrive home from work? Perhaps we could talk then?

Re your question on the mileage, I have approached our Financial Officer with a request that you receive
full reimbursement on the grounds that your actual total travel costs are less than the estimated total travel costs if you had flown to DC, stayed in our more expensive hotels, and received the higher per diem for 3 days (instead of 1). I have not yet received a response from her and she has been out of the office much of this week, so I don't know what she decided to do. --- Peggy

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> 4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job. ---
> Peggy
> 
> Can we make it 4 est? I have another meeting at 3.
> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: <psims@eac.gov> 
> To:
I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you. How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before them because of other commitments. --- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:42 To AM
psims@eac.gov
cc

Re: Re:

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM 
Subject: Re:

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon
Hi, What's going on? I have not received responses from either one of you in a week. I'd like to wrap this up in the next two weeks if we can.

Did you get my recommendations? Thanks.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto]
Sent: Friday, June 09, 2006 8:17 AM
To: Tova Wang
Subject: RE: Transcript & Teleconference

Normally I am not home for lunch.

--- Tova Wan>> wrote:
> What about during a lunch hour?

-----Original Message-----
From: Job Serebrov [mailto
Sent: Thursday, June 08 20 9:42 PM
To: psims@eac.gov;
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference


Peggy:

I can't predict when I get home but it is between
5:30
and 6:30 my time. I know that is generally too late
to
have a teleconference.

I plan to review Tova's recommendations this weekend
and work on my own as well as expanding the
explanation of the case section.

Please see what your financial officer did with
regards to my travel.

Thank you,

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

> What time do you arrive home from work? Perhaps
we
could talk then?

> Re your question on the mileage, I have approached
our Financial Officer
> with a request that you receive full reimbursement
> on the grounds that
> your actual total travel costs are less than the
> estimated total travel
> costs if you had flown to DC, stayed in our more
> expensive hotels, and
> received the higher per diem for 3 days (instead
> of
> 1). I have not yet
> received a response from her and she has been out
of

013212
the office much of this week, so I don't know what she decided to do. --- Peggy

"Job Serebrov"
06/08/2006 01:10 PM

To psims@eac.gov, wang@tcf.org
cc
Subject Re: Transcript & Teleconference

Peg:

I just arrived home for lunch. I can no longer take time during the work day for telephone conferences. As I told you I will need to finish this project after daily working hours. I am still getting things done from being out for ten days. I will review Tova's recommendations and expand on mine this weekend.

Also, I sent you an e-mail asking how you handled the mileage portion of my travel voucher?

Job

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

4 PM EST is fine with me, if it works for Job. ---

Peggy

06/08/2006 10:10 AM

To psims@eac.gov cc
Can we make it 4 EST? I have another meeting at 3.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:55 AM 
Subject: Re: Transcript & Teleconference 

I'll see how it comes in. I hope we receive an electronic copy. If we only receive a hard copy, we can pdf it and email it to the two of you.

How about Monday afternoon at 3 PM EST for a brief teleconference? I really can't do it before them because of other commitments. --- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:42 To AM
psims@eac.gov
cc

How will you be getting it to us? Will it be something you can email? And
can we set up a call for some time in the next few days? Thanks.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <psims@eac.gov>
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2006 9:35 AM 
Subject: Re: 

Sorry. We have been swamped with other program activities and preparations for today's testimony before House Admin. We have not yet received the transcript of the Working Group session. Devon checked with the court reporter, who said it will be delivered today. -- Peggy

06/08/2006 09:15 To AM

--- message truncated ---

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

"Job Serebrov" 
To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: teleconference

Tova:

5 pm EST is 4 pm Central. Peg would have to call at 7 pm EST to be 6 pm Central.

Job

--- wang@tcf.org wrote:

> Let's try to do that. Peg, you will call us 5 pm
Subject: Re: teleconference

> Wednesday next week? It would have to be 6 pm.

> --- Tova Wang <wang@tcf.org> wrote:

> Hi Job,

> Peg tells me that we should now be getting the transcript early next week. Regardless, we should talk about the organization and distribution of work on the final report and try to finally get it done.

> Would it be possible for you to do a call before you leave for work in the morning, say 8 am your time, on Wednesday? If not, could you do 6 pm your time on Wednesday?

> Thanks.

> Tova

> Tova Andrea Wang

> The Century Foundation

> 41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021

> phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534


> www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

> <mailto:join-tcfmain@mailhost.groundspring.org>

> Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ----
Hi Peg and Job,

I don't know how we might be able to use these but here, finally, are the super-refined versions of the nexis charts. Can we include them? Thanks. Tova

---

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Job Serebrov"  
To: Tova Wang  
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 10:17 PM  
Subject: Re: teleconference  

> Tova:  
>  
> 5 pm EST is 4 pm Central. Peg would have to call at 7 pm EST to be 6 pm Central. 
> >  
> > Job  
> >  
> > --- wang@tcf.org wrote:  
> >  
> > Let's try to do that. Peg, you will call us 5 pm EST? 
> >  
> > ----- Original Message -----  
> > From: "Job Serebrov"  
> > To: Tova Wang  
> > Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 6:29 PM  
> > Subject: Re: teleconference  
> >  
> > > Wednesday next week? It would have to be 6 pm.  
> > > 
> > > --- Tova Wang wrote:  
> > >
Hi Job,

Peg tells me that we should now be getting the transcript early next week. Regardless, we should talk about the organization and distribution of work on the final report and try to finally get it done.

Would it be possible for you to do a call before you leave for work in the morning, say 8 am your time, on Wednesday? If not, could you do 6 pm your time on Wednesday?

Thanks.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

How about Monday at 6:30 or 7 est?

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Job Serebrov" psims@eac.gov
To: <psims@eac.gov>; "Tova Andrea Wang"
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 6:21 PM
Subject: Re: Teleconference

> It will need to be early next week. What news of the
> transcript?
>
> --- psims@eac.gov wrote:
> >>
> >> I am sorry, but I have to postpone the
> >> teleconference originally scheduled
> >> for this evening. Is another day this week or early
> >> next week good for you
> >> two?
> >> Peggy
> >> --------------------------
> >> Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >
>
>----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

Devon E. Romig/EAC/GOV

06/22/2006 03:44 PM

To        Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc        
Subject   Fw: May 18, 2006 Meeting

Good news!!! The transcript is finally here.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Devon E. Romig/EAC/GOV on 06/22/2006 03:44 PM -----

"Carol J. Thomas Reporting"

To        dromig@eac.gov
cc        jwilson@eac.gov
Subject   May 18, 2006 Meeting

Dear EAC,
Attached please note the ASCII file for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Meeting taken on Wednesday, May 18, 2006. Your transcript has been shipped to you.

ASCII file name: 051806.txt

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Timothy Brischler, Office Manager, 703.273.9221 051806.TXT

---- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM ----

*Job Serkrov*

06/21/2006 06:21 PM

To psims@eac.gov, "Tova Andrea Wang"

cc

Subject Re: Teleconference

It will need to be early next week. What news of the transcript?

--- psims@eac.gov wrote:

>
> I am sorry, but I have to postpone the
teleconference originally scheduled
for this evening. Is another day this week or early
next week good for you
> two?
> Peggy
>
> Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
>
>

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----

06/22/2006 10:29 AM

To psims@eac.gov

cc

Subject

Can I also get an answer on whether we can speak about the project publicly?

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
06/19/2006 12:19 PM

To 
cc
Subject Re: teleconference

OK. I have marked my calendar for a 7 PM EST/6 PM CST teleconference for this Wednesday. Still no transcript. --- Peggy

06/15/2006 03:30 PM

To "Job Serebrov" psims@eac.gov 
cc
Subject Re: teleconference

fine

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Job Serebrov" 
To: psims@eac.gov 
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 10:17 PM 
Subject: Re: teleconference 

> Tova: 
> 
> 5 pm EST is 4 pm Central. Peg would have to call at 7 
> pm EST to be 6 pm Central. 
> 
> Job 
> 
> --- wrote: 
> 
> >> Let's try to do that. Peg, you will call us 5 pm 
> >> EST? 
> >> ----- Original Message ----- 
> >> From: "Job Serebrov" 
> >> To: "Tova Wang" 
> >> Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 6:29 PM 
> >> Subject: Re: teleconference 
> >> 
> >> > Wednesday next week? It would have to be 6 pm. 
> >> > 
> >> > --- Tova Wang wrote: 
> >> > 
> >> > >> Hi Job, 
> >> >> 
> >> >> >> Peg tells me that we should now be getting the 
> >> >> transcript early next week. 
> >> >> >> Regardless, we should talk about the organization
and distribution of work
on the final report and try to finally get it done.
Would it be possible for you to do a call before you leave for work in the morning, say 8 am your time, on Wednesday? If not, could you do 6 pm your time on Wednesday?
Thanks.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534
www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
"Job Serebrov"
06/21/2006 09:34 PM    To    psims@eac.gov
Subject    Re: Teleconference

Monday at 7 EST is ok with me. What about you Peg?

Job

--"Job Serebrov" wrote:

> How about Monday at 6:30 or 7 est?
> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: "Job Serebrov" <serebrov@sbcglobal.net>
To: <psims@eac.gov>; "Tova Andrea Wang"

Subject: Re: Teleconference

>
> It will need to be early next week. What news of
> the
> transcript?
>
> --- psims@eac.gov wrote:
> 
> > I am sorry, but I have to postpone the
> > teleconference originally scheduled
> > for this evening. Is another day this week or
> > early
> > next week good for you
> > two?
> > Peggy
> > --------------------------
> > Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
>
>

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
06/22/2006 10:30 AM	To "Job Serebrov" 	– 	"Tova Andrea Wang"

cc

Subject Re: Teleconference

OK. Next Monday (6-26) at 7 PM EST. I’ll call you.
Peggy

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----
From: "Job Serebrov"  
Sent: 06/21/2006 09:34 PM
To: psims@eac.gov
Subject: Re: Teleconference
Monday at 7 EST is ok with me. What about you Peg?

Job

---original message---

> How about Monday at 6:30 or 7 est?
> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: "Job Serebrov" 
> To: psims@eac.gov>; "Tova Andrea Wang" 
> Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 6:21 PM 
> Subject: Re: Teleconference

> It will need to be early next week. What news of the transcript?

> --- psims@eac.gov wrote: 
> 
> I am sorry, but I have to postpone the teleconference originally scheduled for this evening. Is another day this week or early next week good for you two? 
> Peggy

Anyday anytime except tomorrow is OK by me. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 11:15 AM
I am sorry, but I have to postpone the teleconference originally scheduled for this evening. Is another day this week or early next week good for you two? Peggy

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Peggy:

When Tova sent me her suggestions I made some changes and additions. Tova later wrote to me and said she expected me to come up with my own list. Due to time constraints and at risk of duplication I rather go with the corrected suggestions.

I have no objection to amending the official findings/CD to add these.

--- Tova Wang wrote:
>
> Hi Peg and Job,
>
> I don’t know how we might be able to use these but here, finally, are the super-refined versions of the nexis charts. Can we
I am sorry, but I have to postpone the teleconference originally scheduled for this evening. Is another day this week or early next week good for you two?

Peggy

--------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Agreed

--- Tova Wang wrote:

> As you may recall, the working group expressed
> interest in the risk analysis
> method. The recent report by the Brennan Center on
> voting machines employs
> this methodology. If you look at pp. 8-19 of the
> attached, it provides a
> potential model. I think it might be worth
> including this as an appendix or
> footnote in the methodology section. Please let me
> know what you think.
> Tova
> 
> Tova Andrea Wang
> Democracy Fellow
> The Century Foundation
> 41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
> phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534
Peggy:

In the transcript, there is one serious mistake that must be changed immediately. On page 5 it indicates that I helped review and draft changes to the election code of Libya. It should be Namibia not Libya. The reason this is so serious if it stands is that at the time I reviewed Namibia's Code it was illegal for Americans to deal with Libya. I need to know that this has been corrected any ALL parties who have seen the transcript notified.

Job

Wow, there are a lot of errors in this. But at least it gets at the substance. Will this be circulated to the commissioners?
Subject: Fw: May 18, 2006 Meeting

Good news!!! The transcript is finally here.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Devon E. Romig/EAC/GOV on 06/22/2006 03:44 PM -----
"Carol J. Thomas Reporting" [redacted]

06/22/2006 03:24 PM

Dear EAC,

Attached please note the ASCII file for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Meeting taken on Wednesday, May 18, 2006. Your transcript has been shipped to you.

ASCII file name: 051806.txt

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Timothy Brischler, Office Manager, 703.273.9221

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 11/29/2006 01:47 PM -----
"Tova Wang" [redacted]
06/27/2006 12:26 PM
To psims@eac.gov, "Job Serebrov" [redacted]
cc [redacted]

Subject outline of final report

Does this work for you?

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
I am still in Florida but it is supposed to be released next Thursday at our public meeting. I would have Job and or you request advance copy from Julie who is putting the finishing touches on it. We need to talk when I get back.

Thanks
Tom

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

---- Original Message ----
From: wang
Sent: 12/01/2006 01:31 PM
To: Thomas Wilkey
Subject: fraud and intimidation report

Hi Tom, Any news? Any estimate of when it will be released and whether we will be able to see an embargoed copy ahead of time? Please let me know, I really don't want to be caught off guard on this. I'm on email and cell phone today and the weekend, in the office Monday.

I hope you are doing well and we can get together soon.

Tova
We started doing that as soon as the article came out.
Julie:

You should have these as existing literature summaries.

Job

--- jhodgkins@eac.gov wrote:

> Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
> General Counsel
> United States Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> (202) 566-3100

----- Forwarded by Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV on 12/01/2006 12:13 PM -----
Sounds good. I will come by the EAC since its literally a few feet from my office. I look forward to seeing you. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Thanks!

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----  
From: "Job Serebrov"  
Sent: 11/03/2006 06:04 PM  
To: Juliet Hodgkins  
Subject: Re: Please send me the summary

Julie:

You should have these as existing literature summaries.

Job

--- jhodgkins@eac.gov wrote:

> Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
> General Counsel
> United States Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
> Washington, DC  20005
Karen:

Either day is fine for me.

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> All-
> > Although Tom Wilkey and I are still working to
> > process each of your
> > contracts on this project, we would like to
> > tentatively schedule an
> > in-person meeting on September 12, here in
> > Washington.
> > > In the meantime, I'd like to propose that we all
> > have a short
> > teleconference call next Wednesday or Thursday at
> > 1:00 PM to begin to talk
> > through the scope of this project and the respective
> > roles and
> > responsibilities each of you might take on.
> > > Could you let me know your availability for a 45
> > minute call on August 31
> > or September 1 at 1:00?
Julie:

Just a reminder that we have a telephone conference for the vote fraud group at 4:00 today. You were going to see if you could talk to Commissioner Davidson before that time so I could know what the possibilities are for serving as her executive assistant. If this is even possible and if the Commission is willing to raise the salaries of the executive assistants, her time table could affect the vote fraud project time table.

Regards,

Job

--- Forwarded by Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV on 12/01/2006 12:18 PM ---

"Job Serebrov"

To twikey@eac.gov, klynndyson@eac.gov, sda@mit.edu, jthompson@eac.gov

09/06/2005 11:42 AM

Subject Draft Schedule Proposal for Vote Fraud Group

I have attached a draft proposed schedule of events for our discussion today. Please keep in mind that this is only a proposal but I thought that we needed somewhere to start from.

Regards,

Job

----- Forwarded by Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV on 12/01/2006 12:18 PM -----

"Job Serebrov"

To twikey@eac.gov, klynndyson@eac.gov, sda@mit.edu, jthompson@eac.gov

09/06/2005 11:46 AM

cc

Subject Once again

I neglected to send the last attachment as a .doc. Please ignore it.

Job

----- Forwarded by Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV on 12/01/2006 12:18 PM -----
Julie:

Any luck finding the whereabouts of our contracts? Also, I assume that we will not hear from Peg until Monday.

Job

Julie:

I see that I will have to drive folks up there crazy Monday to make the Tuesday deadline for the signing of our contracts so we get paid on time.

At this point, on Tuesday I just plan to e-mail a standard invoice for this month.

Job
Hi Karen and Tom,

As we discussed yesterday, attached is a preliminary work plan/division of labor for your review. Please let us know if this is sufficient for the present and if you have any comments or questions.

In terms of hours dedicated to the project, Job and Tova are able to commit to 15-20 hours per week assuming that includes reimbursed periodic travel. Steve can do approximately 2 hours per week. We have tentatively scheduled to meet at your offices in DC, if that is convenient for you, on September 20. We will be able to confirm that within the next day or so.

All of us are very eager to get started on this important work as soon as possible. However, because we also have other work related responsibilities, we are a bit reluctant to do so before having an opportunity to review our contracts. We look forward to receiving them so we can get going right away.

Thanks so much. Speak to you soon.

Tova, Job and Steve

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2005 3:19 PM
To: klynndyson@eac.gov; nmortellito@eac.gov
Cc: jthompson@eac.gov; nmortellito@eac.gov; sda@mit.edu; Job Serebrov; twilkey@eac.gov;
For the FOIA request

Bert A. Benavides
Special Assistant to the Executive Director
U. S. Elections Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3114

--- Forwarded by Bert A. Benavides/EAC/GOV on 12/08/2006 10:40 AM ---

Job,

I have changed the time, per your request, of the conference call scheduled for Wednesday, November 15 to 6:30 PM EST.

Bert A. Benavides
Special Assistant to the Executive Director
202-566-3114

"Job Serebrov"

6:00 pm will not work for me as I am in route home. It would have to be between 6:30 and 7:00 pm your time. Remember I am one hour behind.

Job

--- bbenavides@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova, Job -- I have scheduled 6:00 PM EST on
> Wednesday, November 15 for a
> conference call with Tom Wilkey and Julie
> Thompson-Hodgkins.

> Conference call in # is **********

> Bert A. Benavides
> Special Assistant to the Executive Director
> U. S. Elections Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW
> Suite 1100
> Washington, DC  20005
> 202-566-3114
Job,

I have changed the time, per your request, of the conference call scheduled for Wednesday, November 15 to 6:30 PM EST.

Job

--- bbenavides@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova, Job -- I have scheduled 6:00 PM EST on
> Wednesday, November 15 for a
> conference call with Tom Wilkey and Julie
> Thompson-Hodgkins.
Tova, due to the change in time, both Julie and Tom will be calling into the conference call from their respective residences. Thanks. Take care.

Bert A. Benavides
Special Assistant to the Executive Director
U. S. Elections Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3114

Tova, Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Tova, Job -- I have scheduled 6:00 PM EST on Wednesday, November 15 for a conference call with Tom Wilkey and Julie Thompson-Hodgkins.

Conference call in # is 866-222-9044, Passcode [redacted]
Bert A. Benavides
Special Assistant to the Executive Director
U. S. Elections Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3114

Tova, due to the change in time, both Julie and Tom will be calling into the conference call from their respective residences. Thanks. Take care.

Bert A. Benavides
Special Assistant to the Executive Director
U. S. Elections Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3114

"Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>

Sounds good. I will come by the EAC since its literally a few feet from my office. I look forward to seeing you. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Conference call in #________ Passcode________

Bert A. Benavides  
Special Assistant to the Executive Director  
U. S. Elections Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
202-566-3114
November 27, 2006

Mr. Ralph Neas
President
People for the American Way
2000 M Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Mr. Neas:

Thank you for your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request regarding the U.S. Election Assistance Commission's research on voter fraud and intimidation. The document you requested on voter fraud and intimidation is protected from release under FOIA. Specifically, the responsive information is protected by the Deliberative Process Privilege and exempted from release under 5 U.S.C. §552(b)(5). As you may know, the Deliberative Process Privilege protects intra-agency documents that are (1) predecisional in nature and (2) part of the deliberative process. In other words, the documents must be part of a process that recommends or presents opinions on a policy matter before that matter is adopted. Such documents are exempt from release (1) to encourage open and frank discussions on policy matters between agency subordinates and superiors; (2) to protect against premature disclosure of proposed policies; and (3) to protect against public confusion that might result from disclosure of rationales that were not in fact the ultimate basis for agency action.

The report you have requested is an intra-agency document that is not yet complete and has not been reviewed and approved by the Commissioners (the relevant policy makers). An initial draft of the document was created by two contract employees with the support of EAC staff. The contract employees were hired pursuant EAC's authority to hire consultants and experts under 5 U.S.C. §3109 (See 42 U.S.C. §15324(b)). Individuals hired under this authority enter into an employment relationship with the EAC. The contract employees at issue were closely supervised by an EAC program director who participated directly in the project. For example, the supervisor approved, facilitated, scheduled and participated in interviews conducted for the project. Further, the contract employees were provided research materials and other support from EAC law clerks and staff. Communications with contract employees are intra-agency communications for the purposes of FOIA.¹ Work continues to proceed on the draft.

Similarly, the document you have requested constitutes a recommendation on a policy matter. The purpose or subject of the draft report at issue is to make an EAC determination on how voter fraud should be studied by the Agency. This is to be done by (1) assessing the nature and quality of information that presently exists on the subject matter; (2) defining the terms and scope of EAC study as proposed under HAVA; (3) determining what is to be studied; and (4) determining how it is to be studied. Clearly, EAC’s interpretation of HAVA and its determination of what it will study and how it will use its resources are matters of Agency policy. This policy can only be made by the EAC’s duly appointed Commissioners. This has not yet been done. Thus, any draft created by staff is a proposal or recommendation on a policy matter and clearly both predecisional and deliberative.

For these reasons, the draft document you have requested is exempt from release. We expect the report to be made final and approved by the Commission in December. It will be made public at that time. Upon its release you may obtain a copy of it at www.eac.gov.

The EAC has decided to waive the processing fees for your request. If you interpret any portion of this response as an adverse action, you may appeal it to the Commission. Your appeal must be in writing and sent to the address noted on the above letterhead. Any appeal submitted must be postmarked no later than 60 calendar days from the date of this letter. Please include your reasons for reconsideration and attach a copy of this letter.

Sincerely,

Jeannie Layson
Director of Communications
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
FAX COVER SHEET

To: JEANNIE LAYSON, Director of Communications, U.S. Election Assistance Commission

From: JUDITH E. SCHAEFFER, Deputy Legal Director

Date: October 27, 2006

Fax: 202-566-3127

No. of pages including cover sheet: 4

Phone: 202-467-4999

Fax: 202-293-2672

FOIA request attached
October 27, 2006

Via email and fax

Jeannie Layson
Director of Communications
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

Re: FOIA Request

Dear Ms. Layson:

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, I am writing on behalf of People For the American Way to request a copy of a study concerning voter fraud conducted by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov and presented to the EAC in report form sometime subsequent to May 2006.

As you may know, I wrote to the EAC on October 18, 2006 on behalf of People For the American Way Foundation, asking for a copy of the report of this study. On October 19, I received a letter from Paul S. DeGregorio, Chair of the EAC, denying the request. (A copy of Mr. DeGregorio’s letter is attached.) According to Mr. DeGregorio, the report was a “draft” and would not be released. However, as even Mr. DeGregorio’s letter underscores, the report we are seeking is not a “draft” but rather the authors’ report of their study of voter fraud. That the Commission may, in the words of Mr. DeGregorio, “release a final report from this study” does not make the study itself a draft. In any event, the Commission should not, and in our view cannot, withhold from public disclosure this important study, which was funded by federal taxpayers.

In accordance with FOIA, I would appreciate your furnishing the requested report to us at your earliest convenience, and no later than 20 working days from today. If you deny this request in whole or in part, please cite the specific exemption(s) that you maintain allows the Commission to withhold the release of this report in whole or in part, and, as also required by law, please release any segregable portion of the report that remains after the exempted material has been deleted. We are willing to pay the statutory fee for the copying of this report.

2000 M Street, NW • Suite 400 • Washington, DC 20036
Telephone 202.467.4999 • Fax 202.293.2672 • E-mail pfaw@pfaw.org • Web site http://www.pfaw.org
Please do not hesitate to call our Deputy Legal Director, Judith E. Schaeffer, if you have any questions about this request. Thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ralph G. Neas
President

Encl.
October 19, 2006

Ralph G. Neas
President, People for the American Way Foundation
2000 M Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036

RE: October 18, 2006 Letter

Dear Mr. Neas:

Your letter of October 18, 2006 requests the release of EAC's Voter Fraud and Intimidation Report. I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the purpose and status of this study.

In late 2005, EAC hired two consultants for the purpose of assisting EAC with two things: 1) developing a uniform definition of the phrase voter fraud, and 2) making recommendations on how to further study the existence, prosecution, and means of deterring such voter fraud. In May 2006, a status report on this study was given to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors during their public meetings. During the same week, a working group convened to react to and provide comment on the progress and potential conclusions that could be reached from the work of the two consultants.

The conversation at the working group meeting was lively on the very points that we were trying to accomplish as a part of this study, namely what is voter fraud and how do we pursue studying it. Many of the proposed conclusions that were suggested by the consultants were challenged by the working group members. As such, the consultants were tasked with reviewing the concerns expressed at the working group meeting, conducting additional research as necessary, and providing a draft report to EAC that took into account the working group's concerns and issues.

That draft report is currently being vetted by EAC staff. EAC will release a final report from this study after it has conducted a review of the draft provided by the consultants. However, it is important to remember the purpose of this study — finding a uniform definition of voter fraud and making recommendations on how to study the existence, prosecution and deterrence of voter fraud — as it will serve as the basis of the EAC report on this study.

Thank you for your letter. You can be assured that as soon as a final report on the fraud and intimidation study is available, a copy will be made available to the public.

Sincerely,

Paul S. DeGregorio
Chairman
December 12, 2006

Ms. Wendy R. Weiser
Deputy Director, Democracy Program
Brennan Center for Justice
161 Avenue of the Americas, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10013

Dear Ms. Weiser:

This letter is in response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request received by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) on November 13, 2006. The request sought certain agency records concerning two agency draft reports, *The Voter Fraud and Intimidation Report* and *The Voter Identification Report*. Specifically, the request sought: (1) "the report on voter identification prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics and the Moritz College of Law," (2) "the report on voter fraud and voter intimidation prepared by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov," (3) The voter identification and voting fraud report requests for proposals and contracts, and (4) communications relating to the above reports between the EAC and Eagleton Institute of Politics, the Moritz College of Law, Ms. Tova Wang, Mr. Job Serebrov, or other third parties.

This letter is a partial response to your request and deals only with your request for documents consistent with items (1) – (3), above. With regard to item (4), we continue to search our files, e-mails and computers for all relevant communications. We expect to have all relevant, releasable documents collected, reviewed and sent to you within five working days. If you have any questions regarding this process, please contact the undersigned.

With regard to items (1) – (3) above, please find copies of all responsive contracts and request for proposals enclosed. Upon review of the records, you will find a few places where small portions of information have been redacted (in black). As required by FOIA exemption 6, the EAC has redacted certain pieces of personal information, including home addresses, telephone numbers, and personal e-mail addresses. The EAC has also redacted confidential commercial information as mandated by FOIA exemption 4. Specifically, the EAC has redacted information that can be used to calculate unit costs regarding a contractor's labor rates. With regard to your requests for "the report on voter identification prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics and the Moritz College of Law," and "the report on voter fraud and voter intimidation prepared by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov," these draft documents are predecisional drafts protected by the Deliberative Process Privilege and exempted from release under 5 U.S.C. §522(b)(5).

As you may know, the Deliberative Process Privilege protects intra-agency documents that are (1) predecisional in nature and (2) part of the deliberative process. In other words, the documents must be part of a process that recommends or presents opinions on a policy matter or governmental decision before that matter is finally decided. It is a well settled matter of law that the work of contract employees and
contractors ("consultants") constitute intra-agency documents. This is true even where the consultants are deemed to be independent contractors and are not subject to the degree of control that agency employment entails. The courts have made this determination after recognizing that agencies have a special need for the opinions and recommendations of temporary consultants. Ultimately, deliberative documents are exempt from release (1) to encourage open and frank discussions on policy matters between agency subordinates and superiors, (2) to protect against premature disclosure of proposed policies and (3) to protect against public confusion that might result from disclosure of rationales that were not in fact the ultimate basis for agency action.

In both cases, the reports you have requested are drafts, representing one phase of the deliberative process—before the document was vetted by staff, approved by the executive director and reviewed and approved by the Commissioners (the relevant policy makers). Ultimately, the draft documents were created by experts to aid the EAC’s Commissioners in their decisions. The consultants had no personal interest in their submissions and had no agency decision-making authority. Each was tasked with simply providing pre-decisional research and information to the EAC. Their efforts were limited to creating truthful and comprehensive draft reports. Finally, both reports when finalized would constitute an EAC decision or a policy determination.

These conclusions are born out in the facts surrounding the projects at issue, including the attached contract documents. First, the voter fraud and intimidation study you have requested is a draft of a final document that has already been released after being vetted by staff and approved by the EAC Commissioners. It is available in its final form on EAC’s website (www.eac.gov). The draft document at issue was created by two contract employees hired pursuant to 5 U.S.C. §3109 (see 42 U.S.C. §15324(b)). Individuals hired under this authority enter into an employment relationship with the EAC. The contract employees were supervised by an EAC program director who participated directly in the project. For example, the supervisor approved, facilitated, scheduled and participated in interviews conducted for the project. Further, the contract employees were provided research materials and other support from EAC law clerks and staff. As stated by their contract, these consultants were hired so that the EAC could “…obtain consulting services from an individual who can provide advice drawn from broad professional and technical experience in the area of voter fraud and intimidation.” Moreover, the contracts clearly forbid the consultants from releasing the draft they created consistent with the privilege the EAC is asserting. The contract states:

All research, information, documents, and any other intellectual property (including but not limited to policies, procedures, manuals, and other work created at the request or otherwise while laboring for the EAC) shall be owned exclusively by the EAC, including copyright. All such work product shall be turned over to the EAC upon completion of your appointment term or as directed by the EAC. The EAC shall have exclusive rights over this material. You may not release government information or documents without the express written permission of the EAC.

2 Klamath, at 10.
3 Hoover, 611 F.2d at 1138.
4 NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 41 U.S. at 151.
6 See the consultant contracts for Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, enclosed.
6 See Id.
Finally, the purpose or subject of the draft report at issue was to make an EAC determination on how voter fraud should be studied by the agency. This was to be done by (1) accessing the nature and quality of the information that presently exists on the subject matter, (2) defining the terms and scope of EAC study as proposed by HAVA, (3) determining what is to be studied and (4) determining how it is to be studied. EAC’s interpretation of HAVA and its determination of what it will study and how it will use its resources to study it are matters of agency policy and decision.

With regard to the Voter Identification draft, it was created by Rutgers University in conjunction with the Moritz College of Law (Ohio State University) to “…provide research assistance to the EAC for the development of voluntary guidance on provisional voting and voting identification procedures.”7 The stated objective of the contract was to:

…obtain assistance with the collection, analysis and interpretation of information regarding HAVA provisional voting and voter identification requirements for the purpose of drafting guidance on these topics... The anticipated outcome of this activity is the generation of concrete policy recommendations to be issued as voluntary guidance for States.8

As with the voter fraud and intimidation study mentioned above, the contractors were provided guidance, information, and were directed by EAC personnel. The final product they delivered (draft report sought) was identified as “a guidance document for EAC adoption.” Clearly, as noted by the contract, the issuance of Federal guidance to states is a matter of government policy and limited to official EAC action.

The EAC has decided to waive the processing fees for your request. If you interpret any portion of this response as an adverse action, you will have an opportunity to appeal it to the Election Assistance Commission. However, as this letter is only partially responsive to your request, please hold any appeal until your request has been fully addressed. At that time, your appeal must be in writing and sent to the address noted on the above letterhead. Any appeal submitted, must be postmarked no later than 60 calendar days from the date of EAC’s final response letter. Please include your reasons for reconsideration and attach a copy of this and subsequent EAC responses.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jeannie Layson
Director of Communications
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Attachments:
1. Your Request Letter (dated November 8, 2006)
2. Responsive Documents

7 See EAC Contract, Act Number E4014127 (enclosed).
8 See Id.
Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached Eagleton proposal and EAC Statement of Work for description and details of specifics and requirements.

TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $560,002.00

Contact: Keith Osterhage
52.210-79 PACKING LIST (DEC 1989)

(a) A packing list or other suitable shipping document shall accompany each shipment and shall indicate: (1) Name and address of consignor; (2) Name and address of consignee; (3) Government order number; (4) Government bill of lading number and date if any; (5) Description of the material shipped, including quantity, number of containers, and package number (if any).

(b) When payment will be made by Government commercial credit card, in addition to the information in (a) above, the packing list or shipping document shall include: (1) Cardholder name and telephone number and (2) the term "Credit Card".

52.232-1 PAYMENTS (APR 1984)

The Government shall pay the Contractor, upon the submission of proper invoices or vouchers, the prices stipulated in this contract for supplies delivered or services performed (except to the extent that such amounts are suspended by suspension of the contract for non-payment) if the amount due on the invoices is at least $1,000 or 50 percent of the total contract price.

52.232-2 DISCOUNTS FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (APR 1989)

(a) Discounts for prompt payment will not be considered in the evaluation of offers. However, any offered discount will form a part of the award. Discounts will be taken in connection with any discount offered for prompt payment in connection with a contract award. Contractors awarded contracts may include prompt payment discounts in individual invoices.

(b) In connection with any discount offered for prompt payment, time shall be computed from the date of the invoice. For the purpse of computing the discount earned, payment shall be considered to have been made on the date which appears on the payment check or the date on which an electronic funds transfer was made.

52.232-25 PROMPT PAYMENT

(a) The due date for making invoice payments by the designated payment office shall be the later of the following two events:

(i) The 30th day after the designated billing office has received a proper invoice from the Contractor.

(ii) The 30th day after Government acceptance of supplies delivered or services performed by the Contractor.

(b) An invoice shall be prepared and submitted to the designated billing office specified in the contract. A proper invoice must include the items listed in (a) through (viii). If the invoice does not comply with these requirements, then the Contractor will be notified of the defect within 7 days after receipt of the invoice at the designated billing office. Untimely notification shall be taken into account in the computation of any interest penalty owed the Contractor.

(i) Name and address of the Contractor.

(ii) Invoice date.

(iii) Contract number or other authorization for supplies delivered or services performed (including order number and contract line item number).

(iv) Description, quantity, unit of measure, unit price, and extended price of supplies delivered or services performed.

(v) Shipping and payment terms (e.g., shipment number and date of shipment, prompt payment discount terms) shall be in form to have been made on the date which appears on the payment check or the date on which an electronic funds transfer was made.

(vi) Name and address of person to whom payment is to be sent.

52.232-37 Employment Reports on Special Disabled and Vietnam Era Veterans (JAN 88) (Applies whenever clause 52.222-35 is included)

This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect:

Federal Acquisition Regulation (48 CFR chapter 1) clauses:

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

52.203-2 Anti-Kickback Procedures (OCT 88)

52.203-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)

In the preceding clause, the permissible variations are stated in the schedule.

52.204-7 Convict Labor (APR 84)

52.204-26 Equal Opportunity (APR 84) (Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.204-26 Affirmative Action for Special Disabled and Vietnam Era Veterans (APR 84) (Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.204-26 Affirmative Action for Handicapped Workers (APR 84) (Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.204-27 Employment Reports on Special Disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era (JAN 88) (Applies whenever clause 52.222-35 is included)

52.204-8 Drug Free Workplace (JUL 90) (Applies if contract is awarded to an individual)

52.204-9 Buy American Act - Supplies (JAN 89)

52.204-11 Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases (MAY 92)

52.204-18 Prompt Payment (SEP 92)

52.233-12 Debarment (SEP 92)

52.233-13 Protest After Award (AUG 89)

52.233-14 Contractor Inspection Requirements (APR 84)

52.248-8 Default (Fixed-Price Supply and Service) (APR 84)

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation (MAY 88) (Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 88) (Applies when amount exceeds $2,500)

52.222-4 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)

52.248-8 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Fixed Price) (Short Form) (APR 84)

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 88) (Applies when amount exceeds $2,500)

52.222-4 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)

52.248-8 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Fixed Price) (Short Form) (APR 84)

GSA FSS 300 BACK (REV. 2-93)

013257
### ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES

**Date of Order:** 05/24/05

**Contract Number:** E4014127

**Important:**
- This form is not to be used as an Invoice. See reverse for Invoice requirements and payment information.
- The invoice remit to address must be the same as Block 12. Notify the contracting/ordering officer if the information in Block 12 is incorrect.
- Failure to show the ACT number (Block 4) on Invoice will delay payment and render the Invoice improper.
- Failure to mail invoice to address in Block 24 will delay payment.
- Failure of service contractors to provide information in Block 9A will result in 20% of payment being withheld (26 U.S.C. 3406(a)).

**Contractor:** Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
- **Office of Research and Sponsored Programs**
- **3 Rutgers Plaza**
- **New Brunswick, NJ 08901**

**Contact:** Keith Osterhage

**Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey Office of Research and Sponsored Programs**

**Order No.:** 22-600-1086 (NAICS 61131-Not for Profit Public Institution)

**9A. Employer's Identification Number:** 22-600-1086

**9B. Check, if applicable withhold 20%**

**10A. Classification:**
- A. Small Business
- B. Other Than Small Business
- C. Small Disadvantaged Business
- D. Small Women-Owned

**Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached Eagleton proposal and EAC Statement of Work for description and details of specifics and requirements.**

**Total Cost of Contract:** $560,002.00

**23. Gross Ship Wt.:**

**24. Mail Invoice To:**
- **Excluded Zip Code:**
- **General Services Administration (FUND):**
- **1225 New York Ave., NW, Suite 1100**
- **Washington, DC 20005**

**25A. For Inquiries Regarding Payment Contact:**
- **Name:** Diana Scott
- **Telephone No.:** (202) 566-3100

**28A. Name of Contracting/Ordering Officer (Type):**
- **Gracia Hillman, Chair**
- **Telephone No.:** (202) 566-3100

**26. Telephone No.:**
- **(202) 566-3100**

**27. Signature:**

**28. Signature:**

---

**TOTAL FROM 300-A(a):** $560,002.00

**GRAND TOTAL:** $560,002.00

---

**GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION**

**2. Contractor's Original**

---

**GSA FORM 300 (REV. 2-93)**

---

**013258**
The contract price includes all applicable Federal, State, and local taxes. No adjustment will be made to cover taxes which may subsequently be imposed on this transaction or changes in the rates of currently applicable taxes. However, the Government will, upon the request of the Contractor, furnish evidence appropriate to establish exemption from any tax from which the Government is exempt and which was not included in the contract price.

552.210-79 PACKING LIST (DEC 1989)

(a) A packing list or other suitable shipping document shall accompany each shipment and shall indicate (1) Name and address of consignor; (2) Name and address of consignee; (3) Government order or requisition number; (4) Government bill of lading number covering the shipment (if any); and (5) Description of the material shipped, including item number, quantity, number of containers, and package number (if any).

(b) When payment will be made by Government commercial credit card, in addition to the information in (a) above, the packing list or shipping document shall include: (1) Cardholder name and telephone number and (2) the term "Credit Card".

52.232-1 PAYMENTS (APR 1984)

The Government shall pay the Contractor, upon the submission of proper invoices or vouchers, the prices stipulated in this contract for supplies delivered and accepted or services rendered and accepted, less any discount awarded the Government in the contract. Unless otherwise specified in this contract, payment shall be made on partial deliveries accepted by the Government: (1) The amount due on the deliveries warrants payment according to (a) The Contractor requests it and the amount due on the delivery is at least $1,000 or 50 percent of the total contract price.

52.232-8 DISCOUNTS FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (APR 1989)

(a) Discounts for prompt payment will not be considered in the evaluation of offers. However, any offered discount will form a part of the award, and will be taken if payment is made within the discount period indicated in the offer by the offeror. As an alternative to offering a prompt payment discount in conjunction with the offer, offerors awarded contracts may include prompt payment discounts on individual invoices.

(b) In connection with any discount offered for prompt payment, time shall be computed from the date of the invoice. For the purpose of computing the discount earned, payment shall be considered to have been made on the date on which the check is received or the date on which an electronic funds transfer was made.

PROMPT PAYMENT

Prompt Payment clause 52.232-26 is incorporated in this contract by reference. The clause contains information on prompt payment date, invoice requirements, constructive acceptance and interest penalties. Certain provisions of the clause may be modified by agreement between the parties. A copy of the clause, or, alternatively, a statement of the clause will be provided to you by your Contractor.

(1) The 30th day after the designated billing office has received a proper invoice from the Contractor, furnished in the manner specified in the contract.

(ii) The 30th day after Government acceptance of supplies delivered or services performed by the Contractor . . .

(2) An invoice shall be prepared and submitted to the designated billing office specified in the contract. A proper invoice must include the items listed in . . . (ii) through . . . (viii) . . . If the invoice does not comply with these requirements, then the Contractor will be notified of the defect within ten days after receipt of the invoice at the designated billing office . . .

(iii) Name and address of the Contractor.

(ii) Invoice date.

(iii) Contract number or other authorization for supplies delivered or services performed (including order number and contract line item number).

(iv) Description, quantity, unit of measure, unit price, and extended price of supplies delivered or services performed.

(v) Shipping and payment terms (e.g., shipment number and date of shipment, prompt payment discount terms). Bill of lading number and weight of shipment will be shown for shipments on Government bills of lading.

(vi) Name and address of Contractor official to whom payment is to be sent must be the same as that in the contract or in a proper notice of assignment.

(vii) Name (where practicable), title, phone number, and mailing address of person to be notified in event of a defective invoice.

NOTE: Invoices must include the ACT number (block 4) and shall be submitted in an original only, less any discount awarded the Government in the contract. The remit to address must correspond to the remittance address in block 12.

(a)(1)(i) For the sole purpose of computing an interest penalty that might be due the Contractor, Government acceptance shall be deemed to have occurred constructively on the 7th day (unless otherwise specified in block 20) after the Contractor delivered the supplies or performed the services in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, unless there is a disagreement over quantity, quality or contractor compliance with a contract provision . . .

52.222-40 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1985, AS AMENDED - CONTRACTS OF $2,500 OR LESS (MAY 1989)

Except to the extent that an exception, variation, or tolerance would apply if this contract were in excess of $2,500, the Contractor and any subcontracts shall pay all employees working on the contract not less than the minimum wages specified under Section 6. (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 201-206).

52.222-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1985, AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)

52.222-42 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRING (MAY 1989)

52.222-41 and 52.222-42 apply to service contracts when the amount exceeds $2,500.

The GSA Form 2186, Service Contract Act of 1985 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (JUN 1988)

This clause incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request the Contracting Officer will make their full text available:

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 C.F.R. PART 1) CLAUSES

52.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)

52.203-3 Gratuities (APR 84)

52.203-6 Covenant Against Contingent Fees (APR 84)

52.203-6 Restriction on Subcontractor Sales to the Government (JUL 86)

52.203-7 Anti-Kickback Procedures (OCT 88)

52.212-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)

52.223-3 Convict Labor (APR 84)

52.223-6 Equal Opportunity (APR 84) (Applicable when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.223-35 Affirmative Action for Special Disabled and Vietnam Era Veterans (APR 84) (Applicable when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.223-36 Affirmative Action for Handicapped Workers (APR 84) (Applicable when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.223-37 Employment Reports on Special Disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era (JAN 88) (Applicable when amount exceeds $25,000)

52.236-6 Drug Free Workplace (JUL 90) (Applicable if contract is awarded to an individual)

52.225-8 Buy American Act - Supplies (JAN 89)

52.225-11 Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases (MAY 92)

52.225-26 Prompt Payment (SEP 92)

52.233-1 Disputes (DEC 81)

52.233-3 Protest After Award (AUG 89)

52.234-1 Contractor Inspection Requirements (APR 84)

52.234-8 Default (Fixed-Price Supply and Service) (APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 84) (Applicable when amount is between $2,500 and $10,000)

52.222-20 Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (APR 84) (Applicable when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)

52.248-1 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Fixed Price) (Short Form) (APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 84) (Applicable when amount exceeds $25,000)

52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (APR 84) - Alt. II

52.248-4 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Services) (Short Form) (APR 84)
May 24, 2005

Mr. Keith Osterhage, Director
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901

Dear Mr. Osterhage:

Enclosed is a signed contract in the amount of $560,002.00 for the provision of research assistance to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) for the development of voluntary guidance on provisional voting and voter identification procedures. The EAC has accepted the basic proposal submitted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics and has also elected to include the optional survey of local election officials. This proposal was evaluated as providing the best value to the government through a competitive source selection process. The proposal is incorporated by reference into the contract.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) was created by the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) and is charged with assisting the States in meeting the election reform requirements mandated by this legislation. One of the EAC's principal tasks is to provide guidance to the States on the interpretation of HAVA and its requirements. The provisional voting and voter identification effort that will be supported by this contract is a major element of EAC's Fiscal Year 2005 research agenda. The objective of this work is to develop guidance on these topics that States can utilize in the 2006 election cycle.

To acknowledge your receipt and acceptance of this contract, please countersign and date below and return one copy of this letter to the attention of Carol A. Paquette, Interim Executive Director.

We look forward to working with Rutgers University and the Eagleton Institute on this very important research effort.

Sincerely,

Gracia Hillman, Chair

Keith Osterhage
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
CONTRACT TO PROVIDE RESEARCH ASSISTANCE TO THE EAC FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOLUNTARY GUIDANCE ON PROVISIONAL VOTING AND VOTER IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES

0.0 Background: Sec. 302(a) of HAVA requires that all States allow the casting of provisional ballots in instances where a voter declares their eligibility to vote but their name does not appear on the official list of eligible voters, or an election official asserts that a voter is not eligible to vote. This section describes several requirements for implementation of provisional voting, but the States have considerable latitude in specifying how to carry out these requirements. The EAC seeks to examine how provisional voting was implemented in the 2004 general election and to prepare guidance for the States on this topic for the 2006 Federal elections.

HAVA Sec. 303(b) mandates that first time voters who register by mail are required to show proof of identity before being allowed to cast a ballot. The law prescribes certain requirements concerning this section, but also leaves considerable discretion to the States for its implementation. The EAC seeks to examine how these voter identification requirements were implemented in the 2004 elections and to prepare guidance on this topic for the 2006 elections.

One of the remedies for a voter not having an acceptable proof of identity is to allow the voter to cast a provisional ballot, either at the polling place or by mail. This linkage between these two HAVA sections provides a rationale for conducting research on these topics in parallel. However, it is anticipated that two separate guidance documents will result.

1.0 Objective: The objective of this contract is for EAC to obtain assistance with the collection, analysis and interpretation of information regarding HAVA provisional voting and voter identification requirements for the purpose of drafting guidance on these topics in time for implementation for the 2006 Federal elections. The anticipated outcome of this activity is the generation of concrete policy recommendations to be issued as voluntary guidance for States.

2.0 Scope: In general the Contractor shall be responsible for all research and analysis activities, including the conduct of public hearings for fact finding and public comment purposes. However, in light of the need to get started on this work, the EAC conducted a public hearing on provisional voting on February 23, 2005.

An initial framework for provisional voting policy has been set by the court decisions rendered on the election procedures utilized in the 2004 election. The 6th Circuit decision, in particular, has drawn some boundaries which must be given
due regard in the course of considering future policy alternatives for provisional voting.

Notice of public meetings and hearings is required to be published in the Federal Register. The Contractor shall be responsible for preparing the notice documents, and the EAC will submit the notices and cover the cost of publication. In addition, draft guidance documents must be published in the Federal Register to obtain public comment prior to their adoption. Again, the Contractor will work with the EAC to prepare the draft documents for publication, which the EAC will submit and pay for the cost of publication. Comments received will be provided to the Contractor for analysis and incorporation into the final guidance documents, as appropriate.

3.0 Specific Tasks

For ease of reference, following task 3.3 the remaining tasks are listed separately under the headings of Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Requirements. It is anticipated that the work on these two topics will be conducted essentially concurrently.

3.1 Update the project work plan, as required. The Contractor shall update and deliver the Project Plan not later than 10 days after contract award. This plan shall describe how the Contractor will accomplish each of the project tasks, including a timeline indicating major milestones. A single document will be prepared to include both provisional voting and voter identification tasks. The updated Project Plan shall be formally briefed to the EAC Project Manager and lead Commissioner.

3.2 Submit monthly progress reports. The Contractor shall submit a monthly progress report within 2 weeks of the end of each month. This report shall provide a brief summary of activities performed and indicate progress against the timeline provided in the Project Plan. Any issues that could adversely affect schedule should be identified for resolution. Budget status shall also be provided.

3.3 Conduct periodic briefings for the EAC. The Contractor shall periodically meet with the EAC Project Manager and the lead Commissioner for this work to discuss research findings and progress. The Project Plan should make allowance for this activity. The number and frequency of briefings will be determined by the Contractor Project Manager and the EAC Project Manager as the work progresses. The Contractor may also be required to periodically brief the full Commission on their work.
Provisional Voting

3.4 Collect and analyze State legislation, administrative procedures, and court cases. An understanding of the disparities and similarities of how provisional voting was implemented around the country will provide a baseline for the consideration of future approaches. Seventeen States never had provisional voting before HAVA was enacted, while many other States did. A State-by-State compendium of the legislation, procedures, and litigation reviewed shall be delivered along with the analysis results.

Topics of particular interest include the following:
- How did States prepare for the onset of the HAVA provisional ballot requirement?
- How did this vary between States that had previously had some form of provisional ballots and those that did not?
- How did litigation affect the implementation?
- How effective was provisional voting in enfranchising qualified voters?
- Did State and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots?
- Did local election officials have a clear understanding of how to implement provisional voting?

3.5 Recommend alternative approaches for future implementation of provisional voting. The Contractor shall conduct a literature review to identify other research results and data available on this topic. The EAC Election Day Survey, for example, contained several questions on provisional voting. The EAC will make these survey data available to the Contractor. Based on their analysis of available research and the results of Task 4.5, the Contractor shall diagnose the problems and challenges of provisional voting implementation and hypothesize alternative approaches.

The Contractor shall assess the efficacy of these alternatives in relation to the following inter-related policy objectives: (1) enabling the maximum number of eligible voters to cast ballots that will be counted; (2) providing procedural simplicity for voters, poll workers, and election officials; (3) minimizing opportunity for voter fraud; and (4) maintaining a reasonable workload for election officials and poll workers. Additional policy considerations may be identified in the course of this research effort. The Contractor shall document and brief these alternatives to the Commission.

3.6 Prepare preliminary draft guidance document. Based on the feedback received from the Commission, the Contractor shall prepare a draft guidance document for review and comment by the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board. EAC will convene a meeting or teleconference of the Boards for the discussion of this document. The Contractor shall provide the document in advance and participate in the meeting to answer questions and
record comments.

3.7 Revise draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register. The Contractor shall revise the guidance document as appropriate to reflect the comments of the EAC, the Board of Advisors and the Standards Board and prepare the draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register by the EAC.

3.8 Arrange one public hearing for receiving public comment on draft guidance. This hearing should be scheduled 30 days after the initial publication date. The Contractor shall select the location in consultation with the EAC. EAC will handle publicity for the meeting.

3.9 Prepare final guidance document for EAC adoption. Review all comments received in response to Federal Register publication and at public hearing and revise guidance document as appropriate. Provide final version to EAC for adoption.

Voter Identification Requirements

3.10 Collect and analyze State legislation, administrative procedures, and court cases. It is assumed that the collection of information for analysis of voter identification requirements will be performed concurrently with the research for Task 4.5. An understanding of the disparities and similarities of how voter identification requirements were implemented around the country will provide a baseline for the consideration of future approaches. A State-by-State compendium of the legislation, procedures, and litigation reviewed shall be delivered along with the analysis results.

3.11 Convene a half day public hearing on the topic of voter identification requirements. This hearing should occur early in the research process as an informational hearing where all points of view on this topic can be aired. The Contractor shall be responsible for all aspects of planning and conducting this hearing in consultation with the EAC. The Contractor shall identify three panels of three to four speakers each. The Contractor shall arrange for speaker attendance to include travel and per diem expenses. The EAC will provide publicity for the hearing. The Contractor shall prepare a document summarizing the proceedings and containing all testimony provided.

3.12 Recommend alternative approaches for future implementation of HAVA voter identification requirements. The Contractor shall conduct a literature review to identify other research results and data available on this topic. Based on their analysis of available research and the results of Task 4.11, the Contractor shall diagnose the problems and challenges of voter identification and hypothesize alternative approaches. The Contractor shall
coordinate with the EAC to identify appropriate policy objectives by which to assess these alternatives. The Contractor shall document and brief these alternatives to the Commission.

3.13 Prepare preliminary draft guidance document. Based on the feedback received from the Commission, the Contractor shall prepare a draft guidance document for review and comment by the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board. EAC will convene a meeting or teleconference of the Boards for the discussion of this document. The Contractor shall provide the document in advance and participate in the Board meeting to answer questions and record comments.

3.14 Revise draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register. The Contractor shall revise the guidance document as appropriate to reflect the comments of the EAC, the Board of Advisors and the Standards Board and prepare the draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register by the EAC.

3.15 Arrange a second public hearing for receiving public comment on the draft guidance. This hearing should be scheduled 30 days after the initial publication date. The Contractor shall select the location in consultation with the EAC. EAC will handle publicity for the hearing.

3.16 Prepare final guidance document for EAC adoption. Review all comments received in response to Federal Register publication and at public hearing and revise guidance document as appropriate. Provide final version to EAC for adoption.

4.0 Contract Type. The contract type will be Time and Materials in the amount of $560,002.00.

5.0 Place of Performance. The principal place of performance will be the Contractor's place of business. Meetings and occasional work efforts may be performed at the EAC offices. Some travel will be required.

6.0 Period of Performance. The period of performance is from date of award until December 30, 2005.

7.0 Schedule of Deliverables:

1. Updated project plan – 10 days after contract award
2. Progress reports – monthly
3. Briefings – as required
4. Analysis report on provisional voting, including compendium of legislation, procedures and litigation - TBD
5. Alternatives report on provisional voting – TBD
6. Preliminary draft guidance on provisional voting - TBD
7. Draft guidance on provisional voting for publication – 9/2005
8. Public hearing on draft guidance – 30 days after publication
10. Analysis report on voter identification requirements, including compendium of legislation, procedures and litigation – TBD
11. Public hearing on voter identification requirements – TBD
12. Summary of voter identification requirements hearing - TBD
13. Alternatives report on voter identification requirements - TBD
14. Preliminary draft guidance on voter identification requirements - TBD
15. Draft guidance on voter identification requirements for publication – 11/2005
16. Public hearing on draft guidance – 30 days after publication
17. Final guidance on voter identification requirements to EAC for adoption – 12/2005

8.0 Inspection and Acceptance Criteria. Final inspection and acceptance of all work performed, reports, and other deliverables will be performed at the offices of the EAC. The Contracting Officer’s Representative for this effort will be Karen Lynn-Dyson. She will review and approve all work on behalf of the Commission.

9.0 Invoicing. Invoices may be submitted monthly using Standard Form 1034, Public Voucher for Purchases and Services Other Than Personal. Invoices shall be mailed to the attention of Ms. Diana Scott, Administrative Officer, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington D.C. 20005.

10.0 Accounting and Appropriation Data: Funds in the amount of $560,002.00 are available for this task order.

11.0 General Provisions:

11.1 Proposal Incorporated. The Contractor’s proposal is incorporated by reference into the statement of work.

11.2 Inspection/Acceptance. The Contractor shall only tender for acceptance those items that conform to the requirements of this contract. The EAC reserves the right to inspect and review any products or services that have been tendered for acceptance. The EAC may require correction or re-performance of nonconforming items at no increase in contract price. The EAC must exercise its post-acceptance rights within ten (10) days after the defect was discovered or should have been discovered.

11.3 Contract Terms. Should there be a conflict between the contract clauses included in this document and the “Purchase Order Terms and Conditions” on the back of GSA Form 300, which is used to record contract financial
data, the contract clauses in this document shall take precedence.

11.4 Changes. Changes in the terms and conditions of this Contract may be made only by written agreement signed by authorized representatives of both parties.

11.5 Disputes. This Contract is subject to the Contract Disputes Act of 1978, as amended (41 U.S.C. 601-613). The Contractor shall proceed diligently with performance of this Contract, pending final resolution of any dispute arising under the Contract.

11.6 Excusable Delays. The Contractor shall be liable for default unless nonperformance is caused by an occurrence beyond the reasonable control of the Contractor and without its fault or negligence such as, acts of God or the public enemy, acts of the Government in either its sovereign or contractual capacity, fires, floods, epidemics, quarantine restrictions, strikes, unusually severe weather, and delays of common carriers. The Contractor shall notify the EAC, in writing, as soon as possible after the beginning of an excusable delay. The Contractor shall explain the basis for the excusable delay, and correct the problem as soon as possible. The Contractor shall notify the EAC, in writing, at the end of the delay.

11.7 Other compliances. The Contractor shall comply with all applicable Federal, State and local laws, executive orders, rules and regulations applicable to its performance under this contract.


11.9 Limitation of Government Liability. The Contractor is not authorized to make expenditures or incur obligations exceeding the total amount allocated to the contract. The Contractor is required to notify the Contracting Officer's Representative when 75% of funding has been obligated.

11.10 Termination for convenience. The EAC, by written notice, may terminate this contract without fault, in whole or in part, when it is in the best interest of the government. In the event of contract termination for convenience, the rights, duties, and obligations of the parties, including compensation to the Contractor, shall be in accordance with Part 49 of the Federal Acquisition Regulations in effect on the date of this contract.
**Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey**
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
3 Rutgers Plaza, NJ 08901

Contact: Keith Osterhage

**Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC).**

Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached for description of this no-cost extension amendment.

**TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $560,002.00**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**RECEIVING OFFICE (Name, symbol and telephone no.)**

**MAIL INVOICE TO: (Include zip code)**

ral Services Administration (FUND)
Action Assistance Commission
25 New York Ave., NW, Suite 1100
ashington, DC 20005

**PAYING OFFICE**

ERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
The contract price includes all applicable Federal, State, and local taxes. No adjustment will be made to cover taxes which may subsequently be imposed on this transaction or changes in the rates of currently applicable taxes. However, the Government will, upon the request of the Contractor, furnish evidence appropriate to establish exemption from any tax from which the Government is exempt and which was not included in the contract price.

652.210-79 PACKING LIST (DEC 1989)

(a) A packing list or other suitable shipping document shall accompany each shipment and shall indicate (1) Name and address of consignor; (2) Name and address of consignee; (3) Government order or requisition number; (4) Government bill of lading number covering the shipment (if any); and (5) Description of the material shipped, including item number, quantity, number of containers, and package number (if any).

(b) When payment will be made by Government commercial credit card, in addition to the information in (a) above, the packing list or shipping document shall include: (1) Cardholder name and telephone number and (2) the term "Credit Card".

52.232-1 PAYMENTS (APR 1984)

The Government shall pay the Contractor, upon the submission of proper invoices or vouchers, the prices stipulated in this contract for supplies delivered, set forth or services rendered and accepted, less any deductions provided in this contract. Unless otherwise specified in this contract, payment shall be made on partial deliveries accepted by the Government. The amount due on the deliveries is at least $1,000 or 50 percent of the total contract price.

52.232-8 DISCOUNTS FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (APR 1989)

(a) Discounts for prompt payment will not be considered in the evaluation of offers. However, any offered discount will be made to cover taxes which may subsequently be imposed on this transaction or changes in the rates of currently applicable taxes. However, the Government will, upon the request of the Contractor, furnish evidence appropriate to establish exemption from any tax from which the Government is exempt and which was not included in the contract price.

52.224-45 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRES (MAY 1984)

Except to the extent that an exception, variation, or tolerance would apply if this contract were in excess of $2,500, the Contractor and any subcontractor shall pay all employees working on the contract not less than the minimum wage specified under Section 6(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 201-206). Regulations and Interpretations of the Service Contract Act of 1966 are contained in 29 CFR Part 4.

52.224-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)

The GSA Form 2166, Service Contract Act of 1965 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (JUN 1988)

This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request the Contracting Officer will make their full text available:

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

52.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)

52.203-3 Gratuities Against 84

52.203-6 Restriction on Subcontracts Sales to 8the Government (JUL 86)

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 86)(Applies when amount exceeds $2,500.)

52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)
**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDER NUMBER/CONTRACT NUMBER</th>
<th>ORDER NUMBER/CONTRACT NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPORTANT:**
- This form is not to be used as an invoice. See reverse for invoice requirements and payment information.
- The invoice remit to address must be the same as Block 12. Notify the contracting/ordering officer if the information in Block 12 is incorrect.
- Failure to show the ACT number (Block 4) on invoice will delay payment and render the invoice improper.
- Failure to mail invoice to address in Block 24 will delay payment.
- Failure of service contractors to provide information in Block 9A will result in 20% of payment being withheld (26 U.S.C. 3406(a)).

---

**Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey**
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Contact: Keith Osterhage

---

**20. SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached for description of this no-cost extension amendment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT:** $560,002.00

---

**26C. SIGNATURE:**

**General Services Administration**

---

**25A. FOR INQUIRIES REGARDING PAYMENT CONTACT:**
Diana Scott
(202) 566-3100

**26A. NAME OF CONTRACTING/ORDERING OFFICER (Type):**
Thomas R. Wilkey, Executive Director
(202) 566-3100

---

**GSA FORM 300 (REV. 2-93)**

---

**013270**
The contract price includes all applicable Federal, State, and local taxes. No discounts will be considered in the evaluation of offers, except for those specifically stated in the offer and accepted by the Government.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Background

On May 24, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission awarded an eight month contract (December 30, 2005) in the amount of $560,002.00 to the Eagleton Institute of Politics (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures.

Contractor's Request for a No-Cost Extension

On November 15, 2005, John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, requested via e-mail, a no-cost extension on this contract (E4014127). Mr. Weingart had requested an extension to complete the work of this contract to February 28, 2006.

In response to EAC’s requests for additional information related to the no-cost extension, in a January 13, 2006 e-mail, Mr. Weingart revised the request for the extension to March 31, 2006. Mr. Weingart did note that he would still like to conclude the project’s work by the end of February.

In various correspondences, Mr. Weingart notes the following reasons for the request:

"The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October, voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting, based on Eagleton’s research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication.... The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report of that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid-January”.

“Our request for a no-cost, reallocation of resources is based on (a) the fact that our personnel costs have already been higher than we anticipated and (b) the reality that keeping the project operating for at least nine months, instead of the seven as planned,
will require the participants to devote more time than anticipated. While we are not producing more product than originally promised, the time involved in our work continues to increase... We anticipate this research monitoring and revising to continue for the months added to the project, necessitating significantly more hours by all members of the project team than anticipated”.

The contractor anticipates reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line item ($81,120) and spending approximately $33,750 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,171 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants. The EAC elected to not hold public hearings on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification.

Specifics of the Extension

The contractor has provided the following breakdown and explanation of the personnel and consultant costs, associated with this extension.

1. *Eagleton Institute of Politics personnel:*

   Original budgeted project personnel costs-$110,695 (May-December)
   Revised project personnel costs- $144,444 (May-February)

2. *Consultant Services:*

   Original budgeted costs: $79,500 (May-December)
   Revised costs -$99,750 (May-February)

3. *Moritz School of Law personnel and overhead:*

   Original budgeted costs: $84,744 (May-December)
   Revised costs- $107,915 (May-February)

Total project budget:

Original budgeted costs: $560,002 (May- December)
Revised project cost: $549,831 (May-February)

EAC Staff Recommendation

Karen Lynn-Dyson, the EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative assigned to this contract has reviewed this request, the rationale and authority for it (FAR 43.103(a)(3)) and finds it to be appropriate. To date the Eagleton Institute has consistently met its deadlines for major project deliverables and stayed within the project’s overall budget.
Based upon the work products provided to the EAC, thus far, the additional personnel expenses which the contractor has incurred appear to be reasonable. To grant the Eagleton Institute a three-month extension on this contract in order to obtain the necessary feedback on major documents it has produced will be within the best interests of the Election Assistance Commission, and therefore, the federal government.

EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative finds that to grant the Eagleton Institute a no-cost extension for the modification of its contract with the EAC is within the scope of the original agreement and is recommending that this modification to the contract be made.

Signed

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Contracting Officer Representative
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Thomas R. Wilkey
Executive Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE
   E4014127

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO
   00

3. EFFECTIVE DATE
   01/24/2008

4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.
   00

5. PROJECT NO. (if applicable)
   00

6. ISSUED BY
   U.S. Election Assistance Commission

   1225 New York Avenue
   Suite 1100

   Washington, DC 20005

7. ADMINISTERED BY (if other than item 6)

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (ie., street, city, state and ZIP Code)
   Rutgers, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs

   3 Rutgers Plaza
   New Brunswick, NJ 08901

9. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO
   [X]

   [ ] 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.

   [ ] 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
   E4014127

   [X] CODE

   [X] FACILITY CODE

10. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS
   If ☐ is extended, ☐ is not extended.

   Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:
   1. By preparing Item 11.15, and returning __________ copies of the amendment;
      2. By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted;
      3. By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAX or E-MAIL YOUR CONFIRMATION TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment your dates to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided such telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

11. ACCOUNTING AND APPLICATION (DATA IS REQUIRED)

12. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS.
   IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

   [X] A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PUNITUARY TO (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO.

   [X] B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in pricing office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PUNITUARY TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).

   [X] C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:

   [ ] D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not ☐ is required to sign this document and return __________ copies to the issuing office.

13. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

   Pursuant to the terms of the above-referenced contract, the contractor was to present EAC with draft reports that would form the basis for recommended best practices for provisional voting. The documents were to be published in mid-October after EAC review. The contractor did not receive EAC comments on the draft document until October, 2005. As a result, additional time is required to complete the work on provisional voting and analysis of Voter Identification issues. The extension will entail additional personnel time, but no additional funds to complete the work. The contractor anticipates that it will be able to complete its work during the week of March 31, 2008.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in item 1A or 10A, as hereinafter changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

1A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNING OFFICIAL/PERSON (Type or print)
   Constance J. Bornheimer
   Accounting Manager

1B. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICIAL (If type or print)
   Thomas R. Wilkey, Executive Director

1C. DATE SIGNED
   03/06/06

1D. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

013275
Instructions for items other than those that are self-explanatory, are as follows:

(a) **Item 1 (Contract ID Code).** Insert the contract type identification code that appears in the title block of the contract being modified.

(b) **Item 3 (Effective date).**

(1) For a solicitation amendment, change order, or administrative change, the effective date shall be the issue date of the amendment, change order, or administrative change.

(2) For a supplemental agreement, the effective date shall be the date agreed to by the contracting parties.

(3) For a modification issued as an initial or confirming notice of termination for the convenience of the Government, the effective date and the modification number of the confirming notice shall be the same as the effective date and modification number of the initial notice.

(4) For a modification converting a termination for default to a termination for the convenience of the Government, the effective date shall be the same as the effective date of the termination for default.

(5) For a modification confirming the contracting officer's determination of the amount due in settlement of a contract termination, the effective date shall be the same as the effective date of the initial decision.

(c) **Item 6 (Issued By).** Insert the name and address of the issuing office. If applicable, insert the appropriate issuing office code in the code block.

(d) **Item 8 (Name and Address of Contractor).** For modifications to a contract or order, enter the contractor's name, address, and code as shown in the original contract or order, unless changed by this or a previous modification.

(e) **Item 9, (Amendment of Solicitation No. - Dated), and 10, (Modification of Contract/Order No. - Dated).** Check the appropriate box and in the corresponding blanks insert the number and date of the original solicitation, contract, or order.

(f) **Item 12 (Accounting and Appropriation Data).** When appropriate, indicate the impact of the modification on each affected accounting classification by inserting one of the following entries:

   (1) Accounting classification
       Net increase $________

(2) Accounting classification
    Net decrease $________

   NOTE: If there are changes to multiple accounting classifications that cannot be placed in block 12, insert an asterisk and the words "See continuation sheet".

(g) **Item 13.** Check the appropriate box to indicate the type of modification. Insert in the corresponding blank the authority under which the modification is issued. Check whether or not contractor must sign this document. (See FAR 43.103.)

(h) **Item 14 (Description of Amendment/Modification).**

(1) Organize amendments or modifications under the appropriate Uniform Contract Format (UCF) section headings from the applicable solicitation or contract. The UCF table of contents, however, shall not be set forth in this document

(2) Indicate the impact of the modification on the overall total contract price by inserting one of the following entries:

   (i) Total contract price increased by $_______

   (ii) Total contract price decreased by $_______

   (iii) Total contract price unchanged.

(3) State reason for modification.

(4) When removing, reinstating, or adding funds, identify the contract items and accounting classifications.

(5) When the SF 30 is used to reflect a determination by the contracting officer of the amount due in settlement of a contract terminated for the convenience of the Government, the entry in Item 14 of the modification may be limited to --

   (i) A reference to the letter determination; and

   (ii) A statement of the net amount determined to be due in settlement of the contract.

(6) Include subject matter or short title of solicitation/contract where feasible.

(i) **Item 16B.** The contracting officer's signature is not required on solicitation amendments. The contracting officer's signature is normally affixed last on supplemental agreements.
# US Election Assistance Commission Project Budget (3/22/05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleton faculty/senior staff</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleton staff: logistical/administrative/clerical</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe (32.5%)</td>
<td>16,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hourly Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Coordinator</td>
<td>21,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics/Admin Coordinator</td>
<td>12,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research assistants</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe on Hourly (9%)</td>
<td>3,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honoraria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria for Peer Review Group</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Hearings (3 in 3 cities)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hearings in DC, train, ground, lodging, meals*</td>
<td>3,480 attended by 3 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hearings in St. Louis, air, ground, lodging, meals**</td>
<td>2,640 attended by 3 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Briefings/Meetings with EAC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train, ground, lodging, meals***</td>
<td>5,200 6 briefings in DC, attended by 2 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies, software, telephone, copying, postage</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop computers, laptop, printer</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcontract</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director-O'Neill</td>
<td>79,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University, Legal Analysis</td>
<td>84,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal All Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>391,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modified Total Direct Cost $277,015</strong>****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;A on Modified Total Direct Cost (55.5%)</td>
<td>153,743 Rutgers University federally approved rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FM on Modified Total Direct Cost (55.5%)</strong></td>
<td>153,743 Rutgers University federally approved rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Optional Surveys (no F&amp;A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Election Officials</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Voters</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Voting, 1st state</td>
<td>116,000 OSU Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Voting, 1st additional state</td>
<td>75,000 OSU Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Voting, 2nd additional state</td>
<td>60,000 OSU Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Optional Surveys (no F&amp;A)</strong></td>
<td>$291,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Travel and lodging to two hearings in DC includes $260 for train fare to DC, $200 for hotel/lodging, and $60 per day for two days for meals= $580 per person per trip for three people.  
** Travel and lodging to one hearing in St. Louis includes $500 airfare to St. Louis, 2 nights hotel/lodging at $100, and $60 per day for three days for meals= $880 per person for three people.  
*** Travel and lodging to five Briefings/Meetings with EAC includes $260 for train fare to DC, $200 for hotel/lodging, and $60 for meals= $520 per person per trip for two people.  
**** Modified total direct cost is equivalent to total direct cost except for two items - F&A included only on first $25K of subcontract with Project Director ($79,500) and first $25K of subcontract with OSU ($84,744).
ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES

1. DATE OF ORDER: 04/26/06
2. ORDER NUMBER:
3. CONTRACT NUMBER: E4014127B
4. ACT NUMBER:
5. ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION
   - FOR GOVERNMENT USE ONLY
     - FUND: 8035
     - ORG CODE: TZM9110
     - B/A CODE: 10
     - G/C CODE: 25
     - AC: SS
8. TYPE OF ORDER: A. PURCHASE
   - Please furnish the following on the terms specified on both sides of the order and the attached sheets, if any, including any as indicated.
   - B. DELIVERY
     - This delivery order is subject to instructions contained on this side only of this form and is issued subject to the terms and conditions of the above numbered contract.
6. FINANCE DIVISION
   - VENDOR NAME:
   - DISCOUNT:

7. TO: CONTRACTOR (Name, address and zip code)
   - Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
   - 3 Rutgers Plaza
   - New Brunswick, NJ 08901
   - Contact: Keith Osterhage

9. EMPLOYER'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER:
   - BIA CODE:
   - G/C CODE:

10. TYPE OF BUSINESS ORGANIZATION
   - A. CORPORATE
   - B. PARTNER
   - C. SOLE
   - X SMALL BUSINESS

11. ISSUING OFFICE
   - Election Assistance Commission
   - 1225 New York Ave., NW, Suite 1100
   - Washington, DC 20005
   - Phone: (202) 566-3100

12. REMITTANCE ADDRESS (MANDATORY)
   - Remittance via EFT

13. SHIP TO
   - Election Assistance Commission
   - 1225 New York Ave., NW, Suite 1100
   - Washington, DC 20005
   - Phone: (202) 566-3100

14. REQUISITION OFFICE (Name, symbol and telephone no.)
   - Election Assistance Commission
   - 1225 New York Ave., Suite 1100
   - Washington, DC 20005

15. GOVERNMENT B/L NO.
16. DELIVERY F.O.B. POINT ON OR BEFORE
17. GOVERNMENT B/L NO.
18. PAYMENT/DISCOUNT TERMS
   - Net 30

20. SCHEDULE
   - Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached for description of this no-cost extension amendment.

   TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $560,002.00

RECEIVING OFFICE (Name, symbol and telephone no.)
S. Election Assistance Commission (202) 566-3100

23. GROSS SHIP WT.
GRAND TOTAL

MAIL INVOICE TO: (Include zip code) and Services Administration (FUND)

26A. FOR INQUIRIES REGARDING PAYMENT CONTACT:
Diana Scott
(202) 566-3100

26B. TELEPHONE NO.

26A. NAME OF CONTRACTING/ORDERING OFFICER (Type)
Thomas F. Wilkey, Executive Director

26C. SIGNATURE

013278

GERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
1. PAYING OFFICE
GSA FORM 300 (REV. 2-83)
b) When payment will be made by Government commercial credit card, in addition to the information in (a) above, the packing list or shipping document shall include: (1) Cardholder name and telephone number and (2) the term "Credit Card".

12.232-1 PAYMENTS (APR 1984)

The Government shall pay the Contractor, upon the submission of proper invoices or vouchers, the amounts stipulated in this contract for supplies delivered and accepted or services rendered and accepted, see any deduction proposed in the described contract. If the amount stipulated in this contract, payment shall be made on the date designated by the Government if: (a) There is no amount due on the delivery, or (b) The Contractor requests it and the amount due on the delivery is at least $1,000 or 50 percent of the total contract price.

12.232-8 DISCOUNTS FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (APR 1989)

a) Discounts for prompt payment will not be considered in the valuation of offers. However, any offered discount will be part of the award and will be taken into account in the computation of any interest penalty owed the Contractor.

b) The due date for making invoice payments by the designated billing office shall be the later of the following two events:

(i) The 30th day after Government acceptance of supplies delivered or services performed by the Contractor.

(ii) The 30th day after the designated billing office has received a proper invoice from the Contractor.

NOTE: Invoices must include the ACT number (block 4) and shall be submitted in an original only, unless otherwise specified, to the billing office designated in block 24 to receive invoices. The "Credit to" address must correspond to the remittance address in block 12.

[a][b][c] For the sole purpose of computing an interest penalty that might be due the Contractor, Government acceptance shall be deemed to have occurred contractually on the 7th day (unless otherwise specified in block 20) after the Contractor delivers the supplies or performs the services in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, unless there is a disagreement over quantity, quality or contractor compliance with a contract provision.

52.222-40 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1986, AS AMENDED - CONTRACTS OF $2,500 OR LESS (MAY 1989)

Except to the extent that an exception, variation, or tolerance would apply if this contract were in excess of $2,500, the Contractor and any subcontractor shall pay all employees working on the contract not less than prevailing rates provided in the Federal Wage Order applicable to the area, unless there is a disagreement over quantity, quality or contractor compliance with a contract provision.

52.222-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1986, AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)

52.222-42 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRERS (MAY 1989)

52.222-41 and 52.222-42 apply to service contracts when the amount exceeds $2,500.

The GSA Form 2166, Service Contract Act of 1986 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (JUN 1988)

This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request the Contracting Officer will make their full text available.

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

52.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)

52.203-2 Gratuties (APR 84)

52.203-3 Covenant Against Contingent Fees (APR 84)

52.203-6 Restriction on Subcontractor Sales to the Government (JUL 86)

52.203-7 Anti-Kickback Procedures (OCT 88)

52.212-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)

52.232-23 Convict Labor (APR 84)

52.232-38 Opportunity (APR 84) (Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.232-35 Affirmative Action for Special Disabled and Vietnam Era Veterans (APR 84) (Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.232-37 Employment Reports on Special Disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era (JAN 88) (Applies whenever there is $2,500-35 is included)

52.222-6 Drug Free Workplace (JUL 90) (Applies if contract is awarded to an individual)

52.232-8 Buy American Act - Supplies (JAN 88)

52.232-11 Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases (MAY 92)

52.232-26 Prompt Payment (SEP 92)

52.233-1 Disputes (DEC 88)

52.233-3 Protest After Award (AUG 89)

52.241-1 Contractor Inspection Requirements (APR 84)

52.248-6 Default (Fixed-Price Supply and Service) (APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies:

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime and Compensation - (MAR 86) (Applies when amount is between $2,500 and $10,000)

52.222-20 Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (APR 84) (Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.241-3 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)

52.241-1 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Short Form) (APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime and Compensation - (MAR 86) (Applies when amount is between $2,500 and $10,000)

52.241-3 Changes - Fixed Price (APR 84) - Alt. II

52.241-4 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Services) (Short Form) (APR 84)
To: File
From: Tamar Nedzar, Law Clerk
Date: April 21, 2006
Re: No-Cost Extension to contract number E4014127 with the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University

Background:
Contract E4014127 with the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University ("contractor") was originally scheduled to be concluded on March 31, 2006. The contract's final products include a report on Voter Identification and a report on Provisional Voting. The contractor has vetted the reports with a Peer Review Group, pursuant to the terms of the contract.

Justification for No-Cost Extension:
The EAC wishes to supplement the contractor's Peer Review of the reports by adding another review process with some of the EAC's key stakeholders. The EAC proposes to assemble a panel of researchers during the week of May 8th to conduct the second review.

Following the second review, the contractor will revise its draft reports based on the comments it receives. The contractor will present its draft reports on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification to the EAC Advisory Board at its May 25th meeting in Washington, DC. The contractor will revise both draft reports, taking into account the EAC's Advisory Board's comments and submit the final reports to the EAC toward the end of June.

Recommendation:
The EAC recommends that contract E4014127 be modified at no cost to allow the contractor to complete their work by June 30, 2006.
AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of offers is extended.

The contractor is required to sign this document and return one copy to the issuing office.

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF Solicitations.

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.

B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).

C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:

D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

IMPORTANT: Contractor is not, is required to sign this document and return one copies to the issuing office.

NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)

NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)

CONTRACT MODIFICATION ORDER

SIGNATURES

4/25/06

013281

7640-01-182-0370
Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), request to provide consulting services to the EAC to assist in the development of a Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project. See the attached statement work for a description of the specifics.

LABOR COST: $50,000.00
TRAVEL COST: $5,000.00
TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $55,000.00

S. Election Assistance Commission (202) 566-3100

MAIL INVOICE TO: (Include zip code)

VERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

1. PAYING OFFICE

GSA FORM 300 (REV. 2-93)

013282
PURCHASE ORDER TERMS AND CONDITIONS

552.229-70 FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES (APR 1984)

The contract price includes all applicable Federal, State, and local taxes. No adjustment will be made to cover taxes which may subsequently be imposed on this transaction or changes in the rates of currently applicable taxes. However, the Government will, upon the request of the Contractor, furnish evidence appropriate to establish exemption from any tax from which the Government is exempt and which was not included in the contract price.

552.210-79 PACKING LIST (DEC 1989)

(a) A packing list or other suitable shipping document shall accompany each shipment and shall indicate (1) Name and address of consignor; (2) Name and address of consignee; (3) Government order or requisition number; (4) Government bill of lading number covering the shipment (if any); and (5) Description of the material shipped, including item number, quantity, number of containers, and package number (if any).

(b) When payment will be made by Government commercial credit card, in addition to the information in (a) above, the packing list or shipping document shall include: (1) Cardholder name and telephone number and (2) the term "Credit Card." 

52.232-1 PAYMENTS (APR 1984)

The Government shall pay the Contractor, upon the submission of proper invoices or vouchers, the prices stipulated in this contract. In connection with any discount offered for prompt payment, time shall be computed from the date of the invoice. For the purpose of computing an interest penalty that might be due the Contractor, Government acceptance shall be deemed to have occurred constructively on the 7th day (unless otherwise specified in block 20) after the Contractor delivered the supplies or performed the services in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, unless there is a disagreement over quantity, quality or contractor compliance with a contract provision...

52.222-40 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED - CONTRACTS OF $2,600 OR LESS (MAY 1989)

Except to the extent that an exception, variation, or tolerance would apply if this contract were in excess of $2,600, the Contractor and any subcontractor shall pay all employees working on the contract not less than the minimum wage specified under Section 8. (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 201-206).

52.222-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)

52.222-42 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRER'S (MAY 1989)

For the sole purpose of computing an interest penalty that might be due the Contractor, Government acceptance shall be deemed to have occurred constructively on the 7th day (unless otherwise specified in block 20) after the Contractor delivered the supplies or performed the services in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, unless there is a disagreement over quantity, quality or contractor compliance with a contract provision...

52.262-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (JUN 1988)

This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request the Contracting Officer will make their full text available:

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

52.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)

52.203-3 Gratuities (APR 84)

52.203-6 Covenant Against Contingent Fees (APR 84)

52.203-7 Anti-Kickback Procedures (OCT 88)

52.212-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)

52.222-2 Convict Labor (APR 84)

52.222-22 Equal Opportunity (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.222-38 Affirmative Action for Special Disabled and Vietnam Era Veterans (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.222-36 Affirmative Action for Handicapped Workers (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $2,600)

52.222-37 Employment Reports on Special Disabled Veterans and Vietnam Era Veterans of the Vietnam Era (JAN 88)(Applies whenever clause 52.222-36 is included)

52.231-2 Drug Free Workplace (JUL 90)(Applies if contract is awarded to an individual)

52.233-3 Buy American - Supplies (JAN 80)

52.233-11 Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases (MAY 92)

52.232-4 Price Disputes (SEP 92)

52.233-1 Disputes (DEC 91)

52.233-3 Protest After Award (AUG 89)

52.249-1 Contractor Inspection Requirements (APR 84)

52.249-8 Default (Fixed-Price Supply and Service)(APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:

52.222-24 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 86)(Applies when amount is between $2,600 and $10,000)

52.222-20 Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $2,600)

52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)

52.249-1 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Fixed Price)(Short Form)

52.249-4 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Services)(Short Form)(APR 84)

NOTE: Invoices must include the ACT number (block 4) and shall be submitted in an original only, unless otherwise specified to the billing office designated in block 24 to receive invoices. The "remit to" address must correspond to the remittance address in block 12.

(a)(6)(i) For the sole purpose of computing an interest penalty that might be due the Contractor, Government acceptance shall be deemed to have occurred constructively on the 7th day (unless otherwise specified in block 20) after the Contractor delivered the supplies or performed the services in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, unless there is a disagreement over quantity, quality or contractor compliance with a contract provision...

(a)(6)(ii) For the sole purpose of computing an interest penalty that might be due the Contractor, Government acceptance shall be deemed to have occurred constructively on the 7th day (unless otherwise specified in block 20) after the Contractor delivered the supplies or performed the services in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, unless there is a disagreement over quantity, quality or contractor compliance with a contract provision.

013283

GSA FORM 300 BACK (REV. 2-93)
Consulting Services to Assist EAC in the Development of a Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

Section 241 of HAVA lists a number of election administration topics on which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to do research. In particular, Section 241(b) (6) and (7) state the two topics of nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal offices; and identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation. The EAC Board of Advisors has recommended that the EAC make research on these topics a high priority.

The EAC seeks to obtain consulting services from an individual who can provide advice drawn from broad professional and technical experience in the area of voter fraud and intimidation. The EAC needs this consultant to conduct a preliminary examination of these topics to determine if a larger research project might be warranted. If so, the consultant would also be tasked to define the scope of the project and prepare a Statement of Work for the EAC to use for a subsequent competitive procurement. To promote a balanced and non-partisan approach to this effort, EAC is contracting with two consultants, who will work jointly to perform the work described below.

Nature of the Appointment

The EAC enters into this contract pursuant to its authority to contract for consultants under 5 U.S.C. §3109 (See 42 U.S.C. §15324(b)). As such this contract is for personal services and creates a limited employment relationship. (See 5 C.F.R. §304). As a result of this unique relationship, and pursuant to this agreement, you are required to follow all Federal laws and regulations as they relate to the release of agency documents and information, travel and conduct. All research, information, documents and any other intellectual property, (including but not limited to policies, procedures, manuals, and other work created at the request or otherwise while laboring for the EAC) shall be owned exclusively by the EAC, including copyright. All such work product shall be turned over to the EAC upon completion of your appointment term or as directed by the EAC. The EAC shall have exclusive rights over this material. You may not release government information or documents without the express permission of the EAC.

Supervision and Management.

The EAC Project Manager for this effort is Margaret Sims, EAC Research Specialist. Ms. Sims will provide taskings, and supervise, review and approve all work and performance.
Period of Appointment, Compensation and Travel.

The period of appointment under this contract is estimated at six months. The appointment shall constitute intermittent appointment (without a regularly scheduled tour of duty) per 5 C.F.R. §340.401(b). The consultant shall not incur overtime. The consultants shall not receive automatic adjustments of pay based upon 5 U.S.C. 5303. The consultants are not eligible for sick and annual leave, nor compensation for work performed on federal holidays. The Consultant is expected to work 450 hours during the estimated six month appointment period. These hours must be distributed evenly over the period so that the Consultant is working approximately, but no more than 20 hours per week. The consultant shall be paid at a rate of $111 per hour. The dates of performance are flexible but shall be based upon the needs of the project and the EAC. The project at issue is sought to be completed within the sixth month period. The period of appointment shall continue until the project, outlined below, is completed.

Consultant's duty station shall be his/her home or place of business. The consultant has access to and shall supply common office equipment to include telecommunications, internet, a computer, office supplies, facsimile machine and common workplace software (including Microsoft Word and Excel). Other resources will be provided by the EAC as needed and at its discretion.

The Consultant is required to travel on a periodic, as needed basis, throughout the duration of their appointment. All travel must be pre-approved by the EAC per Federal Travel Regulations and EAC policy. The Consultant will be reimbursed, at the Federal government rates, for hotel and ground transportation costs, proper incidental expenses, and per diem while on official, pre-approved EAC travel.

Areas of Responsibility


2. Using the description developed above, perform background research, including both Federal and State administrative and case law review, and a summation of current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics. Deliver a written summary of this research and all source documentation.

3. Work in consultation with other EAC staff and the Commissioners to identify a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The Working Group will be provided with the results of Tasks 1 and 2 as background information. The consultant will be responsible for developing a discussion agenda and convene the Working Group with the objective of identifying promising avenues for future research by EAC.
4. The consultant shall be responsible for creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and Working Group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future research resulting from this effort.

5. Should the EAC decide to pursue one or more of the recommendations made in the report noted above, the consultant will be responsible for defining the appropriate project scope(s) and preparing Statement(s) of Work sufficient for use in a competitive procurement.

Compensation Procedures

Compensation shall be made for work done by submitting invoices. Invoices shall be submitted on a monthly basis. These invoices shall state the number of labor hours that have been expended. Invoices shall be delivered to Ms. Margaret Sims for review and Ms. Diana Scott, Administrative Officer, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington DC 20005. Compensation for travel shall be submitted by travel voucher consistent with federal travel regulation and EAC requirements.

Termination

This consultant contract can be terminated without cause in advance of the current end date by two weeks' notice in writing by either of the parties.

Estimated Project Timetable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project work plan</td>
<td>10 days after contract award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress reports</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of voting fraud and voter intimidation</td>
<td>October 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of background research and associated source documentation</td>
<td>January 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene working group</td>
<td>February 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary report describing findings and recommendations for future EAC research</td>
<td>March 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement(s) of Work for future research project(s)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES

**ORDER NUMBER:** EAC 06-05  
**DATE OF ORDER:** 02/24/06

**Accounting Classification:**  
**Fund:** 8036  
**Org Code:** TZM91100  
**B/A Code:** 10  
**C/E Code:** 516  
**Project/Program No.:** CC-A

**Contact:** Job Serebrov

---

**Reference Your Order:**
- **Item:** Purchase
- **Terms:** Net 30

---

**ITEM NO.** | **SUPPLIES OR SERVICES** | **QUANTITY ORDERED** | **UNIT** | **UNIT PRICE** | **AMOUNT** |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
1 | Labor: $24,975.00  
Travel: $3,500.00  
**TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT:** $28,475.00 | | | | |
PURCHASE ORDER TERMS AND CONDITIONS

52.229-70 FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES (APR 1984)

The contract price includes all applicable Federal, State, and local taxes. No adjustment will be made to cover taxes which may subsequently be imposed on this transaction or changes in the rates of currently applicable taxes. However, the Government will, upon the request of the Contractor, furnish evidence appropriate to establish exemption from any tax from which the Government is exempt and which was not included in the contract price.

52.210-79 PACKING LIST (DEC 1989)

a) A packing list or other suitable shipping document shall accompany each shipment and shall indicate (1) Name and address of consignee; (2) Name and address of shipper; (3) Government bill of lading number covering the shipment (if any); and (6) Description of the material shipped, including arm number, quantity, number of containers, and package number (if any).

b) When payment will be made by Government commercial credit card, in addition to the information in (a) above, the packing list or shipping document shall include: (1) Cardholder name and telephone number; and (2) the term "Credit Card.”

2.232-1 PAYMENTS (APR 1984)

he Government shall pay the Contractor, upon the submission of proper invoices or vouchers, the prices stipulated in this contract for supplies delivered and accepted or services rendered and accepted, in any deductions provided in this contract. Unless otherwise specified in this contract, payment shall be made on partial deliveries accepted by the Government; (a) The amount due on the deliveries is at least $1,000 or 50 percent of the total contract price.

2.232-8 DISCOUNTS FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (APR 1989)

i) Discounts for prompt payment will not be considered in the valuation of offers. However, any offered discount will form a part of the award, and will be taken if payment is made within the discount period indicated in the offer by the offeror. As an alternative to offering a prompt payment discount in conjunction with the offer, offerors awarded contracts may include prompt payment discounts on individual invoices.

j) In connection with any discount offered for prompt payment, time shall be computed from the date of the invoice. For the purpose of computing the discount earned, payment shall be considered to have been made on the date which appears on the payment check or the ste on which an electronic funds transfer was made.

2.232-8 PROMPT PAYMENT

Prompt Payment clause 52.232-25 is incorporated in this contract by reference. The clause contains information on payment due date, voice requirements, constructive acceptance and interest penalties, but portions of the clause regarding payment due date, invoice requirements, and constructive acceptance have been extracted for your convenience. All days referred to in the exhibits below are calendar days.

2.292-1 The due date for making invoice payments by the designated person or office shall be the later of the following two events:

(a)(i) The 30th day after the designated billing office has received a copy invoice from the Contractor.

(ii) The 30th day after Government acceptance of supplies delivered or services performed by the Contractor.

(iii) An invoice shall be prepared and submitted to the designated billing office specified in the contract. A proper invoice must include all items listed in (i) through (vii). Within 30 days of receipt of the invoice, the Contractor will acknowledge the invoice and shall make any necessary adjustments.

(iv) Description, quantity, unit of measure, unit price, and extended cost of supplies delivered or services performed.

(v) Shipping and packing terms (e.g., shipment number and date of shipment, prompt payment discount, etc.). Bill of lading number and date of shipment shall be provided on Government bills of lading.

(vi) Name and address of Contractor official to whom payment is to be sent (must be the same as that in the contract or in a proper notice assignment).

(vii) Name (where practicable), title, phone number, and mailing address of person to be notified in event of a defective invoice.

NOTE: Invoices must include the ACT number (block 4) and shall be submitted in an original only, unless otherwise specified in block 24 to receive invoices. The amount due must correspond to the remittance address in block 12.

(a)(6) For the sole purpose of computing an interest penalty that might be due the Contractor, Government acceptance shall be deemed to have occurred constructively on the 7th day unless otherwise specified in block 24. If the Contractor delivered the supplies or performed the services in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, unless there is a disagreement over quality, quantity or contractor compliance with a contract provision.

52.222-40 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED - CONTRACTS OF $2,500 OR LESS (MAY 1989)

Except to the extent that an exception, variation, or tolerance would apply if the contract were not in excess of $2,500, the Contractor and any subcontractor shall pay all employees working on the contract not less than the minimum wages specified under Section 6 of (1) Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 201-206). Regulations and Interpretations of the Service Contract Act of 1965 are contained in 29 C.F.R Part 4.

52.222-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)

52.222-42 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRE (JAN 1989)

52.222-41 and 52.222-42 apply to service contracts when the amount exceeds $2,500.

The GSA Form 2168, Service Contract Act of 1965 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (JUN 1988)

This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request the Contracting Officer will make their full text available:

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

20.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)

20.203-3 (Gratuities (APR 84)

20.203-6 Restriction on Subcontractor Sales to the Government (JUL 86)

20.203-7 Anti-Kickback Procedures (OCT 88)

20.212-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)

(52.222-4 and 52.222-42 apply to service contracts when the amount exceeds $2,500.)

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 2) CLAUSES

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies:

22.222-3 Convict Labor (APR 84)

22.222-10 Equal Opportunity (APR 84) (Applicable when amount exceeds $1,000.)

22.222-35 Affirmative Action for Special Disabled and Vietnam Era Veterans (APR 84) (Applicable when amount exceeds $10,000.)

22.222-39 Affirmative Action for Handicapped Workers (APR 84) (Applicable when amount exceeds $2,500.)

22.222-37 Employment Reports on Special Disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era (JAN 88) (Applicable whenever clause 52.222-36 is included.)

22.222-38 Drug Free Workplace (JUL 90) (Applicable if contract is awarded to an individual)

22.222-17 Buy American Act - Supplies (JAN 89)

22.222-11 Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases (JUNE 92)

22.232-1 Prompt Payment (SEP 92)

22.233-1 Disputes (DEC 91)

22.233-3 Protest After Award (AUG 89)

22.241-1 Contractor Inspection Requirements (APR 84)

22.241-8 Default (Fixed-Price Supply and Service) (APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies:

22.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime (MAY 89) (Applicable when amount is between $2,500 and $10,000.)

22.222-20 Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (APR 84) (Applicable when amount exceeds $10,000.)

22.241-3 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)

22.241-1 Termination for convenience of the Government (Fixed Price) (Short Form) (APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:

22.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime (MAY 89) (Applicable when amount is between $2,500 and $10,000.)

22.241-3 Changes - Fixed Price (APR 84) - Alt. II

22.241-1 Termination for convenience of the Government (Short Form) (APR 84)

GSA FORM 300 BACK (REV. 2-93)
**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES**

**NOTE:** MARK ALL PACKAGES WITH:

12/24/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF ORDER</th>
<th>ORDER NUMBER</th>
<th>CONTRACT NUMBER</th>
<th>ACT NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/24/06</td>
<td>EAC 06-05</td>
<td>E4019905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPORTANT:**
- This form is not to be used as an invoice. See reverse for invoice requirements and payment information.
- The invoice remit to address must be the same as Block 12. Notify the contracting/ordering officer if the information in Block 12 is incorrect.
- Failure to show the ACT number (Block 4) on invoice will delay payment and render the invoice improper.
- Failure of service contractors to provide information in Block 9A will result in 20% of payment being withheld (26 U.S.C. 3406(a)).

**TO:** Contractor (Name, address and zip code)

ob Serebrov

Contact: Job Serebrov

**A. EMPLOYER'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER**

44-64-7486

**B. TYPE OF ORDER**

A. Purchase

**C. ISSUING OFFICE**

Office Assistance Commission

225 New York Ave, NW Suite - 1100

Washington, DC 20005

**D. REMITTANCE ADDRESS (MANDATORY)**

Job Serebrov

2110 South Spring Street

Little Rock, AR 72206

**12. PLACE OF INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE**

- S. EAC, 1225 NY Ave., NW, Suite 1100, Wash., DC 20005
- U.S. Election Assistance Commission

**13. SHIP TO**

Consignee address, zip code and telephone no.

Same as block 11

**20. SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor: $24,975.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel: $3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $28,475.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**23. TOTAL FROM 300-A(s)**

$28,475.00

**24. MAIL INVOICE TO:**

Federal Services Administration (FUND)

Election Assistance Commission

225 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20005

**25A. FOR INQUIRIES REGARDING PAYMENT CONTACT:**

Diana M. Scott (202) 566-3100

**25B. TELEPHONE NO.**

(202) 566-3100

**26A. NAME OF CONTRACTING/OFFICER (TYPE)**

Thomas P. Wilkey, Executive Director

**26B. TELEPHONE NO.**

(202) 566-3100

**26C. SIGNATURE**

[Signature]

**2. CONTRACTORS ORIGINAL**

GSA FORM 300 (REV. 2-93)
PURCHASE ORDER TERMS AND CONDITIONS

52.229-70 FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES (APR 1984)

The contract price includes all applicable Federal, State, and local taxes. No adjustment will be made to cover taxes which may subsequently be imposed on this transaction or changes in the rates of currently applicable taxes. However, the Government will, upon the request of the Contractor, furnish evidence appropriate to establish exemption from any tax from which the Government is exempt and which was not included in the contract price.

52.210-79 PACKING LIST (DEC 1989)

(a) A packing list or other suitable shipping document shall accompany each shipment and shall indicate: (1) Name and address of consignor; (2) Name and address of consignee; (3) Government order number and contract number; (4) Government bill of lading number covering the shipment (if any); and (5) Description of the material shipped, including item number, quantity, number of containers, and package number (if any).

(b) When payment will be made by Government commercial credit card, in addition to the information in (a) above, the packing list or shipping document shall include: (1) Cardholder name and telephone number; and (2) the term “Credit Card”.

2.232-1 PAYMENTS (APR 1984)

The Government shall pay the Contractor, upon the submission of proper invoices or vouchers, the prices stipulated in this contract for supplies delivered or services performed. The Government will make no any deductions provided in this contract. Unless otherwise specified in this contract, payment shall be made on partial deliveries accepted by the Government; (a) The amount due on the deliveries unless it is $1,000 or 50 percent of the total contract price.

2.232-8 DISCOUNTS FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (APR 1989)

(a) Discounts for prompt payment will not be considered in the valuation of offers. However, any offered discount will form a part of the award, and will be taken into payment is made within the discount period indicated in the offer by the offeror. As an alternative to offering a prompt payment discount in connection with the offer, offerors awarded contracts may include prompt payment discounts on individual invoices.

(b) In connection with any discount offered for prompt payment, time shall be computed from the date of the invoice. For the purpose of computing the account earned, payment shall be considered to have been made on the date which appears on the payment check or the date on which an electronic funds transfer was made.

ROMPT PAYMENT

Prompt Payment clause 52.232-26 is incorporated in this contract by reference. The clause contains information on payment due date, invoice requirements, constructive acceptance, and interest penalties. Certain portions of the clause regarding payment due date, invoice requirements, and constructive acceptance have been extracted for our convenience. All days referred to in the extracts below are calendar days.

(i) The 30th day after the designated billing office has received a proper invoice from the Contractor.

(ii) The 30th day after Government acceptance of supplies delivered or services performed by the Contractor.

(j) (i) An invoice shall be prepared and submitted to the designated billing office specified in the contract. A proper invoice must include the items listed in (i) through (vii). If the invoice does not comply with these requirements, then the Contractor will be notified of the defect within 7 days after receipt of the invoice at the designated billing office. Unilateral notification will be taken into account in the computation of any interest penalty owed the Contractor.

(i) Name and address of the Contractor.

(ii) Invoice date.

(iii) Contract number or other authorization for supplies delivered or services performed (including order number and contract line item number).

(iv) Description, quantity, unit of measure, unit price, and extended price of supplies delivered or services performed.

(v) Shipping and payment terms (e.g., shipment number and date of shipment, prompt payment discount terms). Bill of lading number and weight of shipment will be shown for shipments on Government bills of lading.

(vi) Name and address of Contractor official to whom payment is to be sent (must be the same as that in the contract or in a proper notice of assignment).

(vii) Name (where practicable), title, phone number, and mailing address of person to be notified in event of a defective invoice.

NOTE: Invoices must include the ACT number (block 4) and shall be submitted in an original only, unless otherwise specified, to the billing office designated in block 24. The remittance address must correspond to the remittance address in block 12.

(a)(6)(i) For the sole purpose of computing an interest penalty that might be due the Contractor, Government acceptance shall be deemed to have occurred constructively on the 7th day (unless otherwise specified in block 20) after the Contractor delivered the supplies or performed the services in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, unless there is a disagreement over quantity, quality or contractor compliance with a contract provision.

52.222-40 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED - CONTRACTS OF $2,500 OR LESS (MAY 1989)

Except to the extent that an exception, variation, or tolerance would apply if this contract were in excess of $2,500, the Contractor and any subcontractor shall pay all employees working on the contract not less than the minimum wage specified under Section 6 (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 201-206). Regulations and interpretations of the Service Contract Act of 1985 are contained in 29 CFR Part 4.

52.222-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)

52.222-42 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRES (MAY 1989)

52.222-41 and 52.222-42 apply to service contracts when the amount exceeds $2,500.

The GSA Form 2166, Service Contract Act of 1965 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached hereeto and is made a part hereof.

52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (JUN 1988)

This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request the Contracting Officer will make their full text available:

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

52.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)

52.203-3 Gratuities (APR 84)

52.203-6 Covenant Against Contingent Fees (APR 84)

52.203-7 Anti-Kickback Procedures (OCT 88)

52.212-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)

52.222-3 Convict Labor (APR 84)

52.222-26 Equal Opportunity (APR 84)(Applicable when amount exceeds $4,500)

52.222-36 Affirmative Action for Special Disabled and Vietnam Era Veterans (APR 84)(Applicable when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.222-36 Affirmative Action for Handicapped Workers (APR 84)(Applicable when amount exceeds $2,500)

52.223-37 Employment Reports on Special Disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era (JAN 88)(Applicable whenever clause 52.223-36 is included.

52.233-3 Drug Free Workplace (JUL 90)(Applicable if contract is awarded to an individual)

52.233-3 Buy American Act - Supplies (JAN 89)

52.226-11 Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases (MAY 92)

52.232-25 Prompt Payment (SEP 92)

52.233-3 Protest After Award (AUG 96)

52.246-1 Contractor Inspection Requirements (APR 84)

52.246-6 Default (Fixed-Price Supply and Service)(APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies:

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 88)(Applicable when amount is between $2,600 and $10,000.)

52.222-20 Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (APR 84)(Applicable when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)

52.249-1 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Short Form)(APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 88)(Applicable when amount exceeds $2,500)

52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (APR 84) - Alt. II

52.249-4 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Services) (Short Form)(APR 84)
ACT NUMBER E4019905; EAC CONTRACT NUMBER 06-05
Personal Services Contract for Interim Expert Services

Background

Section 241 of HAVA lists a number of election administration topics on which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to do research. In particular, Section 241(b)(6) and (7) state the two topics of nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal offices; and identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation. The EAC Board of Advisors has recommended that the EAC make research on these topics a high priority.

The EAC seeks to obtain consulting services from an individual who can provide advice drawn from broad professional and technical experience in the area of voter fraud and intimidation. The EAC needs this expert to conduct a preliminary examination of these topics to determine if a larger research project might be warranted. To promote a balanced and non-partisan approach to this effort, EAC is contracting with two experts, who will work jointly to perform the work described below. This contract is a follow-on agreement to EAC Contract Number 05-67. That agreement for non-severable services expires February 25, 2006, without completion of the project. The originally estimated labor hours for the project were insufficient. As such, the EAC seeks to continue the work started in the previous contract but has changed the scope (or duties) of the contractor to limit project costs. This change is reflected in the scope of work section, below.

Nature of the Appointment

The EAC enters into this contract pursuant to its authority to contract for consultants and experts under 5 U.S.C. §3109 (See 42 U.S.C. §15324(b)). As such, this contract is for personal services and creates a limited employment relationship. (See 5 C.F.R. §304). The initial appointment under this agreement shall be for the intermittent employment of an expert as defined by 5 C.F.R. §304.102(d) and (e). The expert (hereinafter “contractor”) shall work as required by the EAC, without a regularly scheduled tour of duty. Under no circumstances may contractor work more than 225 hours during the term of this agreement (5 C.F.R. §304.103(c)(2)(i)).

Supervision and Management.

The EAC Manager and Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) for this effort is Peggy Sims. Ms. Sims will provide taskings, and authorize, supervise, review and approve all work and performance. She will also approve all labor hours on invoices and travel vouchers submitted for compensation under this agreement.
Period of Appointment.

The appointment under this contract is temporary and shall be for a period of up to four months. The contract period shall begin February 26, 2006. The contract may be extended and contractor reappointed for an additional period (not exceed one year) upon agreement of both parties. (See 5 C.F.R. §304.103(c)).

Compensation

The consultant shall be paid at a rate of $111 per hour. Contractor shall perform the services prescribed by this agreement as directed by the COR on an intermittent basis. However, in any event, the contractor shall not work more that [41 hours] in either of the 2 two week periods that make up each four week pay period. Further, as aforementioned, the contractor may not work more than 225 hours during the term of this agreement. The dates of performance are flexible but shall be based upon the needs of the project and the EAC. COR shall provide contractor notice and authorization when performance under this agreement is required.

The consultant shall not incur overtime and is not eligible for premium pay under subchapter V of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code. (5 C.F.R. §304.106(b)). The contractor, as an intermittent appointee, is also not entitled to sick or annual leave. Contractor will not receive compensation for Federal holidays when no work is performed. (5 C.F.R. §304.106(b)). The contractor shall not receive automatic adjustments of pay based upon 5 U.S.C. §5303. Contractor's pay rate may be increased at the sole discretion of the Contracting Officer, consistent with Federal regulations. Contractor may be reimbursed for other costs, such as local travel, consistent with this agreement if approved by the COR and submitted in writing via invoice.

Travel

The contractor may be required to travel on a periodic, as needed basis, throughout the duration of their appointment. All travel must be pre-approved by the EAC COR. The contractor will be reimbursed for hotel and ground transportation costs, proper incidental expenses, and per diem while on official, pre-approved EAC travel. Compensation for travel shall be made in accordance with the rates set forth in the Federal Travel Regulation. The amount reimbursed for travel shall not exceed $3,500 in Federal Fiscal Year 2006.

Release of Information

As a result of the limited employment relationship created by this agreement, and pursuant to this agreement, you are required to follow all Federal laws and regulations as they relate to the release of agency documents and information. All research, information, documents and any other intellectual property (including but not limited to policies, procedures, manuals, and other work created at the request or otherwise while laboring for the EAC) shall be owned exclusively by the EAC, including copyright. All
such work product shall be turned over to the EAC upon completion of your appointment term or as directed by the EAC. The EAC shall have exclusive rights over this material. You may not release government information or documents without the express written permission of the EAC.

Compensation Procedures

Compensation shall be made for work done (labor hours) by submitting invoices. Invoices shall be submitted every four weeks from the date of award. A week shall be from Sunday to Saturday. The first pay period shall begin February 26, 2006. Invoices must be submitted every 4 weeks when compensable work under this contract has been performed. The COR will provide the contractor with an invoice schedule, identifying each of the invoice periods, and model invoice forms. Invoices shall be delivered to the COR for review and approval. Each invoice shall:

(1) Identify each day (by date) that work was performed and the number of labor hours performed that day. Briefly describe the nature of the work perform for that day;
(2) State the total number of labor hours that have been expended under the agreement for the invoice period;
(3) State the total number of hours worked for each of the two week periods that make up the total invoice time;
(4) Provide a cumulative total of hours worked during the entire contract performance period (one year);
(5) Submit, as a separate line item, all reimbursable travel costs for approval. The submission must provide dates of travel, receipts and other information as required by the Federal Travel Regulation.
(6) Include the contractor’s signature, affirming that information contained in the invoice is accurate.

Duty Location

Contractor’s duty station shall be his/her home or place of business. The contractor has access to and shall supply common office equipment to include telecommunications, internet access, a computer, office supplies, facsimile machine and common workplace software (including Microsoft Word, Project and Excel). All other resources will be provided by the EAC as needed and at its discretion.

Notices

Any notice, given by any of the parties hereunder, shall be sufficient only if in writing and delivered in person or sent by telegraph, telegram, registered, or regular mail as follows:

To EAC: 1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20005,
Attention: Contracting Officer Representative, Peggy Sims.
To Contractor: At EAC and at the Contractor's address shown on the Cover Page of this contract or to such other address as either of such parties shall designate by notice given as herein required. Notices hereunder shall be effective in accordance with this clause or on the effective date of the notice whichever is later.

Areas of Responsibility (Statement of Work)

1. Submit a revised work plan reflecting revised due dates for deliverables.


3. Using the description developed for 2 above, perform background research, including both Federal and State administrative and case law review, and a summation of current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics. Deliver a written summary of this research and all source documentation.

4. Work in consultation with other EAC staff and the Commissioners to identify a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The Working Group will be provided with the results of the consultant's research (discussed in 2 and 3, above) as background information. The consultant will be responsible for developing a discussion agenda and convene the Working Group with the objective of identifying promising avenues for future research by EAC.

5. The consultant shall be responsible for creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and Working Group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort.

Terms and Conditions

The following additional terms and conditions shall apply to this personal services contract:

a. Federal Acquisition Regulation Clauses Incorporated by Reference:

This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available. These clauses may be obtained on the internet at http://farsite.hill.af.mil/.

52.203-7 Anti-Kickback Procedures (JUL 1995)

52.203-12 Limitation on Payments to Influence Certain Federal Transactions (Sept 2005)
b. Federal Acquisition Regulation Clauses in Full Text:

**Contract Termination (FAR 52.249-12)**

The Government may terminate this contract at any time upon at least 15 days' written notice by the Contracting Officer to the Contractor. The Contractor, with the written consent of the Contracting Officer, may terminate this contract upon at least 15 days' written notice to the Contracting Officer. (End of Clause)

**Site Visit (FAR 52.237-1)**

Offerors or quoters are urged and expected to inspect the site where services are to be performed and to satisfy themselves regarding all general and local conditions that may affect the cost of contract performance, to the extent that the information is reasonably obtainable. In no event shall failure to inspect the site constitute grounds for a claim after contract award. (End of Clause)

**Protection of Government Buildings, Equipment, and Vegetation (FAR 52.237-2)**

The Contractor shall use reasonable care to avoid damaging existing buildings, equipment, and vegetation on the Government installation. If the Contractor's failure to use reasonable care causes damage to any of this property, the Contractor shall replace or repair the damage at no expense to the Government as the Contracting Officer directs. If the Contractor fails or refuses to make such repair or replacement, the Contractor shall be liable for the cost, which may be deducted from the contract price. (End of Clause)

**Covenant Against Contingent Fees (FAR 52.203-5)**

(a) The Contractor warrants that no person or agency has been employed or retained to solicit or obtain this contract upon an agreement or understanding for a contingent fee, except a bona fide employee or agency. For breach or violation of this warranty,
the Government shall have the right to annul this contract without liability or, in its
discretion, to deduct from the contract price or consideration, or otherwise recover,
the full amount of the contingent fee.

(b) "Bona fide agency," as used in this clause, means an established commercial or
selling agency, maintained by a contractor for the purpose of securing business, that
neither exerts nor proposes to exert improper influence to solicit or obtain
Government contracts nor holds itself out as being able to obtain any Government
contract or contracts through improper influence.

"Bona fide employee," as used in this clause, means a person, employed by a
contractor and subject to the contractor's supervision and control as to time, place,
and manner of performance, who neither exerts nor proposes to exert improper
influence to solicit or obtain Government contracts nor holds itself out as being able
to obtain any Government contract or contracts through improper influence.

"Contingent Fee," as used in this clause, means any commission, percentage,
brokerage, or other fee that is contingent upon the success that a person or concern
has in securing a Government contract.

"Improper influence," as used in this clause, means any influence that induces or
tends to induce a Government employee or officer to give consideration or to act
regarding a Government contract on any basis other than the merits of the matter.
(End of Clause)

Disputes (FAR 52.233-1), Alternate I

(a) This contract is subject to the Contract Disputes Act of 1978, as amended (41

(b) Except as provided in the Act, all disputes arising under or relating to this contract
shall be resolved under this clause.

(c) “Claim,” as used in this clause, means a written demand or written assertion by
one of the contracting parties seeking, as a matter of right, the payment of money in a
sum certain, the adjustment or interpretation of contract terms, or other relief arising
under or relating to this contract. However, a written demand or written assertion by
the Contractor seeking the payment of money exceeding $100,000 is not a claim
under the Act until certified. A voucher, invoice, or other routine request for payment
that is not in dispute when submitted is not a claim under the Act. The submission
may be converted to a claim under the Act, by complying with the submission and
certification requirements of this clause, if it is disputed either as to liability or
amount or is not acted upon in a reasonable time.

(d) (1) A claim by the Contractor shall be made in writing and, unless otherwise
stated in this contract, submitted within 6 years after accrual of the claim to the
Contracting Officer for a written decision. A claim by the Government against the
Contractor shall be subject to a written decision by the Contracting Officer.
(2)

(i) The contractor shall provide the certification specified in paragraph (d)(2)(iii) of this clause when submitting any claim exceeding $100,000.

(ii) The certification requirement does not apply to issues in controversy that have not been submitted as all or part of a claim.

(iii) The certification shall state as follows: "I certify that the claim is made in good faith; that the supporting data are accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief; that the amount requested accurately reflects the contract adjustment for which the Contractor believes the Government is liable; and that I am duly authorized to certify the claim on behalf of the Contractor."

(3) The certification may be executed by any person duly authorized to bind the Contractor with respect to the claim.

(e) For Contractor claims of $100,000 or less, the Contracting Officer must, if requested in writing by the Contractor, render a decision within 60 days of the request. For Contractor-certified claims over $100,000, the Contracting Officer must, within 60 days, decide the claim or notify the Contractor of the date by which the decision will be made.

(f) The Contracting Officer's decision shall be final unless the Contractor appeals or files a suit as provided in the Act.

(g) If the claim by the Contractor is submitted to the Contracting Officer or a claim by the Government is presented to the Contractor, the parties, by mutual consent, may agree to use alternative dispute resolution (ADR). If the Contractor refuses an offer for ADR, the Contractor shall inform the Contracting Officer, in writing, of the Contractor's specific reasons for rejecting the offer.

(h) The Government shall pay interest on the amount found due and unpaid from

(1) the date that the Contracting Officer receives the claim (certified, if required); or

(2) the date that payment otherwise would be due, if that date is later, until the date of payment.

With regard to claims having defective certifications, as defined in FAR 33.201, interest shall be paid from the date that the Contracting Officer initially receives the claim. Simple interest on claims shall be paid at the rate, fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in the Act, which is applicable to the period during which the Contracting Officer receives the claim and then at the rate applicable for each 6-month period as fixed by the Treasury Secretary during the pendency of the claim.
(i) The Contractor shall proceed diligently with performance of this contract, pending final resolution of any request for relief, claim, appeal, or action arising under or relating to the contract, and comply with any decision of the Contracting Officer. (End of Clause)

By signing below, contractor agrees to furnish the personal services set forth or otherwise identified, above, consistent with the conditions noted above and for the consideration stated herein.

Contractor: 

[Signature]

Job Surobrov

EAC Contracting Officer: 

[Signature]

Thomas Wilkey
Executive Director
ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES

1. DATE OF ORDER: 02/24/06
2. ORDER NUMBER: EAC 06-04
3. CONTRACT NUMBER: EAC 06-04
4. VENDOR NAME: Tova Wang
5. ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION:
   - FUND: TZM91100
   - ORG CODE: 8036
   - B/A CODE: 10
   - O/C CODE: 25
   - AC: 516
   - CC-A
   - MDL: FI
   - G/L DEBT: LC
6. FINANCE DIVISION: DISCOUNT

TO: CONTRACTOR (Name, address and zip code)

Tova Wang

Contact: Tova Wang

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FOR GOVERNMENT USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUND</td>
<td>ORG CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TZM91100</td>
<td>8036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/C CODE</td>
<td>PROJ./PROS. NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/ITEM</td>
<td>PRT./CRFT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. TYPE OF ORDER:
   - A. PURCHASE
   - B. DELIVERY

B. CONSTRUCTION
   - SUBCONTRACT

C. MODIFICATION NO.

I. EMPLOYER'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

9. CHECK, IF APPROPRIATE:
   - WITHHOLD 20%

10. FUNDING:
    - SMALL BUSINESS
    - OTHER THAN SMALL BUSINESS
    - SMALL BUSINESS

11. ISSUING OFFICE:
    - Address, zip code, and telephone no.

12. REMITTANCE ADDRESS (Mandatory):
    - Tova Wang
    - 201 West 74th Street, Apt. 11F
    - New York, NY 10023

13. PLACE OF INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE:
    - U.S. Election Assistance Commission
    - 25 New York Ave., NW Suite 1100, Wash., DC 20005

14. RECUSION OFFICE:
    - Address, symbol and telephone no.

15. F.O.B. POINT:
    - S. EAC, 1225 NY Ave., NW, Suite 1100, Wash., DC 20005

16. GOVERNMENT B/L NO.

17. DELIVERY F.O.B. POINT ON OR BEFORE:
    - 2/26/06
    - Net 30

20. SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). Request to provide consulting services to the EAC to assist in the development of a Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project. See the attached statement work for a description of the specifics. Labor: $24,975.00 Travel: $3,448.34 TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $28,423.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. PAYING OFFICE:
   - Sure Services Administration (FUND)
   - Election Assistance Commission
   - 5 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 1100
   - Wash., DC 20005

23. GROSS SHIP WT.: 28,423.34

25A. FOR INQUIRIES REGARDING PAYMENT CONTACT:
    - Diana M. Scott

25B. TELEPHONE NO.
    - (202) 566-3100

26A. NAME OF CONTRACTING/ORDERING OFFICER (Type of officer)
    - Thomas H. Wilkey, Executive Director

26B. TELEPHONE NO.
    - (202) 566-3100
PURCHASE ORDER TERMS AND CONDITIONS

52.229-70 FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES (APR 1984)
The contract price includes all applicable Federal, State, and local taxes. No adjustment will be made to cover taxes which may be assessed against the Contractor, and no evidence appropriate to establish exemption from any tax from which the Government is exempt and which was not included in the contract price.

52.210-79 PACKING LIST (DEC 1989)
(a) A packing list or other suitable shipping document shall accompany each shipment and shall indicate: (1) Name and address of consignor; (2) Name and address of consignee; (3) Government order or requisition number; (4) Government bill of lading number (if any); and (5) Description of the material shipped, including item number, quantity, number of containers, and package number (if any).

(b) When payment will be made by Government commercial credit card, in addition to the information in (a) above, the packing list or shipping document shall include: (1) Cardholder name and telephone number and (2) the term "Credit Card".

32.232-1 PAYMENTS (APR 1984)
The Government shall pay the Contractor, upon the submission of proper invoices or vouchers, the prices stipulated in this contract for supplies delivered and accepted or services rendered and accepted, less any reductions provided in this contract. Unless otherwise specified in this contract, payment shall be made on partial deliveries accepted by the Government if: (a) The amount due on the delivery warrants it; or (b) The Contractor requests it and the amount due on the delivery is at least $1,000 or 50 percent of the total contract price.

2.232-8 DISCOUNTS FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (APR 1989)
(a) Discounts for prompt payment will not be considered in the valuation of offers. However, any offered discount will form a part of the award, and will be taken if payment is made within the discount period indicated in the offer by the offeror. As an alternative to offering a prompt payment discount in conjunction with the offer, offerors awarded contracts may include prompt payment discounts on individual invoices.

(b) In connection with any discount offered for prompt payment, time shall be computed from the date of the invoice. For the purposes of computing the discount earned, payment shall be considered to have been made on the date which appears on the payment check or the date on which an electronic funds transfer was made.

3OMPT PAYMENT
Prompt Payment clause 52.232-25 is incorporated in this contract by reference. The clause contains information on payment due date, invoice requirements, constructive acceptance and interest penalties. All portions of the clause regarding payment due date, invoice requirements, and constructive acceptance have been extracted for your convenience. All days referred to in the extracts below are calendar days.

(2) The 30th day after the designated billing office has received a copy of the invoice from the Contractor.

(i) The 30th day after Government acceptance of supplies delivered or services performed by the Contractor . . . .

(4) An invoice shall be prepared and submitted to the designated billing office specified in the contract. A proper invoice must include all items listed in . . . . (i) through . . . . (viii) . . . . If the invoice does not comply with these requirements, then the Contractor will be notified from within 10 days after receipt of the invoice at the designated billing office . . . . Untimely notification will be taken into account in the computation of any interest penalty owed the Contractor . . . .

(i) Name and address of the Contractor.

(ii) Invoice date.

(iii) Contract number or other authorization for supplies delivered or services performed (including order number and contract line item number).

(iv) Description; quantity, unit of measure, unit price, and extended price of supplies delivered or services performed.

(v) Shipping and payment terms (e.g., shipment number and date of shipment, prompt payment discount terms). Bill of lading number and date of shipment will be shown for shipments on Government bills of lading.

(vi) Name and address of Contractor official to whom payment is to be sent (must be the same as that in the contract or in a proper notice assignment).

(vii) Name (where practicable), title, phone number, and mailing address of person to be notified in event of a defective invoice.

NOTE: Invoices must include the ACT number (block 4) and shall be sent to an original address unless otherwise specified to the billing office designated in block 2. The "Act" to address must correspond to the remittance address in block 12.

(a)(6) For the sole purpose of computing an interest penalty that might be due the Contractor, Government acceptance shall be deemed constructive on the 7th day (unless otherwise specified in block 20) after the Contractor delivered the supplies or performed the services concerned in accord with the terms and conditions of the contract unless there is a disagreement over quantity, quality, or whether or not the Contractor complied with a contract provision . . . .

52.222-40 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED - CONTRACTS OF $2,500 OR LESS (MAY 1989)
Except to the extent that an exception, variation, or tolerance would apply if this contract were in excess of $2,500, the Contractor and any subcontractor shall pay all employees working on the contract not less than the minimum wage specified under Section 6 a) (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 201-206). Regulations and Interpretations of the Service Contract Act of 1985 are contained in 29 CFR Part 4.

52.222-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)

52.222-42 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRES (MAY 1989)
(52.222-41 and 52.222-42 apply to service contracts when the amount exceeds $2,500).

The GSA Form 2106, Service Contract Act of 1965 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (JUN 1988)
This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request the Contracting Officer will make their full text available:

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES
Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

2.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)

2.203-3 Gratuities (APR 84)

2.203-4 Covenant Against Contingent Fees (APR 84)

2.203-6 Restriction on Subcontractor Sales to the Government (JUL 86)

2.203-7 Anti-Kickback Procedures (OCT 88)

2.212-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)
(In the preceding clause, the permissible variations are stated in the schedule.)

2.223-3 Convict Labor (APR 84)

2.223-6 Correct Employment Opportunity (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

2.223-36 Affirmative Action for Special Disabled and Vietnam Era Veterans (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

2.223-38 Affirmative Action for Handicapped Workers (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

2.223-37 Employment Reports on Special Disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era (JAN 88)(Applies whenever clause 2.223-26 is included)

2.223-6 Drug Free Workplace (JUL 90)(Applies if contract is awarded to an individual)

2.223-3 Buy American Act - Supplies (JAN 89)

2.223-11 Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases (MAY 92)

2.223-25 Prompt Payment (SEP 92)

2.233-1 Disputes (OCT 91)

2.233-3 Protest After Award (AUG 89)

2.246-1 Contractor Inspection Requirements (APR 84)

2.249-8 Default (Fixed-Price Supply and Service)(APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:

2.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 86)(Applies when amount exceeds $2,500 and $10,000)

52.222-21-20 Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)

52.243-1 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Short Form)(APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 86)(Applies when amount exceeds $2,500)

52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (APR 84) - Alt. II

52.243-4 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Services)(Short Form)(APR 84)

GSA FORM 300 BACK (REV. 2-93)
**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES**

**NOTE:** MARK ALL PACKAGES WITH  
ORDER NUMBER/CONTRACT NUMBER

**DATE OF ORDER** | 2/24/06
---|---
**ORDER NUMBER** | EAC 06-04
**CONTRACT NUMBER** | E4019904
**ACT NUMBER** | 1

**IMPORTANT:**
- This form is not to be used as an invoice. See reverse for invoice requirements and payment information.
- The invoice remit to address must be the same as Block 12. Notify the contracting/ordering officer if the information in Block 12 is incorrect.
- Failure to show the ACT number (Block 4) on invoice will delay payment and render the invoice improper.
- Failure to mail invoice to address in Block 24 will delay payment.
- Failure of service contractors to provide information in Block 9A will result in 20% of payment being withheld (26 U.S.C. 3406(a)).

**TO:** CONTRACTOR  
(Name, address and zip code)
Tova Wang

**CONTACT:** Tova Wang

**EMPLOYER'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER** | 19-70-1137
---|---
**A. CLASSIFICATION** | A. SMALL BUSINESS
**B. OTHER THAN** | 
**C. SMALL BUSINESS-OWNED** | 
**D. SMALL WOMEN-OWNED** | 
**ISSUING OFFICE** | Election Assistance Commission

25 New York Ave, NW Suite - 1100  
Washington, DC 20005

**REMITTANCE ADDRESS** (Mandatory) | Tova Wang  
201 West 74th Street, Apt. 11F  
New York, NY 10023

**SHIP TO** (Consignee address, zip code and telephone no.) | Same as block 11

**PLACE OF INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE** | S. EAC, 1225 NY Ave., NW, Suite 1100, Wash., DC 20005

**U.S. Election Assistance Commission**

**F.O.B. POINT** | 25 New York Ave, NW Suite - 1100  
**GOVERNMENT B/L NO.** | 

**DELIVERY F.O.B. POINT OR BEFORE** | 2/26/06
**PAYMENT/DISCOUNT TERMS** | Net 30

**20. SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). Request to provide consulting services to the EAC to assist in the development of a Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project. See the attached statement work for a description of the specifics. Labor: $24,975.00 Travel: $3,448.34 TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $28,423.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECEIVING OFFICE** (Name, symbol and telephone no.) | Election Assistance Commission (202) 566-3100

**SHIPPI NG POINT** |

**MAIL INVOICE TO:** (Include zip code)  
(U.S. Election Assistance Commission (FUND)

**26A. NAME OF CONTRACTING/ORDERING OFFICER (Type)** | Diana M. Scott
**26B. TELEPHONE NO.** | (202) 566-3100

**28A. NAME OF CONTRACTING/ORDERING OFFICER (Type)** | Thomas R. Wilkey, Executive Director
**28B. TELEPHONE NO.** | (202) 566-3100

**26C. SIGNATURE** | [Signature]

**15. REQUISITION OFFICE** (Name, symbol and telephone no.) | U.S. Election Assistance Commission

**FUND** |

**25. GROSS SHIP WT.** |
**GRAND TOTAL** | $28,423.34

**30. TOTAL FROM 300-A(a)** | $28,423.34

**GSA FORM 300 (REV. 2-93)**
Pursuant to the Acquisition Regulation (48 CFR Chapter 1) Clauses

52.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)
52.203-3 Gratuities (APR 84)
52.203-6 Covenant Against Contingent Fees (APR 84)
52.203-8 Restriction on Subcontractor Sales to the Government (JUL 85)
52.203-7 Anti-Kickback Procedures (OCT 88)
52.212-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)
52.222-41 Service Contract Act of 1965, as Amended (MAY 1989)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:
52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 86) (Applies when amount exceeds $2,500 and $10,000.)
52.222-20 Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (APR 84) (Applies when amount exceeds $10,000.)
52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (APR 84) - Alt. II
52.249-4 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Fixed Price)(Short Form)(APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies:
52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 86) (Applies when amount is between $2,500 and $10,000.)
52.222-23 Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (APR 84) (Applies when amount exceeds $2,500.)
52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)
52.248-1 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Fixed Price)(Short Form)(APR 84)

52.222-41 Service Contract Act of 1965, as Amended - CONTRACTS OF $2,500 OR LESS (MAY 1989)

Except to the extent that an exception, variation, or tolerance would apply if this contract were in excess of $2,500, the Contractor shall pay all employees working on the contract not less than the minimum wage specified under Section 6 (a) (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 201-206).

ACT NUMBER E4019904, EAC CONTRACT NUMBER 06-04
Personal Services Contract for Interim Expert Services

Background

Section 241 of HAVA lists a number of election administration topics on which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to do research. In particular, Section 241(b) (6) and (7) state the two topics of nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal offices; and identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation. The EAC Board of Advisors has recommended that the EAC make research on these topics a high priority.

The EAC seeks to obtain consulting services from an individual who can provide advice drawn from broad professional and technical experience in the area of voter fraud and intimidation. The EAC needs this expert to conduct a preliminary examination of these topics to determine if a larger research project might be warranted. To promote a balanced and non-partisan approach to this effort, EAC is contracting with two experts, who will work jointly to perform the work described below. This contract is a follow-on agreement to EAC Contract Number 05-65. That agreement for non-severable services expires February 15, 2006, without completion of the project. The originally estimated labor hours for this project were insufficient. As such, the EAC seeks to continue the work started in the previous contract but has changed the scope (or duties) of the contractor to limit project costs. This change is reflected in the scope of work section, below.

Nature of the Appointment

The EAC enters into this contract pursuant to its authority to contract for consultants and experts under 5 U.S.C. §3109 (See 42 U.S.C. §15324(b)). As such, this contract is for personal services and creates a limited employment relationship. (See 5 C.F.R. §304). The initial appointment under this agreement shall be for the intermittent employment of an expert as defined by 5 C.F.R. §304.102(d) and (e). The expert (hereinafter "contractor") shall work as required by the EAC, without a regularly scheduled tour of duty. Under no circumstances may contractor work more than 275 hours during the term of this agreement (5 C.F.R. §304.103(c)(2)(i)).

Supervision and Management.

The EAC Manager and Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) for this effort is Peggy Sims. Ms Sims will provide taskings, and authorize, supervise, review and approve all work and performance. She will also approve all labor hours on invoices and travel vouchers submitted for compensation under this agreement.
Period of Appointment.

The appointment under this contract is temporary and shall be for a period of up to four months. The contract period shall begin February 26, 2006. The contract may be extended and contractor reappointed for an additional period (not exceed one year) upon agreement of both parties. (See 5 C.F.R. §304.103(c)).

Compensation

The consultant shall be paid at a rate of $111 per hour. Contractor shall perform the services prescribed by this agreement as directed by the COR on an intermittent basis. However, in any event, the contractor shall not work more than 41 hours in either of the two week periods that make up each four week pay period. Further, as aforementioned, the contractor may not work more than 225 hours during the term of this agreement. The dates of performance are flexible but shall be based upon the needs of the project and the EAC. COR shall provide contractor notice and authorization when performance under this agreement is required.

The consultant shall not incur overtime and is not eligible for premium pay under subchapter V of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code. (5 C.F.R. §304.106(b)). The contractor, as an intermittent appointee, is also not entitled to sick or annual leave. Contractor will not receive compensation for Federal holidays when no work is performed. (5 C.F.R. §304.106(b)). The contractor shall not receive automatic adjustments of pay based upon 5 U.S.C. §3203. Contractor's pay rate may be increased at the sole discretion of the Contracting Officer, consistent with Federal regulations. Contractor may be reimbursed for other costs, such as local travel, consistent with this agreement if approved by the COR and submitted in writing via invoice.

Travel

The contractor may be required to travel on a periodic, as needed basis, throughout the duration of their appointment. All travel must be pre-approved by the EAC COR. The contractor will be reimbursed for hotel and ground transportation costs, proper incidental expenses, and per diem while on official, pre-approved EAC travel. Compensation for travel shall be made in accordance with the rates set forth in the Federal Travel Regulation. The amount reimbursed for travel shall not exceed $6,500 in Federal Fiscal Year 2006.

Release of Information

As a result of the limited employment relationship created by this agreement, and pursuant to this agreement, you are required to follow all Federal laws and regulations as they relate to the release of agency documents and information. All research, information, documents and any other intellectual property (including but not limited to policies, procedures, manuals, and other work created at the request or otherwise while laboring for the EAC) shall be owned exclusively by the EAC, including copyright. All
such work produced shall be turned over to the EAC upon completion of your appointment term or as directed by the EAC. The EAC shall have exclusive rights over this material. You may not release government information or documents without the express written permission of the EAC.

Compensation Procedures

Compensation shall be made for work done (labor hours) by submitting invoices. Invoices shall be submitted every four weeks from the date of award. A week shall be from Sunday to Saturday. The first pay period shall begin February 26, 2006. Invoices must be submitted every 4 weeks when compensable work under this contract has been performed. The COR will provide the contractor with an invoice schedule, identifying each of the invoice periods, and model invoice forms. Invoices shall be delivered to the COR for review and approval. Each invoice shall:

(1) Identify each day (by date) that work was performed and the number of labor hours performed that day. Briefly describe the nature of the work performed for that day;

(2) State the total number of labor hours that have been expended under the agreement for the invoice period;

(3) State the total number of hours worked for each of the two week periods that make up the total invoice time;

(4) Provide a cumulative total of hours worked during the entire contract performance period (one year);

(5) Submit, as a separate line item, all reimbursable travel costs for approval. The submission must provide dates of travel, receipts and other information as required by the Federal Travel Regulation.

(6) Include the contractor's signature, affirming that information contained in the invoice is accurate.

Duty Location

Contractor’s duty station shall be his/her home or place of business. The contractor has access to and shall supply common office equipment to include telecommunications, internet access, a computer, office supplies, fax machine and common workplace software (including Microsoft Word, Project and Excel). All other resources will be provided by the EAC as needed and at its discretion.

Notices

Any notice, given by any of the parties hereunder, shall be sufficient only if in writing and delivered in person or sent by telegraph, telegram, registered, or regular mail as follows:

To EAC: 1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20005, Attention: Contracting Officer Representative, Peggy Sims.
To Contractor: At EAC and at the Contractor's address shown on the Cover Page of this contract or to such other address as either of such parties shall designate by notice given as herein required. Notices hereunder shall be effective in accordance with this clause or on the effective date of the notice whichever is later.

Areas of Responsibility (Statement of Work)

1. Submit a revised work plan reflecting revised due dates for deliverables.


3. Using the description developed for 2 above, perform background research, including both Federal and State administrative and case law review, and a summation of current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics. Deliver a written summary of this research and all source documentation.

4. Work in consultation with other EAC staff and the Commissioners to identify a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The Working Group will be provided with the results of the consultant's research (discussed in 2 and 3, above) as background information. The consultant will be responsible for developing a discussion agenda and convene the Working Group with the objective of identifying promising avenues for future research by EAC.

5. The consultant shall be responsible for creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and Working Group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort.

Terms and Conditions

The following additional terms and conditions shall apply to this personal services contract:

a. Federal Acquisition Regulation Clauses Incorporated by Reference:

This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available. These clauses may be obtained on the Internet at http://farsite.hill.af.mil/.

52.203-7 Anti-Kickback Procedures (JUL 1995)

52.203-12 Limitation on Payments to Influence Certain Federal Transactions (Sept 2005)
b. Federal Acquisition Regulation Clauses in Full Text:

**Contract Termination (FAR 52.249-12)**

The Government may terminate this contract at any time upon at least 1.5 days' written notice by the Contracting Officer to the Contractor. The Contractor, with the written consent of the Contracting Officer, may terminate this contract upon at least 15 days' written notice to the Contracting Officer. (End of Clause)

**Site Visit (FAR 52.237-1)**

Offerors or quoters are urged and expected to inspect the site where services are to be performed and to satisfy themselves regarding all general and local conditions that may affect the cost of contract performance, to the extent that the information is reasonably obtainable. In no event shall failure to inspect the site constitute grounds for a claim after contract award. (End of Clause)

**Protection of Government Buildings, Equipment, and Vegetation (FAR 52.237-2)**

The Contractor shall use reasonable care to avoid damaging existing buildings, equipment, and vegetation on the Government installation. If the Contractor's failure to use reasonable care causes damage to any of this property, the Contractor shall replace or repair the damage at no expense to the Government as the Contracting Officer directs. If the Contractor fails or refuses to make such repair or replacement, the Contractor shall be liable for the cost, which may be deducted from the contract price. (End of Clause)

**Covenant Against Contingent Fees (FAR 52.203-5)**

(a) The Contractor warrants that no person or agency has been employed or retained to solicit or obtain this contract upon an agreement or understanding for a contingent fee, expect a bona fide employee or agency. For breach or violation of this warranty,
the Government shall have the right to annul this contract without liability or, in its discretion, to deduct from the contract price or consideration, or otherwise recover, the full amount of the contingent fee.

(b) "Bona fide agency," as used in this clause, means an established commercial or selling agency, maintained by a contractor for the purpose of securing business, that neither exerts nor proposes to exert improper influence to solicit or obtain Government contracts nor holds itself out as being able to obtain any Government contract or contracts through improper influence.

"Bona fide employee," as used in this clause, means a person, employed by a contractor and subject to the contractor's supervision and control as to time, place, and manner of performance, who neither exerts nor proposes to exert improper influence to solicit or obtain Government contracts nor holds itself out as being able to obtain any Government contract or contracts through improper influence.

"Contingent Fee," as used in this clause, means any commission, percentage, brokerage, or other fee that is contingent upon the success that a person or concern has in securing a Government contract.

"Improper influence," as used in this clause, means any influence that induces or tends to induce a Government employee or officer to give consideration or to act regarding a Government contract on any basis other than the merits of the matter.

(End of Clause)

Disputes (FAR 52.233-1), Alternate I

(a) This contract is subject to the Contract Disputes Act of 1973, as amended (41 U.S.C. 601-612).

(b) Except as provided in the Act, all disputes arising under or relating to this contract shall be resolved under this clause.

(c) "Claim," as used in this clause, means a written demand or written assertion by one of the contracting parties seeking, as a matter of right, the payment of money in a sum certain, the adjustment or interpretation of contract terms, or other relief arising under or relating to this contract. However, a written demand or written assertion by the Contractor seeking the payment of money exceeding $100,000 is not a claim under the Act until certified. A voucher, invoice, or other routine request for payment that is not in dispute when submitted is not a claim under the Act. The submission may be converted to a claim under the Act by complying with the submission and certification requirements of this clause, if it is disputed either as to liability or amount or is not acted upon in a reasonable time.

(d) (1) A claim by the Contractor shall be made in writing and, unless otherwise stated in this contract, submitted within 6 years after accrual of the claim to the Contracting Officer for a written decision. A claim by the Government against the Contractor shall be subject to a written decision by the Contracting Officer.
(2)

(i) The contractor shall provide the certification specified in paragraph (d)(2)(iii) of this clause when submitting any claim exceeding $100,000.

(ii) The certification requirement does not apply to issues in controversy that have not been submitted as all or part of a claim.

(iii) The certification shall state as follows: "I certify that the claim is made in good faith; that the supporting data are accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief; that the amount requested accurately reflects the contract adjustment for which the Contractor believes the Government is liable; and that I am duly authorized to certify the claim on behalf of the Contractor."

(3) The certification may be executed by any person duly authorized to bind the Contractor with respect to the claim.

(e) For Contractor claims of $100,000 or less, the Contracting Officer must, if requested in writing by the Contractor, render a decision within 60 days of the request. For Contractor-certified claims over $100,000, the Contracting Officer must, within 60 days, decide the claim or notify the Contractor of the date by which the decision will be made.

(f) The Contracting Officer's decision shall be final unless the Contractor appeals or files a suit as provided in the Act.

(g) If the claim by the Contractor is submitted to the Contracting Officer or a claim by the Government is presented to the Contractor, the parties, by mutual consent, may agree to use alternative dispute resolution (ADR). If the Contractor refuses an offer for ADR, the Contractor shall inform the Contracting Officer, in writing, of the Contractor's specific reasons for rejecting the offer.

(h) The Government shall pay interest on the amount found due and unpaid from

(1) the date that the Contracting Officer receives the claim (certified, if required); or

(2) the date that payment otherwise would be due, if that date is later, until the date of payment.

With regard to claims having defective certifications, as defined in FAR 33.201, interest shall be paid from the date that the Contracting Officer initially receives the claim. Simple interest on claims shall be paid at the rate, fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in the Act, which is applicable to the period during which the Contracting Officer receives the claim and then at the rate applicable for each 6-month period as fixed by the Treasury Secretary during the pendency of the claim.
(i) The Contractor shall proceed diligently with performance of this contract, pending final resolution of any request for relief, claim, appeal, or action arising under or relating to the contract, and comply with any decision of the Contracting Officer.
(End of Clause)

By signing below, contractor agrees to furnish the personal services set forth or otherwise identified, above, consistent with the conditions noted above and for the consideration stated herein.

Contractor:

[Signature]
Tova Wang

FAC Contracting Officer:

[Signature]
Thomas Wilks
Executive Director
**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES**

**Date of Order:** 11/08/05

**ORDERNUMBER**

**FUND**
- 8035

**ORG CODE**
- TZM91100

**S/A CODE**
- 10

**O/C CODE**
- 25

**AC**
- 01

**SS**
- 00

**VENDOR NAME**
- GOVERNMENT

**USE CODE**
- C

**C/E CODE**
- PROJ/PROS. NO.
- CC-A

**PRJ/GRFT**
- 000

**DISCOUNT**
- 01

**DEBT**
- 00

**TO: CONTRACTOR**
- (Name, address and zip code)

**Contact:** Tova Wang

**ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION**

**119701137**

**ADDRESS**
- 225 New York Ave., N.W., Suite 1100
- Washington, DC 20005

**REMITTANCE ADDRESS**
- Tova Wang
- 201 West 74th Street, Apt. 11F
- New York, NY 10023

**PAYMENT/DISCOUNT TERMS**
- Net 30

**SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). Request to provide consulting services to the EAC to assist in the development of a Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project. See the attached statement work for a description of the specifics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LABOR COST: $50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRAVEL COST: $5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $55,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECEIVING OFFICE**

**MAIL INVOICE TO:**
- (Include zip code)

**ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION**

- 5 New York Ave., NW Suite 1100
- Washington, DC 20005

**SIGNATURE:**

**1. PAYING OFFICE**

**ELECTION SERVICES ADMINISTRATION**

**26A. FOR INQUIRIES REGARDING PAYMENT CONTACT:**
- Diana Scott

**26B. TELEPHONE NO.**
- 202-566-3100

**26A. NAME OF CONTRACTING/ORDERING OFFICER (Type)**
- Grace Hillman, Chair

**26B. TELEPHONE NO.**
- 202-566-3100

**GSA FORM 300 (REV. 2-93)**
PURCHASE ORDER TERMS AND CONDITIONS

552.229-70 FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES (APR 1984)

The contract price includes all applicable Federal, State, and local taxes. No surcharge will be collected to cover taxes which may subsequently be imposed on this transaction or changes in the rates of currently applicable taxes. However, the Government will, upon the request of the Contractor, furnish evidence appropriate to establish exemption from any tax from which the Government is exempt and which was not included in the contract price.

552.210-79 PACKING LIST (DEC 1989)

(a) A packing list or other suitable shipping document shall accompany each shipment and shall indicate (1) Name and address of consignor; (2) Name and address of consignee; (3) Government order or shipment (if any); and (b) Description of the material shipped, including item number, quantity, number of containers, and package number (if any).

(b) When payment will be made by Government commercial credit card, in addition to the information in (a) above, the packing list or shipping document shall include: (1) Cardholder name and telephone number and (2) the term "Credit Card".

52.232-1 PAYMENTS (APR 1984)

The Government shall pay the Contractor, upon the submission of proper invoices or vouchers, the prices stipulated in this contract for supplies delivered and accepted or services rendered and accepted, less any discounts allowed by the Government in this contract. Unless otherwise specified in this contract, payment shall be made on partial deliveries on the 30th day after Government acceptance if (a) the amount due on the deliveries is at least $1,000 or 50 percent of the total contract price.

52.232-8 DISCOUNTS FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (APR 1989)

(a) Discounts for prompt payment will not be considered in the evaluation of offers. However, any offered discount will form a part of the contract price and will be taken if payment is made within the discount period indicated in the offer by the offeror. As an alternative to offering a prompt payment discount in conjunction with the offer, offerors awarded contracts may include prompt payment discounts on individual invoices.

(b) In connection with any discount offered for prompt payment, time shall be computed from the date of the invoice. For the purpose of computing the discount earned, payment shall be considered to have been made on the date which appears on the payment check or the "to" on which an electronic funds transfer was made.

NOTE: Invoices must include the ACT number (block 4) and shall be submitted in an original only, unless otherwise specified, to the billing address; or, a copy must be sent (must and the date of receipt of the invoice at the designated billing office shall be the later of the following two events:

(i) The 30th day after the designated billing office has received a proper invoice from the Contractor.

(ii) The 30th day after Government acceptance of supplies delivered or services performed by the Contractor.

(4) An invoice shall be prepared and submitted to the designated billing office specified in the contract. A proper invoice must include all items listed in . . . (i) through . . . (viii) . . . If the invoice does not comply with these requirements, then the Contractor will be notified of the deficiency within 7 days after receipt of the invoice at the designated billing office . . . Untimely notification will be taken into account in the computation of any interest penalty owed the Contractor . . .

(i) Name and address of the Contractor.

(ii) Invoice date.

(iii) Contract number or other authorization for supplies delivered or services performed (including order number and contract line item number).

(iv) Description , quantity, unit of measure, unit price, and extended price of supplies delivered or services performed.

(v) Shipping and payment terms (e.g., shipment number and date of shipment, prompt payment discount terms), Bill of lading number and sight of shipment will be shown for shipments on Government bills of lading.

(i) Name and address of Contractor official to whom payment is to be sent (must be the same as that in the contract or in a proper notice assignment).

(ii) Name (where practicable), title, phone number, and mailing address of person to be notified in event of a defective invoice.

52.222-40 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED - CONTRACTS OF $2,500 OR LESS (MAY 1989)

Except to the extent that an exception, variation, or tolerance would apply if this contract were in excess of $2,500, the Contractor and any subcontractor shall pay all employees working on the contract not less than the minimum wage specified under Section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 201-208). The GSA Form 2186, Service Contract Act of 1965 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

52.222-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)

52.222-42 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRES (MAY 1989)

52.222-41 and 52.222-42 apply to service contracts where the amount exceeds $2,500.

The GSA Form 2186, Service Contract Act of 1965 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

52.262-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (JUN 1988)

This contract incorporates the following clauses with reference by title or page number:

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

52.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)

52.203-3 Gratuities (APR 84)

52.203-6 Covenant Against Contingent Fees (APR 84)

52.203-8 Restriction on Subcontractor Sales to the Government (JUL 88)

52.203-7 Anti-Kickback Procedures (OCT 88)

52.212-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)

(A) In the preceding clause, the permissible variations are stated in the schedule.

52.222-3 Convict Labor (APR 84)

52.222-28 Equal Opportunity (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.222-35 Affirmative Action for Special Disabled and Vietnam Era Veterans (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.222-36 Affirmative Action for Handicapped Workers (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $2,500)

52.222-37 Employment Reports On Special Disabled Veterans and Vietnam Veterans (JAN 88)(Applies when amount exceeds $2,500)

52.223-6 Drug Free Workplace (JUL 90)(Applies if contract is awarded to an individual)

52.225-18 Buy American Act Supplies (JAN 89)

52.225-11 Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases (MAY 92)

52.225-28 Prompt Payment (SEP 92)

52.233-1 Disputes (DEC 91)

52.233-3 Protest After Award (AUG 89)

52.244-1 Contractor Inspection Requirements (APR 84)

52.244-8 Default (Fixed-Price Supply and Services)(APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies:

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - MAR 88(Applies when amount is between $2,500 and $10,000)

52.222-20 Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000)

52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)

52.243-9 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Fixed Price)(Short Form)(APR 84)

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - MAR 88(Applies when amount exceeds $2,500)

52.243-3 Changes - Fixed Price (APR 84) - Alt. I

52.243-4 Application for Convenience of the Government (Services)(Short Form)(APR 84)
Consulting Services to Assist EAC in the Development of a Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

Section 241 of HAVA lists a number of election administration topics on which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to do research. In particular, Section 241(b)(6) and (7) state the two topics of nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal offices; and identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation. The EAC Board of Advisors has recommended that the EAC make research on these topics a high priority.

The EAC seeks to obtain consulting services from an individual who can provide advice drawn from broad professional and technical experience in the area of voter fraud and intimidation. The EAC needs this consultant to conduct a preliminary examination of these topics to determine if a larger research project might be warranted. If so, the consultant would also be tasked to define the scope of the project and prepare a Statement of Work for the EAC to use for a subsequent competitive procurement. To promote a balanced and non-partisan approach to this effort, EAC is contracting with two consultants, who will work jointly to perform the work described below.

Nature of the Appointment

The EAC enters into this contract pursuant to its authority to contract for consultants under 5 U.S.C. §3109 (See 42 U.S.C. §15324(b)). As such this contract is for personal services and creates a limited employment relationship. (See 5 C.F.R. §304). As a result of this unique relationship, and pursuant to this agreement, you are required to follow all Federal laws and regulations as they relate to the release of agency documents and information, travel and conduct. All research, information, documents and any other intellectual property, (including but not limited to policies, procedures, manuals, and other work created at the request or otherwise while laboring for the EAC) shall be owned exclusively by the EAC, including copyright. All such work product shall be turned over to the EAC upon completion of your appointment term or as directed by the EAC. The EAC shall have exclusive rights over this material. You may not release government information or documents without the express permission of the EAC.

Supervision and Management.

The EAC Project Manager for this effort is Margaret Sims, EAC Research Specialist. Ms. Sims will provide taskings, and supervise, review and approve all work and performance.
Period of Appointment, Compensation and Travel.

The period of appointment under this contract is estimated at six months. The appointment shall constitute intermittent appointment (without a regularly scheduled tour of duty) per 5 C.F.R. §340.401(b). The consultant shall not incur overtime. The consultants shall not receive automatic adjustments of pay based upon 5 U.S.C. 5303. The consultants are not eligible for sick and annual leave, nor compensation for work performed on federal holidays. The Consultant is expected to work 450 hours during the estimated six month appointment period. These hours must be distributed evenly over the period so that the Consultant is working approximately, but no more than 20 hours per week. The consultant shall be paid at a rate of $111 per hour. The dates of performance are flexible but shall be based upon the needs of the project and the EAC. The project at issue is sought to be completed within the sixth month period. The period of appointment shall continue until the project, outlined below, is completed.

Consultant’s duty station shall be his/her home or place of business. The consultant has access to and shall supply common office equipment to include telecommunications, internet, a computer, office supplies, facsimile machine and common workplace software (including Microsoft Word and Excel). Other resources will be provided by the EAC as needed and at its discretion.

The Consultant is required to travel on a periodic, as needed basis, throughout the duration of their appointment. All travel must be pre-approved by the EAC per Federal Travel Regulations and EAC policy. The Consultant will be reimbursed, at the Federal government rates, for hotel and ground transportation costs, proper incidental expenses, and per diem while on official, pre-approved EAC travel.

Areas of Responsibility


2. Using the description developed above, perform background research, including both Federal and State administrative and case law review, and a summation of current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics. Deliver a written summary of this research and all source documentation.

3. Work in consultation with other EAC staff and the Commissioners to identify a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The Working Group will be provided with the results of Tasks 1 and 2 as background information. The consultant will be responsible for developing a discussion agenda and convene the Working Group with the objective of identifying promising avenues for future research by EAC.
4. The consultant shall be responsible for creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and Working Group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future research resulting from this effort.

5. Should the EAC decide to pursue one or more of the recommendations made in the report noted above, the consultant will be responsible for defining the appropriate project scope(s) and preparing Statement(s) of Work sufficient for use in a competitive procurement.

Compensation Procedures

Compensation shall be made for work done by submitting invoices. Invoices shall be submitted on a monthly basis. These invoices shall state the number of labor hours that have been expended. Invoices shall be delivered to Ms. Margaret Sims for review and Ms. Diana Scott, Administrative Officer, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington DC 20005. Compensation for travel shall be submitted by travel voucher consistent with federal travel regulation and EAC requirements.

Termination

This consultant contract can be terminated without cause in advance of the current end date by two weeks' notice in writing by either of the parties.

Estimated Project Timetable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project work plan</td>
<td>10 days after contract award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress reports</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of voting fraud and voter intimidation</td>
<td>October 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of background research and associated source documentation</td>
<td>January 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene working group</td>
<td>February 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary report describing findings and recommendations for future EAC research</td>
<td>March 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement(s) of Work for future research project(s)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, together with the Moritz College of Law and the Department of Political Science at The Ohio State University have formed a consortium to respond to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission’s Request for Proposals to support the development of voluntary guidance on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Procedures. These institutions have a record of accomplishment in this and closely related fields and are pleased to have this opportunity to contribute to the nationally significant research agenda proposed by the Commission. The consortium offers an independent, objective team of scholars and researchers whose experience and previous contributions to the field will facilitate the completion of the ambitious research agenda in the compressed time established in the RFP.

The research described follows the Commission’s Resolution of October 12, 2004 that made the following points:

- Provisional Voting should ensure that all voters who are—or believe they are—registered can cast a ballot in federal elections with the knowledge that a fair process will be followed to determine if the provisional ballot should be counted;
- Election officials have a duty to make certain that provisional balloting is administered fairly and effectively;
- Just before the election, the public was unclear about Provisional Voting procedures;

The Consortium

THE EAGLETON INSTITUTE

The Eagleton Institute explores state and national politics through research, education, and public service, linking the study of politics with its day-to-day practice. It focuses attention on how contemporary political systems work, how they change, and how they might work better. Eagleton offers a range of education programs, including an undergraduate certificate, graduate fellowships, research internships, and opportunities to interact with political practitioners. Eagleton’s unusual experience in combining scholarly work with the practice of politics means that the Commission will receive information, analysis and recommendations that are credible, practical, and effective.

The Institute regularly undertakes projects to enhance political understanding and involvement, often in collaboration with government agencies, the media, non-profit groups, and other academic Institutions. Its faculty, centers and programs specialize in fields that are directly relevant to the Commission’s needs, including the study of: state legislatures; minority and immigrant political behavior; campaigns, elections and political parties; and civic education. The Institute is well known for its Eagleton Poll, a survey research center, which may contribute to this project if the EAC elects to include the optional surveys of young voters (who face particular hurdles as first-time registrants and voters) and of local election officials across the country. These surveys are described in this proposal as possible supplements to the research outlined specifically in the Commission’s RFP.
THE MORITZ COLLEGE OF LAW
The College of Law has served the citizens of Ohio and the nation since its establishment in 1891. It has played a leading role in the legal profession through countless contributions made by graduates and faculty. It offers a broad and deep curriculum of approximately 145 courses, covering nearly every area of the law. Its contributions to election law have become well known through its Election Law @ Moritz website. Election Law @ Moritz illuminates public understanding of election law and its role in our nation's democracy. Moritz's role in the research may be enhanced by the inclusion of the OSU Department of Political Science, which is prepared to undertake an in-depth survey of provisional voting and voter identification requirements in one to three states if EAC elects to include that optional research in its contract.

Design and Management of the Project
The Consortium's work will be directed by a Project Team. Dr. Ruth B. Mandel, Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics and Board of Governors Professor of Politics at Rutgers, chairs the Project Team, and will be the Principal Investigator. Project Team members are:

Edward B. Foley, Robert M. Duncan/Jones Day Designated Professor of Law at the Moritz College of Law and Director of Election Law @ Moritz

Ingrid Reed, Director of the New Jersey Project at the Eagleton Institute of Politics. Reed's work has focused on campaigns and elections from the point of view of the citizen.

Daniel P. Tokaji, Assistant Professor of Law at the Moritz College of Law. His areas of expertise include voting rights, civil rights, freedom of speech, disability rights, and civil procedure.

John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, whose publications focus on government process and citizen involvement.

To manage the project, Eagleton has retained Thomas O'Neill. He has long experience in leading and managing complex research and analysis projects. For the past 20 years, O'Neill served as President of The Partnership for New Jersey and led its Leadership New Jersey, diversity management and education improvement programs. Previously he was Executive Director of The Center for Analysis of Public Issues in Princeton, which, among other research, analyzed campaigns and elections. He served for several years as election night analyst for New Jersey Network Television and for WNET-Channel 13 in New York. The team he leads will include a research administrator and support staff necessary for the timely completion of all tasks specified in the RFP. The work will benefit from review by an advisory group of senior scholars and a bi-partisan group of practitioners to provide peer review of draft reports. The peer review group will broaden the viewpoints reflected in the work and lend depth to the Project Team.
The Peer Review Group is now in formation. Both Eagleton and Moritz are connected to a wide, national network of academics, authorities, and activists involved in elections and election law. Upon award of the contract, we will activate that network to recruit 8 to 10 outstanding men and women to constitute the Peer Review Group. Those listed below have not been approached yet, but they represent the range and caliber we intend to recruit for the Peer Review Group.

- Kim Alexander, California Voter Foundation, a nonpartisan organization she founded in 1994 to advance new technologies to improve elections.
- William Baroni, an attorney, Republican member of the New Jersey General Assembly, who specializes in election law.
- Mickey Edwards, former Oklahoma Congressman and faculty member at Harvard's Kennedy School who taught courses on Congress, political leadership, issue advocacy, election strategies, conservative political theory, and the constitutional separation of
powers. Now at the Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs.

- Elaine Jones, former president and director-counsel of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund.
- Richard C. Leone, President, The Century Foundation, which sponsors an active project on election law. Former New Jersey Treasurer and candidate for the U. S. Senate.
- Frank Reiche, an attorney in private practice, chaired the Federal Election Commission during the Administration of George H. W. Bush.
- Trevor Potter, President, Campaign Legal Center and former member of the FEC. The Campaign Legal Center is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization which works in campaign finance, and elections. Advisor to Senator John McCain.
- Peter Veniero, an attorney in private practice, former Justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, who provided election-related legal advice to former Governor Christine Todd Whitman during her first campaign.
- Alan Rosenthal, Professor of Public Policy, Rutgers, the State University, whose research focuses on state legislatures.

The Peer Review Group will bring a wide range of thinking and informed opinion to the project. Its members will broaden and deepen the Project Team's consideration of how provisional voting and the voter identification regime affect access to the ballot while preserving the integrity of the election process. The Peer Review Group will comment on an early draft of the analysis called for in Tasks 3.4 and 3.10 and in the development of alternative approaches called for in Tasks 3.5 and 3.12.

Approach to the Research and Analysis

The Commission's resolution of October 12 (Resolution 2004-02) provided guidance for election administrators in the states on how to achieve the goals of the Help America Vote Act. The research proposed here should determine the degree to which that guidance was followed in the case of Provisional Voting and in the intertwined topic of Voter Identification Requirements. Through research, interviews, survey analysis and hearings, we will develop information on key questions about the 2004 election, including:

- Did the States have in place clear and uniform written procedures, guidelines and/or instructions to govern the casting and counting of provisional ballots?
- Did local procedures reflect the state's uniform procedures?
- Did all States and election jurisdictions make these procedures available to the public, political parties and candidates before the election;
- To what extent were poll workers appropriately trained on how to administer provisional ballots, including establishing the identity of the potential voter seeking a provisional ballot?
- How were Federal funds under the Help America Vote Act used to educate voters about their rights to cast a provisional ballot, as well as where such provisional ballots must be cast in order to be counted?
- In States where a provisional ballot had to be cast at the voter's assigned polling place or precinct, was information available to poll workers to allow them to determine the voter's assigned precinct and polling place?
- Do states have mechanisms in place to inform voters casting provisional ballots whether or not their vote was counted, and whether or not they are now registered for subsequent elections?
The answers to these questions will reveal the nationwide response to HAVA and to the Commission’s guidance in its Resolution 2004-02. They will also help the Project Team develop recommendations to improve the Commission’s ability to tailor its guidance document to the needs of voters and election officials. The Commission will gain the knowledge needed to provide a clear basis for practical action by those responsible for administering elections, and thereby move closer to the goals of the Help America Vote Act. It will determine the degree to which Provisional Voting provides a “fail-safe” ballot for those who would otherwise be disenfranchised by confusion or administrative error. This work is important.

Figure 2
Objectives for Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Requirements

A critical area of inquiry throughout this study will be the balance between ballot access and ballot integrity. Striking that balance requires well-trained election administrators who can make fine distinctions under pressure. Figure 2 shows the interplay among the three goals of voter access, ballot security, and administrative clarity, illustrating that tradeoffs must be made in pursuing these important goals. The balance among these goals was one issue at stake in *Spencer v. Blackwell*, which raised the central issue of discrimination against African-American voters by poll challengers in Ohio. Just before the 2004 election, the U.S. Court Of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit In *Summit County Democratic Central and Executive Committee v. Blackwell* described the tension
between the conflicting goals of ballot access and ballot integrity, concerns that apply to assessing the effects of provisional voting:

There is a strong public interest in allowing every registered voter to vote freely. There is also a strong public interest in permitting legitimate statutory processes to operate to preclude voting by those who are not entitled to vote. Finally, there is a strong public interest in smooth and effective administration of the voting laws that militates against changing the rules in the hours immediately preceding the election.

We will pay particular attention to these tensions. The study will weigh questions of open access, administrative practicality, equitable treatment of all voters, the role of technology in extending the boundaries of the possible, and the realities of reliance on state and local entities to devise and administer election law in compliance with constitutional protections within a framework of federalism.

We will reach out to organizations, such as those listed below; with an interest in HAVA and issues surrounding Provisional Voting and Voter Identification to gather information and invite their comments, suggestions, and recommendations:

- American Enterprise Institute [www.aei.org]
- Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law [www.brennancenter.org]
- Center for Digital Government
- The Century Foundation [www.tcf.org]
- The Constitution Project
- DEMOS-USA [www.demos-usa.org]
- The Election Center [www.votewatch.us]
- Election Reform Information Project [www.electionline.org]
- Leadership Conference on Civil Rights [www.civilrights.org]
- League of Women Voters [www.lwv.org]
- National Association of State Election Directors [www.nased.org]
- People for the American Way [www.pfaw.org]
- Secretaries of State Association [www.nass.org]

The information and perspectives held by these organizations will provide leads for further research and analysis. For example, DEMOS-USA, a New York-based NGO, undertook a 50-state survey of plans for provisional ballots. Published as "Placebo Ballots—Will Fall Safe Voting Fall", its findings suggest areas for further inquiry:

- Officials were asked the circumstances under which provisional ballots would be offered, which races the ballots would include, and how they would be determined valid and subsequently counted. The responses differed widely among states. At times, different elections officials within the same state offered different answers.

- Idaho and Minnesota do not offer provisional ballots to first-time, newly registered voters who cannot show identification.

- Ten other states do not allow these individuals a chance to substantiate their identity after Election Day or verify their eligibility through other means. Instead, they will automatically invalidate provisional ballots cast by these "voters."
• At least fifteen other states require provisional voters to return to the election clerk’s office after Election Day to present identification. Poll worker error is likely to have a particularly strong effect on provisional voters. Many voters will likely leave the polling place without understanding that they must return with identification sometime later for their provisional ballot to count.

• Twenty-three states provide provisional ballots and verify voters' eligibility without requiring them to present identification subsequent to Election Day.

WORK PLAN
Figure 4, attached, is a preliminary Gantt chart of the project. Please refer to it in conjunction with the following narrative. The chart projects a start date of April 4, 2005, with completion by the end of October 2005, for a duration of 7 months.

PROVISIONAL VOTING

Task 3.1 (By April 14)
We will submit an updated work plan and more detailed Gantt chart. The updated work plan will contain additional detail on the approach and methods we will apply to each task and will provide a more precise estimate of the time required for completion of those tasks. The Project Director and selected members of the Project Team will brief the EAC Project Manager and lead Commissioner as required. Before April 14 we expect to know from the Project Manager if the EAC wishes us to undertake the optional surveys described in this proposal as supplements to the research.

Task 3.2 (By middle of each month, May – October)
The Project Director will submit progress reports that summarize activities, indicate progress, report preliminary results and conclusions, identify problems to be resolved, and track the budget.

Task 3.3 (Periodically, May – October)
The Project Team will brief the EAC as desired. The work plan provides for as many as 6 briefings at appropriate milestones (see Gantt chart). Some of these would be by conference call, others would take place at the EAC’s offices.

Task 3.4 Collect and Analyze (April -- May)
The analysis of variation in the administration of Provisional Voting across the country is the keystone of this phase of the research. With the research team and advisory group in place, we will begin immediately to collect and analyze state legislation, administrative procedures, and court cases to understand variations in implementation across the country. The compendium of statutes, case law and procedural guidance collected will provide a valuable continuing resource for the EAC. The analysis of that material—and, we hope, of the optional surveys described below—will provide the basis for possible alternative approaches to Provisional Voting called for in Task 3.5 that we and the EAC will consider in drafting the preliminary guidance document called for in Task 3.6.
In 2004, according to Electionline, more than 1.6 million provisional ballots were cast, with nearly 1.1 million (68 percent) counted. In Florida and Ohio alone, this meant nearly 200,000 voters who would have been turned away from polling places if their names could not be found in 2000 had a chance to cast a ballot in 2004. Election Line's work points to the critical importance of different procedures state-by-state across the country in the Implementation of Provisional Voting. It found that: "Provisional vote-counting varied widely among states, from a national high of 97 percent counted in Alaska to a low of 6 percent counted in Delaware. The report found a national average of 68 percent counted. While lacking any concrete data of the reasons for accepting or declining the votes, anecdotal reports from state and local election officials indicate some people were confused into thinking that provisional ballots could be used in lieu of registration. Those ballots were not counted. "State rules had an impact on the percentage of provisional ballots counted. States that allowed voters to cast ballots outside of their correct precinct but inside of their jurisdiction counted an average of 70 percent of provisional ballots. States that disqualified any provisional ballots counted outside of a voter's correct precinct counted 60 percent of the ballots."

"The national mandate for provisional voting did not mean national uniformity. In fact, we found that whether a voter had his or her provisional ballot counted relied nearly as much on where they cast it as their actual registration status. Had the election been closer, this would have been a flashpoint for controversy... The debate over provisional ballots is far from over."

Our goal in this project is to provide the EAC with the information and analysis needed to move that debate closer to resolution.

The Project Director and staff at Eagleton, working with one or more graduate assistants, will undertake a comprehensive survey of the literature on Provisional Voting and of news and government reports in the experience with Provisional Voting in the November 2004 election.

If the Commission elects to fund the optional survey of local election officials, the work will also include producing reliable and valid data on how these officials conducted themselves and how they evaluate the clarity of the instructions and guidance they received. The sampling of the view of these officials, whose responsibilities are critical to the effective Implementation of Provisional Voting, will provide information more reliable and thorough than the anecdotal reports available through a literature search. The Commission may also elect to fund the optional survey of provisional voters in 1 – 3 states that is described below. It will enrich the study by providing valid and reliable, non-anecdotal information on the experience of those who cast a provisional ballot.

1 ElectionLine.Org, Solution or Problem? Provisional Ballots in 2004, March 2005
Optional Survey of Provisional Voters

A survey of provisional voters would provide rare, reliable information about the process of casting a provisional ballot as reported by the voters themselves. The OSU Department of Political Science will design a survey instrument and commission a survey of a sample of those casting provisional ballots in one to three states (including at least one of the 17 states where Provisional Voting was new in 2004).

The survey would reveal the voters' understanding about why they had to cast a provisional ballot. Was this due to their changing residences before the election, faulty voter identification, or other reasons? It would gauge their reactions to the provisional ballot process. The results of this survey would enrich the research and provide a new dimension of the EAC's understanding of the provisional voting process.

Learning how the process worked for provisional voters is important. We lack systematic information about how citizens view casting a provisional ballot. Is the experience positive or negative for them? Did they expect their vote would be counted, or did they believe that being asked to cast a provisional ballot implied that their vote would be discarded? The survey will summarize voters' reports about whether they were informed that their ballot was or was not counted. Demographic questions will ascertain the correlates of provisional voting: if it was more common among racial and ethnic minorities in some areas, among young voters, etc.

The OSU team will begin the survey by constructing a sample of 3,000 provisional voters with names and addresses. It will obtain the list of provisional voters, write the survey questions, verify the programming of the questionnaire, analyze the data, and write up the data. In writing the survey, the OSU political scientists will reflect the results of the EAC's Election Day Survey.

OSU plans to subcontract the actual administration of the survey instrument to Knowledge Networks (www.knowledgenetworks.com), which has conducted Internet surveys funded by several federal agencies, including the NSF and the EPA. Knowledge Networks will send letters to the provisional voters in the sample to notify them of the study. Of the 3,000 provisional voters, 2,400 will receive directions to complete the interview on a website. Knowledge Networks will conduct 10-minute phone interviews with 200 of those who do not complete the web interview. It will also conduct telephone interviews with 200 of the 600 people not assigned to the web interviews.

The interview process, including the mailing and programming, pretest, revisions, field period, and file construction, will require 56 days. Consequently the survey of provisional voters should begin at the very start of the project so that its results can be considered in drafting the guidance document on Provisional Voting.

Optional Survey of Young Voters

Eagleton's Center for Public Interest Polling (the Eagleton Poll) has won a grant from the Carnegie Foundation to survey the experience of young voters as a result of their participation in the 2004 election. Young voters are one of the groups most likely to encounter difficulties in registration, identifying themselves, finding the proper polling place, and other topics relevant to this research. This proposal offers the Commission the option of funding the addition of questions to this survey to highlight issues faced by
young, often first-time voters. The additional questions could determine, with measurable
reliability, the frequency with which young voters cast provisional ballots, their
Impressions of the process by which they voted provisionally, and their experience with
Identifying themselves at the polls. Answers to these question would deepen the
analysis of these issues and provide results more reliable than those produced by the
collection of anecdotal evidence.

At the same time, the researchers at Moritz will undertake a thorough collection and
analysis of legislation and litigation to reveal how each of the 50 states approached
HAVA's mandates. They will analyze the effect of litigation on that implementation and
of the continuing influence of case law on the interpretation of HAVA. We will merge the
legal analysis with the political and procedural analysis to illuminate the key questions
posed by the RFP.

The merged analysis will increase understanding of the range of approaches to
implementing Provisional Voting across the country. It will permit us to categorize the
states by the nature of their Provisional Voting regimes, which will produce insights into
the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches to implementing HAVA. The goal
of the new guidance document, of course, is to build on the strengths and correct the
weaknesses.

Our analysis will consider the variation in experience between those states that
previously provided for provisional voting and the 17 where provisional voting was new
in 2004.

Developing answers to three key questions poses a challenge.

1. Ideally, gauging the effectiveness of provisional voting in enfranchising qualified voters
requires an examination that goes beyond calculating the percentage of provisional
ballots cast counted. That number alone does not reveal the subjective experience of
those who voted by provisional ballot. Did they feel enfranchised, or did they harbor
doubts that their votes would count? The optional survey described above would assess
that dimension of the question, which is important to understand the credibility of the
provisional ballot, particularly in a closely contested election.

2. Measuring the consistency of counting of provisional ballots also poses significant
challenges. The literature search will reveal anecdotal reports from various jurisdictions,
but the optional survey of local election officials could provide results that are more
revealing from the observations of those in the best position to answer this question.

3. Assessing how well local election officials understood how to implement provisional
voting will be difficult. The option survey by the Eagleton Poll would tap the opinions of a
national sample of local election official to assess their self-reports about their level of
understanding and their evaluation of the training and explanatory materials provided to
them.
Deliverables

1. Indexed database of major articles on Provisional Voting and related topics
2. Summary of case law on Provisional Voting
3. Compendium of states' legislation, procedures, and litigation.
5. Analysis of disparities and similarities of how provisional voting was implemented around the country, which will be critiqued by the Peer Review Group.
6. [Optional] Survey results of local election officials' experience in interpreting guidance from the EAC and state election officials by the Eagleton Poll.
7. [Optional] Survey report on the experience of provisional voters in 1 – 3 selected states by the OSU Department of Political Science.

Task 3.5 Analysis and Alternative Approaches (June)

We see this task as the heart of the project: to assess the potential, problems, and challenges of provisional voting and develop alternative means to achieve the goals of provisional voting.

The first step in this task is to undertake a thorough analysis of the information developed in the first phase of the project (Task 3.4). The Project Team and its staff will merge the legal analysis, review of case law, study of procedures, and, if the optional surveys are included in the project, the information gleaned from the reports of provisional voters and local election officials. Our work will take the following approach:

1. Review the facts and opinions revealed in the Columbus hearing, in the Commission's Election Day Study, the literature review, and the optional surveys (if undertaken) to prepare a written summary of the experience with Provisional Voting.
2. Clarify the additional policy considerations involved in improving the processes of Provisional Voting, such as the relationship between the Provisional Voting regime and the approach to voter registration and voter identification.
3. Summarize the views of the groups with a stake in Provisional Voting and related issues.
4. Analyze the tensions among the triangle of competing forces that connect the three major objectives for Provisional Voting: enabling maximum number of eligible voters to cast ballots that will be counted; establishing procedural simplicity for voters with a reasonable workload for election officials; minimizing the opportunity for voter fraud.
5. Describe and evaluate alternative ways to achieve the goals of HAVA through Provisional Voting.
6. Tap the views of the members of the Peer Review in preparation for briefing for
the Commission on our preliminary conclusions and recommendations.
7. Also during this period, the Project Director, in consultation with EAC staff, will
select a location and make preliminary arrangements for a public hearing on the
Provisional Voting Guidance Document to take place in September.

Deliverables
1. Written analysis of the experience of Provisional Voting across the country in
2004 based on all available sources and original research.
2. Report of alternatives to existing practices and procedures for Provisional Voting
and voter identification and assess which objectives or values each alternative
favors.
3. Recommendations for best practices
4. Briefing documents for Peer Review Group.
5. Briefing for the Commission

Task 3.6 Preliminary Guidance Document (July – early August)

In this phase of the project, we will develop policy recommendations based on the
research and analysis performed in the previous task. Successful completion of this
task will require the closest coordination on a continuing basis with EAC staff.

Based on the Commission’s reaction to the briefing at the conclusion of Task 3.4 the
Project Team will draft a preliminary guidance document for review by the EAC Board of
Advisors and the Standards Board at a meeting to be convened by the Commission.
The meeting will take place in early August.

The Project Team will:

1. Outline major findings, flesh out preferred alternative approaches, and review
with EAC staff.
2. Develop draft Preliminary Guidance Document (PGD)
3. Submit the PGD to the Peer Review Group and revise based on its comments.
4. Prepare final draft of PGD for review by Commission staff; revise
5. Distribute document to EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board 5 – 7 days
before the meeting or teleconference.
6. Project Director and selected members of the Project Team will brief and
respond to questions and comments during the meeting or teleconference.
7. Prepare summary of issues raised by members of the EAC Board of Advisors
and Standards Board at the meeting or teleconference.

Deliverables
1. Draft Preliminary Guidance Document
2. Briefing for EAC Board and Advisors and Standards Board
3. Summary of comments from Board of Advisors and Standards Board
Task 3.7. Revise Guidance Document for Publication (August)

Based on the comments from the EAC, the Board of Advisors and the Standards Board, the Project Team will revise the PGD to prepare it for publication in the Federal Register. The target for publication will be the week of August 22.

**Deliverable**
Revised PGD suitable for publication in Federal Register

Task 3.8 Arrange Public Hearing (August)

The target date for the hearing is the third week of September, 30 days after publication of the draft Guidance Document in the Federal Register during the week of August 22.

The Project Director will have made preliminary arrangements for the public hearing – selection of city and reserving a venue, for example – earlier in consultation with EAC staff. Arrangements will be finalized in June and July, with retention of a transcription service and provision of day staff to register those testifying. The Project Team will begin to review and summarize written comments as they arrive.

**Deliverables**
Contract for use of venue for public hearing
Contract with transcription service for coverage of hearing
Contract with office temp agency for admin support of hearing

Task 3.9 Final Guidance Document for Adoption (late September)

In the week following the hearing, the Project Team will review the comments and testimony received, summarize that material for discussion with the EAC staff, and revise the Guidance Document as appropriate. The EAC will receive the final Guidance Document in time to adopt it before the end of September.

**Deliverable**
Final Guidance Document

VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Voter identification requirements are intertwined with provisional voting issues. Understanding the connections between the two parts of this research will be critical in achieving the goals of the project.

Ferment is bubbling in the states over voter identification issues. The sharp debate over voter identification makes this work more immediately relevant. Legislatures are now wrestling with the very issues to be analyzed in these tasks. The current edition of
Democracy Dispatches\textsuperscript{2}, for example, highlights recent developments and contentious debates that the Guidance Document on this subject may help resolve.

- In Indiana the Republican-controlled House Elections Committee reported out a bill by a 7-5 margin that would require most people to show government-issued ID before voting. Opponents argue that the legislation will discourage people from voting. "It is very clear who is being disenfranchised," said a poll worker quoted in the newsletter. "It's people of color, it's the poor, it's the elderly."
- African American lawmakers in the Georgia State Legislature led a walkout by Democrats after the passage of a bill in both Houses that would require Georgia voters to show photographic identification. "What's happening today is just an updated form of Jim Crow," said one senator from Atlanta. "You may be more polite about it... but we know who's going to be disenfranchised."
- In New Mexico, House Republicans attacked Democrats for not including more stringent voter ID requirements in their election reform bills. After several House Republicans left an elections committee meeting on March 13, one representative accused them of planning a walkout to prevent his bill's passage.
- In Texas, new bills would require voters to show proof of citizenship before registering to vote for the first time. A spokesman for People For the American Way is quoted as saying that "this type of legislation will be just as burdensome for U.S.-born voters who move from state to state, or from county for county, as for naturalized citizens."

Authoritative research on the effect of different voter ID regimes on electoral participation, including registering and turnout, particularly turnout by minority voters, promises to raise the level of the debate across the nation.

Advocates on voter ID issues are divided into two, polarized camps. Some seek to minimize identification requirements in order to maximize the number of potential voters who register and cast a ballot. Advocates of this position fear that minority and immigrant voters, young voters, and elderly voters will lack convenient access to the required ID documents, or that they will be more fearful of submitting their ID documents to official scrutiny. On the other side of this debate are people and groups that seek to maximize the security of the franchise, prevent multiple voting or voting by those who are not citizens, and ensure that only those legally entitled to vote do so, and do so once only for each election. Each position pursues legitimate and important goals, but the tradeoffs between them have not been clarified.

The debate between these two positions is rich in assertion, but poor in evidence. We propose to test the hypothesis that more stringent voter ID requirements depress voter participation in general or for the poor, minorities and older voters in particular. We will also search for evidence of a change in the frequency of voter fraud under different requirements for Voter Identification. This research appears practical because the 50 states can be classified into 4 broad, different Voter ID regimes --from requiring ID at every election to merely signing in without verification. We plan to include in our

\textsuperscript{2} Demos Democracy Dispatches
research a statistical analysis of voter turnout in the jurisdictions, with special attention
to participation by minority voters, using the variety of Voter ID requirements that
existed before HAVA as a controlling variable.

A study by The Constitution Project, published by Electionline.org in 2002\(^3\) found
"a wide variety of practices around the country – from procedures requiring nothing
more than voters stating their names to rules ordering voters to produce picture
identification before casting ballots." In the pre-HAVA era it found the following
distribution of practices, which provides a potentially rich mine of data to compare voter
participation in states with different Voter ID regimes:

- 11 states required in-person voters to present documentary information; local
jurisdictions and/or poll workers in 4 more states can choose to require identification.
- 18 states required only that voters sign in at the polls.
- 9 states required the signatures to be matched against other signed documents.
- 9 states only required voters to announce their names at the polls.

Performing this analysis will strengthen the factual basis on which the commission
proposes new guidance on Voter Identification Requirements.

Task 3.10 Collect and Analyze (April – May)

We will perform this task in conjunction with Task 3.4. The material we gather on Voter
ID legislation, administrative procedures and case law will be included in the
compendium to be delivered at the end of June. While the Project Team and staff
collect and begin the analysis of the material, the Project Director will plan the public
hearing on Voter ID Issues that will take place in early June.

Our research staff will begin the statistical study of voter participation under various
Voter ID regimes, with the aim of completing that work in time for its results to be
considered in drafting the Preliminary Guidance Document to be delivered to the EAC in
mid July.

**Deliverables**
1. Indexed database of major articles on Voter ID Requirements and related topics
2. Summary of case law on Voter ID issues
3. Compendium of states’ legislation, procedures, and litigation.
4. Analysis of voter participation and vote fraud under various Voter ID regimes to
be reviewed by the the Peer Review Group.

Task 3.11 Conduct Public Hearing (June)

The Project Director will consult closely with EAC staff on planning for the half-day,
informational public hearing, including on questions of site selection, development of

\(^3\) The Constitution Project, "Election Reform Briefing –Voter Identification," 2002,
topics to be covered by panels, and the recruitment of panelists with contrasting views and information on those topics. The target for Invitations to panelists will be no later than early May. The information and perspectives gleaned at the hearing will be included in the analysis of Voter ID issues that shapes the drafting of the Preliminary Guidance Document.

Deliverables
1. Outline of topics for 3 panels
2. List of 9 - 12 panelists
3. Invitations to panelists
4. Hearing announcement
5. Hearing transcript
6. Hearing summary

Task 3.12 Alternative Approaches (late June)

Following the hearing, the Project Team will review its compilation of materials from the states, the results of its research on voter participation and vote fraud under different Voter ID regimes, its literature search, and the information from the public hearing to assess the problems and challenges of Voter Identification procedures and devise a range of alternative policy measures to respond to those problems and challenges. The Project Director will work closely with the EAC and its staff to identify policy objectives with which to assess the alternatives, using the triangle of contending forces as an organizing principle to categorize objectives.

The Peer Review Group will be kept informed of the progress of this work and its comments will be sought on an early draft of the Analysis and Alternative Approaches paper. The comments of the Peer Review Group will help shape our briefing for the Commission on this critical task. The Project Director and members of the Project Team will conduct that briefing in late June, just as the Commission receives the Draft Report and Compendium of materials on Provisional Voting (Task 3.4).

During this time period, the Project Director, in consultation with the EAC, will select a site and make preliminary arrangements for the public hearing on the draft guidance document, which will be held in early October.

Deliverables
Draft analysis and alternatives for Peer Review Group
Briefing on analysis and alternatives for EAC

Task 3.12 Preliminary Guidance Document (July - August)

Based on comments by the EAC on the briefing, particularly the discussion of alternatives, as well as the evidence, and criteria for evaluation, the Project Team will draft the Preliminary Guidance Document. The draft will be distributed to the EAC Board of Advisors and the Standards Board for a meeting in mid August (just as the draft...
Guidance Document on Provisional Voting is delivered to the EAC for publication in the Federal Register. The Project Director and selected members of the Project Team will participate in the Board meeting to present the document for discussion and respond to questions and comments. It will record comments for review in revising the document.

**Deliverables**
1. Draft Guidance Document
2. Briefing for EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board
3. Summary of comments from Boards

**Task 3.14  Revise Guidance Document for Publication (Late August)**

The Project Team will review on the comments by the Peer Review Group, EAC, the Board of Advisors, and the Standards Board and reflect their views in the Guidance Document. The target is to deliver it to the EAC for publication before the end of August.

**Deliverable**
Draft Guidance Document for publication

**Task 3.15  Public Hearing (October)**

The Project Director will have completed arrangements for the hearing (city, venue, transcription service, etc.) by late July. The hearing will take place in the first two weeks of October, 30 days after publication of the draft in the Federal Register.

**Deliverables**
1. Public hearing
2. Transcript
3. Summary of comments

**Task 3.16  Final Guidance Document (late October)**

In the week following the hearing, the Project Team will review the comments and testimony received, summarize that material for discussion with the EAC staff, and revise the Guidance Document as appropriate. The EAC will receive the final Guidance Document in time to adopt it before the end of October.

**Deliverable**
Final Guidance Document
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruit</td>
<td>PRG/Arrange</td>
<td>Pub Hearings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finalize VID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Voting</td>
<td>Moritz</td>
<td>Compile Legal Materials</td>
<td>Draft An &amp; Ails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit Draft GD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagleton</td>
<td>Compile Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report and compendium to EAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAC Comment</td>
<td>Meet EAC BOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU Poll Sci</td>
<td>State PV Survey</td>
<td>Draft GD to EAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Revise GD Draft GD to EAC for publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagleton Poll</td>
<td>Young Voter Survey</td>
<td>PRG coms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagleton Poll</td>
<td>Election Official Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report and compendium to EAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAC Comment</td>
<td>Meet EAC BOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft GD to EAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Revise GD Draft GD to EAC for publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter ID</td>
<td>Moritz</td>
<td>Compile Legal Materials</td>
<td>Draft Alternatives Brief to EAC</td>
<td>Draft PGD</td>
<td>BOA Meet EAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagleton</td>
<td>Compile Procedures</td>
<td>Draft GD to EAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EAC Rev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagleton</td>
<td>Hearing Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>PERFORMED BY</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provisional Voting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Collect and analyze State legislation, procedures, and court cases</td>
<td>Legislation and cases — MCL Team led by Foley Procedures — EIP Team led by PI with Reed, O'Neill, and Linky</td>
<td>Graduate students and EIP Research Coordinator will also participate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Recommend alternative approaches</td>
<td>Steering Committee with O'Neill directing staff</td>
<td>Graduate students and EIP Research Coordinator will also participate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Prepare preliminary draft guidance document</td>
<td>Steering Committee with O'Neill directing staff</td>
<td>This task may include derived from the optional surveys described in the proposal: Optional Survey of Election Officials — TBD. Optional Survey of Young Voters — TBD. Optional Survey of Ohio Provisional Ballots — TBD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Revise draft guidance for publication</td>
<td>Steering Committee with O'Neill directing staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Arrange public hearing on draft guidance</td>
<td>O'Neill and Admin Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Prepare final guidance document for EAC adoption</td>
<td>Steering Committee with O'Neill directing staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voter Identification Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Collect and analyze State legislation, procedures, and court cases</td>
<td>Legislation and cases — MCL Team led by Foley Procedures — EIP Team led by PI with Reed, O'Neill, and Linky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Convene informational public hearing</td>
<td>O'Neill and Admin Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Recommend alternative approaches</td>
<td>Steering Committee with O'Neill directing staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13 Prepare preliminary draft guidance document</td>
<td>Steering Committee with O'Neill directing staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The Steering Committee for the project is responsible for the completion of all tasks. Chaired by Dr. Ruth Mandel, Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, its members are Professor Edward Foley of the Moritz College of Law, Ohio State University, Ingrid W. Reed, Director of the New Jersey Project of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, Professor Dan Tokaji of the Moritz College of Law, Ohio State University, and John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics. Thomas O'Neill, a consultant to the Eagleton Institute of Politics, directs the staff overseen by the Committee.

5. The preliminary guidance documents for both the Provisional Voting and for Voter Identification Requirements will be reviewed by a Peer Review Group appointed by the Steering Committee and may be revised as a result of that review before being submitted to the EAC. Members of the Peer Review Group are listed in a separate appendix to this proposal.

6. The surveys would provide additional and valid and reliable data on which to base the conclusions reflected in the draft preliminary guidance document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Revise draft guidance for publication</td>
<td>Steering Committee with O'Neill directing staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Arrange public hearing on draft guidance</td>
<td>O'Neill and Admin Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Prepare final guidance document for EAC adoption</td>
<td>Steering Committee with O'Neill directing staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The principal investigator, Dr. Ruth B. Mandel, is director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics and Board of Governors Professor of Politics. As Institute director, she is responsible for general direction and oversight of all programs and projects at Eagleton. Under Mandel’s leadership, the Institute has been successfully completed dozens of projects under federal, state and foundation grants and contracts, many of which address topics related to voters and voting, civic engagement and political participation, and representative democracy.

Three projects in which she has played a significant and direct substantive role are described below: the New Jersey Initiative: Building Management Capacity in New Jersey Municipalities; the Young Elected Leaders Project; and the New Jersey Civic Education Consortium.

a) The New Jersey Initiative: Building Management Capacity in New Jersey Municipalities
Sponsoring Organizations: The Pew Charitable Trusts and the NJ Department of Community Affairs
Project Managers: Dale Jones, Syracuse University, Mark Pfeiffer, NJ Department of Community Affairs
Period of Performance: 5/01 to 11/02
Value of Award: $90,000 to Eagleton Institute of Politics

Mandel oversaw the implementation of the New Jersey Initiative, which was conducted as a partnership between the Alan K. Campbell Public Affairs Institute of the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University and the Eagleton Institute of Politics. Mandel guided the formation of the collaboration, the identification of the tasks, including issues related to selecting the case studies, and dissemination of the recommendations and results.

The overall goal of the New Jersey Initiative was to provide opportunities for municipalities and other levels of government, educational institutions, non-profit organizations and individuals to learn about public management systems, how they might be improved, and how they can better meet the needs of those in leadership positions and the needs of citizens. Recommendations for state policy and municipal administration were included.

Seven New Jersey municipal governments volunteered to participate in the Initiative – Brick Township, Elizabeth City, Franklin Township, Irvington Township, Old Bridge Township, Paterson City, and Trenton City. Through their involvement, the project examined the five core management system areas that comprise management capacity – financial management, capital management, human resources management, information technology management, and managing for results. Much was learned about management capacity at the municipal level in New Jersey and the role of the state government in municipal management.

b) Young Elected Leaders Project
Sponsoring Organization: The Pew Charitable Trusts
Project Managers: Tobi Walker, Program Officer, Civic Life Initiatives;
Period of Performance: January, 2002 - June, 2004
Value of Award: $211,000

Mandel led the project team that conducted a pioneering national study of young officeholders. Under her direction, Eagleton identified and surveyed elected officials age 35 and under in three categories: federal (members of Congress); state (statewide elected officials and state legislators); and local (mayors and municipal council members from cities with populations of 30,000 or more). In May 2003, Eagleton convened Political Generation Next: America's Young Elected Leaders, the first national conference for young elected leaders, an occasion to explore issues raised in the research and discuss the challenges of public leadership facing the next generation.

Mandel was centrally involved in every phase of the project, providing the vision that resulted in the successful proposal to Pew, contributing both to the ideas guiding the project and the actual day-to-day management. She played a key role in the design of the survey administered to young elected leaders, in the selection of conference participants, and in the planning of the conference agenda and presenters, as well as at the conference itself. She co-authored the final report provided to the funder and issued to the general public, also titled Political Generation Next: America's Young Elected Leaders, and she led dissemination efforts, speaking at public programs and to the media about the findings from the research and conference.

c) New Jersey Civic Education Consortium
Sponsoring Organization: The Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation
Project Manager: David Grant
Period of Performance: March, 2000 - May, 2001
Value of Award: $211,000

The New Jersey Civic Education Consortium was created by the Eagleton Institute of Politics as a statewide partnership of educators, schools, nonprofit organizations, corporations, and political leaders committed to expanding and strengthening civic education and political participation in New Jersey. Sponsored and hosted by Eagleton, the Consortium seeks to promote partnerships among schools, community organizations, and public servants to educate and encourage a citizenry informed about and engaged in the practice of a democratic society. More than 100 organizations,
agencies and school districts signed on as Consortium partners, and more than 125 individuals in the education, non-profit, and political communities served on Consortium work groups. The Consortium came into existence to strengthen the state’s infrastructure to educate and encourage a citizenry informed about and engaged in the practice of a democratic society. It seeks to leverage limited resources through partnerships and information-sharing and by increasing public awareness.

With support from the Dodge Foundation, the Consortium hosted a statewide conference to highlight best practices, exchange ideas, and explore how to use the 2001 gubernatorial election as an educational opportunity. Approximately 90 people gathered at the New Jersey Law Center in New Brunswick to share ideas, make connections, and find new ways of improving civic education in New Jersey. The conference included: a poster session highlighting some of the best practices in civic education from across the state; panels of educators, government, academia, the media, and the non-profit community; and a keynote speaker, Professor Alan Rosenthal, discussing democracy and youth civic engagement.

The Consortium also awarded mini-grants for exemplary programs and engaged the public sector in civic education through a pilot project to bring public officials into the classroom. Some of the grantees presented their work at the Consortium’s conference. Under a related grant from the Schumann Fund for New Jersey, the Consortium developed a toolkit with educational resources and suggested activities to assist public officials in working with students.

Mandel worked on the original plan for Eagleton to convene the Consortium and directed Institute staff in shaping the mission and direction of the Consortium. She has been actively involved in development of the Consortium’s activities and materials.

Dr. Mandel’s current resume is provided in Attachment 8 – Resumes of the Project Team.
Attachment 4: Comparable Projects Performed by the Eagleton Institute of Politics

a) Seminar Series: The Challenge of Implementing the Help America Vote Act
   Sponsoring Organization: The Fund for New Jersey
   Project Manager: Mark Murphy, Executive Director
   Grant: $5,000 for direct expenses of speakers.

This project demonstrates Eagleton's continuing interest in the implementation of HAVA and knowledge of implementation issues. It shows the Institute's knowledge of implementation issues and its ability to achieve productive results by identifying competencies in other states and making contact with key leaders, summarizing information in useful formats and engaging individuals with diverse perspectives on election administration.

In the fall of 2003, the Eagleton Institute of Politics presented a series of three seminars, organized by Ingrid W. Reed, Director of the Institute's New Jersey Project, designed to give New Jersey an opportunity to gain perspectives from six states – New Mexico, Maryland, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Georgia and California – on election reform and implementation of the then-new federal Help America Vote Act. The seminars were held at Eagleton on the Rutgers University campus in New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Each seminar featured speakers from two states where election administration initiatives are underway and addressed one of three areas – state administration, statewide voter registration lists, and communication and education. The programs also included extensive discussion periods with individuals from New Jersey's state and county governments, academic institutions and non-profit organizations interested in election reform, as well as members of the New Jersey HAVA planning committee. The seminars were supported in part by a grant from the Fund for New Jersey.

The first seminar, on September 25, 2003 focused on state administration of elections and plans for implementing HAVA. Presentations were made by Rebecca Vigil-Giron, New Mexico Secretary of State and president-elect of the Association of Secretaries of State, and Linda Lamone, the State Administrator of the Maryland State Board of Elections. They focused on how states are working with counties to provide state-coordinated management practices.

The second seminar on October 28, 2003 focused on HAVA requirements to create a statewide voter registration list. Presentations were made by Christopher Thomas, Director of the Bureau of Elections in the Michigan Department of State who headed his state's efforts to create a statewide voter data base that began in the mid-1990's before HAVA, and Ted Koval, project manager for the Statewide Uniform Registry of Electors (SURE) in the Pennsylvania Department of State who leads the development of his state's registration list in the post-HAVA period. Thomas and Koval discussed state initiatives for addressing a key provision of HAVA which involves application of information technology and new approaches to inter-governmental relations.
The third seminar, on November 20, 2003 focused on the HAVA requirement to provide voter information and education. Presentations were made by Alison Bracewell McCullick, Statewide Voter Education Coordinator for the Georgia Department of State where she oversees 12 voter education coordinators around the state, and Conny G. McCormack, County Clerk for Los Angeles County who has responsibility for conducting elections with over 4 million voters and 5,000 voting places. Bracewell McCullick and McCormack presented examples of communications approaches reaching different audiences through diverse media.

As a follow-up to the seminars, a summary of specific key points from the presentations of each of the speakers was prepared and mailed and e-mailed to staff members in the to New Jersey partisan and non-partisan legislative staff offices to help inform new legislation New Jersey would need to implement the requirements of HAVA. The summary was also provided to the election administration staffs in each of New Jersey's 21 counties and to the leadership of the municipal clerks organization in order to give them a sense of what other states have done in working with county and local leadership to implement HAVA. As a direct result of Eagleton's work, New Jersey election officials subsequently visited the State of Michigan election office and are now modeling New Jersey effort to create a statewide voter list on Michigan's. In addition, the summary has been useful to organizations who have advocated for changes in the election system and who are acting as watch dogs of New Jersey's progress on implementation. The summary is posted on the Eagleton Institute web site.

b) Second HAVA Seminar Series

Subsequent to the HAVA seminar series focusing on other states, the Eagleton Institute of Politics supported the subsequent seminars as part of the Institute’s public service mission. This series was directed by Ingrid Reed of Eagleton and included the following:

July 24, 2004 - The Chairman of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, Dr. DeForest B. Soaries, Jr., spoke about “Implementing HAVA: Perspectives from the Federal Level.” The program also Included Attorney General Peter C. Harvey, New Jersey's Chief Election Official.

October 8, 2004 – The topic was “Implementing HAVA: Can We Alleviate Risk and Improve Public Confidence When Using New DRE Voting Systems?” Eric Lazarus, lead developer of the report "Recommendations for Improving Reliability of Direct Recording Electronic Voting Systems" issued by the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU Law School and the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, discussed how and why these recommendations were made for the 2004 election and how election officials were asked to respond to them. New Jersey election officials then discussed how these recommendations were being addressed, which measures should be considered for the future and which measures appeared irrelevant for New Jersey.
January 5, 2004 - The topic was "Next Steps for HAVA Implementation in 2006 Based on 2004 - and what it means for the New Jersey Election in 2005." The session used the Election Official Report Card 2004 developed by the Brennan Center as a starting point for a discussion to set an agenda for evaluating the next elections. Bonnie Blader of NJ Appleseed reported on her inspections and discussions about security matters in several counties. Deborah Goldberg, Program Director of the Democracy Project of Brennan Center for Justice at NYU Law School discussed the use of the Election 2004 Report Card and Eric Lazarus presented plans for assessing what information is needed to make decisions about voting systems.


Sponsoring Organization: The Century Foundation
Project Manager: Tova Wang
Period of Performance 2001-2002
Value of Award: $6,000

This project illustrates the Eagleton Institute's early interest in issues related to HAVA and its ability to conduct applied research, analyze data and information, work with election officials, craft recommendations and contribute to state-by-state comparison of election issues.

The Century Foundation requested Ingrid Reed, director of the Eagleton New Jersey Project, to prepare one of four studies of 2001 elections designed to assess the extent to which problems evident in Florida and elsewhere in 2000 persisted in the absence of fundamental reform throughout most of the country. Reed provided a study with recommendation of the New Jersey gubernatorial election. The other three were the governor's race in Virginia, and mayoral races in New York City and Los Angeles.

The Century Foundation reports were released and discussed at the National Press Club, Washington D.C. on October 15, at a program, "Does the Federal Election Bill Fix The Problem?" moderated by Juan Williams, senior correspondent for National Public Radio's Morning Edition.

Overall, the reports show that election problems were much less pervasive in Virginia and Los Angeles -- which have long-standing voting laws and practices that parallel the reforms that Congress enacted -- than in New Jersey and New York City, where there have been more scattershot approaches to election reform. The reports can be found on www.reformelections.com.

The Overview of the Century Foundation Report (p. xxxiv) notes that in New Jersey, "structural flaws in the system reduce responsibility for carrying out elections effectively and leave local and county administration unaccountable." The report notes that in the 2001 election, the number of uncounted votes rose – usually New Jersey hovers around the national average – despite the fact that the state replaced its punch card ballot machines. It also notes that New Jersey uses a wide variety of voting machines, and
Despite official reports, election observers and voting advocates report polling sites and systems remain inaccessible for the disabled.

The report on the 2001 New Jersey Election points out that New Jersey’s decentralized, county-based election system is very similar to Florida’s and lacks transparency and accountability.

The first part of the New Jersey report gives the context for the 2001 elections and describes initiatives taken in 2000 such as eliminating punch card machines and increasing poll worker pay. It discusses how the process worked by looking at four places where specific election problems arose -- Atlantic City, Cumberland County, Passaic County, and Mercer County. It also presents results of an informal survey conducted by Eagleton with the assistance of two research fellows of election administrators about the 2001 election that showed that the increase in poll worker pay successfully addressed the need for workers. It also makes recommendations for improving future elections (p.39): They include:

- define a state leadership role in managing elections
- set county standards for streamlined administration
- address the needs of citizens with disabilities
- examine role of absentee ballots
- improve services for bilingual voters
- upgrade and standardize voting equipment
- consider practices in other states for such initiatives as statewide voter lists, mail ballots, shorter registration deadlines
- use modern communications to promote elections
- recognize outstanding achievements in election administration at the county and local level

Reed concludes the report noting that “the challenge is to find a way to address the systemic issues about election administration in order to assure that the more specific issues are implemented fairly and efficiently and not simply added on to an already complex, overburdened structure…. Leadership from the governor and the legislature will be required to define the expectations for reform and to engage, not ignore, the many individuals and entities already involved in the election process to craft a new system.”

Reed added that the new federal election reform act will be catalyst for addressing many of the problems with New Jersey’s system and provides funds to make improvements in voting equipment.
d) RU Voting

Sponsoring Organization: Rutgers University
Project Manager: Greg Blimiing, Vice President
Period of Performance: Fall 2004
Value of Award: $20,000

The Eagleton Institute initiated and managed a project to register and educate Rutgers University students and get them out to vote. Helping to form and mobilize a non-partisan association of staff, faculty, and student groups, Eagleton assistant research professor Susan Sherr served as faculty advisor for a project led by a recent Rutgers graduate. The coalition collected approximately 11,000 registration forms for students registering for the first time, seeking absentee ballots or filing address changes. The group also sponsored a website providing information for student voters.

The election-day experience of this project is particularly relevant to this proposal to the EAC. While thousands of Rutgers students headed to the polls, apparently because of the huge influx of new voter registrations, many found their names had not been added to the rolls. While they were able to vote by provisional ballot, many found this frustrating and disappointing, and contacted Eagleton. Several Eagleton faculty and staff members spent much of election day in contact with area local election officials, reporters and students trying to determine exactly what the problem was and what solutions could be found quickly. The difficulty of making these determinations along with the wild rumors the problems generated were sobering and instructive for considering how to improve the use of provisional ballots in particular.

e) Public Interest Polling

Sponsoring Organization: NJ Motor Vehicles Commission
Project Manager: Sharon Harrington, Director
Period of Performance: 2003-2005
Value of Awards: $160,000

The fifth comparable project is the survey research work performed by the Eagleton Institute's Center for Public Interest Polling, also known as the Eagleton Poll. Whether or not the EAC chooses to fund the optional polls described in this proposal, the work done by the Eagleton Poll is relevant both for helping the project team understand the value and limits of polling as a gauge of public opinion and because the prominence of the Poll has contributed to public knowledge and respect for the Institute as a whole.

The Eagleton Poll, established in 1971, was one of the first, and most respected academic-based state survey research organizations in the country. The Center engages with approximately 25 government or non-profit agencies each year to conduct polls and focus groups. One client has been the New Jersey Motor Vehicles Commission which has hired Eagleton twice over the last three years to conduct
customer satisfaction surveys. The current contract also calls for convening of focus groups to probe issues more deeply and an assessment of Motor Vehicles employee attitudes and impressions.

In addition, Eagleton collaborates with New Jersey's largest newspaper, The Star-Ledger, to conduct the Star-Ledger/Eagleton-Rutgers Poll. Conducted five to six times a year, this is the most prominent and oldest survey of public opinion in the state.
Attachment 5 - Risks re Provisional Voting

The research proposed to develop the guidance document for Provisional Voting involves a contentious political and policy debate, requires the use of a large mass of information to varying reliability, and requires aiming at a moving target because considerable action is underway across the country based on the experiences with the 2004 election. Each of these factors could undermine the credibility and utility of the work, but reasonable precautions can moderate that risk.

Polarized Political and Policy Debate
The debate over Provisional Voting has resulted in a clash over policy with a distinct partisan tinge. Republicans and Democrats are at odds over the proper role for Provisional Voting in the electoral system, election officials are exposed to a more stringent scrutiny that had been the norm, and the federal role in what had previously been a state and local responsibility is controversial in some quarters. All of these conditions make Provisional Voting a controversial topic and will put the analysis and recommendations of this project not just under a microscope but one illuminated by a harsh light.

The most effective way to moderate the risk that controversy could undermine credibility of the project is to turn to independent institutions with a strong reputation and the credentials that inspire confidence. We believe that the Eagleton Institute of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey and the Moritz College of Law of the Ohio State University have that reputation and that their scholarly, policy-relevant work has created a reputation that inspires confidence.

Data Analysis
The volume and types of information related to Provisional Voting nationwide is staggering. Relying on narratives in the press or form the organizations that have sprung up in the last several years to monitor election reform is appropriate for much of the work proposed. But judging the validity and reliability of that information can frequently be problematic. Unreliable data will produce unreliable conclusions, which, in the present contentious political atmosphere, will quickly undermine the project.

This proposal addresses that problem by supplementing the available sources of data with survey research, the reliability and validity of which is measurable. The proposed survey of provisional voters would go beyond the anecdotal to provide statistically significant measures of their subjective experiences. The survey of local election officials would tap systematically their assessment of the clarity of the guidance they received in 2004 more reliable that the anecdotal reports frequently found in the existing literature.

The Moving Target
The states are not sitting back waiting for instructions on how to proceed in improving the process of Provisional Voting. This project to provide them guidance, which they may or not accept, is aimed at a moving target.
The best way to ensure the relevance of the guidance when published is to conduct the project in a way that provides information too good to ignore. The thorough nationwide search for best practices, clear-eyed analysis, independent review of the experience in 2004, and clear objectives will make the guidance document useful to all jurisdictions.
Attachment 6 – Risks re Voter Identification

The research proposed to develop the guidance document for Voter Identification Requirements and Procedures comes at a time of particularly sharp debate. That debate reveals a racial dimension as well as a partisan dimension, and it is taking place in state houses across the country. The vocabulary of the controversy is richer in invective and allegation than it is in information and analysis. As with the project on Provisional Voting, we are aiming at a moving target as the states grapple with how to modify their requirements for Voter Identification at a pace that may be faster than the schedule for publication of the Commission’s guidance on this topic.

Polarized Debate
The debate over Provisional Voting has resulted in a clash over policy with a distinct partisan tinge. Republicans tend to favor more demanding Voter Identification procedures to increase the security of the ballot. Democrats advocate for a more open system, fearing that stringent requirements would reduce the electoral participation of the poor, the elderly, African-Americans and immigrants, and other groups. Stepping into the middle of this conflict is inherently risky because motives and intentions will be called into question.

The most effective way to moderate the risk that controversy could undermine credibility of the project is to provide information that is not now found in the debate. The analysis of the effects of different Voter Identification regimes on voter participation will bring new information to the debate. If our Intentions are realized—and they should be—the analysis will yield a clearer understanding of what tradeoffs may exist between various Voter Identification regimes. This kind of good data will not end the debate, but it should raise it to a higher level, and that would be no small achievement in this case. A higher level of debate will likely make the Commission’s guidance more influential.

Quality of the data
Raising the quality of the debate by providing information both sides can find useful carries its own risk. The time available for this work is limited. To fail to produce the information as needed in the workplan is real because the work is demanding. But we believe that careful management and the resources of the two institutions will make it possible to develop the analysis in time to be useful in shaping the guidance document.

The Moving Target
The states are moving ahead to change their Voter Identification Procedures. This project to provide them guidance, which they may or not accept, is aimed at a moving target.

As with the Provisional Voting Project, The best way to ensure the relevance of the guidance when published is to conduct the project in a way that provides information too good to ignore. The thorough nationwide search for best practices, clear-eyed analysis of the tradeoffs between Voter ID procedures, and clear objectives will make the guidance document useful across the country.
Attachment 7 – Five Top Reasons Eagleton/Moritz Is the best qualified candidate

1. This project involves subjects in sharp debate. The Eagleton Institute of Politics of Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and the Moritz College of Law of the Ohio State University are well-respected, independent academic institutions whose work will lend credibility to the research and the resulting Guidance Documents.

2. Eagleton and Moritz have an active and admirable record of involvement in election analysis, inter-governmental relations, election law and related topics. This experience not only enhances their reputations, it provides them with a rare, if not unique, perspective on the issues that will be apparent in the quality of the work produced.

3. The partnership in this project between an Institute of Politics and a College of Law will enrich the analysis. The synergies derived from focusing two different perspectives and ways of thinking on the issues will strengthen the conclusions. The guidance documents that result will rest on a platform both broad and strong.

4. The Peer Review Group created for this project in the proposal will enlarge even further the perspectives and experience focused on improving the process of Provisional Voting and assessing Voter Identification Requirements. The Peer Review Group’s comments will strengthen the analysis so that it can survive the scrutiny it is sure to receive in the current, contentious climate.

5. Both Eagleton and Moritz have strong record of obtaining and analyzing information from governments and interest groups and involving them in the interpretation of the data. They are truly independent: neither is a vendor or contractor involved in elections. Their work will be—and will be seen to be—objective and thorough.
Qualifications and Resumes for Project Team

QUALIFICATIONS

Jeffrey Levine - Director of Eagleton's Center for Public Interest Polling

Levine has written extensively on political behavior. He is author or co-author of chapters in three forthcoming books: *The Social Logic of Politics: Family, Friends, Neighbors, and Workmates as Contexts for Political Behavior* (Alan Zuckerman, editor), *The Behavioral Study of Political Ideology and Policy Formulation* (Carl Grafton and Anne Permaloff, editors), and *The Persistence of Political Disagreement among Citizens: How Disagreement Survives within Communication Networks* (Robert Huckfeldt, Paul Johnson, and John Sprague, authors). Levine's research has also been published in a variety of academic journals, including *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *American Political Science Review*, and *American Journal of Political Science*. Currently, he is engaged in an ongoing research project that examines the incidence and nature of informal political debate and deliberation in the American electorate.

Before his appointment as Director of the Center for Public Interest Polling in 2004, Levine was Managing Director of a commercial research firm, where he directed hundreds of quantitative and qualitative research studies for a range of corporate, non-profit, and political clients. He has also provided public opinion analysis on MSNBC and the FOX News Channel.

Levine earned his B.A. in Political Science from University of Rochester and his M.A. and Ph.D. in Political Science from Indiana University.

DON LINKY - Director, Electronic Government Project

Linky is focusing on how electronic technology is affecting government, politics and public affairs. He also continues as president of the Public Affairs Research Institute of New Jersey, a corporate-supported nonprofit founded in 1930 that monitors New Jersey economic, demographic and fiscal trends, and as president of Joshua Communications, a for-profit publishing and information consulting firm.

During the administration of New Jersey Governor Brendan T. Byrne, Linky served as chief counsel to the governor and director of the Governor's office of policy and planning. He had key roles in the development of such programs as the Pinelands Protection Act, the Spill Compensation and Protection Act, the Community Development Bond Act, the Enterprise Zone program, and the creation of New Jersey Transit.

He is the editor or co-editor of the reference books *The New Jersey Directory: The Insider Guide to New Jersey Leaders; The New Jersey Almanac; and The New Jersey Municipal Almanac*, and serves on the editorial board of *The New Jersey Encyclopedia*. A native of Asbury Park, he now resides in Princeton.
Linky received a BA from Dartmouth College in 1968 and a JD from Harvard Law School in 1972. He also attended the London School of Economics and Political Science.

**RUTH B. MANDEL -** Director, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University and Board of Governors Professor of Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University

From 1971 through 1994, Ruth B. Mandel directed Eagleton's Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP), where she remains affiliated as a Senior Scholar. Mandel teaches and writes about women and leadership, with emphasis on U.S. women's political history, women as political candidates and officeholders, women's political networks, and the "gender gap." She is the author of numerous publications about women's changing political roles. Recently, she headed an Eagleton team in developing the Young Elected Leaders Project, a new area of study focused on elected officials age thirty-five and under.

Mandel's public service includes a presidential appointment on the governing board of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C. She has served as Vice Chairperson of the board since being named by President Bill Clinton in 1993 and reappointed by President George Bush in 2002. Mandel is a member of the Museum's Executive Committee, its Academic Committee, and chairs its Education Committee. She chaired the task group charged with proposing a governing structure for the new Museum. In the 1990's, she led the process to create the Museum's Committee on Conscience, which was established in 1996 with Mandel as its founding chair.

Professor Mandel is a member of the board of the Charles H. Revson Foundation. Her service has also included membership on the board of the National Council for Research on Women; the National Commission for the Renewal of American Democracy; Princeton University's Center for Jewish Life; the Mercer County Commission on the Status of Women; and various editorial boards for scholarly journals and academic publishers.

Awards include: Woodrow Wilson Public Service Award given in the Governor's Pride of New Jersey Awards (1992); Gloria Stelnem Women of Vision Award presented by the Ms. Foundation (1996); Twenty-First Century Leadership Award, presented by the President of the National Women's Hall of Fame; Breaking the Glass Ceiling Award from Women Executives in State Government (1998); honorary Doctor of Public Service degree from Chatham College (1998); Award for Distinguished Policy Leadership and Advancement of Women in Public Life from the Women Legislators and College Presidents of Maryland (2002); Salute to the Policy Makers award from Executive Women of New Jersey (2004).
As an observer and analyst of American politics and emerging trends in leadership, she lectures and speaks frequently to a wide range of community, civic and academic audiences.

Ruth B. Mandel holds a B.A. in English from Brooklyn College and an M.A. and Ph.D. in American Literature from the University of Connecticut.

THOMAS M. O'NEILL — Project Director

For the past 20 years, O'Neill served as President of The Partnership for New Jersey and led its Leadership New Jersey, diversity management and education improvement programs. Previously he was Executive Director of The Center for Analysis of Public Issues in Princeton, which, among other research, analyzed campaigns and elections. He served for several years as election night analyst for New Jersey Network Television and for WNET-Channel 13 in New York.

INGRID W. REED - Director, New Jersey Project, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University

Ingrid W. Reed directs the Eagleton New Jersey Project, an initiative designed to reinforce and expand the contributions of Rutgers' Eagleton Institute of Politics to the governance and politics of its home state. Among its initiatives are programs on campaign and election activity, women and politics, welfare reform, and governance issues.

Recently Reed's work has focused on campaigns and elections from the point of view of the citizen. She is the co-author with Professor Gerald Pomper of a report with recommendations about the 1998 New Jersey Congressional Campaigns, Not Bad But Not Enough. She has conducted similar studies for the 2000 congressional campaigns, for the 2001 and 2003 for the New Jersey gubernatorial and legislative races, and 2002 U.S. Senate and House races. She is the author of The 2001 New Jersey Election, one of four reports prepared for The Century Foundation assessing the extent to which problems in the 2000 Florida election persisted in 2001. In March 2004, she presented a paper at Rutgers's Center for Government Services Policy Seminar Series on “Issues in Voter Participation: Do We Know What They Are? If We Know, What Can We Do About Them?” In partnership with Eagleton's Center for American Women and Politics, she organizes the Bi-Partisan Coalition for Women's Appointments. In 2001-2002, Reed was associate director for a pilot project funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts and the NJ Department of Community Affairs, conducted collaboratively with Syracuse University's Maxwell School for Citizenship and Public Administration, that resulted in a report, The New Jersey Initiative: Building Management Capacity in New Jersey Municipalities.

Before joining the Eagleton Institute, Reed served as assistant dean of Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs where she also
directed the Rockefeller Public Service Awards Program, and as vice president for public affairs and corporate secretary of The Rockefeller University in New York City.

Reed has written op-ed columns on politics for the *Home News and Tribune* (central New Jersey), *The Times of Trenton*, *New Jersey Law Journal*, the *Philadelphia Inquirer* and *The Record*; as well as authored pieces on public administration, urban redevelopment, welfare reform and municipal management. She is frequently interviewed for analyses of New Jersey politics by state, national and international media.

In her public service activities, Reed has a wide range of experiences in state politics and planning, governance and community affairs. She has chaired the Capital City (Trenton) Redevelopment Corporation, a state agency, since it began in 1988. She is a founder and board member of New Jersey Future, the organization advocating the Implementation of the State Development and Redevelopment Act, and she was on the board of the New Jersey Conservation Foundation and is currently on the Regional Plan Association, New Jersey Committee. She was elected to the board of the Community Foundation of New Jersey in April 2000.

Reed is a member of the board of the Institute of Public Administration (NYC). In 1993, she was elected a fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration and served on its special panel on Civic Trust and Citizen Responsibility. From 1983 to 1986, she held a Kellogg Foundation National Leadership Fellowship.

She is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the University of Pennsylvania.

**JOHN WEINGART - Associate Director, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University**

John Weingart is the associate director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University. He also chairs two state commissions: the Highlands Water Protection and Planning Council and the Delaware and Raritan Canal Commission.

John's publications include the Eagleton Institute study, "Another Government Success Story: Citizen Volunteers on New Jersey State Boards and Commissions" (2004); *Waste Is A Terrible Thing To Mind: Risk, Radiation, and Distrust of Government* (described at [www.WasteIsATerribleThingToMind.com](http://www.WasteIsATerribleThingToMind.com)), and *Reform of Undergraduate Education* (written with Arthur E. Levine) which was named "Book Of The Year" by the American Council on Education.

Before coming to Eagleton, John served in New Jersey state government for 23 years during the administrations of two Democratic and two Republican governors. He worked at the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection from 1975 to 1994 where his posts included director of the Division of Coastal Resources and Assistant
Commissioner for Environmental Regulation. He then spent four years as Executive Director of the state's Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Facility Siting Board.

John holds a B.A. in Sociology from Brandeis University and a Master's in Public Affairs from Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School.
RUTH B. MANDEL

Office
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers, The University of New Jersey

Home

EDUCATION
B.A. 1960, Brooklyn College, English; Ph.D. 1969, M.A. 1962, University of Connecticut, English/American Literature

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
Board of Governors Professor of Politics, Rutgers University, since 1994
Professor, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, 1985-94; Associate Professor, 1978-85; Assistant Professor, 1971-78.
Director, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, since January 1995
   Established in 1956, the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University explores state and national politics through research, education, and public service activities, linking the study of politics with its day-to-day practice. Eagleton offers graduate fellowship programs and an undergraduate certificate program for Rutgers students. The Institute's faculty and programs specialize in the study of: state legislatures; public opinion polling and survey research; women's participation in politics; minority and immigrant political participation; campaigns, elections and political parties; civic education and engagement; electronic democracy; and New Jersey politics.
Director, Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP), a unit of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, 1971-95
   Built a research, education, and public service program to promote greater understanding of women's relationship to politics and government and to develop a body of knowledge about women's public leadership. Co-Director of CAWP, 1971-73; Educational Coordinator, 1971. CAWP was established in 1971.
   Senior Scholar, CAWP, since 1995
   Affiliated Faculty, Department of American Studies, since 2002
   Affiliated Faculty, Department of Women's and Gender Studies, since 2001
   Fellow, Douglass College, Rutgers University, since 1982
   Member, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Rutgers University, since 1981
   Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of English, Rider College, 1970-71
   Lecturer, Department of English, University of Pittsburgh, 1968-70
   Part-time Instructor, Department of English, University of Connecticut, 1960-66

Teaching at Rutgers
Department of Political Science: Women and Political Leadership (graduate); Eagleton Seminar in American Politics (graduate);
Women and American Politics (undergraduate); Becoming A Public Citizen (undergraduate)
Department of Women's and Gender Studies: Leadership Scholar's Seminar (undergraduate)
Department of English: Autobiographies of American Women; Women and Contemporary Problems; Women in Modern America
and England; Politics and Fiction

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT
Vice Chairperson, U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, the governing board of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum


Committees: Search Committees for Director of the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, 1992, 1995, 1998; Executive Committee (Vice Chair); Compensation Committee; Long Range Planning Committee; Development Committee; Academic Committee; Committee on Collections and Acquisitions; Chair, Task Force on Governance; Chair, Exploratory Group for A Committee on Conscience, 1994-96; Founding Chair, Committee on Conscience, 1996-97, 1999-2000; Chair, Strategic Planning Committee; Chair, Education Committee, 2003-04.
HONORS/AWARDS

Awards/Honors
Honoree, "Salute the Policy Makers–Awards Dinner Honoring Women of Achievement,"

Honoree, as one of three Founders of the national Public Leadership Education Network on the occasion of its 25th Anniversary

Honoree, “Women of Distinction” award, American Association of University Women, June 2002

Honoree, Women Legislators and Women College Presidents of Maryland, Maryland Independent College and University Association, Annapolis, Maryland, January 2002

Honoree, The Section for Women in Public Administration, American Society for Public Administration, March 2001


Honorary Doctor of Public Service degree, Chatham College, Pittsburgh, PA, May 1998

Breaking the Glass Ceiling Award for a Person in the Public Sector, Women Executives in State Government, January 1998

Mary Louise Smith Chair in Women and Politics, Iowa State University, 1997-98

Twenty-First Century Leadership Award, presented by the President of the National Women's Hall of Fame, October 1996

Gloria Steinem Woman of Vision Award, presented by the Ms. Foundation for Women, May 1996

The League of Women Voters of New Jersey 75th Anniversary Achievement Award, May 1996

Honoree, YWCA of Central Jersey, March 1993

Faculty Merit Awards, Rutgers University, 1982, 1988, 1993

Recipient of the Governor of New Jersey’s Woodrow Wilson Public Service Award in the 1992 Governor’s Pride of New Jersey Awards Program
Designated "Jerseyan of the Week" by the Sunday Star-Ledger, October 18, 1992, January 8, 1995.


Awarded The Douglass Medal by Douglass College of Rutgers University, June 1989.

Named 1984 Ralph Bates Lecturer by the Chatham Board of Education, Chatham, NJ.

Named one of 33 New Jersey Women of Achievement by New Jersey Monthly, October 1983.


Research and teaching fellowships, University of Connecticut Graduate School, 1960-68.

PUBLICATIONS

Books, Monographs, Book Chapters, Professional Journals

Political Generation Next: America's Young elected Leaders, Ruth B. Mandel and Katherine E. Kleeman (Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, 2004).


*Voices, Views, Votes: The Impact of Women in the 103rd Congress*, with D. Dodson, S.J. Carroll, K.E. Kleeman, R. Schreiber and D. Liebowitz, monograph report from a research project (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, Eagleton Institute of Politics, 1995).


Educating Women for Public Life: Report from the Visiting Program in Practical Politics (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, Eagleton Institute of Politics, 1974).


Magazines and Other Writing


"Old Myths Are Finally Getting Buried this Year," Guest Column, USA Today, September 22, 1986.


SELECTED PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
Grants (since 2000)
Principal Investigator with Debbie Walsh and Susan Sherr, The Pew Charitable Trusts (2001-2004), Young Elected Leaders Project ($211,000).

Co-Principal Investigator with Mary S. Hartman and Marianne Gaunt, SROA grant (2000-2001), Women in Leadership Multimedia Oral History Project ($25,000).


Co-Principal Investigator with Tobi Walker, The Dodge Foundation (2000), New Jersey Civic Education Consortium ($75,000).

The Center for American Women and Politics was established in 1971 with $50,000 from the Ford Foundation. Since that time, CAWP has raised funds from foundations, corporations and government. Selected grants during (or resulting from) my tenure as CAWP's director include:

Charles H. Revson Foundation (1993-1995) for study of the impact of women in Congress; an assessment of research about women in office; and expansion of a database about elected women ($458,000)

Charles H. Revson Foundation (1987-1991) for study of the impact of women in public office ($450,000)

Charles H. Revson Foundation (1980-1985) for study of the routes women take to elective and appointive offices ($220,000)

W.K. Kellogg Foundation (1990-1994) public leadership education for college-age women ($962,000)

Ford Foundation (1997) for Good Housekeeping Award for Women in Government ($326,000)

Ford Foundation (1996) for a study of women in the 104th Congress ($75,000)

Ford Foundation (1993-94) for a conference to develop a research agenda for the study of women and American politics into the 21st century ($75,000)

Ford Foundation (1991) for assessing the feasibility of developing a women officials' policy network ($55,000)

Ford Foundation (1989) for research about the abortion issue's impact on elections ($35,000)
Ford Foundation (1989) for meeting of representatives of national organizations of women officials ($39,000)

Ford Foundation (1971-80) for general support and for two research grants programs: to study women's voluntary activities; and to study women and local government

Carnegie Corporation of New York (1981-88) for program for women state legislators ($447,000)

Carnegie Corporation of New York (1978-84) for developing a public leadership education network of women's colleges ($72,000)

Carnegie Corporation of New York (1975) for study of women's campaigns ($38,000)

Carnegie Corporation of New York (1972) for a conference and study of women state legislators ($86,000)

American Express Foundation (1983-1993) for program for women state legislators ($139,408)

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (1991) for program for women state legislators ($19,800)


Rockefeller Foundation (1989) for research about the abortion issue's impact on elections ($35,000)

Robert Sterling Clark Foundation (1989, 1992) for research about the abortion issue's impact on elections ($75,000)

The Huber Foundation (1989, 1990, 1992) for research about the abortion issue's impact on elections ($70,000)

John Merck Fund (1989-92) for research about the abortion issue's impact on elections ($125,990)

South Branch Foundation (1989) for research about the abortion issue's impact on elections ($20,000)

777 Women Fund/Tides Foundation (1992) for research about the abortion issue's impact on elections ($20,000)

Helena Rubinstein Foundation (1981-84) for data bank on women in public office
Mobil Foundation, Inc. (1971, 1975, 1976, 1978) for general support

Prudential Foundation (1972-1993) for general support and research

Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, Inc. (1973) for research grants program

US Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research (1978-81) for research on women in public service ($440,000)

US Office of Personnel Management (1979) for evaluation research ($15,000)

National Institute of Education (1977) for research about school boards ($44,948)

Chase Manhattan Bank (1973) for developing a model education program

Research

2001-2004: a national study of young elected officials (age 35 and under) serving at federal, state, county and municipal levels, which includes developing a national data base, conducting an on-line and mail survey of officeholders, and convening a conference to extend and deepen survey findings. The study has resulted in a report and analysis summarizing demographic characteristics, backgrounds, attitudes, ideology and ambitions of the population of young elected leaders holding office at the beginning of the new century.

Since 2000: a multi-year study of U.S. women’s leadership in collaboration with Professor Mary Hartman. The project currently involves a series of videotaped interviews with women who contributed in significant ways, primarily on the national level, during the last quarter of the 20th century to the social change movement that reshaped women’s roles, status, aspirations and opportunities in the United States.

1996-97: study comparing the impact of women serving in the 104th Congress with that of women in the 103rd Congress

1993-95: study of the impact of women serving in the 103rd Congress

1993-95: assessment of the findings of two decades of research about women in public office, and development of an agenda to guide future research on women and politics

1989, 90, 92: studies of the politics of the abortion issue in campaigns for state and national offices

1987-91: first national study of the impact of women in public office based on nationally representative samples of women and men elected to state legislatures

1987-91: designed grants program and awarded stipends for eleven small-scale studies examining the impact of women serving in different types and levels of public office

1981-83: national survey comparing women and men in elected office, focusing on the factors which facilitate and impede women’s entry into public office

1981-83: first study of women appointed to high-level positions in a presidential administration

1981-83: first nationwide study of women appointed to high-level positions in state cabinets
1978-80: study of women in municipal management

1978-80: study of the development of organizations of women public officials

1977-79: study of women on school boards

1977-78: second national survey of women officeholders, collecting and analyzing data about women's social backgrounds, political experiences, organizational ties, perceptions and policy attitudes

1976: study of proportions of women serving on state boards and commissions in 39 states

1976: study of the campaign experiences of female candidates for elective office

1976: designed grants program and awarded stipends to six scholars for studies of women and local government

1975-76: first ever national survey of women serving in elective office at local, county, state and federal levels

1974: developed grants program and awarded stipends to six scholars for study of the nature and political impact of women's voluntary activities

**Data Bank on Candidates and Officeholders**

Since 1975 CAWP has developed a computerized database on women in elective office at municipal, county, state legislative, statewide and federal levels. The Center also regularly collects pre- and post-election data on female candidates in congressional, statewide and state legislative races. The data bank serves a variety of constituencies (from students and scholars to activists and journalists) as a national resource for current and historical information about women in politics.

**Program for Women State Legislators**

1995, 1991, 1987, 1983: Planned and organized the *National Forum for Women State Legislators*, the largest meetings of elected women ever convened. Held in San Diego, California, each Forum has attracted close to 1000 participants, including hundreds of legislators, as well as scholars, issue experts, organization leaders, political party officials and journalists. The agenda has focused on several themes emerging from CAWP’s studies of women legislators and from various related research and education programs: (1) the impact of elected women on public policy, and the ways in which female officials may respond differently from men to policy issues; (2) the barriers and opportunities for increasing the numbers and influence of women in public office, particularly in state legislatures; (3) the movement of women into positions of legislative leadership.

1990: Co-convened a Midwest regional seminar for women state legislators with the Institute for Policy Leadership at the University of Missouri — St. Louis.

1989: Convened a national educational forum for newly elected women state legislators, with veteran women lawmakers serving as core faculty.

1985: Convened a national Conference for Women in Legislative Leadership to explore ways in which women in leadership affect the legislative institution and the public policy agenda.

1982: Convened the Conference for Women State Legislators to examine and assess the prospects for women as elected lawmakers and the progress which had been made since CAWP’s first Conference for Women State Legislators held ten years earlier (Pocono conference, May 1972).

**National Education for Women’s Leadership (NEW Leadership)**

Conceived and developed a national program of summer institutes to teach college women leadership theory and skills as well as women’s political history. Initially funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the program became a model for subsequent regional CAWP programs in New Jersey, the South, the Midwest, and later throughout the country at colleges and universities that became part of CAWP’s NEW Leadership Development Network.

**Public Leadership Education Network (PLEN)**

A founder of the Public Leadership Education Network (1978). PLEN is a consortium of eighteen women’s colleges working to educate their students about women in policymaking and
public leadership. PLEN maintains a national office in Washington, DC. CAWP has been a consulting organization to PLEN.

Documentary Film
Executive Producer of a one-hour documentary film examining the progress made by women and the obstacles they encountered during more than a decade of increasing involvement in political life. Entitled Not One of the Boys, the film aired nationally on Frontline (PBS), October 1984.

Editing
Oversaw the publication of books, monographs, and reports resulting from studies and related projects conducted by the Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) and issued by commercial publishers or through the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University. These include publications about the backgrounds, issue orientations, political experience, ambitions and impact of women and men in public office; the networks and organizations of political women which have developed across the country since the mid-1970s; women in public management positions in urban government; women in state legislatures; studies of the barriers facing male and female office seekers and the routes they have taken to elected and appointed positions; studies of the impact of women in public office.


General Editor (with Professor Rita Mae Kelly), Praeger series of scholarly books by political scientists in the field of women and politics (1982-1987).


Manuscript Reviewer/Advisor for Have You Considered Government and Politics? (Career Options Series for Undergraduate Women) and Government and Politics (Career Opportunities Series for Post-College Women). New York: Catalyst, 1976.

Media
Interviewed and quoted regularly in major newspapers, wire service stories, popular magazines and news magazines. Press conferences and scores of interview and call-in programs for national and local television and radio. Selected television appearances include: Washington Journal, C-SPAN, Lehrer News Hour, PBS; Nightline, ABC-TV; Charlie Rose, PBS; CBS Evening News; NBC Nightly Business Report, PBS; Sonya Live, CNN; Good Morning America, ABC-TV; Today, NBC-TV; Not for Women Only, WNBC-TV; In Your Corner, New Jersey Network; Take Two, Cable News Network; Straight Talk, WOR-TV; Caucus New Jersey, WNET, New York public television; Word Is Out, Philadelphia TV; Today in New York, WNBC-TV; New Jersey Nightly News; Bloomberg Television: Rutgers Forum, News 12 New Jersey. National radio interviews and commentary include; NPR's Talk of the Nation, All Things Considered, Morning Edition, and Radio Times.

SERVICE

Rutgers University (selected)

Presidential Search Committee, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 2002

Member, Alexander Library, D1 Subcommittee on Collections, Women's and Gender Archival Collections, 2002-present

Speaker, Faculty Service Recognition Program, May 2002


Judge, "What's your Point?" Rutgers Academic Challenge, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, May 2001
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Search Committees, Social Studies Education, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University, 2000-01, 2001-02

Advisory Committee, 2001 Forum for Women State Legislators, CAWP, Eagleton Institute of Politics, 2000-2001

Planning Committee, The Margery Somers Foster Center at Douglass Library: A Research Network and Digital Archives for Gender and Women's Studies, 1999-Present

Advisory Committee, Holocaust Resource Center, Allen and Joan Bildner Center for the Study of Jewish Life, since 1999

Rutgers Council on Government Relations, 1995-1997

Advisory Committee, Center for Government Services, Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy, since 1996

Board of Directors, Institute for Women's Leadership, since 1995


Strategic Plan Implementation Committee for Gender Studies, 1995-96

Provost's Advisory Committee on Academic Development, 1994-96

Search Committee for the Provost/Dean of the Graduate School, 1993

Presidential Search Committee, Rutgers University, 1990

Faculty Committee on Honorary Degrees, 1992-95

Provost's Faculty Council Budget and Planning Committee, 1990-96

Advisory Board, Hispanic Women Leadership Institute, 1989-93

Policy and Planning Committee, Center for Women's Global Leadership, Douglass College, since 1986

Advisory Board, Laurie New Jersey Chair in Women's Studies, Douglass College, 1986-96

Advisory Committee, Women's Archives, Douglass College, 1985-95

Advisory Committee, Institute for Research on Women, 1982-present; Executive Committee, 1983-87

Advisory and Planning Group, Douglass College Program for the Public Leadership Education Network, since 1980

Eagleton Fellowship Program Selection Committee, Eagleton Institute, since 1972

Faculty Supplemental Salary Adjustment Committee, Eagleton Institute of Politics, 1983-84; chairperson 1984-86, 1992-93

Provost's Committee on Administrative Restructuring, 1990-91

Douglass Fellows Policy Committee, 1987-91

Provost's Faculty Budget and Planning Committee, 1988-90
Committee on Appointments and Promotions, Department of Journalism and Mass Media, School of Communication, Information and Library Studies, 1989.

Search Committee, Dean of the Faculty of Planning, 1988-89

Douglass Fellows Opportunity Committee, 1986-88

Search Committees, Bagleton Institute of Politics, 1987-88, 1988-89

Co-Convenor, with Douglass Dean Mary Hartman, planning Conference on Women in International Leadership, April 1987

Search Committee, Department of Political Science, 1986-87

Search Committees, Laurie New Jersey Chair in Women's Studies, Douglass College, 1983-84, 1986-87


Search Committee, Bagleton Institute of Politics and Graduate School of Education, 1986-87

Co-Chair, Search Committee for Director of the Women's Studies Program at Rutgers University, 1986

Rutgers University Commencement Colloquium Committee, 1985-86

Provost's Committee on Social and Public Policy, 1985

Provost's Committee on Political Oppression, 1985

Research Council Advisory Panels on the Social Sciences, Rutgers University, 1982-85

Bagleton Institute Standing Committees on Personnel, Education, Services, 1975-85

President's Advisory Commission on the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences in an Era of High Technology, 1983-84

Chairperson, Seminar Series on American Politics and Public Policy, Bagleton Institute, 1983

Rutgers University Senate, 1976-77, Academic Personnel Committee, 1976-77

Chairperson, By-Laws Committee, Bagleton Institute, 1975-76

Manuscript Reviewer, Rutgers University Press

National, State, and Misc. Service (selected)


Member, U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, since 1991; Vice Chairperson, since 1993

Member, Board of Directors, Charles H. Revson Foundation, since 1998; member, Board Nominating Committee, since 1998

Advisory Board, Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland, since 2001

Judge, National Panel of Judges for the National Women's Hall of Fame Awards, since 2000

“Spirit of Trenton” Council, appointed by Governor James McGreevey, April 2002

Advisory Board, United Leaders, a new organization for identifying and training young men and women for careers in political service, housed at the JFK School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, since 2001

Co-Chair, Selection Committees, National Ballot for Women Presidential Candidates (1999) and Women Vice Presidential Candidates (2000), The White House Project.
National Advisory Committee and National Consultation Participant, Forum 98: Setting a Course for Women into the New Century, co-sponsored by Hobart and William Smith Colleges and University of Rochester, 1998

Diversity in Action Advisory Committee, New Jersey Network, since 1997

Review Board, New Jersey Medicine, 1995-1999


Honorary Committee, Preserving Paulsdale, Alice Paul Centennial Foundation, 1989-95

Selection Panel, "Breaking the Glass Ceiling," awards program of Women Executives in State Government, 1993

National Commission for the Renewal of American Democracy (appointed by the National Association of Secretaries of State for Project Democracy) 1992-93

Board of Directors, National Council for Research on Women, 1985-92; Vice-Chair, 1989-91; Chair, Board Committee on the Future, 1988-89

Organizer, National Hispana Leadership Initiative, New Brunswick, NJ, April 1988

Fifteenth Anniversary Honorary Committee, "9 to 5," National Association of Working Women, 1988

Program Committee, "Women and the Constitution: A Bicentennial Perspective," a national symposium sponsored by The Carter Center of Emory University and convened by former First Ladies Carter, Ford, Nixon and Johnson, 1988

National Advisory Committee to the California Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family, 1988


Nominating Committee, Women's Caucus for Political Science, 1985-86

Planning Committee, The Women's Dialogue — US/USSR, The Rockefeller Foundation, 1984-85. Member of US delegation of eleven women invited to the USSR (December 1984) for a seminar with Soviet women leaders on the theme of "Women and Community Leadership"

Mercer County Commission on the Status of Women, 1977-1984

Appointed by the Governor of New Jersey to the Commission to Study the Need and Necessary Fiscal Commitments for Creating a Chair of Women's Studies at Douglass College (Chairperson, Committee on Academic Needs), 1982

Advisory Committee, Women's Leadership Conference, the Committee for National Security, 1982

Final Selection Judge, Coro Foundation Fellowship Program, 1977; Public Affairs Training Program for Women, 1981

Member, Search Committee for Executive Director, National Women's Education Fund, Washington, DC, 1979

Board of Judges, Catherine L. O'Brien Award, Competition for Achievement in Women's Interest Newspaper Reporting, 1978-79

Member, Planning Committee, Conference on Technical Assistance Needs of Women Officeholders, Aspen Institute, 1977

Appointed by President's National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year to State Coordinating Committee for New Jersey's IWY Conference, 1976; Co-chairperson, Nominating Committee, New Jersey IWY State Conference, 1977; Elected Delegate from New Jersey to US National Women's Conference, Houston, TX, 1977

Consultant, Women in Power Committee, National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, 1975 (testified for Committee hearing on women's participation in the political process, 1976)

Convener, Task Force on Fair Representation and Participation in the Political Process, US National Women's Agenda, a program of the Women's Action Alliance, 1975-76


PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Many lectures, speeches, panels and workshops each year. Below is a sample of presentations between 1987 and 2004.

Selected Guest Lectures and Conference Participation—Colleges and Universities

Faculty Commencement Speaker, 83rd Commencement convocation at Douglass College, Rutgers University, May 2004.


Discussant and Advisor, "Instituting Gender," Yale University, New Haven, CT, March 2002.


Speaker, Program on "University-Community Relations in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania," Center for Russian, Central and East European Studies, Rutgers University, NJ, December 2001.


Interviewee, By the Book, Rutgers University Television Network, January 2001.


Speaker, "From Holocaust History to Memory: Germany, Jews and the Future," Princeton University, April 1999.


Speaker, "New Directions in Politics," ACE-NIP, Rutgers University, April 1998.

Speaker, "Moving Forward Together: A Women's Political Movement," Mary Louise Smith Chair in Women and Politics, Carrie Chapman Catt Center for Women and Politics, Iowa State University, April 1998.

Speaker, "Incrementalism Versus the Ketchup Bottle: Women's Progression in Politics," Mary Louise Smith Chair in Women and Politics, Carrie Chapman Catt Center for Women and Politics, Iowa State University, October 1997.

Speaker, Women in Public Life: Past Perspectives, Future Challenges, co-sponsored by the John F. Kennedy Library and Museum and the Center for Women in Politics and Public Policy of the McCormack Institute of Public Affairs, University of Massachusetts, October 1997.


Moderator, War and Gender Relations, sponsored by The Center for Study of Jewish Life and The Women's Studies Program, Rutgers University, April 1997.


Speaker, Rutgers University 1996 Alumni College, Cape Cod, MA, October 1996.


Speaker, Politics' 96, Knight Center for Specialized Journalism, University of Maryland, October 1995.


Lecturer, "Women in American Politics," CAWP NBW Leadership Summer Institute, Rutgers University, June 1993.

Keynote Speaker, Conference on Southern Women in Public Service, John C. Stennis Center for Public Service and Mississippi University for Women, Atlanta, GA, May 1993.


Panelist, "Women in Leadership: A Breakthrough in the 1990s?" The Institute for Women's Leadership at Douglass College, Rutgers University, December 1992.

Speaker, "More Women in Politics...Why Bother?" Newcomb College Center for Research on Women, Tulane University, October 1992.


Speaker, Stanford University Institute for Research on Women and Gender, NY Area Associates Group, NYC, September 1992.


Speaker, Hispanic Women's Leadership Institute, Rutgers University, February 1992.


Lecturer, "Early Feminism and Women's Political History," CAWP New Leadership Summer Institute, Rutgers University, June 1991.

Lecturer, "Women in Contemporary American Politics," CAWP New Leadership Summer Institute, Rutgers University, June 1991.


Selected Professional Meetings and Public Speeches


Speaker, “Women and Presidential Politics,” annual meeting of the Journalism and Women Symposium, Sundance, UT, September 1999.


Rapporteur, Vital Voices: Women in Democracy, an international conference convened by the US Department of State, Vienna, Austria, July 1997.


Speaker, Johnson & Johnson Executive Luncheon Series, New Brunswick, NJ, November 1996.


Speaker, Women Lawyers Section of the Middlesex County Bar Association, New Brunswick, NJ, March 1996.


Speaker, New Jersey Commission on Holocaust Education, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, February 1996.

Speaker, "Whose America Is It?" Annual Lecture Series of the Jewish Congregation of Rossmoor, Jamesburg, NJ, October 1995.

Speaker, Volunteer Appreciation Night, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, DC, June 1995.


Speaker, Post-Election Debriefing and Analysis for Women State Legislators, conference sponsored by the National Women's Political Caucus, Washington, DC, November 1992.


Speaker, National Order of Women Legislators, Annual Meeting, Mackinac Island, Michigan, August 1991.

Speaker, "It's Better to be Present: Women in Leadership," Conference on A New Decade of Leadership: Women State Legislators, CAWP and Institute for Policy Leadership, University of Missouri-St. Louis, November 1990.


Keynote Speaker, Minnesota Women's Political Assembly, Minneapolis, MN, January 1987.


Experience

Consultant

Founded new consulting practice in public policy, organizational and leadership development. Initial clients include Rutgers University and Volunteers of America/Delaware Valley

New Brunswick, New Jersey

President

- Founded and led association of corporate and non-profit CEOs dedicated to making New Jersey a better place to live and work. Responsible for raising annual budget of $500,000 – $750,000 and funds for restricted programs
- Developed and led leadership development programs (Leadership New Jersey, Leadership Newark, Leadership Trenton) that has created a statewide network of civic leaders of more than 1,000 outstanding men and women.
- Created and led educational improvement initiatives including the Invest in Children Coalition that expanded preschool programs, NetDay that wired 10,000 classrooms across the state for Internet connections, Institute for School Innovation that developed and advocated measures to improve the efficiency of public schools.
- Organized and led diversity initiatives that doubled the number of corporations with formal diversity programs. Managed The Governor's Leadership Summit on Diversity to demonstrate the value of the state's increasing diversity and recommend programs to increase that value. Designed and managed first statewide survey of public attitudes on race and inter-group relations.

1977 – 1984 Center for Analysis of Public Issues
Princeton, New Jersey

President

- Led major studies on campaign finance, lobbying disclosure, foster are, government integrity, and related topics. Wrote or edited reports on these studies.
- Founded and edited award-winning magazine analyzing public policy and politics, New Jersey Reporter. Created and published annual New Jersey Political Almanac.
- Commentator and election analyst for NJ Public Television and hosted weekly public affairs program on WNET-Channel 13.
1975–1977  
Center for Environmental Studies  
Princeton University

Research Staff and Lecturer
- Member of research team on energy policy, environmental management and land use controls.
- Developed and taught upper level course, "Environmental Policy Making," Engineering 303.

1970 – 1975  
Department of Environmental Protection  
Trenton, New Jersey

Chief of Staff
- Member of the Commissioner's staff responsible for the organization of this new department of state government, for legislative initiatives, program review and assessment, and direction of review of major proposed projects.
- Director of the Division of Marine Resources, first administrator of new coastal land use controls and responsible for the NJ Marine Police, wetlands regulation, and control of ocean dumping.
- Director, Governor's Task Force on Energy. Led emergency task force to respond to the 1973 oil embargo and craft a plan to improve the state's capacity to conserve energy and regulate supply.
- Executive Director, Governor's Advisory Council on the Future of New Jersey. Formed and led panel to assess trends shaping New Jersey's economy and environment and develop a strategy for shaping land use controls to assure a high quality of life.

Education
- Wesleyan University, BA with Honors in Government, 1968
- Princeton University, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Masters program in Public Affairs, 1968 - 1970

Military Service
U.S. Army Intelligence Corps, Berlin Station, 1962 – 1965

Civic Activities
- Director, Merrill Lynch Bank & Trust, 1993 – present
  Trustee, Citizens for the Public Good 2001 – present
  Founding Trustee, New Jersey Future, 1984 – present
  American Littoral Society, Trustee, 2003 – present
  Trustee, Thomas Edison State College, 1996 – 2004
  Founding Chair, NJ Institute for School Innovation, 1999 – 2001
  Founding Chair, Early Childhood Facilities Fund, 1996 - 1999
  Trustee, Regional Planning Partnership, 1976 – 2001
  Chair and trustee, Center for Analysis of Public Issues, 1984 -- 2001
  Member, Pennington Borough Council, 1976 -- 1979
CURRENT EMPLOYMENT:

Associate Director
EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
New Brunswick, NJ (February 2000 to present)

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

Chairman
NEW JERSEY HIGHLANDS WATER PROTECTION AND PLANNING
Council
Appointed by Governor and confirmed by State Senate to 5-year term

Chairman
DELAWARE AND RARITAN CANAL COMMISSION
Appointed by Governor and confirmed by State Senate to second 5-year term

Producer and Host
Music You Can't Hear On The Radio
Weekly radio program of folk music and bluegrass on WPRB-FM and WPRB.com, Princeton, NJ

PAST EMPLOYMENT:

Senior Fellow
CENTER FOR ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC ISSUES
Princeton, NJ (September 1998 to February 2000)

Wrote a book analyzing New Jersey's attempt to encourage municipalities to volunteer to host a disposal facility for low-level radioactive waste, viewing this program as a lens through which to examine risk communication, community involvement in decision-making and state government. Secured funding from the U.S. Department of Energy. Published in 2001.

Executive Director
NJ LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITY SITING BOARD
Trenton, NJ (September 1994-July 1998)

Directed an innovative effort to encourage New Jersey municipalities to consider volunteering to host a disposal facility for low-level radioactive waste. Included communicating about risk and science, confronting public distrust of government, and fostering effective community processes for decision-making. Managed a staff of seven with an annual budget of $1 million, and reported to an 11-member board.
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PAST EMPLOYMENT (continued)
Assistant Commissioner for Environmental Regulation  
NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  

Directed most of the Department's planning and permitting programs for both land use and industrial facilities. Managed a staff of 650 with an annual budget of $11 million in federal and state funds. Worked with the Legislature, local governments, permit applicants and citizen groups, with the goal of developing mechanisms to improve planning and regulatory programs and link them together for more comprehensive environmental protection and greater common sense and efficiency.

Director, Division of Coastal Resources  
NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  

Administered a State agency with a staff of 300 and budget of $5 million responsible for land use planning and regulation along New Jersey's ocean shore and urban waterfronts, and in flood plains and wetlands. Had lead responsibility for federal Coastal Zone Management grant. Also, responsible for capital projects for shore protection, dredging and flood control.

Various staff positions  
NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
Trenton, NJ (1975-1982)

Joined DEP in 1975 as Public Participation Coordinator for the Office of Coastal Zone Management; then served as Assistant Chief of the Office, Chief of the Bureau of Coastal Planning and Development, and Deputy Director, all within the Division of Coastal Resources.

Also, served as Staff Director for the Governor's Hudson Waterfront Study, Planning and Development Commission from 1979 to 1981. Initiated and fostered the planning and development of the Hudson River Walkway to increase public access and urban revitalization.

Project Co-Director  
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM EVALUATION  
Waltham, MA (1970-1973)

Co-designed and directed a study evaluating the implementation of curricular reforms at 26 colleges. Received funding from private foundations and the U.S. Office of Education. Study resulted in the two books listed below.
OTHER ACTIVITIES:

Board Member, *Delaware River Mill Society*, 1996 to present.  
(Vice-President from 1999 to 2002).

Board Member, *Hudson Waterfront Conservancy*, 1999-present.


EDUCATION:

Graduate of *Leadership New Jersey Program*;  


Bachelor of Arts, *Brandeis University*; Waltham, MA (1970);  
major in sociology; President of the Student Body.

PUBLICATIONS:

**BOOKS**


ARTICLES:

Government


Environment


Education

"The Need For Environmental Education," Humanistic Judaism, (Spring 1993).
HONORS

Volunteer of the Year Award, Delaware River Mill Society (March, 2005)

Fifteen Years of Leadership Award, Leadership New Jersey (December 2001).

Frank Oliver Earth Day Award, New Jersey Environmental Lobby, "for outstanding service to the citizens of New Jersey as a responsible public servant protecting the state's environment and health," [April 2000]

The Citizen Award, New Jersey Society of Municipal Engineers (November 1994).

New Jersey Folk Festival Award for Distinguished Service to the Traditional Arts (May 1993).

Man of the Year Award, North Bergen Action Group, (November 1985).

Book of the Year Award (for Reform of Undergraduate Education), American Council On Education (October 1974).

March 2005
Donald Linky
Director, Electronic Government Project
Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey

Don Linky is director of the Electronic Government Project at the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. He also coordinates the Rutgers Ethics Initiative, a joint project of the Eagleton Institute and the Prudential Business Ethics Center at the Rutgers Business School.

He also continues as president of Joshua Communications, Inc., a publishing and information services firm in Princeton, and edits reference books published by Joshua, including The New Jersey Directory: The Insider Guide to New Jersey Leaders; The New Jersey Almanac; and New Jersey Fast Facts. He is a former president of the Public Affairs Research Institute of New Jersey, a corporate-supported nonprofit founded in 1930 that monitored New Jersey economic, demographic and fiscal trends.

During the Administration of New Jersey Governor Brendan T. Byrne, Don served as chief counsel to the governor and director of the governor's office of policy and planning. He had key roles in the development of such programs as the Spill Compensation and Protection Act, which served as the model for the federal Superfund program, the Pinelands Protection Act, the Community Development Bond Act, the Urban Enterprise Zone program, the creation of New Jersey Transit and school finance reform.

He has been the editor of The New Jersey Municipal Almanac, and served on the editorial board of The New Jersey Encyclopedia. He also has been a monthly columnist for the magazines New Jersey Reporter, New Jersey Business and the Business Journal of New Jersey. He has served as a member of the governing boards of New Jersey Future, the Council of State Planning Agencies, Directory Publishers Forum North America and other organizations.

Don is a graduate of Harvard Law School and Dartmouth College, and attended the London School of Economics and Political Science. A native of Asbury Park, he now resides in Princeton.

Contact:
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey
191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
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Experience:

2001-
Visiting Professor and Director, Electronic Government Project
Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey
New Brunswick, New Jersey

1994-2001
President, Public Affairs Research Institute of New Jersey
Princeton, New Jersey

1989-
President, Joshua Communications, Inc.
Princeton, New Jersey

1986-90
Counsel, Hill Wallack (law firm)
Princeton, New Jersey

1982-86
Senior Vice President and General Counsel,
New Jersey Business and Industry Association, Inc.
Trenton, New Jersey

1981-82
Chief Counsel to the Governor of New Jersey
Trenton, New Jersey

1978-82
Director, Governor's Office of Policy & Planning
Trenton, New Jersey

1975-78
Deputy Counsel and Assistant Counsel to the Governor of New Jersey

1973-75
Attorney, Hannoch, Weisman, Stern & Besser
Newark, New Jersey

1972-73
Law Clerk, Supreme Court of New Jersey
Education:

J.D., Harvard Law School 1972

B.A., Dartmouth College 1968

London School of Economics and Political Science 1966-67

Publications:

Reference Books

The New Jersey Directory: The Insider Guide to New Jersey Leaders (8 editions: Joshua Communications)

The New Jersey Almanac (3 editions: Joshua Communications 2005; Center for Analysis of Public Issues 1999, 2001)

The New Jersey Municipal Almanac (Center for Analysis of Public Issues 2000)

Selected Articles and Reports

New Jersey Health & Wellness by the Numbers (New Jersey Monthly Magazine October 2005; January 2004)

An Evaluation of New Jersey State Government Web Sites: Design, Content and Usability
(New Jersey Office of Information Technology April 2004)


Online Resources for Teaching Civics, Government and the Law (Eagleton Institute of Politics, March 2002)

New Jersey State Government Web Report Cards (Eagleton Institute of Politics, September 2002)

No Free Lunch: School Construction and Accountability (New Jersey Reporter Magazine, April 2001)


New Jersey at the Millennium: Where Do We Go from Here? (New Jersey Reporter Magazine, January 2000)
INGRID W. REED
Office:
Eagleton Institute of Politics,
Rutgers, The State University
191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Professional Experience
-Eagleton Institute of Politics. Director, Eagleton New Jersey Project, January 1996-.
-Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, Director, Rockefeller Public Service Awards, 1975-81; Assistant Dean, September 1975-May 1992;
-Lecturer, 1989;
-New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Assistant for Special Projects to the Deputy Commissioner, 1975.

Current Public Service Activities
-American Society for Public Administration, NJ Chapter Governing Council, 1996-.
-Capital City (Trenton) Redevelopment Corporation (a State agency), Chair of the Board, 1988-.
-Community Foundation of New Jersey, Board Member, 2000-
-Institute for Public Administration (NYC), Board Member, 1988-.
-National Public Service Awards Selection Committee, 1988- and executive committee member, 2001-.
-New Jersey Department of Human Services Work First N.J. Program, Task Force member, 1997-.
-New Jersey Future (coalition for state planning), Board Member, founder, former Board Chair, 1986-.
-Regional Plan Association, New Jersey Committee, 1997-. (Formerly New York Committee and Committee on the Third Plan, 1992-96.)
-Sandra Starr Foundation (Princeton, N.J.), Vice Chair of the Board, 1998-.

Publications


Columnist on political matters, Op-ed Section, Home News and Tribune, New Brunswick, 1996-.


Awards
-New Jersey Chapter, American Society for Public Administration Achievement Award, 1990.
-Kellogg National Leadership Fellowship, 1983-86.
-Phi Beta Kappa, 1958.

Education

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
06/28/2006 11:45 AM

To Darrell D. Lee/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV
cc
bcc

Subject Fw: Please provide me with a hard copy of the Eagleton cost proposal, when you can

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 11:43 AM -----

Nicole Mortellito/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV
01/20/2006 02:01 PM

To Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc

Subject Re: Please provide me with a hard copy of the Eagleton cost proposal, when you can

EAC Eagleton Institute Budget 3-22-05-1.xls

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Special Projects
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.2209 phone
202.566.3128 fax
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
01/20/2006 12:54 PM

To Nicole Mortellito/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc

Subject Please provide me with a hard copy of the Eagleton cost proposal, when you can

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
# US Election Assistance Commission Project Budget (3/22/05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleton faculty/senior staff</td>
<td>35,000 (Mandel, Weingart, Reed, Linky (various percentages))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleton staff: logistics/administrative/clerical</td>
<td>15,000 (various percentages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe (32.5%)</td>
<td>16,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Coordinator</td>
<td>21,250 (1250 hours at $17 per hour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics/Admin Coordinator</td>
<td>12,325 (725 hours at $17 per hour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research assistants</td>
<td>7,200 (300 hours at $12 per hour for two researchers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe on Hourly (9%)</td>
<td>3,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$110,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honoraria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria for Peer Review Group</td>
<td>10,000 (10 at $1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Hearings (3 in 3 cities)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
<td>75,000 (3 hearings at $25K per EAC figures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hearings in DC- train, ground, lodging, meals*</td>
<td>3,480 (attended by 3 staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hearings in St. Louis- air, ground, lodging, meals**</td>
<td>2,640 (attended by 3 staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Briefings/Meetings with EAC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train, ground, lodging, meals***</td>
<td>5,200 (5 briefings in DC, attended by 2 staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies, software, telephone, copying, postage</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop computers, laptop, printer</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcontract</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director- O'Neill</td>
<td>79,500 (80% time April - Aug., 60% Sept. - Oct.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University- Legal Analysis</td>
<td>84,744 (Partner institution, Moritz College of Law, OSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Non Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$280,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal All Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>$391,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modified Total Direct Cost $277,015</strong>****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;A on Modified Total Direct Cost (55.5%)</td>
<td>153,743 (Rutgers University federally approved rate.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL: Project Budget</strong></td>
<td>$545,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optional Surveys</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Election Officials</td>
<td>15,000 (Eagleton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Voters</td>
<td>25,000 (Eagleton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Voting, 1st state</td>
<td>116,000 (OSU Political Science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Voting, 1st additional state</td>
<td>75,000 (OSU Political Science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Voting, 2nd additional state</td>
<td>60,000 (OSU Political Science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Optional Surveys (no F&amp;A)</strong></td>
<td>$291,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Travel and lodging to two hearings in DC includes $260 for train fare to DC, $200 for hotel/lodging, and $60 per day for two days for meals= $580 per person per trip for three people.
** Travel and lodging to one hearing in St. Louis includes $500 airfare to St. Louis, 2 nights hotel/lodging at $100, and $60 per day for three days for meals= $880 per person for three people.
*** Travel and lodging to five Briefings/Meetings with EAC includes $260 for train fare to DC, $200 for hotel/lodging, and $60 for meals= $520 per person per trip for two people.
**** Modified total direct cost is equivalent to total direct cost except for two items - F&A included only on first $25K of subcontract with Project Director ($79,500) and first $25K of subcontract with OSU ($84,744).
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
06/28/2006 11:44 AM

To Darrell D. Lee/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV
cc
bcc

Subject Fw: No Cost Extension Request

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 11:43 AM -----

"John Weingart"
<johncweingart@rutgers.edu>
01/13/2006 01:15 PM

Please respond to
john.weingart@rutgers.edu

To "Karen Lynn-Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
cc "Lucy Baruch" <baruch@rci.rutgers.edu>

Subject No Cost Extension Request

Karen - I am attaching a spreadsheet providing the information you have requested (Attachment 1), but I want to highlight a few points which may not be immediately self-evident.

First, the original budget (Attachment 2) we submitted to the EAC, dated March 22nd, did not itemize personnel expenses by each person. In addition, when we actually began work two months after submitting that budget, we decided to reallocate more time to people within Eagleton and hire fewer outside hourlies.

Second, in the figures I sent you in late December we tried to account for all the expenses and projections but overlooked a few things including neglecting to include the honoraria for our peer review team. Hence, the figures we’re now sending are different than what I sent in December.

Lastly, we originally discussed a no-cost extension through February, but since we don’t yet have the EAC comments on our draft Provisional Voting material nor an estimate of when they are likely to be ready, I think it is prudent to extend the no-cost extension through March 31st. We would still like to conclude by the end of February, but if you can approve the extension for another month we could avoid going through this process again if everything is not complete six weeks from now.

It is my understanding that Rutgers will soon be sending our December invoice. At this time, I would also like to request that we combine January and February an invoice the EAC once for that time period.

As you can see, we are currently projecting an ending balance of approximately $10,000. If additional expenses are incurred beyond what is currently projected, we’re confident they will not exceed the original budget of $560,002.

Thanks and I look forward to hearing from you.
-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
06/28/2006 11:44 AM

To Darrell D. Lee/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: No Cost Extension Request

--- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 11:42 AM ---

"John Weingart"
<john.weingart@rutgers.edu>
11/30/2005 04:47 PM
To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc "Tom O'Neill"
Subject No Cost Extension Request

Please respond to john.weingart@rutgers.edu

Extension Justification.doc
Karen - I am attaching the documentation for our request. Please let me know if you require the material in a different format and/or further information.

Thanks very much, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> > John-
> > Thanks ever so much for forwarding this message on to Connie.
> > I'm awaiting your language describing why you are requiring a no-cost extension on the contract, and for what period of time you wish to extend the contract.
> > I'm told this is a very simple process on this end, and I've prepared the necessary form and a memo.
> > Karen Lynn-Dyson
> > Research Manager
> > U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100

013395
EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS

Request to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission
for a No-Cost Extension and Reallocation of Funds

November 30, 2005

Why we need a no-cost extension

The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting based on our research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication. The draft was complete in August, but the EAC’s schedule did not permit us to brief the commissioners and staff until early September. We did not receive EAC comments until October, making it impossible to complete the work on the original schedule. Taking account of those comments and guidance from EAC required several weeks. The EAC did not receive our final draft report and recommendations for best practices until late November. We are now awaiting the EAC’s comments on that final draft, which we have been told to expect in January.

The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report on that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid January.

Because the EAC has decided to issue recommendations for best practices on these topics, rather than voluntary guidance, we will finish the work within two months of the original completion date since the adoption process will be shorter. Note that meeting this schedule is dependent on the time needed by the EAC to review our work.

This extension will entail additional personnel time but, since no public hearings on “best practices” are required, if the EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work.

When will work be completed and funds fully expended?

As shown on the attached schedule, work on this contract will be completed in three phases. The EAC will receive our final report and recommendations for best practices in provisional voting during the week of January 23, 2006 (assuming that we receive the EAC’s comments on the draft report submitted on November 28 by January 9).

We will submit our draft report, alternative approaches, and compendium of statutes, regulations, and litigation on Voter Identification Issues during the week of January 16, 2006. If the EAC is able to return comments to us no later than the week of January 30, we will have submit the final report and recommendations for best practices on Voter Identification to the EAC during the week of February 13.

The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $399,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project.
REVISED SCHEDULE FOR
November 2005 - February 2006
November 10, 2005
Assumes no guidance document, only analysis and recommended best practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>Provisional Voting</th>
<th>Voter ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week of 10/31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review draft report to EAC (Team)</td>
<td>Voter ID Research to TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit comments on report (Team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/7</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for October tasks (all)</td>
<td>Redraft report (TON)</td>
<td>Research continues (TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and approve report (Team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final draft report (TON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/14</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Submit report to Project Team for comments (TON)</td>
<td>Research continues (TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/21</td>
<td>Project team comments received</td>
<td>Complete data collection for Voter ID analysis (TV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit report to EAC for review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and to PRG for information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(TON, JW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/28</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Draft report on Voter ID analysis (TV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/5</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for November tasks (all)</td>
<td>Internal review (PT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/12</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revise draft (TV)</td>
<td>Draft alternatives (TON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and comment on alternatives (PT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/19</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Complete draft report and alternatives (TV,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/26</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Review draft report and alternatives (PT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/2/06</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for December tasks (all)</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Report and alternatives to PRG for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/9/06</td>
<td>Receive comments from EAC and revise report as needed</td>
<td>PRG meets and comments</td>
<td>Revise (TV &amp; TON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/16/06</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Project team reviews and approves revised report</td>
<td>Submit draft report, alternatives and compendium to EAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EAC reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/23/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Finalize analysis and best practices and submit to EAC for publication and further action as appropriate</td>
<td>EAC review continues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/30/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments from EAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revise (TV &amp; TON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/6/06</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for January tasks (all)</td>
<td>Review and approve revised report and recommendations for best practices (PT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/13/06</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Submit report and best practices to EAC for publication and further action as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/20/06</td>
<td>FINAL status reports to JD for all tasks (all)</td>
<td>Final project and fiscal report to EAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT ENDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hey Karen,

Once John signs and faxes back the document, we need to get it to Tom with the memo to file (attached) for his signature. I believe that is all we need to do for the no-cost modification.

Thanks,

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
04/21/2006 10:10 AM

Thanks, John.

I’m passing this on to our legal staff, who will be preparing the documents.

Will let you know if I need additional information and/or clarification.

Regards-
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"John Weingart"<john.weingart@rutgers.edu>

Karen - We are requesting a no-cost extension on the EAC contract to the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University to have the contract’s concluding date move from March 31, 2006 to June 30, 2006. As I indicated earlier, it would be very helpful if we could receive approval of this request no later than April 28th.

This extension is necessary to enable the following activities:

1. The EAC has informed us that it will assemble a panel of researchers the week of May 8th to review the Eagleton/Moritz draft background report on Voter Identification. The EAC wishes to supplement the review of this draft already conducted by the Peer Review Group called for in the contract. The Eagleton/Moritz research team, as well as at least some of the Peer Review Group will participate in the conference call or meeting of the
EAC's reviewers;

2. Eagleton/Moritz will revise the draft Voter Identification report based upon comments made by the two sets of reviewers, and distribute the revised report to the EAC and its Advisory Board in mid-May.

3. Eagleton/Moritz will present its draft reports on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification to the EAC Advisory Board at its May 25th meeting in Washington, D.C.;

4. Eagleton/Moritz will revise both draft reports to take into account comments made by the EAC Advisory Board, and submit printed final reports to the EAC before June 23rd. Eagleton/Moritz will also prepare a PowerPoint presentation for both reports.

5. Eagleton/Moritz will present both reports at the EAC public meeting in Washington, D.C. on June 23rd, thus concluding its work under this contract.

Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Thanks,

John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Hi -- nice to meet you in person, finally!

And thanks for inviting me to your gathering, I enjoyed it and hope I was helpful. Of course, any time you want anything, you do know where to track me down.

As to the potential reviewers of the Eagleton Voter ID study, here are my suggestions, in order:

Jonathan Nagler, New York University
Jan Leighley, University of Arizona
Ben Highton, UC-Davis
Adam Berinsky, MIT
Bernard Grofman, UC-Irvine

All have worked with the CPS turnout/registration data, and are very familiar with this research literature.

If these don't work, or you want more recommendations, let me know.

--

R. Michael Alvarez
626-395-4089
Professor of Political Science
626-405-9841
Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, CA 91125
rma@hss.caltech.edu

Contributor to Election Updates, http://electionupdates.caltech.edu/blog.html

************************************************************************************************************************************
To: File
From: Tamar Nedzar, Law Clerk
Date: April 21, 2006
Re: No-Cost Extension to contract number E4014127 with the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University

Background:
Contract E4014127 with the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University ("contractor") was originally scheduled to be concluded on March 31, 2006. The contract's final products include a report on Voter Identification and a report on Provisional Voting. The contractor has vetted the reports with a Peer Review Group, pursuant to the terms of the contract.

Justification for No-Cost Extension:
The EAC wishes to supplement the contractor's Peer Review of the reports by adding another review process with some of the EAC's key stakeholders. The EAC proposes to assemble a panel of researchers during the week of May 8th to conduct the second review.

Following the second review, the contractor will revise its draft reports based on the comments it receives. The contractor will present its draft reports on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification to the EAC Advisory Board at its May 25th meeting in Washington, DC. The contractor will revise both draft reports, taking into account the EAC's Advisory Board's comments and submit the final reports to the EAC toward the end of June.

Recommendation:
The EAC recommends that contract E4014127 be modified at no cost to allow the contractor to complete their work by June 30, 2006.
Tim O'Rourke, Dean of the Fulton School of Liberal Arts at Salisbury University in Maryland, has agreed to serve on the Peer Review Committee.

Tom O'Neill
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 11:07 AM -----

"Tom O’Neill"

To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc
Subject Peer Review Group

Karen,

Attached is a report on the status of recruitment of members of the Peer Review Group. We extended 9 invitations. We have four confirmed members, one reluctant turn-down, one who has yet to respond to an initial inquiry, and are awaiting confirmation from 3 others who initially agreed. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Tom O’Neill

RecruitmentStatus.doc
STATUS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP RECRUITMENT
(As of August 17, 2005)

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.                          YES/CONFIRMED
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology

Guy-Uriel Charles                                YES*
Associate Professor, School of Law
University of Minnesota
612-626-9154

Brad Clark                                       NO
Professor of Law
George Washington University School of Law

Pamela Susan Karlan                              YES
Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law
Stanford Law School
650-725-4851

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.                           YES/CONFIRMED
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu

Daniel H. Lowenstein                             YES
Professor of Law
UCLA
310-825-4841

John F. Manning                                  NO RESPONSE
Professor
Harvard Law School

Tim Storey                                       YES/CONFIRMED
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures

Peter G. Verniero, Esq.                          YES/CONFIRMED
Counsel
Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
(Former NJ Attorney General and Supreme Court Justice)
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

------ Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:58 AM ------

"Tom O'Neill"
06/27/2005 09:52 AM
To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc
Subject July 12 and Peer Review Group

Karen:

The Eagleton project team usually meets on Tuesdays from 9:30 -- 11. At tomorrow's meeting I'll confirm with the group that we will meet on July 12, if that will fit your schedule. If that is a bad time for you, we have moved our meeting time before and can do so again if we can align participants' calendars. This week for the first time, Laura Williams --representing Moritz-- will join the session by telephone. For the meeting on the 12th I'll try to arrange for Ned Foley and Dan Tokaji to participate as well.

On the Peer Review Group
Your request to include the election officials on the group caused us to think anew about its purpose and composition. We agreed that election officials would add a useful dose of real world experience to the research. One of them could be Peter Veniero, who as AG (where he served before appointment to our Supreme Court) was New Jersey's chief election official. We would like Tom Wilkey to suggest a couple of former, senior election officials who could contribute to the PRG's work. While the PRG needs the experience of election administrators, we believe that perspective can be conveyed best by a senior, former official who is not appointed to represent a group of such officials --only to represent him or herself. We believe the group's advice would be most useful if came from people with the perspective provided by now being some distance from the daily fray.

This analysis emerged from a Friday conference call in which Ingrid Reed, Ned Foley, Laura Williams and I rethought the composition of the PRG. We concluded that the group should not, after all, include members from organizations that have taken advocacy positions on the issues we are researching. We agreed that the PRG should focus on methodologies and research findings rather than debate policy outcomes. PRG members should be free to represent themselves, rather than argue from an existing institutional position on policy. The PRG is not an advisory committee or a group of stakeholders to vet and take some ownership of policy recommendations. We'll consult the stakeholders separately, beginning with the list of groups in the proposal.

To replace those from advocacy organizations, we believe it would be preferable to add more members (from academia and the law, such as Pam Karlan, Guy-Uriel Charles, or Dan Lowenstein, whose CVs are summarized on the attachment. Finally, I will draft a mission statement for the PRG. Attached is a revised
list of proposed PRG members, showing 2 slots to be filled by senior, former election officials.

Hope you have received the Gantt chart by now and that it fits your needs.

Ingrid Reed and I will attend the meeting in New York on Thursday and look forward to seeing you there.

Tom

----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2005 6:36 PM
To: twilkey@eac.gov
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Peer Review Group

Tom-

I'd like to schedule a conference call among EAC and Eagleton staff for sometime the early part of the week of July 11. Please let me know dates and times on your end and I'll coordinate with staff here.

During the call we can review your monthly report and cover any problems, challenges, needs, etc. that the Eagleton team may have.

Thanks

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

Thanks, Karen.
Tom
-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2005 2:24 PM
To: tom_oneill@verizon.net
Subject: Re: Peer Review Group

Tom-

I will be back to you early next week with EAC's feedback on this.

Our initial reaction is that the group needs to include some local and/or state-level election officials, who have first-hand experience with these issues.

We will get you additional names and reactions by mid-week next week.

Thanks
K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen,

As you probably recall, one of the features of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group to look over our findings, conclusions and draft reports before we prepare final drafts for the EAC's review. The EAC asked that before recruiting members of the PRG we submit names for EAC's review. The aim, course, is to assemble a panel that is experienced, informed, and
balanced.

Attached is a list of potential PRG members drawn from academia, the law, and non-profit organizations with interests in this area. Please look it over.

We may conclude that the PRG should also include two or three former government officials now in academia or related fields. We have a conference call with our partners at Moritz planned for tomorrow or Friday to decide a) if former officials should be included in the PRG and b) if so, who they should be. I'll keep you informed of our thinking as it develops.

Tom PROPOSED MEMBERS OF PRGREV.doc
Karen,

As you probably recall, one of the features of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group to look over our findings, conclusions and draft reports before we prepare final drafts for the EAC's review. The EAC asked that before recruiting members of the PRG we submit names for EAC's review. The aim, course, is to assemble a panel that is experienced, informed, and balanced.
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PROPOSED MEMBERS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology
rma@hss.caltech.edu
626-395-4422
Alvarez has taught political science at Caltech since 1992. He received his B.A. in political science from Carleton College; his M.A. and Ph.D. from Duke University. Alvarez focuses on the study of electoral politics. He has published many articles on electoral behavior and public opinion. Support for his research has come from the National Science Foundation, The IBM Corporation, the Carnegie Corporation, of New York, and the Knight Foundation. Alvarez edits the Analytical Methods for Social Research book series and is on the editorial boards of a number of academic journals. He is Co-Director of the Caltech-MIT Voting Technology Project.

Deborah Goldberg, Ph.D.
Program Director, Democracy Program
Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law
161 Avenue Of The Americas, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10013
212-998-6730
Goldberg supervises the Democracy Program’s litigation, scholarship, and public education. She was the principal author of Writing Reform: A Guide to Drafting State & Local Campaign Finance Laws, and was lead counsel to the intervenor in the Supreme Court case Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Government PAC. She serves on the Steering Committee of a coalition to restore voting rights to persons with past felony convictions. Goldberg is a graduate of Harvard Law School. Before joining the Brennan Center, she was in private practice. She holds a Ph.D. in philosophy and taught ethics at Columbia University.

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu
Kropf has been on the faculty at Missouri since 1999. She received her BA Summa Cum Laude, Phi Beta Kappa from Kansas State University and her PhD in Political Science from American University. Her work concentrates on Research Methods, Urban Politics, American Government, and Political Behavior. Before joining the faculty at Missouri, she was Project Coordinator at the University of Maryland Survey Research Center. She has published recent on undervoting in presidential elections, and on invalidated ballots in the 1996 presidential election, and on the incremental process of election reform in Missouri.

Wade Henderson, Esq.
Executive Director
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
1629 K Street, NW, 10th Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Wade Henderson is the Executive Director of the LCCR and Counsel to the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund (LCCREF), and leads the organizations' work on issues involving nationwide election reform. He is a graduate of Howard University and the Rutgers University School of Law. During its over 50 years of existence, LCCR has worked to redefine civil rights issues in broad and inclusive ways. Today, it includes over 180 national organizations. Previously Henderson served as Washington Bureau Director of the NAACP. He began his career as a legislative counsel of the ACLU.

Kay Maxwell
President
League of Women Voters of the U.S.
1730 M Street NW, Suite 1000
Kay J. Maxwell has been a member of the League since 1976. She attended Smith College and earned a B.A. in International Relations from the University of Pennsylvania. She has conducted civic participation training for women leaders in Bosnia, Israel, the West Bank, Rwanda, Kuwait and Jamaica. She has also served as vice president at the International Executive Service Corps (IESC), an international economic development organization. She is a board member of DC Vote, and the New Voters Project.

Tim Storey
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures
7700 East First Place
Denver, CO 80230
303-364-7700
or
444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-5400

Peter G. Verniero, Esq.
Counsel
Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, New Jersey 07102
Tel: 973- 643-7000
Verniero chairs the firm's Appellate Practice Group. He earned his B.A. at Drew University, Phi Beta Kappa, and his J.D. (with honors) at the Duke University School of Law. In 1999, he was appointed a justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, where he served for 7 years before re-entering private practice. Before his appointment to the Supreme Court, he served as New Jersey's Attorney General, and in that capacity oversaw the state's election laws. He also served as Chief of Staff and Chief Counsel to Governor Christine Todd Whitman.
Electionline.org unsuccessful bidder de-brief.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:51 AM -----
"Doug Chapin"
<dchapin@electionline.org>
06/06/2005 07:56 AM
To: nmortellito@eac.gov
cc cpaquette@eac.gov, klynndyson@eac.gov
Subject: RE: Notification to Bidders

Let's do the afternoon of June 16th. I'll pencil it in for 2pm but feel free to adjust to your schedule(s).

Thanks.

Doug Chapin

Mr Chapin:

Carol has time to do a debrief with you on the afternoon of the 15th, the afternoon of the 16th or any time on the 17th of June. Please advise as to your availability.

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Interim Executive Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
I would like a debrief on this procurement.

Doug Chapin
Director, electionline.org

From: nmortellito@eac.gov [mailto:nmortellito@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2005 2:12 PM
To: Doug Chapin
Subject: Notification to Bidders

Notification to bidders

You are hereby advised that the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has competitively awarded a contract to the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey for research assistance to support the development of guidance on the two topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. Eagleton is partnering with the Moritz College of Law of Ohio State University for this work effort. The amount of this award is $560,002.

EAC appreciates the interest you have expressed in supporting our research agenda by submitting a proposal for this work. Should you wish to receive a de-brief on this procurement, please contact Carol A. Paquette, Interim Executive Director, by email at cpaquette@eac.gov.

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Interim Executive Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
202.566.3127 fax
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV 06/28/2006 10:43 AM

To Darrell D. Lee/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Voter ID Paper --Final Draft

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:42 AM -----

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV
04/28/2006 12:50 PM
To Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Re: Voter ID Paper --Final Draft

Karen,
Was this part of the contract. I thought there was a peer review group in place,

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 04/28/2006 12:44 PM
To: Tom O'neill" <tom_oneill@verizon.net/@GSAEXTERNAL
Cc: arapp@rci.rutgers.edu; davander@eden.rutgers.edu;
dlinky@rci.rutgers.edu; foley.33@osu.edu; ireed@rutgers.edu; 'Johanna
Dobrich" <jdobrich@eden.rutgers.edu>; joharris@eden.rutgers.edu;
john.weingart@rutgers.edu; lauracw@columbus.rr.com; rmandel@rci.rutgers.edu;
Tim Vercellotti" <tim.vercellotti@rutgers.edu>; tokaji.l@osu.edu
Subject: Re: Voter ID Paper --Final Draft

Tim, Tom, John, et.al--

The EAC has identified three academics who are going to serve as peer reviewers of the Eagleton Voter
ID paper and research.

They are Jonathan Nagler of New York University, Jan Leighley, University of Arizona, and Adam
Berinsky of MIT.
They are ready to review the documents as soon as they are available.

I would like to them one week to review the material and then have a joint conference call on Thursday,
May 11, in which we would all have an opportunity to discuss the research methodology and statistical
analysis, along with general comments and suggestions.

If you are able to get to me the paper and the supporting data analysis, I will distribute to the documents
ASAP.
Also let me know, if you would, your availability on May 11 to do this conference all.
I anticipate that it will last approximately 90 minutes.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
This e-mail should be a part of the no-cost extension file and/or the financial file you create for the Eagleton contract.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:29 AM -----

"John Weingart"
<john.weingart@rutgers.edu>
12/16/2005 01:25 PM
Please respond to john.weingart@rutgers.edu
To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Karen - At this time, we anticipate reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line item and spending approximately $35,500 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,250 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants. There are other additional variances but they are not significant (e.g. less on honoraria, less on travel, and more on general operations such as phone expenses). Let me know if you need additional detail or information.

Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> > John-
> >
> > Quick question-
> >
> > How much money do you anticipate will be re-allocated from the original line items outlined in the contract to other project costs?
Karen - There were two typos on the copy I just sent. Please use the attached instead. To minimize confusion, I dated this document December 1st (the first one says November 30). Thanks, John

--
John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:27 AM -----

"John Weingart"
<john.weingart@rutgers.edu>
11/30/2005 05:05 PM
Please respond to
john.weingart@rutgers.edu
To "Karen Lynn-Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
cc "Tom O'Neill" 
Subject Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Extension Justification.doc

Karen - There were two typos on the copy I just sent. Please use the attached instead. To minimize confusion, I dated this document December 1st (the first one says November 30). Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Why we need a no-cost extension

The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting based on our research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication. The draft was complete in August, but the EAC’s schedule did not permit us to brief the commissioners and staff until early September. We did not receive EAC comments until October, making it impossible to complete the work on the original schedule. Taking account of those comments and guidance from EAC required several weeks. The EAC did not receive our final draft report and recommendations for best practices until late November. We are now awaiting the EAC’s comments on that final draft, which we have been told to expect in January.

The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report on that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid January.

Because the EAC has decided to issue recommendations for best practices on these topics, rather than voluntary guidance, we will finish the work within two months of the original completion date since the adoption process will be shorter. Note that meeting this schedule is dependent on the time needed by the EAC to review our work.

This extension will entail additional personnel time but, since no public hearings on “best practices” are required, if the EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work.

When will work be completed and funds fully expended?

As shown on the attached schedule, work on this contract will be completed in three phases. The EAC will receive our final report and recommendations for best practices in provisional voting during the week of January 23, 2006 (assuming that we receive the EAC’s comments on the draft report submitted on November 28 by January 9).

We will submit our draft report, alternative approaches, and compendium of statutes, regulations, and litigation on Voter Identification Issues during the week of January 16, 2006. If the EAC is able to return comments to us no later than the week of January 30, we will have submit the final report and recommendations for best practices on Voter Identification to the EAC during the week of February 13.

The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $300,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project.
REVISED SCHEDULE FOR
November 2005 – February 2006
November 10, 2005
Assumes no guidance document, only analysis and recommended best practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>Provisional Voting</th>
<th>Voter ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week of 10/31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review draft report to EAC (Team)</td>
<td>Voter ID Research to TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit comments on report (Team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/7</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for October tasks (all)</td>
<td>Redraft report (TON)</td>
<td>Research continues (TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and approve report (Team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final draft report (TON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/14</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Submit report to Project Team for comments (TON)</td>
<td>Research continues (TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/21</td>
<td>Project team comments received</td>
<td>Complete data collection for Voter ID analysis (TV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit report to EAC for review and to PRG for information (TON, JW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/28</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Draft report on Voter ID analysis (TV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/5</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for November tasks (all)</td>
<td>Internal review (PT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/12</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Revise draft (TV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Draft alternatives (TON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and comment on alternatives (PT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/19</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Complete draft report and alternatives (TV, TON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/26</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Review draft report and alternatives (PT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/2/06</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Report and alternatives to PRG for review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status reports to JD for December tasks (all)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 1/9/06</th>
<th>Receive comments from EAC and revise report as needed</th>
<th>PRG meets and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 1/16/06</th>
<th>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</th>
<th>Project team reviews and approves revised report</th>
<th>Submit draft report, alternatives and compendium to EAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EAC reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 1/23/06</th>
<th>Finalize analysis and best practices and submit to EAC for publication and further action as appropriate</th>
<th>EAC review continues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 1/30/06</th>
<th>Comments from EAC</th>
<th>Revise (TV &amp; TON)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/6/06</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for January tasks (all)</td>
<td>Review and approve revised report and recommendations for best practices (PT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/13/06</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Submit report and best practices to EAC for publication and further action as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/20/06</td>
<td>FINAL status reports to JD for all tasks (all)</td>
<td>Final fiscal report/invoice to EAC 75 days later</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carol,

After our discussion in New York, you asked me to put in writing our response to the EAC's suggestions for expanding the number and kinds of groups that would review and comment on our work. I hope after your review of this response, we will be able to quickly recruit a balanced Peer Review Group (PRG) and move ahead as the schedule in our work plan indicates. Attached is a revised list of the members we propose for appointment to the PRG. We will probably not be able to persuade all of them to serve, but the number and range of views included on the proposed list should ensure that the resulting group is well-balanced.

Tom

RESPONSE TO EAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW GROUPS

EAC's Recommendations for the PRG
Karen Lynn-Dyson reported this response from the EAC commissioners to our proposal for the composition of the PRG.

1. Not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG

2. Create a “tiered process” of review in which:
   A. The PRG will prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.
   B. PRG’s analysis would be vetted by a defined/select group of local election officials.
   C. A defined/select group of advocacy organizations would review the
comments of the local election officials
D. Empanel a final focus group of local election officials, advocates and academics for an overall, interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Project Team Response
Creating three new committees to the review process to supplement the work of the Peer Review Group (PRG) is possible, but would add at least 8 weeks—and possibly 12 weeks—to our completion of the guidance document on provisional voting. We believe this delay would risk limiting the value of this project for the 2006 election. In addition, the change would add at least $30,000 to the cost of our work. (See the attached table showing the possible effect on our work plan, and note the optimistic assumptions such as the ability to hold a hearing the week after Christmas.) If the same groups were to be engaged in reviewing our work on Voter ID, the time for that work would also have to be stretched at a similar increased cost.

This additional cost and the added time might be worthwhile... if the new layers of review were to produce a consensus on how to strengthen the research, sharpen the analysis, and increase the relevance of the Guidance Document. Our team concluded, however, that additional review groups were unlikely to achieve these results.

PRG focuses on quality of research
We believe that our research would be strengthened by a balanced Peer Review Group that will focus on the design of the research and our conduct of it. Based on the EAC's recommendation, we have revised the composition of the PRG to include additional, well-recognized authorities in the field whose perspective is generally agreed to be conservative.

The PRG will focus on the strength of the research design and the quality of our analysis, not on the politics of our recommendations for the guidance document. The PRG will critique the research design and suggest how to strengthen it. Members of the group will review the quality of our analysis so that we can fill holes and correct errors before we make policy recommendations to the EAC. The PRG may or may not meet as a group. The likelihood is that most comments will come in writing from individual members, most of whose schedules would not permit attendance at meetings. In any case, the PRG members will not gather around a table to come to consensus on the study's recommendations.

While using the PRG as a forum to reach consensus on the knotty issues involved does not appear practical, the EAC can benefit from the work of other groups in this regard. It is not necessary for this project to duplicate the deliberative processes of the Carter-Baker Commission, the Century Foundation and the Election Center. The EAC itself as well as the project team can get the benefit of these reports without duplicating this "policy evaluation board" structure as part of this contract.

Project Team focuses on analysis and recommendations
Karen reported that the Commissioners believed that the PRG would "prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions." As we see it, the PRG will neither analyze data nor draw conclusions, tentative or otherwise. Its members will review and comment on how the Project Team has designed and carried out the research. Analysis, conclusions and recommendations are the responsibility of the Project Team. We have all seen in the preface to books or articles a sentence or two that read something like this, "The author
thanks Mr. X, Ms. Y, and Dr. Z for their review and comment on the manuscript. Their analysis has strengthened the work, but they are in no way responsible for errors or for my conclusions.” That is the way we think about the Peer Review Group.

In short, the PRG will help ensure that EAC’s Guidance Document is founded on a solid base of data and analysis. The review and comment on the Preliminary Guidance Document by the EAC’s Board of Advisors and Standards Board will provide participation by important stakeholder groups without the need for the other review committees. This Board is broad-based and represents a key stakeholder group. It also enjoys a significant advantage over a “defined/select” group we might empanel. Any group we define will be open to criticism or charges of bias by representatives of interest groups not represented.

The criticism and charges of bias might be tolerable, but only if we could expect consensus from the “defined/select” group we would appoint. We believe that consensus would be elusive. In empanelling a “defined/select” group, we would naturally look for balance and would appoint members to represent a point of view or an institutional interest. As representatives they would likely feel that they had little choice but to be strong advocates. They would have little incentive to compromise. Our research, as opposed to our policy recommendations, would be better served by the analysis of scholars than by the advocacy of interests.

Policy judgments
We regard the EAC itself as responsible for the policy judgments involved in shaping the Guidance Document. We plan, of course, to respond to the EAC’s comments on our preliminary draft, so that the EAC’s comments will shape the Preliminary Guidance Document before it is released for public comment. And further revision will follow the public hearing and comments. The EAC and individual Commissioners can always seek comment informally on our analysis or recommendations. That course appears to us preferable to the creation of a new, more elaborate review process.

PROPOSED MEMBERSJuly6.doc
Role of the Peer Review Group

Members of the Peer Review Group will review the research design for the project, including the survey of local election officials, the analysis of Voter ID regime on turnout, the state-by-state narrative of developments in provisional voting and voter identification, and the compilation and analysis of statutes, administrative regulations, and case law affecting provisional voting and voter identification. They will also review the report on Analysis and Alternatives. They may review the draft of the Preliminary Guidance Document before it goes to the Board of Advisors for comment.

Members of the group will be respected authorities in their fields and represent a range of opinions and perspectives, although their views on policy will be less important to the study than their views on the quality of the research on which policy recommendations are based.

Ideally, the group would meet once, but even that may not be possible to arrange given the tight time period for the project, the demanding schedules of the members, and their wide dispersal across the county. They will function largely by reviewing written work and making written comments on it. The timing of their involvement is indicated on the work plan.

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology
rma@hss.caltech.edu
626-395-4422
Alvarez has taught political science at Caltech since 1992. He received his B.A. in political science from Carleton College, his M.A. and Ph.D. from Duke University. Alvarez focuses on the study of electoral politics. He has published many articles on electoral behavior and public opinion. Support for his research has come from the National Science Foundation, The IBM Corporation, the Carnegie Corporation, of New York, and the Knight Foundation. Alvarez edits the Analytical Methods for Social Research book series and is on the editorial boards of a number of academic journals. He is Co-Director of the Caltech-MIT Voting Technology Project.

Guy-Oriel E. Charles
Associate Professor
School of Law
University of Minnesota
342 Mondale Hall
229-19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
612-626-9154
gcharles@umn.edu

Charles teaches and writes on election law, law and politics, and race. He received his B.A. degree in Political Science, cum laude from Spring Arbor University and his J.D. from the University of Michigan Law School, where he was Editor-in-Chief of the Michigan Journal of Race & Law. He is completing a PhD in political science from the University of Michigan.
Brad Clark  
Professor of Law  
George Washington University School of Law  

Clark received his B.A. in Political Science from Florida State University and his J.D. from Columbia Law School in 1985. He served as a law clerk to the Judge Robert H. Bork on the US Court of Appeals and went on to clerk for Justice Antonin Scalia on the Supreme Court. He has been on the faculty at George Washington University Law School for 12 years, where he has taught Constitutional Law, Federal Courts, and Civil Procedure.

Pamela Susan Karlan  
Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law  
Stanford Law School  
559 Nathan Abbott Way  
Stanford, CA 94305-8610  
(650) 725-4851  
karlan@stanford.edu  

Karlan's principal subjects include legal regulation of the political process. She earned her BA, MA, and JD at Yale University, and was previously a Professor at the University of Virginia. She serves on the California Fair Political Practices Commission and is a Cooperating Attorney with the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund. She has also been a lecturer at the FBI National Academy. Among her publications, she is a co-author of When Elections Go Bad: The Law of Democracy and the Presidential Election of 2000.

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor of Political Science  
University of Missouri-Kansas City  
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu  

Kropf has been on the faculty at Missouri since 1999. She received her BA Summa Cum Laude, Phi Beta Kappa from Kansas State University and her PhD in Political Science from American University. Her work concentrates on Research Methods, Urban Politics, American Government, and Political Behavior. Before joining the faculty at Missouri, she was Project Coordinator at the University of Maryland Survey Research Center. She has published recent on undervoting in presidential elections, and on invalidated ballots in the 1996 presidential election, and on the incremental process of election reform in Missouri.

Daniel H. Lowenstein  
Professor of Law  
School of Law  
University of California, Los Angeles  
Box 951476,  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1476  
(310) 825-4841  

Among other courses, Lowenstein teaches Election Law. His textbook, Election Law has become a standard in the field. He earned his A.B. at Yale and his LL.B. at Harvard. While working for California's Secretary of State he was the main drafter of the Political Reform Act in 1971. He was the first chair of the Fair Political Practices Commission. He has served on the national governing board of Common Cause. He has written on such topics as campaign finance, redistricting, bribery, initiative elections, and political parties.

John F. Manning  
Professor  
Harvard Law School  

Deleted: Deborah Goldberg, Ph.D  
Program Director, Democracy Program  
Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law  
161 Avenue Of The Americas, 12th Floor  
New York, NY 10013  
212-998-6730  

Goldberg supervises the Democracy Program's litigation, scholarship, and public education. She was the principal author of Writing Reform: A Guide to Drafting State & Local Campaign Finance Laws, and was lead counsel to the intervenor in the Supreme Court case Nixon v. StRank Missouri Government PAC. She serves on the Steering Committee of a coalition to restore voting rights to persons with past felony convictions. Goldberg is a graduate of Harvard Law School. Before joining the Brennan Center, she was in private practice. She holds a Ph.D. in philosophy and taught ethics at Columbia University.
Now at Harvard, Manning was appointed Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel by President Bush in 2001. He had been Professor of Law at Columbia Law School. Had had served as Assistant to the Solicitor General of the United States and was an Attorney-Adviser in the Office of Legal Counsel at the Department of Justice during the administrations of President George H. W. Bush and President Reagan. He is a graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School.

Tim Storey
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures
7700 East First Place
Denver, CO 80230
303-364-7700
or
444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-5400

Peter G. Veniero, Esq.
Counsel
Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, New Jersey 07102
Tel: 973-643-7000
Veniero chairs the firm’s Appellate Practice Group. He earned his B.A. at Drew University, Phi Beta Kappa, and his J.D. (with honors) at the Duke University School of Law. In 1999, he was appointed a justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, where he served for 7 years before re-entering private practice. Before his appointment to the Supreme Court, he served as New Jersey’s Attorney General, and in that capacity oversaw the state’s election laws. He also served as Chief of Staff and Chief Counsel to Governor Christine Todd Whitman.

Plus one or two former, senior election officials to be suggested by the EAC
Hi -- nice to meet you in person, finally!

And thanks for inviting me to your gathering, I enjoyed it and hope I was helpful. Of course, any time you want anything, you do know where to track me down.

As to the potential reviewers of the Eagleton Voter ID study, here are my suggestions, in order:
Jonathan Nagler, New York University
Jan Leighley, University of Arizona
Ben Highton, UC-Davis
Adam Berinsky, MIT
Bernard Grofman, UC-Irvine

All have worked with the CPS turnout/registration data, and are very familiar with this research literature.

If these don't work, or you want more recommendations, let me know.

--

R. Michael Alvarez
626-395-4089
Professor of Political Science
626-405-9841
Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, CA 91125
rma@hss.caltech.edu

 Contributor to Election Updates,
http://electionupdates.caltech.edu/blog.html
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
06/28/2006 11:45 AM

To Darrell D. Lee/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV
cc
bcc

Subject Fw: Please provide me with a hard copy of the Eagleton cost proposal, when you can

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 11:43 AM -----

Nicole Mortellito/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV
01/20/2006 02:01 PM

To Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc

Subject Re: Please provide me with a hard copy of the Eagleton cost proposal, when you can

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Special Projects
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.2209 phone
202.566.3128 fax
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
01/20/2006 12:54 PM

To Nicole Mortellito/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc

Subject Please provide me with a hard copy of the Eagleton cost proposal, when you can

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100

EAC Eagleton Institute Budget 3-22-05-1.xls
### Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers The State University of New Jersey
US Election Assistance Commission Project Budget (3/22/05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleton faculty/senior staff</td>
<td>35,000 Mandel, Weingart, Reed, Linky (various percentages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleton staff: logistics/administrative/clerical</td>
<td>15,000 (various percentages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe (32.5%)</td>
<td>16,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hourly Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Coordinator</td>
<td>21,250 1250 hours at $17 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics/Admin Coordinator</td>
<td>12,325 725 hours at $17 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research assistants</td>
<td>7,200 300 hours at $12 per hour for two researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe on Hourly (9%)</td>
<td>3,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$110,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honoraria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria for Peer Review Group</td>
<td>10,000 10 at $1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Hearings (3 in 3 cities)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
<td>75,000 3 hearings at $25K per EAC figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hearings in DC- train, ground, lodging, meals*</td>
<td>3,480 attended by 3 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hearings in St. Louis- air, ground, lodging, meals**</td>
<td>2,640 attended by 3 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Briefings/Meetings with EAC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train, ground, lodging, meals***</td>
<td>5,200 5 briefings in DC, attended by 2 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies, software, telephone, copying, postage</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop computers, laptop, printer</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcontract</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director- O’Neill</td>
<td>79,500 80% time April – Aug., 60% Sept. – Oct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University- Legal Analysis</td>
<td>84,744 Partner institution, Moritz College of Law, OSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Non Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$280,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal All Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>$391,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Total Direct Cost $277,015****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;A on Modified Total Direct Cost (55.5%)</td>
<td>153,743 Rutgers University federally approved rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Project Budget</strong></td>
<td>$545,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optional Surveys</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Election Officials</td>
<td>15,000 Eagleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Voters</td>
<td>25,000 Eagleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Voting, 1st state</td>
<td>116,000 OSU Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Voting, 1st additional state</td>
<td>75,000 OSU Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Voting, 2nd additional state</td>
<td>60,000 OSU Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Optional Surveys (no F&amp;A)</strong></td>
<td>$291,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Travel and lodging to two hearings in DC includes $260 for train fare to DC, $200 for hotel/lodging, and $60 per day for two days for meals= $580 per person per trip for three people.
** Travel and lodging to one hearing in St. Louis includes $500 airfare to St. Louis, 2 nights hotel/lodging at $100, and $60 per day for three days for meals= $880 per person for three people.
*** Travel and lodging to five Briefings/Meetings with EAC includes $260 for train fare to DC, $200 for hotel/ lodging, and $60 for meals= $520 per person per trip for two people.
**** Modified total direct cost is equivalent to total direct cost except for two items - F&A included only on first $25K of subcontract with Project Director ($79,500) and first $25K of subcontract with OSU ($84,744).
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
06/28/2006 11:44 AM
To Darrell D. Lee/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: No Cost Extension Request

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 11:42 AM -----

"John Weingart"
<john.weingart@rutgers.edu>
11/30/2005 04:47 PM
Please respond to
john.weingart@rutgers.edu
To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc "Tom O'Neill"
Subject No Cost Extension Request

Extension Justification.doc
Karen - I am attaching the documentation for our request.
Please let me know if you require the material in a different format and/or further information.

Thanks very much, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> John-
> Thanks ever so much for forwarding this message on to Connie.
> I'm awaiting your language describing why you are requiring a no-cost extension on the contract, and for what period of time you wish to extend the contract.
> I'm told this is a very simple process on this end, and I've prepared the necessary form and a memo.
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS

Request to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission
for a No-Cost Extension and Reallocation of Funds

November 30, 2005

Why we need a no-cost extension

The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting based on our research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication. The draft was complete in August, but the EAC’s schedule did not permit us to brief the commissioners and staff until early September. We did not receive EAC comments until October, making it impossible to complete the work on the original schedule. Taking account of those comments and guidance from EAC required several weeks. The EAC did not receive our final draft report and recommendations for best practices until late November. We are now awaiting the EAC’s comments on that final draft, which we have been told to expect in January.

The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report on that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid January.

Because the EAC has decided to issue recommendations for best practices on these topics, rather than voluntary guidance, we will finish the work within two months of the original completion date since the adoption process will be shorter. Note that meeting this schedule is dependent on the time needed by the EAC to review our work.

This extension will entail additional personnel time but, since no public hearings on “best practices” are required, if the EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work.

When will work be completed and funds fully expended?

As shown on the attached schedule, work on this contract will be completed in three phases. The EAC will receive our final report and recommendations for best practices in provisional voting during the week of January 23, 2006 (assuming that we receive the EAC’s comments on the draft report submitted on November 28 by January 9).

We will submit our draft report, alternative approaches, and compendium of statutes, regulations, and litigation on Voter Identification Issues during the week of January 16, 2006. If the EAC is able to return comments to us no later than the week of January 30, we will have submit the final report and recommendations for best practices on Voter Identification to the EAC during the week of February 13.

The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $399,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project.
### REVISED SCHEDULE FOR
November 2005 – February 2006
November 10, 2005
Assumes no guidance document, only analysis and recommended best practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>Provisional Voting</th>
<th>Voter ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week of 10/31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review draft report to EAC (Team)</td>
<td>Voter ID Research to TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit comments on report (Team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/7</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for October tasks (all)</td>
<td>Redraft report (TON)</td>
<td>Research continues (TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and approve report (Team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final draft report (TON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/14</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Submit report to Project Team for comments (TON)</td>
<td>Research continues (TV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Week of 11/21 | Project team comments received  
Submit report to EAC for review and to PRG for information (TON, JW) | Complete data collection for Voter ID analysis (TV) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/28</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Draft report on Voter ID analysis (TV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Week of 12/5 | Status reports to JD for November tasks (all)  
EAC review | Internal review (PT) |
| Week of 12/12 | Submit monthly progress report (JD)  
EAC review | Revise draft (TV)  
Draft alternatives (TON)  
Review and comment on alternatives (PT) |
<p>| Week of 12/19 | EAC review | Complete draft report and alternatives (TV, TON) |
| Week of 12/26 | EAC review | Review draft report and alternatives (PT) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 1/2/06</th>
<th>Report and alternatives to PRG for review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status reports to JD for December tasks (all)</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 1/9/06</th>
<th>PRG meets and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receive comments from EAC and revise report as needed</td>
<td>Revise (TV &amp; TON)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 1/16/06</th>
<th>Submit draft report, alternatives and compendium to EAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Submit draft report, alternatives and compendium to EAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project team reviews and approves revised report</td>
<td>EAC reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 1/23/06</th>
<th>EAC review continues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalize analysis and best practices and submit to EAC for publication and further action as appropriate</td>
<td>EAC review continues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 1/30/06</th>
<th>Comments from EAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revise (TV &amp; TON)</td>
<td>Comments from EAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 013443 | 4 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 2/6/06</th>
<th>Status reports to JD for January tasks (all)</th>
<th>Review and approve revised report and recommendations for best practices (PT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/13/06</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Submit report and best practices to EAC for publication and further action as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/20/06</td>
<td>FINAL status reports to JD for all tasks (all) Final project and fiscal report to EAC PROJECT ENDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tim O'Rourke, Dean of the Fulton School of Liberal Arts at Salisbury University in Maryland, has agreed to serve on the Peer Review Committee.

Tom O'Neill
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 11:07 AM -----

"Tom O'Neill"

To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc

08/19/2005 02:20 PM

Subject Peer Review Group

Karen,

Attached is a report on the status of recruitment of members of the Peer Review Group. We extended 9 invitations. We have four confirmed members, one reluctant turn-down, one who has yet to respond to an initial inquiry, and are awaiting confirmation from 3 others who initially agreed. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Tom O'Neill

RecruitmentStatus.doc
STATUS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP RECRUITMENT
(As of August 17, 2005)

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D. YES/CONFIRMED
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology

Guy-Uriel Charles YES
Associate Professor, School of Law
University of Minnesota
612-626-9154

Brad Clark NO
Professor of Law
George Washington University School of Law

Pamela Susan Karlan YES
Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law
Stanford Law School
650-725-4851

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D. YES/CONFIRMED
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu

Daniel H. Lowenstein YES
Professor of Law
UCLA
310-825-4841

John F. Manning NO RESPONSE
Professor
Harvard Law School

Tim Storey YES/CONFIRMED
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures

Peter G. Verniero, Esq. YES/CONFIRMED
Counsel
Sills, Cummins, Epstein and Gross, PC
(Former NJ Attorney General and Supreme Court Justice)
This is an important e-mail (for audit purposes) related to the large survey of election officials which Eagleton did.

By law, the EAC could not do this survey without going through a lengthy OMB approval process. Eagleton was free to do this survey as long as it was for their clarification purposes and they did not seek our advice on the survey.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:59 AM -----

"Tom O'Neill"

07/07/2005 11:19 AM

To: klynndyson@eac.gov
cc: cpaquette@eac.gov
Subject: Re: Survey Cover Letter and Questionnaire

Karen,

We share the understanding expressed below. Attached is the revised cover letter to local election officials.

Thanks,

Tom

----- Original Message ----- 
From: klynndyson@eac.gov
To: tmoineill@virgin.net
Cc: cpaquette@eac.gov
Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2005 11:14 AM
Subject: Re: Survey Cover Letter and Questionnaire

Tom-

A review of the EAC's Statement of Work for Research Assistance to develop Voluntary Guidance on
Provisional Voting and Voting Identification procedures, does not require that a survey of the elections community, regarding their experiences with provisional voting or voter identification be conducted. Therefore, the EAC is not required to review or approve such a survey.

Should Eagleton elect to conduct such a survey to further educate and inform their work on these topics, they may conduct such a survey on their behalf only.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen,

Attached are the two documents we just discussed. The cover letter will go to 2800+ election officials around the country. It alerts the recipients that they may be called to participate in a survey as a part of our research for the EAC. The survey will, in fact, interview only 400 of the local election officials, but notifying them all is necessary because the selection of those called will be random, and, if the surveyors cannot reach the first county drawn for the sample, they will move on to the next. The need to have your review of the letter is the most urgent. Unless it goes to SBRI, the survey firm that will make the actual calls, today, we will fall behind an already tight schedule.

The questionnaire would also benefit from your review. As you know, question wording is an art. A good question elicits the information sought without biasing the response. Your review, however, can help ensure that the survey elicits information that EAC will find useful. We will rely on the results to draw conclusions about provisional voting as experienced by county-level election officials. It inquires about the quality and timeliness of information and training they may have received from state-level officials and about the information and training that they, in turn, passed on to poll workers. I don't believe this information is available anywhere else. We are over-sampling officials in states that did not offer provisional ballots before 2004 so that we can draw some inferences about the difference between their experience and the experience of officials for whom provisional voting was more familiar. These inferences may provide helpful in shaping the guidance the EAC offers the states for the 2006 election.
Your comments on the questionnaire are also needed urgently, but I believe we can hold SBRI at bay on this document until tomorrow.

As I mentioned, my computer died on Monday, so I have only sporadic access to email. I will have access until about 2 today and then won't be back on-line until early evening. You can always reach me by phone at [redacted]. If you would like to send a fax, that number is [redacted].

Thanks,

[signature]

Tom Revised Final cover letter 070607.doc
Dear NAME,

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, is conducting a national survey of elections officials’ experiences with provisional voting in the 2004 national election. Through this survey we will learn the perspective of those who administer elections. It will improve our understanding of the process as we complete a broad research project on provisional voting in the context of effective election administration, voter access, and ballot security. The findings of the project will be the basis for recommendations to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to consider in the development of its guidance to the states in 2006.

The EAC was established by the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002. It is an independent, bipartisan, federal agency that provides federal funds to states to upgrade voting systems and improve election administration. The EAC publishes voluntary guidelines for the states and serves as a national clearinghouse of information regarding election administration. The EAC is funding the research project.

Participants in this study will be selected randomly and asked to share their experiences administering the provisional voting process in the 2004 election. The study will be conducted July 18th through August 5th. During that period a survey researcher may call you if you are, in fact, chosen at random from a national list of election officials. The researcher will ask you questions about your experience with provisional voting, your evaluation of the process, and your recommendations to improve it. The survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes. All of your answers will be completely confidential, and no statement or comment you make will be ascribed to you.

At the conclusion of the research project, we will present a report to the EAC including analysis of provisional voting procedures as well as recommendations for future practices and procedures. The guidance document based on our research will be published by the EAC in the Federal Register for public review and comment, and the EAC will hold a hearing on the guidance document this fall before adopting it.

Your participation in the survey will assure that we understand the views of election officials who have direct experience with provisional voting. We hope you will participate if called. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

[scanned signature]

Ruth B. Mandel
Director and Board of Governors Professor of Politics
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:58 AM -----

"Tom O'Neill"

To klynndyson@eac.gov

06/27/2005 09:52 AM
Subject July 12 and Peer Review Group

Karen:

The Eagleton project team usually meets on Tuesdays from 9:30 -- 11. At tomorrow's meeting I'll confirm with the group that we will meet on July 12, if that will fit your schedule. If that is a bad time for you, we have moved our meeting time before and can do so again if we can align participants' calendars. This week for the first time, Laura Williams --representing Moritz-- will join the session by telephone. For the meeting on the 12th I'll try to arrange for Ned Foley and Dan Tokaji to participate as well.

On the Peer Review Group
Your request to include the election officials on the group caused us to think anew about its purpose and composition. We agreed that election officials would add a useful dose of real world experience to the research. One of them could be Peter Veniero, who as AG (where he served before appointment to our Supreme Court) was New Jersey's chief election official. We would like Tom Wilkey to suggest a couple of former, senior election officials who could contribute to the PRG's work. While the PRG needs the experience of election administrators, we believe that perspective can be conveyed best by a senior, former official who is not appointed to represent a group of such officials --only to represent him or herself. We believe the group's advice would be most useful if came from people with the perspective provided by now being some distance from the daily fray.

This analysis emerged from a Friday conference call in which Ingrid Reed, Ned Foley, Laura Williams and I rethought the composition of the PRG. We concluded that the group should not, after all, include members from organizations that have taken advocacy positions on the issues we are researching. We agreed that the PRG should focus on methodologies and research findings rather than debate policy outcomes. PRG members should be free to represent themselves, rather than argue from an existing institutional position on policy. The PRG is not an advisory committee or a group of stakeholders to vet and take some ownership of policy recommendations. We'll consult the stakeholders separately, beginning with the list of groups in the proposal.

To replace those from advocacy organizations, we believe it would be preferable to add more members from academia and the law, such as Pam Karlan, Guy-Uriel Charles, or Dan Lowenstein, whose CVs are summarized on the attachment. Finally, I will draft a mission statement for the PRG. Attached is a revised
list of proposed PRG members, showing 2 slots to be filled by senior, former election officials.

Hope you have received the Gantt chart by now and that it fits your needs.

Ingrid Reed and I will attend the meeting in New York on Thursday and look forward to seeing you there.

Tom

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2005 6:36 PM
To: tom_oneill@verizon.net
Cc: twilkey@eac.gov
Subject: RE: Peer Review Group

Tom-

I'd like to schedule a conference call among EAC and Eagleton staff for sometime the early part of the week of July 11. Please let me know dates and times on your end and I'll coordinate with staff here.

During the call we can review your monthly report and cover any problems, challenges, needs, etc. that the Eagleton team may have.

Thanks

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

"Tom O'Neil"

06/23/2005 02:43 PM

To: klynndyson@eac.gov
cc
Subject: RE: Peer Review Group

Thanks, Karen.
Tom-

---Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2005 2:24 PM
To: klynndyson@eac.gov
Subject: Re: Peer Review Group

Tom-

I will be back to you early next week with EAC’s feedback on this.

Our initial reaction is that the group needs to include some local and/or state-level election officials, who have first-hand experience with these issues.

We will get you additional names and reactions by mid-week next week.

Thanks

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen,

As you probably recall, one of the features of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group to look over our findings, conclusions and draft reports before we prepare final drafts for the EAC’s review. The EAC asked that before recruiting members of the PRG we submit names for EAC’s review. The aim, course, is to assemble a panel that is experienced, informed, and
balanced.

Attached is a list of potential PRG members drawn from academia, the law, and non-profit organizations with interests in this area. Please look it over.

We may conclude that the PRG should also include two or three former government officials now in academia or related fields. We have a conference call with our partners at Moritz planned for tomorrow or Friday to decide a) if former officials should be included in the PRG and b) if so, who they should be. I'll keep you informed of our thinking as it develops.

Tom PROPOSED MEMBERS OF PRGREV.doc
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:57 AM -----

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:57 AM -----

Karen, 

As you probably recall, one of the features of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group to look over our findings, conclusions and draft reports before we prepare final drafts for the EAC's review. The EAC asked that before recruiting members of the PRG we submit names for EAC's review. The aim, course, is to assemble a panel that is experienced, informed, and balanced.

Attached is a list of potential PRG members drawn from academia, the law, and non-profit organizations with interests in this area. Please look it over.

We may conclude that the PRG should also include two or three former government officials now in academia or related fields. We have a conference call with our partners at Moritz planned for tomorrow or Friday to decide a) if former officials should be included in the PRG and b) if so, who they should be. I'll keep you informed of our thinking as it develops.

Tom

PROPOSED MEMBERS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP.doc
PROPOSED MEMBERS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology
rma@hss.caltech.edu
626-395-4422
Alvarez has taught political science at Caltech since 1992. He received his B.A. in political science from Carleton College; his M.A. and Ph.D. from Duke University. Alvarez focuses on the study of electoral politics. He has published many articles on electoral behavior and public opinion. Support for his research has come from the National Science Foundation, The IBM Corporation, the Carnegie Corporation, of New York, and the Knight Foundation. Alvarez edits the Analytical Methods for Social Research book series and is on the editorial boards of a number of academic journals. He is Co-Director of the Caltech-MIT Voting Technology Project

Deborah Goldberg, Ph.D
Program Director, Democracy Program
Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law
161 Avenue Of The Americas, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10013
212-998-6730
Goldberg supervises the Democracy Program's litigation, scholarship, and public education. She was the principal author of Writing Reform: A Guide to Drafting State & Local Campaign Finance Laws, and was lead counsel to the intervenor in the Supreme Court case Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Government PAC. She serves on the Steering Committee of a coalition to restore voting rights to persons with past felony convictions. Goldberg is a graduate of Harvard Law School. Before joining the Brennan Center, she was in private practice. She holds a Ph.D. in philosophy and taught ethics at Columbia University.

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu
Kropf has been on the faculty at Missouri since 1999. She received her BA Summa Cum Laude, Phi Beta Kappa from Kansas State University and her PhD in Political Science from American University. Her work concentrates on Research Methods, Urban Politics, American Government, and Political Behavior. Before joining the faculty at Missouri, she was Project Coordinator at the University of Maryland Survey Research Center. She has published recent on undervoting in presidential elections, and on invalidated ballots in the 1996 presidential election, and on the incremental process of election reform in Missouri.

Wade Henderson, Esq.
Executive Director
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
1629 K Street, NW, 10th Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Wade Henderson is the Executive Director of the LCCR and Counsel to the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund (LCCREF), and leads the organizations' work on issues involving nationwide election reform. He is a graduate of Howard University and the Rutgers University School of Law. During its over 50 years of existence, LCCR has worked to redefine civil rights issues in broad and inclusive ways. Today, it includes over 180 national organizations. Previously Henderson served as Washington Bureau Director of the NAACP. He began his career as a legislative counsel of the ACLU.

Kay Maxwell
President
League of Women Voters of the U.S.
1730 M Street NW, Suite 1000
Kay J. Maxwell has been a member of the League since 1976. She attended Smith College and earned a B.A. in International Relations from the University of Pennsylvania. She has conducted civic participation training for women leaders in Bosnia, Israel, the West Bank, Rwanda, Kuwait and Jamaica. She has also served as vice president at the International Executive Service Corps (IESC), an international economic development organization. She is a board member of DC Vote, and the New Voters Project.

Tim Storey
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures
7700 East First Place
Denver, CO 80230
303-364-7700
or
444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-5400

Peter G. Veniero, Esq.
Counsel
Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, New Jersey 07102
Tel: 973-643-7000
Verniero chairs the firm’s Appellate Practice Group. He earned his B.A. at Drew University, Phi Beta Kappa, and his J.D. (with honors) at the Duke University School of Law. In 1999, he was appointed a justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, where he served for 7 years before re-entering private practice. Before his appointment to the Supreme Court, he served as New Jersey’s Attorney General, and in that capacity oversaw the state’s election laws. He also served as Chief of Staff and Chief Counsel to Governor Christine Todd Whitman.
Commissioners -

We have tentatively scheduled May 26 at 2:30 for a kickoff meeting here with Eagleton Institute. What will happen at this meeting is Eagleton will introduce their key people and make a brief presentation on their approach to performing the provisional voting and voter ID studies. It will be an opportunity to ask questions, raise any concerns, and/or provide guidance as they begin this work. Please advise if you wish to attend this meeting. I expect it will last about an hour.

Carol A. Paquette
Interim Executive Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202)566-3125 cpaquette@eac.gov
Karen,  
Was this part of the contract. I thought their was a peer review group in place,

---------------------

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Sent: 04/28/2006 12:44 PM  
To: Tom O'neill"@GSAEXTERNAL  
Cc: arapp@rci.rutgers.edu; davander@eden.rutgers.edu; 
dlinky@rci.rutgers.edu; foley.33@osu.edu; ireed@rutgers.edu; 'Johanna 
Dobrich' <jdobrich@eden.rutgers.edu>; joharris@eden.rutgers.edu; 
john.weingart@rutgers.edu; lauracw@columbus.rr.com; rmandel@rci.rutgers.edu; 
Tim Vercellotti" <tim.vercellotti@rutgers.edu>; tokaji.1@osu.edu  
Subject: Re: Voter ID Paper --Final Draft

Tim, Tom, John, et.al--

The EAC has identified three academics who are going to serve as peer reviewers of the Eagleton Voter ID paper and research.

They are Jonathan Nagler of New York University, Jan Leighley, University of Arizona, and Adam Berinsky of MIT.

They are ready to review the documents as soon as they are available.

I would like to them one week to review the material and then have a joint conference call on Thursday, May 11, in which we would all have an opportunity to discuss the research methodology and statistical analysis, along with general comments and suggestions.

If you are able to get to me the paper and the supporting data analysis, I will distribute to the documents ASAP.

Also let me know, if you would, your availability on May 11 to do this conference all.
I anticipate that it will last approximately 90 minutes.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Thanks, John.

Indeed, with the receipt of the missing monthly reports, I believe we have all of the necessary contract deliverables.

The EAC anticipates receiving your final invoice for this contract prior to the conclusion of the Federal fiscal year which is September 30, 2006.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"John Weingart" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>

Karen - I am writing to summarize our phone conversation initiated by me yesterday in response to receipt of Tom Wilkey's June 29th letter. To close out the contract, we will do the following:

1. Prepare separate monthly reports for April, May and June which each briefly summarize our activities under the contract during that month. These reports, which will not include financial information, will be sent to you by email no later than July 24th.

2. Submit a final invoice for the project no later than September 16th, which is 75 days from the close of the contract rather than the 30 days specified in the June 29th letter. I am attaching our previously-submitted "December 1, 2005 Request for a No-Cost Extension" which noted, at the bottom of page 1, the need for a 75-day closeout period.

3. In my January 13, 2006 letter regarding our No-Cost Extension through February 28th (also attached), I had indicated that we expected to have a closing balance of approximately $10,000. As we discussed
yesterday, you appreciate that, with the subsequent No-Cost Extension through June 30th, we have spent the entire contract amount, and you expect us to submit invoices accordingly that will document our use of all remaining funds from the $560,002 contract award.

Please let me know if I have left out any remaining tasks or you have a different interpretation of them. I trust you have by now received all our final work products that were FedExed to you late last week.

Thanks,

John

--

John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS

Request to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission for a No-Cost Extension and Reallocation of Funds

December 1, 2005

Why we need a no-cost extension

The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting based on our research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication. The draft was complete in August, but the EAC's schedule did not permit us to brief the commissioners and staff until early September. We did not receive EAC comments until October, making it impossible to complete the work on the original schedule. Taking account of those comments and guidance from EAC required several weeks. The EAC did not receive our final draft report and recommendations for best practices until late November. We are now awaiting the EAC's comments on that final draft, which we have been told to expect in January.

The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report on that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid January.

Because the EAC has decided to issue recommendations for best practices on these topics, rather than voluntary guidance, we will finish the work within two months of the original completion date since the adoption process will be shorter. Note that meeting this schedule is dependent on the time needed by the EAC to review our work.

This extension will entail additional personnel time but, since no public hearings on "best practices" are required, if the EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work.

When will work be completed and funds fully expended?

As shown on the attached schedule, work on this contract will be completed in three phases. The EAC will receive our final report and recommendations for best practices in provisional voting during the week of January 23, 2006 (assuming that we receive the EAC's comments on the draft report submitted on November 28 by January 9).

We will submit our draft report, alternative approaches, and compendium of statutes, regulations, and litigation on Voter Identification Issues during the week of January 16, 2006. If the EAC is able to return comments to us no later than the week of January 30, we will have submit the final report and recommendations for best practices on Voter Identification to the EAC during the week of February 13.

The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $300,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project.
REVISED SCHEDULE FOR  
November 2005 – February 2006  
November 10, 2005  
Assumes no guidance document, only analysis and recommended best practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>Provisional Voting</th>
<th>Voter ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week of 10/31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review draft report to EAC (Team)</td>
<td>Voter ID Research to TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit comments on report (Team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/7</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for October tasks (all)</td>
<td>Redraft report (TON)</td>
<td>Research continues (TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and approve report (Team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final draft report (TON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/14</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Submit report to Project Team for comments (TON)</td>
<td>Research continues (TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/21</td>
<td>Project team comments received</td>
<td>Complete data collection for Voter ID analysis (TV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit report to EAC for review and to PRG for information (TON, JW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 11/28</th>
<th>EAC review</th>
<th>Draft report on Voter ID analysis (TV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 12/5</th>
<th>Status reports to JD for November tasks (all)</th>
<th>Internal review (PT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 12/12</th>
<th>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</th>
<th>Revise draft (TV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Draft alternatives (TON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and comment on alternatives (PT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 12/19</th>
<th>EAC review</th>
<th>Complete draft report and alternatives (TV, TON)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 12/26</th>
<th>EAC review</th>
<th>Review draft report and alternatives (PT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/2/06</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for December tasks (all)</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/9/06</td>
<td>Receive comments from EAC and revise report as needed</td>
<td>PRG meets and comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise (TV &amp; TON)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/16/06</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Project team reviews and approves revised report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/23/06</td>
<td>Finalize analysis and best practices and submit to EAC for publication and further action as appropriate</td>
<td>EAC review continues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/30/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments from EAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/6/06</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for January tasks (all)</td>
<td>Review and approve revised report and recommendations for best practices (PT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/13/06</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Submit report and best practices to EAC for publication and further action as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/20/06</td>
<td>FINAL status reports to JD for all tasks (all)</td>
<td>Final fiscal report/invoice to EAC 75 days later PROJECT ENDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 13, 2006

Karen - I am attaching a spreadsheet providing the information you have requested (Attachment 1), but I want to highlight a few points which may not be immediately self-evident.

First, the original budget (Attachment 2) we submitted to the EAC, dated March 22nd, did not itemize personnel expenses by each person. In addition, when we actually began work two months after submitting that budget, we decided to reallocate more time to people within Eagleton and hire fewer outside hourlies.

Second, in the figures I sent you in late December we tried to account for all the expenses and projections but overlooked a few things including neglecting to include the honoraria for our peer review team. Hence, the figures we’re now sending are different than what I sent in December.

Lastly, we originally discussed a no-cost extension through February, but since we don’t yet have the EAC comments on our draft Provisional Voting material nor an estimate of when they are likely to be ready, I think it is prudent to extend the no-cost extension through March 31st. We would still like to conclude by the end of February, but if you can approve the extension for another month we could avoid going through this process again if everything is not complete six weeks from now.

It is my understanding that Rutgers will soon be sending our December invoice. At this time, I would also like to request that we combine January and February an invoice the EAC once for that time period.

As you can see, we are currently projecting an ending balance of approximately $10,000. If additional expenses are incurred beyond what is currently projected, we’re confident they will not exceed the original budget of $560,002.

Thanks and I look forward to hearing from you.

--

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Research Manager  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
tel: 202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 11:07 AM -----

"Tom O'Neill"  
08/19/2005 02:20 PM

Karen,

Attached is a report on the status of recruitment of members of the Peer Review Group. We extended 9 invitations. We have four confirmed members, one reluctant turn-down, one who has yet to respond to an initial inquiry, and are awaiting confirmation from 3 others who initially agreed. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Tom O'Neill

RecruitmentStatus.doc
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.</td>
<td>YES/CONFIRMED</td>
<td>Professor of Political Science, California Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy-Uriel Charles</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Associate Professor, School of Law, University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Clark</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Professor of Law, George Washington University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Susan Karlan</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law, Stanford Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.</td>
<td>YES/CONFIRMED</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Missouri-Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel H. Lowenstein</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Professor of Law, UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Storey</td>
<td>YES/CONFIRMED</td>
<td>Program Principal, Legislative Management Program, National Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter G. Verniero, Esq.</td>
<td>YES/CONFIRMED</td>
<td>Counsel, Sills, Cummins, Epstein and Gross, PC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Former NJ Attorney General and Supreme Court Justice)
Carol,

After our discussion in New York, you asked me to put in writing our response to the EAC's suggestions for expanding the number and kinds of groups that would review and comment on our work. I hope after your review of this response, we will be able to quickly recruit a balanced Peer Review Group (PRG) and move ahead as the schedule in our work plan indicates. Attached is a revised list of the members we propose for appointment to the PRG. We will probably not be able to persuade all of them to serve, but the number and range of views included on the proposed list should ensure that the resulting group is well-balanced.

Tom

RESPONSE TO EAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW GROUPS

EAC's Recommendations for the PRG
Karen Lynn-Dyson reported this response from the EAC commissioners to our proposal for the composition of the PRG.

1. Not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG

2. Create a "tiered process" of review in which:
   A. The PRG will prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.
   B. PRG's analysis would be vetted by a defined/select group of local election officials.
   C. A defined/select group of advocacy organizations would review the
D. Empanel a final focus group of local election officials, advocates and academics for an overall, interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Project Team Response
Creating three new committees to the review process to supplement the work of the Peer Review Group (PRG) is possible, but would add at least 8 weeks—and possibly 12 weeks—to our completion of the guidance document on provisional voting. We believe this delay would risk limiting the value of this project for the 2006 election. In addition, the change would add at least $30,000 to the cost of our work. (See the attached table showing the possible effect on our work plan, and note the optimistic assumptions such as the ability to hold a hearing the week after Christmas.). If the same groups were to be engaged in reviewing our work on Voter ID, the time for that work would also have to be stretched at a similar increased cost.

This additional cost and the added time might be worthwhile... if the new layers of review were to produce a consensus on how to strengthen the research, sharpen the analysis, and increase the relevance of the Guidance Document. Our team concluded, however, that additional review groups were unlikely to achieve these results.

PRG focuses on quality of research
We believe that our research would be strengthened by a balanced Peer Review Group that will focus on the design of the research and our conduct of it. Based on the EAC’s recommendation, we have revised the composition of the PRG to include additional, well-recognized authorities in the field whose perspective is generally agreed to be conservative.

The PRG will focus on the strength of the research design and the quality of our analysis, not on the politics of our recommendations for the guidance document. The PRG will critique the research design and suggest how to strengthen it. Members of the group will review the quality of our analysis so that we can fill holes and correct errors before we make policy recommendations to the EAC. The PRG may or may not meet as a group. The likelihood is that most comments will come in writing from individual members, most of whose schedules would not permit attendance at meetings. In any case, the PRG members will not gather around a table to come to consensus on the study’s recommendations.

While using the PRG as a forum to reach consensus on the knotty issues involved does not appear practical, the EAC can benefit from the work of other groups in this regard. It is not necessary for this project to duplicate the deliberative processes of the Carter-Baker Commission, the Century Foundation and the Election Center. The EAC itself as well as the project team can get the benefit of these reports without duplicating this “policy evaluation board” structure as part of this contract.

Project Team focuses on analysis and recommendations
Karen reported that the Commissioners believed that the PRG would “prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.” As we see it, the PRG will neither analyze data nor draw conclusions, tentative or otherwise. Its members will review and comment on how the Project Team has designed and carried out the research. Analysis, conclusions and recommendations are the responsibility of the Project Team. We have all seen in the preface to books or articles a sentence or two that read something like this, “The author
thanks Mr. X, Ms. Y, and Dr. Z for their review and comment on the manuscript. Their analysis has strengthened the work, but they are in no way responsible for errors or for my conclusions." That is the way we think about the Peer Review Group.

In short, the PRG will help ensure that EAC's Guidance Document is founded on a solid base of data and analysis. The review and comment on the Preliminary Guidance Document by the EAC's Board of Advisors and Standards Board will provide participation by important stakeholder groups without the need for the other review committees. This Board is broad-based and represents a key stakeholder group. It also enjoys a significant advantage over a "defined/select" group we might empanel. Any group we define will be open to criticism or charges of bias by representatives of interest groups not represented.

The criticism and charges of bias might be tolerable, but only if we could expect consensus from the "defined/select" group we would appoint. We believe that consensus would be elusive. In empanelling a "defined/select" group, we would naturally look for balance and would appoint members to represent a point of view or an institutional interest. As representatives they would likely feel that they had little choice but to be strong advocates. They would have little incentive to compromise. Our research, as opposed to our policy recommendations, would be better served by the analysis of scholars than by the advocacy of interests.

Policy judgments
We regard the EAC itself as responsible for the policy judgments involved in shaping the Guidance Document. We plan, of course, to respond to the EAC's comments on our preliminary draft, so that the EAC's comments will shape the Preliminary Guidance Document before it is released for public comment. And further revision will follow the public hearing and comments. The EAC and individual Commissioners can always seek comment informally on our analysis or recommendations. That course appears to us preferable to the creation of a new, more elaborate review process.

PROPOSED MEMBERSJuly6.doc
Role of the Peer Review Group

Members of the Peer Review Group will review the research design for the project, including the survey of local election officials, the analysis of Voter ID regime on turnout, the state-by-state narrative of developments in provisional voting and voter identification, and the compilation and analysis of statutes, administrative regulations, and case law affecting provisional voting and voter identification. They will also review the report on Analysis and Alternatives. They may review the draft of the Preliminary Guidance Document before it goes to the Board of Advisors for comment.

Members of the group will be respected authorities in their fields and represent a range of opinions and perspectives, although their views on policy will be less important to the study than their views on the quality of the research on which policy recommendations are based.

Ideally, the group would meet once, but even that may not be possible to arrange given the tight time period for the project, the demanding schedules of the members, and their wide dispersal across the county. They will function largely by reviewing written work and making written comments on it. The timing of their involvement is indicated on the work plan.

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology
rma@hss.caltech.edu
626-395-4422

Alvarez has taught political science at Caltech since 1992. He received his B.A. in political science from Carleton College, his M.A. and Ph.D. from Duke University. Alvarez focuses on the study of electoral politics. He has published many articles on electoral behavior and public opinion. Support for his research has come from the National Science Foundation, The IBM Corporation, the Carnegie Corporation, of New York, and the Knight Foundation. Alvarez edits the Analytical Methods for Social Research book series and is on the editorial boards of a number of academic journals. He is Co-Director of the Caltech-MIT Voting Technology Project.

Guy-Uriel E. Charles
Associate Professor
School of Law
University of Minnesota
342 Mondale Hall
229-19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
612-626-9154
gcharles@umn.edu

Charles teaches and writes on election law, law and politics, and race. He received his B.A. degree in Political Science, cum laude, from Spring Arbor University and his J.D. from the University of Michigan Law School, where he was Editor-in-Chief of the Michigan Journal of Race & Law. He is completing a PhD in political science from the University of Michigan.
Brad Clark
Professor of Law
George Washington University School of Law

Clark received his B.A. in Political Science from Florida State University and his J.D. from Columbia Law School in 1985. He served as a law clerk to the Judge Robert H. Bork on the US Court of Appeals and went on to clerk for Justice Antonin Scalia on the Supreme Court. He has been on the faculty at George Washington University Law School for 12 years, where he has taught Constitutional Law, Federal Courts, and Civil Procedure.

Pamela Susan Karlan
Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law
Stanford Law School
559 Nathan Abbott Way
Stanford, CA 94305-8610
(650) 725-4851
karlan@stanford.edu

Karan’s principal subjects include legal regulation of the political process. She earned her BA, MA, and JD at Yale University, and was previously a Professor at the University of Virginia. She serves on the California Fair Political Practices Commission and is a Cooperating Attorney with the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund. She has also been a lecturer at the FBI National Academy. Among her publications, she is a co-author of When Elections Go Bad: The Law of Democracy and the Presidential Election of 2000.

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu

Kropf has been on the faculty at Missouri since 1999. She received her BA Summa Cum Laude, Phi Beta Kappa from Kansas State University and her PhD in Political Science from American University. Her work concentrates on Research Methods, Urban Politics, American Government, and Political Behavior. Before joining the faculty at Missouri, she was Project Coordinator at the University of Maryland Survey Research Center. She has published recent on undervoting in presidential elections, and on invalidated ballots in the 1996 presidential election, and on the incremental process of election reform in Missouri.

Daniel H. Lowenstein
Professor of Law
School of Law
University of California, Los Angeles
Box 951476,
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1476
(310) 825-4841

Among other courses, Lowenstein teaches Election Law. His textbook, Election Law has become a standard in the field. He earned his A.B. at Yale and his LL.B. at Harvard. While working for California’s Secretary of State he was the main drafter of the Political Reform Act in 1971. He was the first chair of the Fair Political Practices Commission. He has served on the national governing board of Common Cause. He has written on such topics as campaign finance, redistricting, bribery, initiative elections, and political parties.

John F. Manning
Professor
Harvard Law School
Now at Harvard, Manning was appointed Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel by President Bush in 2001. He had been Professor of Law at Columbia Law School. Had had served as Assistant to the Solicitor General of the United States and was an Attorney-Adviser in the Office of Legal Counsel at the Department of Justice during the administrations of President George H. W. Bush and President Reagan. He is a graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School.

Tim Storey
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures
7700 East First Place
Denver, CO 80230
303-364-7700
or
444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-5400

Peter G. Veniero, Esq.
Counsel
Sills, Cummins, Epstein and Gross, PC
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, New Jersey 07102
Tel: 973-643-7000

Verniero chairs the firm's Appellate Practice Group. He earned his B.A. at Drew University, Phi Beta Kappa, and his J.D. (with honors) at the Duke University School of Law. In 1999, he was appointed a justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, where he served for 7 years before re-entering private practice. Before his appointment to the Supreme Court, he served as New Jersey's Attorney General, and in that capacity oversaw the state's election laws. He also served as Chief of Staff and Chief Counsel to Governor Christine Todd Whitman.

Plus one or two former, senior election officials to be suggested by the EAC.
Hi-

Well, I've managed to secure one of the folks on your list- Jan Leighley. As you might imagine, she is very interested in the topic (voter id) and glad to help. Ben Highton is having a baby this week or next so is unavailable. I haven't heard back from the others whom I've called and left detailed messages.

I need to line up at least two others. Perhaps you would be willing to prod your colleagues (I see Nagler is a long-time colleague of yours). Alternatively, do you have a few other names you might offer?

My world has been one of economists and sociologists, not political scientists. So, I'm not able to line up the types of folks you were able to suggest. I think the list you gave me is outstanding, so I'd like folks of this caliber.

The plan is to do the review May 5- May 11 and to do a conference call with Eagleton (including the peer review folks) on or about Friday, May 12.

As always, Mike, I'm grateful for your advice and guidance.

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Glad to help. I don't want to step on toes, but I'd recommend that you think about some sort of single-blind peer review, of the sort that is employed by many research journals and other organizations (like the NSF or National Academies of Science). I think that if you offer them a modest honoraria (perhaps $100) I think you'll find that the folks on that list would be likely to provide quick and thorough feedback to you.

Again, let me know if there is more that I can do to help.
I'm also willing to do a review for you myself. The issue is that I feel somewhat conflicted, given that I'm on their "peer review" panel. But on the other hand that does mean that I'm very well aware of the background of this project. I'd leave it up to you as to whether you think that a review from me would be appropriate or not.

Mike

On Thu, 6 Apr 2006 klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Mike- Nice to finally meet you in person, as well. Indeed, as discussed,
> I am likely to confer with your peers on a number of matters related to
> research methodology and statistical analyses,
> > Thanks again for providing these names.
> >
> > K
> > Karen Lynn-Dyson
> > Research Manager
> > U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> > Washington, DC 20005
> > tel:202-566-3123
> >
> > "Mike Alvarez" <rma@hss.caltech.edu>
> 04/05/2006 07:39 PM
> >
> > To
> > klynndyson@eac.gov
> > cc
> >
> > Subject
> >
> >
> >
> > Hi -- nice to meet you in person, finally!
> >
> > And thanks for inviting me to your gathering, I enjoyed it and hope I was helpful. Of course, any time you want anything, you do know where to track me down.
> >
> > As to the potential reviewers of the Eagleton Voter ID study, here are my suggestions, in order:
> > Jonathan Nagler, New York University
> > Jan Leighley, University of Arizona
> > Ben Highton, UC-Davis
> > Adam Berinsky, MIT
> > Bernard Grofman, UC-Irvine
> >
> > All have worked with the CPS turnout/registration data, and
> are very familiar with this research literature.
> If these don't work, or you want more recommendations, let me know.
>
--

R. Michael Alvarez
626-395-4089
Professor of Political Science
626-405-9841
Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, CA 91125
rma@hss.caltech.edu

Contributor to Election Updates,
http://electionupdates.caltech.edu/blog.html

*******************************************************************************
Hi John-
Could you check with Connie Bornheimer and confirm that one invoice in the amount of $91,787.92 is still forthcoming.

I assume that invoice will be marked as the final payment on the contract.

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
EAC Advisory 2005-006: Provisional Voting and Identification Requirements

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has recently received an inquiry regarding whether a state may impose an identification requirement that would limit a potential voter's access to a provisional ballot to which he or she is otherwise entitled under Section 302 of the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) (42 U.S.C. §15482). After consideration of the matter, EAC has concluded that Section 302 of HAVA creates a voter right. Specifically, the section creates the right for a potential voter to utilize a provisional ballot in the event their name does not appear on the registration list or the voter’s eligibility is challenged by an election official. While States may create voter identification standards that exceed those laid out in HAVA and effect whether a provisional ballot is counted, States may not take action that limits a voter’s right to receive and submit a provisional ballot. In explaining this position, this advisory reviews the plain language of HAVA Section 302, examines the differences between traditional and provisional ballots and analyzes the implementation of provisional voting under HAVA Section 303(b). This advisory also addresses the impact of a state’s authority to create stricter standards than prescribed by HAVA upon HAVA’s provisional voting requirements.1

Plain Language of HAVA Section 302. The right to cast a provisional ballot is created in Section 302 of HAVA. Pursuant to HAVA, when an individual declares that he or she is a registered and eligible voter in a federal election, that individual “shall be permitted to cast a provisional ballot” if (1) their name does not appear on the official list of eligible voters or (2) “an election official asserts that the individual is not eligible to vote.” (Section 302(a)). This right to receive a provisional ballot is contingent upon only one thing (per Section 302(a)(2)), the individual’s execution of a written affirmation that he or she is both a registered and eligible voter for the election at issue.2 See also, Sandusky County Democratic Party v. Blackwell, 387 F.3d 565, 574 (6th Cir. 2004). However, notwithstanding the above, HAVA goes on to recognize that the right to submit a provisional ballot constitutes neither a means to avoid State imposed voter eligibility requirements nor a vote. Instead, HAVA requires election officials at a polling place to

1 The EAC is the Federal agency charged with the administration of HAVA. While the EAC does not have rulemaking authority in the area of provisional voting, HAVA does require the Commission to draft guidance to assist states in their implementation of HAVA’s provisional voting requirements. Although EAC’s administrative interpretations do not have the force of law associated with legislative rules, the Supreme Court has long held that the interpretations of agencies charged with the administration of a statute are to be given deferential treatment by Courts when faced with issues of statutory construction. York v. Secretary of Treasury, 774 F. 2d 417, 419 – 420 (10th Cir. 1985) (citing Compensation Commission of Alaska v. Aragon, 329 U.S. 143, 153 – 154 (1963)) See also Christian v. Harris County, 529 U.S. 576 (2000); Edelman v. Lynchburg College, 122 S. Ct. 1145 (2002).

2 Moreover, a potential voter determined not to be eligible must be informed of their provisional voting rights per Section 302(a)(1) of HAVA.
transmit a provisional ballot (or information associated with the written affirmation) to appropriate election officials for verification. (Section 302(a)(4) of HAVA). These election officials ultimately determine the voter’s eligibility based upon information presented to or gathered by it, in accordance with State law. In this way, the State determines whether any provisional ballot submitted will be counted as a vote. Id.

In simplest terms, provisional voting represents the right of an individual (whose eligibility to vote has been challenged), to reserve their right to vote and postpone the voter eligibility determination to a time when more perfect or complete information may be provided. See Sandusky County Democratic Party, 387 F.3d at 570 and Florida Democratic Party v. Hood, 342 F.Supp 1073, 1079-1080 (N.D. Fla. 2004). A provisional ballot does not represent a different way to vote, nor does it serve as a bypass to State laws governing voter eligibility. Rather, it is designed to prevent an individual from losing his or her right to vote due to the fact that a poll worker did not have all the information available or needed to accurately assess voter eligibility. Thus, based upon the plain language of Section 302(a) of HAVA, a challenge to an individual’s eligibility to vote (such as a challenge based upon identification requirements) cannot serve as a bar to the receipt of a provisional ballot, because it is the election official’s challenge that triggers the provisional ballot procedure in the first place. To hold otherwise would defeat the purpose of provisional voting. In the end, to understand this concept one must understand the differences between traditional and provisional ballots.

Traditional vs. Provisional Ballots. The nature and procedures associated with a provisional ballot are wholly distinct from those of a traditional ballot. Because of this fact, the two processes must be treated differently. While voter identification requirements may serve as a bar to the casting of a traditional ballot, they may not prevent the submission of a provisional ballot. First, the nature and purpose of traditional and provisional ballots are essentially different. The purpose of a traditional ballot is to allow a confirmed, eligible voter to cast a vote. The purpose of a provisional ballot is to allow individuals whose voter eligibility is challenged to reserve the right to vote by memorializing both their intent to vote and their proposed vote. This is evident by the HAVA processes discussed above. The bottom line is that the casting of a proper, traditional ballot constitutes a vote, while the casting or submission of a provisional ballot does not. A traditional ballot is cast only after voter eligibility has been determined by the State. Hence, the moment it is cast, it becomes an individual’s vote. On the other hand, the submission or casting of a provisional ballot is not a vote. Rather, it is a claim that the potential voter who submitted it has the right to vote and reserves that right. As the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals stated:

[T]he primary purpose of HAVA was to prevent on-the-spot denials of provisional ballots to voters deemed ineligible to vote by poll workers. Under HAVA, the only permissible requirement that may be imposed upon a would-be voter before permitting that voter to cast a provisional ballot is the affirmation contained in [42 U.S.C.] §15482(a): that the voter is a registered voter in the jurisdiction in which he or she desires to vote, and that the voter is eligible to vote in an election for federal office. Sandusky County Democratic Party, 387 F.3d at 574.

This goes to the very heart of provisional voting. If provisional voting is a right triggered by an election official’s determination that an individual has not met a voter eligibility requirement, how
can such a requirement also serve as a bar to that right? The concept of provisional voting works only if the right is always available when the application of voter eligibility requirements is in question.

Second, consistent with the differences in purpose between traditional and provisional ballots, the other major distinction between the two lies in the application of voter eligibility requirements. This difference is primarily one of procedural timing. States have the right to create voter eligibility requirements and these requirements must be applied to both traditional and provisional ballots. In casting a traditional ballot, one must meet all eligibility requirements prior to receiving the ballot. However, in the provisional process, the potential voter has already failed to meet these preliminary requirements and the application of State law must occur after the ballot has been received. State voter eligibility requirements should be applied after the provisional ballot and/or supporting affirmation has been transmitted pursuant to Section 302(a)(3) of HAVA. Provisional ballots are counted as votes only after election officials have determined that the individual can meet voter eligibility standards consistent with state law. Again, the purpose of the process is to allow election officials more time, so that they may have more perfect information when making a decision about voter eligibility. Provisional ballots are subject to the full effect of State law regarding the eligibility to vote and the opportunity the law provides provisional voters to supply additional information. Provisional ballots do not escape state or federal voter eligibility requirements, those provisional ballots that do not meet State standards will not be counted.

**Provisional Voting Under HAVA Section 303(b).** Congress provided an example of how provisional voting works by applying the right to a specific circumstance. Section 303(b)(2)(B) of HAVA, entitled *Fail-Safe Voting*, provides that when a first-time voter who registered by mail is required by HAVA Section 303(b) to show identification, that person must be given a provisional ballot if he or she fails to provide such identification at the polling place. This section is important as it clarifies Congressional intent regarding how provisional voting should function.

The *Fail-Safe Voting* provision of Section 303(b)(2)(B) grants clear insight into how provisional voting should be implemented. While Section 303(b) deals with a specific subset of voters (first-time voters who registered by mail), its application of Section 302(a) supports the concept that a provisional ballot must be given to a voter who is determined (at the polling place) not to meet voter identification requirements. A review of the section shows that in the one area where HAVA set a Federal voter identification requirement Congress made clear that an individual’s failure to meet this eligibility requirement triggered the statute’s provisional voting section. Congress saw no difference between an individual’s failure to meet the voter identification requirements it issued in Section 303(b) and the failure to meet eligibility requirements which trigger provisional voting under Section 302. Section 303(b) makes it clear that Congress did not intend voter identification requirements to limit access to provisional voting. Instead, Congress viewed provisional voting as a right, or more specifically, as a fail-safe. The EAC strongly believes that HAVA provisions must be interpreted to bring about consistent and evenly applied results. In this case, if individuals who fail to meet Federal identification standards have the right to a provisional ballot, so must individuals who fail to meet similar State standards.
Stricter Eligibility Standards and Provisional Voting. HAVA specifically provides that States may create stricter voter eligibility standards than provided in HAVA. Arizona’s “Proposition 200” identification requirements are a prime example of this authority. However, the HAVA authority to create stricter eligibility standards does not grant the state authority to create standards that bar access to a provisional ballot. To interpret HAVA otherwise (i.e. allowing stricter state identification standards to bar access to provisional ballots) would render HAVA’s provisional voting mandate (Section 302) void and meaningless. HAVA cannot be read to grant both (1) the right to a provisional ballot if an individual’s voting eligibility is challenged by a State and, (2) the right of that State to deny an individual a provisional ballot if they do not meet voter eligibility standards. These concepts are mutually exclusive. HAVA cannot be interpreted to allow a State to create voter eligibility standards that bar the Section 302 right to cast a provisional ballot without nullifying the effect and intent of that provision. Any such interpretation of HAVA would run afoul of both HAVA Section 304 and longstanding principles of statutory construction.

First, HAVA notes in Section 304 that while States may create standards that are stricter that those established under HAVA, this authority is limited to the extent “such State requirements are not inconsistent with the Federal requirements under [HAVA].” Clearly, provisional voting is a requirement under HAVA. Section 302(a) notes that qualified individuals “shall be permitted to cast a provisional ballot.” (Emphasis added). In this way, States may not create standards that are inconsistent or interfere with the provisional voting mandate.

Furthermore, long established principles of statutory construction further prohibit an interpretation of HAVA that would render any of its provisions meaningless. It is “a cardinal principle of statutory construction’ that ‘a statute ought, upon the whole, to be so construed that, if it can be prevented, no clause, sentence, or word shall be superfluous, void, or insignificant.” TRW Inc. v. Andrews, 534 U.S. 19, 31, 122 S.Ct. 441, 151 L.Ed.2d 339 (2001), (quoting Duncan v. Walker, 533 U.S. 167, 174, 121 S.Ct. 2120, 150 L.Ed.2d 251 (2001)).

A Stricter Provisional Voting Standard. As discussed above, States’ have the right to impose stricter requirements than those laid out in HAVA. The EAC has already made it clear, above, that a stricter voter eligibility requirement cannot be read to bar an individual’s right to a provisional ballot. However, could a stricter requirement regarding provisional voting serve to limit access to such ballots? No. A stricter State requirement for provisional voting would be a standard that enhances a person’s access to a provisional ballot. As the Sixth Circuit noted, “HAVA is quintessentially about being able to cast a provisional ballot.” Sandusky County Democratic Party, 387 F.3d at 576. “HAVA’s requirements ‘are minimum requirements’ permitting deviation from its provisions provided that such deviation is ‘more strict than the requirements established under’ HAVA (in terms of encouraging provisional voting)....” Id., (quoting 42 U.S.C. §15484, emphasis added). Thus, in terms of provisional voting, a stricter standard is one that serves to further encourage provisional voting. When passing laws affecting provisional voting, States must ensure that their provisions are consistent with HAVA or otherwise serve to further an individual’s access to a provisional ballot. EAC concludes that any policy asserting that States may pass laws limiting access to provisional ballots conflicts with HAVA.

3 See 42 U.S.C. §§15485 – 15485, entitled Minimum Requirements and Methods of Implementation Left to Discretion of State, respectively.
Conclusion. A state may not impose an identification requirement that would limit a potential voter’s access to and submission of a provisional ballot. However, such requirements (when coupled with a state’s provisional ballot procedures) may prevent a provisional ballot from being counted.
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Elle-

As I am now in the middle of the contracts award process, I am going to ask Peter to work with you on preparing this final draft for the Commissioner's review tomorrow.

Peter, please work with Elle to create an acceptable version of this draft by COB today.

Thanks

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

Elieen L. Coliver/EAC/GOV

Karen,

Here are our changes....it might seem a little hard to understand since Eagleton gave us a pdf instead of a word doc. It's a little convoluted in parts and the formatting is totally off. But if there is any trouble, I can go over the copy that we marked up and get it onto the most recent copy.

Let me know what you think...

Thanks,
Elle
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BACKGROUND

On September 13, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission issued an advisory (2005-006) and, after consideration of the matter, EAC concluded that Section 302 of HAVA creates a voter right. Specifically, the section creates the right for a potential voter to utilize a provisional ballot in the event his or her name does not appear on the registration list or the voter’s eligibility is challenged by an election official. While States may create voter identification standards that exceed those laid out in HAVA and effect whether a provisional ballot is counted, States may not take action that limits a voter’s right to receive and submit a provisional ballot.

The right to cast a provisional ballot is created in Section 302 of HAVA. Pursuant to HAVA, when an individual declares that he or she is a registered and eligible voter in a federal election, that individual “shall be permitted to cast a provisional ballot” if (1) their name does not appear on the official list of eligible voters or (2) “an election official asserts that the individual is not eligible to vote.” (Section 302(a)). This right to receive a provisional ballot is contingent upon only one thing (per Section 302(a)(2)), the individual’s execution of a written affirmation that he or she is both a registered and eligible voter for the election at issue.

In simplest terms, provisional voting represents the right of an individual (whose eligibility to vote has been challenged), to reserve his or her right to vote and postpone the voter eligibility determination to a time when more perfect or complete information may be provided. A provisional ballot does not represent a different way to vote, nor does it serve as a bypass to State laws governing voter eligibility. Rather, it is designed to prevent an individual from losing his or her right to vote due to the fact that a poll worker did not have all the information available or needed to accurately assess voter eligibility. Thus, based upon the plain language of Section 302(a) of HAVA, a challenge to an individual’s eligibility to vote (such as a challenge based upon identification requirements) cannot serve as a bar to the receipt of a provisional ballot, because it is the election official’s challenge that triggers the provisional ballot procedure in the first place. To hold otherwise would defeat the purpose of provisional voting. In the end, to understand this concept one must understand the differences between traditional and provisional ballots.

The nature and procedures associated with a provisional ballot are wholly distinct from those of a traditional ballot. Because of this fact, the two processes must be treated differently. While voter identification requirements may serve as a bar to the casting of a traditional ballot, they may not prevent the submission of a provisional ballot.

First, the nature and purpose of traditional and provisional ballots are essentially different. The purpose of a traditional ballot is to allow a confirmed, eligible voter to cast a vote. The purpose of a provisional ballot is to allow individuals whose voter eligibility is challenged to reserve the right to vote by memorializing both their intent to vote and their proposed vote. This is evident by the HAVA processes discussed above. The bottom line is that the casting of a proper, traditional ballot constitutes a vote, while the casting or submission of a provisional ballot does not. A traditional ballot is cast only after voter eligibility has been determined by the State. Hence, the moment it is cast, it becomes an individual’s vote. On the other hand, the submission or casting of a provisional ballot is not a vote. Rather, it is a claim that the potential voter who submitted it has the right to vote and reserves that right.

Moreover, a potential voter determined not to be eligible must be informed of their provisional voting rights per Section 302(a)(1) of HAVA.
This goes to the very heart of provisional voting. If provisional voting is a right triggered by an election official’s determination that an individual has not met a voter eligibility requirement, how can such a requirement also serve as a bar to that right? The concept of provisional voting works only if the right is always available when the application of voter eligibility requirements is in question.

Section 303(b)(2)(B) of HAVA, entitled *Fail-Safe Voting*, provides that when a first-time voter who registered by mail is required by HAVA Section 303(b) to show identification, that person must be given a provisional ballot if he or she fails to provide such identification at the polling place. This section is important as it clarifies Congressional intent regarding how provisional voting should function.

The *Fail-Safe Voting* provision of Section 303(b)(2)(B) grants clear insight into how provisional voting should be implemented. While Section 303(b) deals with a specific subset of voters (first-time voters who registered by mail), its application of Section 302(a) supports the concept that a provisional ballot must be given to a voter who is determined (at the polling place) not to meet voter identification requirements. Congress saw no difference between an individual’s failure to meet the voter identification requirements it issued in Section 303(b) and the failure to meet eligibility requirements which trigger provisional voting under Section 302. Section 303(b) makes it clear that Congress did not intend voter identification requirements to limit access to provisional voting. Instead, Congress viewed provisional voting as a right, or more specifically, as a fail-safe. The EAC strongly believes that HAVA provisions must be interpreted to bring about consistent and evenly applied results. In this case, if individuals who fail to meet Federal identification standards have the right to a provisional ballot, so must individuals who fail to meet similar State standards.

HAVA notes in Section 304 that while States may create standards that are stricter than those established under HAVA, this authority is limited to the extent “such State requirements are not inconsistent with the Federal requirements under [HAVA].” Clearly, provisional voting is a requirement under HAVA. Section 302(a) notes that qualified individuals “shall be permitted to cast a provisional ballot.” (Emphasis added). In this way, States may not create standards that are inconsistent or interfere with the provisional voting mandate.

States have the right to impose stricter requirements than those laid out in HAVA. The EAC has made it clear, that a stricter voter eligibility requirement cannot be read to bar an individual’s right to a provisional ballot. However, could a stricter requirement regarding provisional voting serve to limit access to such ballots? No. A stricter State requirement for provisional voting would be a standard that enhances a person’s access to a provisional ballot. A state may not impose an identification requirement that would limit a potential voter’s access to and submission of a provisional ballot. However, such requirements (when coupled with a state’s provisional ballot procedures) may prevent a provisional ballot from being counted.
OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL PRACTICES

The wide variation in the implementation of provisional voting among and particularly within states suggests that EAC can help states strengthen their processes. Research-based recommendations for best, or at least better, practices based on the experience gained in the 2004 election can be useful in states' efforts to achieve greater consistency in the administration of provisional voting.

Self-evaluation of Provisional Voting - 4 Key Questions

The first step to achieving greater consistency within each state is to think about provisional voting systematically. As legislators, election officials, and citizens in the states prepare for the 2006 election, they should ask themselves these questions about their provisional voting systems.

1. Does the provisional voting system distribute, collect, record, and tally provisional ballots with sufficient accuracy to be seen as procedurally legitimate by both supporters and opponents of the winning candidate? Does the tally include all votes cast by properly registered voters who correctly completed the steps required?
2. Is the provisional voting system sufficiently robust to perform well under the pressure of a close election when ballot evaluation will be under scrutiny and litigation looms?
3. Do the procedural requirements of the system permit cost-efficient operation? Are the administrative demands of the system reasonably related to the staff and other resource requirements available?
4. How great is the variation in the use of provisional voting in counties or equivalent levels of voting jurisdiction within the state? Is the variation great enough to cause concern that the system may not be administered uniformly across the state?

If the answers to these questions leave room for doubt about the effectiveness of the system or some of its parts, the EAC's recommendation of sound practices should provide the starting point for a state's effort to improve its provisional voting system.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR Sound PRACTICES

State efforts to improve the provisional voting process have been underway since the 2004 election. By recommending best practices, the EAC will offer informed advice while respecting diversity among the states.

Take a Quality-improvement approach

Defining what constitutes a successful provisional voting system is difficult. Defining quality requires a broad perspective about how well the system works, how open it is to error recognition and correction, and how well provisional voting processes are connected to the registration and voter identification regimes. A first step is for states to recognize that improving quality begins with seeing the provisional voting process as a system and taking a systems approach to regular evaluation through standardized metrics with explicit goals for performance. EAC can facilitate action by the states by recommending as a best practice that:

- Each state collect data systematically on the provisional voting process to permit evaluation of its voting system and assess changes from one election to the next. The data collected should include: provisional votes cast and counted by county; reasons why provisional ballots were not counted; measures of variance among jurisdictions, and time required to evaluate ballots by jurisdiction.

Emphasize the importance of clarity

Above all else, the EAC should emphasize the importance of clarity in the rules by which each state governs provisional voting. As state legislators and election officials prepare for the 2006 election, answers to the questions listed in the recommendations section of this report could be helpful. Among those questions are:
eional voting system distribute, collect, record, and tally provisional
ticient accuracy to be seen as procedurally legitimate by both supporters
of the winning candidate?
ral requirements of the system permit cost-efficient operation?
variation in the use of provisional voting in counties or equivalent levels of
ion within the state? Is the variation great enough to cause concern that the
be administered uniformly across the state?
\[\text{suggest areas for action}\]
ions following the 2004 election also suggest procedures for states to
their procedures for provisional voting. EAC should recommend to the
ards for evaluating provisional ballots, and provide training for the
ill apply those standards.
e materials to be used by local jurisdictions in training poll workers on such
ow to locate polling places for potential voters who show up at the wrong
the only permissible requirement to obtain a provisional ballot is an
the voter is registered in the jurisdiction and eligible to vote in an election for
oll workers need appropriate training to understand their duty to give such
oral ballot.
e of the provisional voting process
. suggested by court decisions, states should assess each stage of the
ess. They can begin by assessing the utility and clarity of the information
ites and by considering what information might be added to sample ballots
lections. The better voters understand their rights and obligations, the
se to manage, and the more legitimate the appearance of the process.
olling place will allow more voters to cast a regular ballot and all others who
isional ballot. Our recommendations for best practices to avoid error at the
staffing of the multi-precinct polling place is important. States should
ing materials distributed to every jurisdiction make poll workers familiar
available to voters.
ballot should be of a design or color sufficiently different from a regular
confusion over counting and include take-away information for the voter on
ballot evaluation process.
oral ballots offer a fail-safe, supplies of the ballots at each polling place
ent for all the potential voters likely to need them. Best practice for states
lines (as do Connecticut and Delaware) to estimate the
supply of
es needed at each polling place.
\text{evaluating voter eligibility is critical to a sound process for deciding
isional ballots should be counted.}

\text{regulations should define a reasonable period for voters who lack the
ID or other information bearing on their eligibility to provide it in order
state's ability to verify that the person casting the provisional ballot is the
registered. At least 11 states allow voters to provide ID or other information
fter voting. Kansas allows voters to proffer their ID by electronic means or
as in person.
d voters have their ballots counted in those states that cast
precinct. While HAVA arguably leaves this decision up to the states,
effect of the narrower definition on the portion of ballots counted could be
es in deciding this question. States should be aware, however, of the
placed on the ballot-evaluation process when out-of-precinct ballots, are
tradeoffs are involved if out-of-precinct voters are unable to vote for the
might appear on the ballot in their district of residence.
quire voters to appear at their assigned precinct, where the same polling site
than one precinct, a voter's provisional ballot should count so long as the voter cast that ballot at the correct polling site even if at the wrong precinct within that location. While the best practice might be for poll workers to direct the voter to correct precinct poll workers' advice is not always correct, and the voter should be protected against ministerial error.

- Officials should follow a written procedure, and perhaps a checklist, to identify the reason why a provisional ballot is rejected. Colorado's election rules offer particularly clear guidance to the official evaluating a provisional ballot.

In verifying provisional ballots, the time by which election officials must make their eligibility determinations is particularly important in presidential elections because of the need to certify electors to the Electoral College. Our research did not identify an optimum division of the five weeks available.

- The best practice here is for states to consider the issue and make a careful decision about how to complete all steps in the evaluation of ballots and challenges to those determinations within the five weeks available.

After the election, timely information to voters about the disposition of their provisional ballot can enable voters to determine if they are registered for future elections and, if not, what they need to do to become registered.

- Best practice for the states is to establish mechanisms to ensure that voters casting provisional ballots are informed whether they are now registered for future elections and, if not, what they need to do to become registered.

**Final observation**

The detailed examination of each stage in the provisional voting process can lay the foundation each state needs to improve its system. Efforts to improve provisional voting may be most effective as part of a broader effort by state and local election officials to strengthen their systems. Collecting and analyzing data about those systems will enable states to identify which aspects of the registration and electoral system are most important in shunting voters into the provisional ballot process. Responsible officials can then look to their registration system, identification requirements or poll worker training as ways to reduce the need for voters to cast their ballots provisionally.
Best Practices For Each Step In The Process
We examined each step of the provisional voting process to identify specific areas where
the states should focus their attention to reduce the inconsistencies noted in our analysis.
We offer recommendations in each area appropriate to the responsibilities that HAVA
assigns the EAC for the proper functioning of the provisional voting process.

The Importance of Clarity
The EAC should emphasize above all else the importance of clarity in the rules governing
every stage of provisional voting. As the Century Foundation's recent report observed,
"Close elections increasingly may be settled in part by the evaluating and counting of
provisional ballots ... To avoid post election disputes over provisional ballots-disputes that
will diminish public confidence in the accuracy and legitimacy of the result-- well in
advance of the election, states should establish, announce, and publicize clear statewide
standards for every aspect of the provisional ballot process, from who is entitled to receive
a provisional ballot to which ones are counted."26

Litigation surrounding the 2004 election resulted in decisions that, if reflected in state
statutes or regulations and disseminated in effective training for poll workers, can increase
the clarity of provisional ballot procedures, increase predictability, and bolster confidence
in the system. By taking the following steps, states can incorporate those court rulings into
their procedures.

- Promulgate, ideally by legislation, clear standards for evaluating provisional ballots,
  and provide training for the officials who will apply those standards. For example,
in Washington State, the court determined that an election official's failure in
evaluating ballots to do a complete check against all signature records is an error
serious enough to warrant re-canvassing.27 Clear direction by regulation or statute
on what records to use in evaluating ballots could have saved precious time and
effort and increased the reliability of the provisional voting system.

- States should provide standard information resources for the training of poll
  workers by local jurisdictions. Training materials might include, for example, maps
  or databases with instruction on how to locate polling places for potential voters
  who show up at the wrong place. Usable and useful information in the hands of poll
  workers can protect voters from being penalized by ministerial errors at the polling
  place.

- State training materials provided to local jurisdictions should make clear that the
  only permissible requirement to obtain a provisional ballot is an affirmation that the
  voter is registered in the jurisdiction and eligible to vote in an election for federal
  office. 29 Recent legislation in Arizona indicates that recommendations should
  emphasize HAVA's requirement that persons appearing at the polling place
  claiming to be registered voters cannot be denied a ballot because they do not have
  identification with them. Poll

26 The Century Foundation, Balancing Access and Integrity, Report of the Working
27 See Washington State Republican Party v. King County Division of Records, 103 P3d
While rejecting the notion that all ballots cast in the wrong precinct should be counted, the
court ruled that provisional votes cast in the wrong precinct should be thrown out provided
that the voter had been directed to the correct precinct. This meant that provisional votes
cast in the wrong precinct (and even the wrong polling place) would count if there were no
evidence that the voter had been directed to a different polling place. The court placed a
duty upon election officials to make sure the voters were in the correct locations. Note that
this question would not arise in a state that counted ballots cast in the wrong polling place
but within the correct county.
On September 13, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission issued an advisory (2005-006) and, after consideration of the matter EAC concluded that Section 302 of HAVA creates a voter right. Specifically, the section creates the right for a potential voter to utilize a provisional ballot in the event his or her name does not appear on the registration list or the voter's eligibility is challenged by an election official. While States may create voter identification standards that exceed those laid out in HAVA and effect whether a provisional ballot is counted, States may not take action that limits a voter's right to receive and submit a provisional ballot.

The right to cast a provisional ballot is created in Section 302 of HAVA. Pursuant to HAVA, when an individual declares that he or she is a registered and eligible voter in a federal election, that individual "shall be permitted to cast a provisional ballot" if (1) their name does not appear on the official list of eligible voters or (2) "an election official asserts that the individual is not eligible to vote." (Section 302(a)). This right to receive a provisional ballot is contingent upon only one thing (per Section 302(a)(2)), the individual’s execution of a written affirmation that he or she is both a registered and eligible voter for the election at issue.¹

In simplest terms, provisional voting represents the right of an individual (whose eligibility to vote has been challenged), to reserve their right to vote and postpone the voter eligibility determination to a time when more perfect or complete information may be provided. A provisional ballot does not represent a different way to vote, nor does it serve as a bypass to State laws governing voter eligibility. Rather, it is designed to prevent an individual from losing his or her right to vote due to the fact that a poll worker did not have all the information available or needed to accurately assess voter eligibility. Thus, based upon the plain language of Section 302(a) of HAVA, a challenge to an individual’s eligibility to vote (such as a challenge based upon identification requirements) cannot serve as a bar to the receipt of a provisional ballot, because it is the election official’s challenge that triggers the provisional ballot procedure in the first place. To hold otherwise would defeat the purpose of provisional voting. In the end, to understand this concept one must understand the differences between traditional and provisional ballots.

The nature and procedures associated with a provisional ballot are wholly distinct from those of a traditional ballot. Because of this fact, the two processes must be treated differently. While voter identification requirements may serve as a bar to the casting of a traditional ballot, they may not prevent the submission of a provisional ballot.

First, the nature and purpose of traditional and provisional ballots are essentially different. The purpose of a traditional ballot is to allow a confirmed, eligible voter to cast a vote. The purpose of a provisional ballot is to allow individuals whose voter eligibility is challenged to reserve the right to vote by memorializing both their intent to vote and their proposed vote. This is

¹ Moreover, a potential voter determined not to be eligible must be informed of their provisional voting rights per Section 302(a)(1) of HAVA.
evident by the HAVA processes discussed above. The bottom line is that the casting of a proper, traditional ballot constitutes a vote, while the casting or submission of a provisional ballot does not. A traditional ballot is cast only after voter eligibility has been determined by the State. Hence, the moment it is cast, it becomes an individual's vote. On the other hand, the submission or casting of a provisional ballot is not a vote. Rather, it is a claim that the potential voter who submitted it has the right to vote and reserves that right.

This goes to the very heart of provisional voting. If provisional voting is a right triggered by an election official's determination that an individual has not met a voter eligibility requirement, how can such a requirement also serve as a bar to that right? The concept of provisional voting works only if the right is always available when the application of voter eligibility requirements is in question.

Section 303(b)(2)(B) of HAVA, entitled Fail-Safe Voting, provides that when a first-time voter who registered by mail is required by HAVA Section 303(b) to show identification, that person must be given a provisional ballot if he or she fails to provide such identification at the polling place. This section is important as it clarifies Congressional intent regarding how provisional voting should function.

The Fail-Safe Voting provision of Section 303(b)(2)(B) grants clear insight into how provisional voting should be implemented. While Section 303(b) deals with a specific subset of voters (first-time voters who registered by mail), its application of Section 302(a) supports the concept that a provisional ballot must be given to a voter who is determined (at the polling place) not to meet voter identification requirements. Congress saw no difference between an individual's failure to meet the voter identification requirements it issued in Section 303(b) and the failure to meet eligibility requirements which trigger provisional voting under Section 302. Section 303(b) makes it clear that Congress did not intend voter identification requirements to limit access to provisional voting. Instead, Congress viewed provisional voting as a right, or more specifically, as a fail-safe. The EAC strongly believes that HAVA provisions must be interpreted to bring about consistent and evenly applied results. In this case, if individuals who fail to meet Federal identification standards have the right to a provisional ballot, so must individuals who fail to meet similar State standards.

First, HAVA notes in Section 304 that while States may create standards that are stricter than those established under HAVA, this authority is limited to the extent "such State requirements are not inconsistent with the Federal requirements under [HAVA]." Clearly, provisional voting is a requirement under HAVA. Section 302(a) notes that qualified individuals "shall be permitted to cast a provisional ballot." (Emphasis added). In this way, States may not create standards that are inconsistent or interfere with the provisional voting mandate.

States' have the right to impose stricter requirements than those laid out in HAVA. The EAC has already made it clear, above, that a stricter voter eligibility requirement cannot be read to bar an individual's right to a provisional ballot. However, could a stricter requirement regarding provisional voting serve to limit access to such ballots? No. A stricter State requirement for provisional voting would be a standard that enhances a person's access to a provisional ballot. A state may not impose an identification requirement that would limit a potential voter's access to and submission of a provisional ballot. However, such requirements (when coupled with a state's provisional ballot procedures) may prevent a provisional ballot from being counted.
Karen - I am attaching a spreadsheet providing the information you have requested (Attachment 1), but I want to highlight a few points which may not be immediately self-evident.

First, the original budget (Attachment 2) we submitted to the EAC, dated March 22nd, did not itemize personnel expenses by each person. In addition, when we actually began work two months after submitting that budget, we decided to reallocate more time to people within Eagleton and hire fewer outside hourlies.

Second, in the figures I sent you in late December we tried to account for all the expenses and projections but overlooked a few things including neglecting to include the honoraria for our peer review team. Hence, the figures we’re now sending are different than what I sent in December.

Lastly, we originally discussed a no-cost extension through February, but since we don’t yet have the EAC comments on our draft Provisional Voting material nor an estimate of when they are likely to be ready, I think it is prudent to extend the no-cost extension through March 31st. We would still like to conclude by the end of February, but if you can approve the extension for another month we could avoid going through this process again if everything is not complete six weeks from now.

It is my understanding that Rutgers will soon be sending our December invoice. At this time, I would also like to request that we combine January and February an invoice the EAC once for that time period.

As you can see, we are currently projecting an ending balance of approximately $10,000. If additional expenses are incurred beyond what is currently projected, we’re confident they will not exceed the original budget of $560,002.

Thanks and I look forward to hearing from you.

--

John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x. 290
Karen,

I am not sure what this means.

GG

Gavin S. Gilmour
Associate General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 12/18/2005 09:54 AM -----
"John Weingart"
<john.weingart@rutgers.edu>  To klynndyson@eac.gov
12/16/2005 01:25 PM  cc
Please respond to
john.weingart@rutgers.edu  Subject Re: Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected
Karen - At this time, we anticipate reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line item and spending approximately $35,500 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,250 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants. There are other additional variances but they are not significant (e.g. less on honoraria, less on travel, and more on general operations such as phone expenses). Let me know if you need additional detail or information.

Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> John-
> Quick question-
> How much money do you anticipate will be re-allocated from the original line items outlined in the contract to other project costs?
> Thanks
>
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
>
> *

> "John Weingart" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>*
> 11/30/2005 05:05 PM
> Please respond to
> john.weingart@rutgers.edu

To
"Karen Lynn-Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
cc
"Tom O'Neill"
Subject
Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected
Karen - There were two typos on the copy I just sent. Please use the attached instead. To minimize confusion, I dated this document December 1st (the first one says November 30). Thanks, John

--
John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Karen - Sorry for the delay. I'll get this information to you by Friday. Thanks.

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> John-
> Quick question-
> How much money do you anticipate will be re-allocated from the original line items outlined in the contract to other project costs?
> Thanks
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123

> **"John Weingart" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>**
> 11/30/2005 05:05 PM
> Please respond to
> john.weingart@rutgers.edu

> To
> "Karen Lynn-Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
> Subject Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected
Karen - There were two typos on the copy I just sent. Please use the
attached instead. To minimize confusion, I dated this document December
1st (the first one says November 30). Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
- Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Thanks for letting me know. This may well extend all the dates in the proposed revised schedule we sent accordingly. When do you think we will hear about the no-cost extension and budget reallocations? Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> John-
> Just wanted to let you know that we've had to push back, by a week,
> the review of Eagleton's Best Practices document.
> EAC staff are very focused on the release of the Voting Systems
> Guidelines; this will be completed by mid-week next week. I'm told
> that the Commissioners will turn their attention to the Best Practices
> document, immediately following this.
> Regards-
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
In case you need to modify anything.


Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov
Karen - I am attaching the documentation for our request. Please let me know if you require the material in a different format and/or further information.

Thanks very much, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Egleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> John-
> Thanks ever so much for forwarding this message on to Connie.
> I'm awaiting your language describing why you are requiring a no-cost extension on the contract, and for what period of time you wish to extend the contract.
> I'm told this is a very simple process on this end, and I've prepared the necessary form and a memo.
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123

Extension Justification.doc
Karen,

Allow me to provide you some guidance (I am just that kind of guy).

First, go to FAR Part 43 (it is short and provides you an outline of the process. Given the lack of FAR clauses in the original contract, you will want to perform a bilateral modification (must be agreed to and signed by both parties). This is the most conservative way to proceed. You can find the FAR on-line.

You will use Standard Form 30 (you will find it in the FAR). I have a hard copy with some notes on it that I will provide you. It will have to be signed by both parties. The CO will have to sign for the EAC (chair?)

The form will require you to describe the modification. There are instructions to guide you.

I also recommend a memo for record signed by you and the chair (I concur). Memorializing some facts and findings. The memo should address:

- background regarding the action, a description of the action and authority (FAR 43.103 (a)(3)).
- Clearly identify the benefit this action provides the government.
- Notes/explains (presumably) that this action is within the scope of the original agreement.
- State (presumably) that there is no cost for the modification.
- recommend modification
- place document in file.

GG

Gavin S. Gilmour
Associate General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

Diana Scott/EAC/GOV
Since we are trying to get our "contracts" house in order, I'll defer to Legal on this. (In the past an amendment would be prepared).

Diana M. Scott  
Administrative Officer  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
(202) 566-3100 (office)  
(202) 566-3127 (fax)  
dscott@eac.gov

Folks-

I'm not certain what process must be followed in order for a contractor to request a no-cost extension.

Eagleton Institute is requesting one to extend their contract beyond the December 31 deadline. It's my understanding that EAC did one for the National Academy of Sciences, although I wasn't a part of that process and therefore not aware of how that one was handled.
Thanks for your guidance.

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
Thanks, Karen.

Tom O'Neill

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2005 3:54 PM
To: 
Cc: dscott@eac.gov; cpaquette@eac.gov
Subject: Re: Request for reallocation within existing budget

Tom-

EAC contract staff indicate that the reallocation you propose can occur and that all other such reallocations that are made from your project budget for this contract budget can be done at your own discretion.

From a contractual standpoint, EAC's only concern is that Eagleton is able to accomplish all of the activities and provide all of the deliverables that have been set forth in your contract.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen:

As we discussed on Tuesday morning in the teleconference, we would like to reallocate within the current budget $9,500 to the survey of local election officials. This will raise the budget for the survey to $24,500 from $15,000.

The additional funding will permit us to double the sample of local election officials from 200 to 400. The larger sample will allow more detailed comparisons between the experience of local election officials in states that offered some form of provisional ballot before HAVA and those that did not. This comparison is a topic of special interest identified in the contract.

The increase of $9,500 is based on an estimate made by SRBI, the contractor that will actually administer the interviews. I can furnish you with a copy of the estimate if you like. We believe the additional funds will improve significantly our ability to provide relevant analysis to EAC on this important issue.

Tom O'Neill
Karen:

As we discussed on Tuesday morning in the teleconference, we would like to reallocate within the current budget $9,500 to the survey of local election officials. This will raise the budget for the survey to $24,500 from $15,000.

The additional funding will permit us to double the sample of local election officials from 200 to 400. The larger sample will allow more detailed comparisons between the experience of local election officials in states that offered some form of provisional ballot before HAVA and those that did not. This comparison is a topic of special interest identified in the contract.

The increase of $9,500 is based on an estimate made by SRBI, the contractor that will actually administer the interviews. I can furnish you with a copy of the estimate if you like. We believe the additional funds will improve significantly our ability to provide relevant analysis to EAC on this important issue.

Tom O'Neill
If we release every single thing that comes in the door every contractor will have a platform to shop their "research" as they see fit at taxpayers expense. Further, I see no need for a Commission, there would only be a need for a research director to dole out government contracts. I am amazed that a "respected" academic institution would behave in this manner.

Gavin S. Gilmour

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Gavin S. Gilmour
Sent: 04/17/2007 05:27 PM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Rosemary Rodriguez; Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Sheila Banks; Juliet Hodgkins; Elieen Kuala; Jeannie Layson; Karen Lynn-Dyson; fms.eacfabre@yahoo.com
Subject: FYI--Letter from Serrano

All,

Today we received a faxed copy of a letter signed by Jose Serrano as Chair of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee. The Chairman urges the EAC to publicly release the full draft version of the Provisional Voting report prepared by Eagleton. The letter states that the Congressman was pleased with our decision to engage our Inspector General and to release the draft version of the Voter ID study (though he was disappointed that we did not adopt it).

Chairman stated in his letter that if we do not decide to release the draft report, he would like an update regarding the study's status, time line for release and a statement regarding why the EAC would deviate from the "precedent" it has now set in releasing draft studies.

It is my understanding that this report was made public at the Board of Advisor and Standards Board meetings in May 2006. I do not know if any changes were made to the document after that time. Perhaps Karen can provide additional information regarding this concern. It is also my understanding that this document has been released to third parties upon request under FOIA. Additionally, I believe a best practices document was created by the EAC based on the research. That document is on our website. Also, Stephanie informed me (and Karen confirmed) that the study is posted on Eagleton's website.

A copy of Serrano's letter is attached.

GG

[attachment "Serrano Letter.pdf" deleted by Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV]
THIS MESSAGE IS FOR ITS INTENDED RECIPIENT ONLY. IT IS A PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED TO A THIRD PARTY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SENDER.
What is the (total) dollar amount of the contract?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----  
From: Jeannie Layson 
Sent: 03/22/2007 10:59 AM EDT 
To: Gracia Hillman 
Cc: Karen Lynn-Dyson 
Subject: Project allotments 

Commissioner, 

Per your question about how much of the contract was actually spent on voter ID research vs provisional voting... I have yet to find the answer. I have reviewed the RFP and the invoices, but so far, it does not appear that these tasks were tracked separately. Karen and I continue to look into this, but I wanted to let you know what we've found so far. 

Jeannie Layson     
U.S. Election Assistance Commission     
1225 New York Ave., NW     
Suite 1100     
Washington, DC 20005     
Phone: 202-566-3100
Karen - I received Tom Wilkey's letter this morning and would like to discuss how best to respond. Are you available to talk either before 2:30 today or sometime tomorrow, Thursday? Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Mr. Benavides Thanks for the advance copy of Tom Wilkey's letter.

Tom O'Neill

Karen, by copy I am attaching the referenced letter sent to Peter Weingart on 6-15-06.

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Tom-

Will ask Tom's office to get you a copy.

Regards-
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Thomas O'Neill"
06/19/2006 04:30 PM

To: klynndyson@eac.gov
cc
Subject: RE: Prov Voting and Voter ID Reports

Karen,

I have not heard from Tom Wilkey. If he signed the letter you drafted for him last Tuesday, could you email me a copy while we await the arrival of the hard copy by mail. I probably don't need to remind you that we have only 11 days left on this contract and need to know how we should move ahead to complete it.

Tom O'Neill

From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 16, 2006 9:33 AM
To: 
Subject: Re: Prov Voting and Voter ID Reports

Tom-

On Tuesday I drafted a letter for the Executive Director's signature.
He should be in touch today or Monday at the latest.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen,

Could you please give me your reading of the status of a response to our letter last week that raised some issues for resolution by the Commission on the completion of our work during the final few weeks of the contract period. The Team needs to know how to proceed during the remaining 2 weeks of the project.

Thanks,

Tom O'Neill
Karen, by copy I am attaching the referenced letter sent to Peter Weingart on 6-15-06.

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Tom-

Will ask Tom's office to get you a copy.

Regards-

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen,
June 15, 2006

Mr. John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers University
191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick NJ 08901-8557

Dear Mr. Weingart:

During a recent briefing by staff, the EAC discussed and reviewed possible next steps with the provisional voting and voter identification studies as well as the Eagleton contract which is scheduled to conclude on June 30, 2006.

We were in agreement that Eagleton's work on the EAC contract should conclude, as scheduled, by June 30, 2006. In preparation for this conclusion, the EAC requests that the comments and suggestions which were noted during the EAC's recent Board of Advisors and Standards Boards meeting (and were described in Mr. O'Neil's June 8, 2006 letter to Chairman DeGregorio) be included in the final draft report on provisional voting which Eagleton will deliver to the EAC on or about June 30, 2006. The Commissioners have determined that they will take this final draft report and, from it, may develop guidance and best practice recommendations that will be presented to the Board of Advisors and Standards Boards for further review.

The EAC Commissioners have also reviewed and considered next steps with the voter identification draft report which Eagleton has prepared. While the final disposition of the results and findings of this study, on the part of the EAC, are still unclear, the Commissioners have asked that the final draft report of this study also be prepared and submitted to the EAC not later than June 30, 2006.

We look forward to receiving these reports. On behalf of the EAC thank you for the considerable time and energy which the Eagleton/Moritz team has devoted to these critical election issues.

Sincerely,

Thomas R. Wilkey
I have not heard from Tom Wilkey. If he signed the letter you drafted for him last Tuesday, could you email me a copy while we await the arrival of the hard copy by mail. I probably don't need to remind you that we have only 11 days left on this contract and need to know how we should move ahead to complete it.

Tom O'Neill

From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 16, 2006 9:33 AM
To: tom_oneill@verizon.net
Subject: Re: Prov Voting and Voter ID Reports

Tom-

On Tuesday I drafted a letter for the Executive Director's signature. He should be in touch today or Monday at the latest.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

*Thomas O'Neill*

06/16/2006 08:49 AM

Karen,

Could you please give me your reading of the status of a response to our letter last week that raised some issues for resolution by the Commission on the completion of our work during the final few weeks of the contract period. The Team needs to know how to proceed during the remaining 2 weeks of the project.

Thanks,
Karen,

I have not heard from Tom Wilkey. If he signed the letter you drafted for him last Tuesday, could you email me a copy while we await the arrival of the hard copy by mail. I probably don't need to remind you that we have only 11 days left on this contract and need to know how we should move ahead to complete it.

Tom O'Neill

From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 16, 2006 9:33 AM
To: tom_oneill@verizon.net
Subject: Re: Prov Voting and Voter ID Reports

Tom-

On Tuesday I drafted a letter for the Executive Director's signature. He should be in touch today or Monday at the latest.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen,

Could you please give me your reading of the status of a response to our letter last week that raised some issues for resolution by the Commission on the completion of our work during the final few weeks of the contract period. The Team needs to know how to proceed during the remaining 2 weeks of the project.

Thanks,

Tom O'Neill
Mr. Weingart,

I faxed a copy of the signed extension this morning.

Thank you,

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

That's wonderful news. If you can fax a copy of the approval to me at that would be most helpful. Thanks, John

> Mr. Weingart, The Executive Director signed everything he needs to sign, so as far as I know, it is already approved. Thanks,
> Tamar Nedzar
> Law Clerk
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> (202) 566-2377
> http://www.eac.gov
> TNedzar@eac.gov
> 
> -----'John Weingart' wrote: -----
> 
> Tamar - Do you know if this request can be approved by this Friday. If that is possible, it would greatly ease our internal path at Rutgers.
> Thanks, John
tnedzar@eac.gov wrote:

Mr. Weingart,

Just sent the form again. Please let me know if you do not receive it today.

Thanks,

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

**"John Weingart"**

04/21/2006 04:47 PM
Please respond to
john.weingart@rutgers.edu

To
tnedzar@eac.gov
cc

Subject
Re: No-Cost Extension Request

Not yet received. Please send again with a cover sheet with my name to (732) 932-6778. Thanks.

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290
Mr. Weingart,

I just faxed the document we need you to sign before our Executive Director can approve the no-cost extension.

Please call if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov

*Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV*

04/21/2006 10:10 AM

To john.weingart@rutgers.edu
cc "Tom O'Neil"

Subject Re: No-Cost Extension Request

Notes:///85256FFC007A9D7C/38D46BF5E8F08834852564B500129B2C/CFBC950B4682EC0E86257157004C6064>

Thanks, John.

I'm passing this on to our legal staff, who will be preparing the documents.

Will let you know if I need additional information and/or clarification.

Regards-
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Karen - We are requesting a no-cost extension on the EAC contract to the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University to have the contract's concluding date move from March 31, 2006 to June 30, 2006. As I indicated earlier, it would be very helpful if we could receive approval of this request no later than April 28th. This extension is necessary to enable the following activities:

1. The EAC has informed us that it will assemble a panel of researchers the week of May 8th to review the Eagleton/Moritz draft background report on Voter Identification. The EAC wishes to supplement the review of this draft already conducted by the Peer Review Group called for in the contract. The Eagleton/Moritz research team, as well as at least some of the Peer Review Group will participate in the conference call or meeting of the EAC's reviewers;

2. Eagleton/Moritz will revise the draft Voter Identification report based upon comments made by the two sets of reviewers, and distribute the revised report to the EAC and its Advisory Board in mid-May.

3. Eagleton/Moritz will present its draft reports on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification to the EAC Advisory Board at its May 25th meeting in Washington, D.C.;

4. Eagleton/Moritz will revise both draft reports to take into account comments made by the EAC Advisory Board, and submit printed final reports to the EAC before June 23rd. Eagleton/Moritz will also prepare
PowerPoint presentation for both reports.

5. Eagleton/Moritz will present both reports at the EAC public meeting in Washington, D.C. on June 23rd, thus concluding its work under this contract.

Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Thanks,

John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290
Karen - We are requesting a no-cost extension on the EAC contract to the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University to have the contract's concluding date move from March 31, 2006 to June 30, 2006. As I indicated earlier, it would be very helpful if we could receive approval of this request no later than April 28th.

This extension is necessary to enable the following activities:

1. The EAC has informed us that it will assemble a panel of researchers the week of May 8th to review the Eagleton/Moritz draft background report on Voter Identification. The EAC wishes to supplement the review of this draft already conducted by the Peer Review Group called for in the contract. The Eagleton/Moritz research team, as well as at least some of the Peer Review Group will participate in the conference call or meeting of the EAC's reviewers;

2. Eagleton/Moritz will revise the draft Voter Identification report based upon comments made by the two sets of reviewers, and distribute the revised report to the EAC and its Advisory Board in mid-May.

3. Eagleton/Moritz will present its draft reports on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification to the EAC Advisory Board at its May 25th meeting in Washington, D.C.;

4. Eagleton/Moritz will revise both draft reports to take into account comments made by the EAC Advisory Board, and submit printed final reports to the EAC before June 23rd. Eagleton/Moritz will also prepare a PowerPoint presentation for both reports.

5. Eagleton/Moritz will present both reports at the EAC public meeting in Washington, D.C. on June 23rd, thus concluding its work under this contract.

Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Thanks,

John

--
John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Thanks for this list, Vice Chair. I've passed it along to Eagleton.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

tel: 202-566-3123
Tom-

Here is a list that can be included in your outreach efforts.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 08/03/2005 06:08 PM -----

Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV
08/04/2005 01:29 PM

To: Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/GOV, Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
cc: Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject: List of centrist/conservative groups

Here's a list of centrist/conservative groups involved in voting issues that Grant prepared for me. I thought it would be helpful to you.

Paul

Grant T. Gelner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. N.W., Suite 1100
Washington DC, 20005
(202) 566-2377

Here is the updated excel file. Sorry I didn't get it to you earlier, but I had a four hour front desk shift this morning and was unable to check email from there. Enjoy the cool Oregon weather.

Grant Gelner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. N.W., Suite 1100
Washington DC, 20005
(202) 566-2377
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Webpage</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Contact / Email</th>
<th>About Org</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>770-386-8372</td>
<td><a href="http://www.theadvocates.org/about-us.html">http://www.theadvocates.org/about-us.html</a></td>
<td>The Liberty Building 213 South Erwin Street, Cartersville, GA 30120</td>
<td><a href="http://www.theadvocates.org/contact-us.html">http://www.theadvocates.org/contact-us.html</a></td>
<td>The Advocates for Self-Government is a non-profit, non-partisan libertarian educational organization. Founded in 1985 by Marshall Fritz, our current president is Sharon Harris. The American Center For Voting Rights (ACVR) was founded in February 2005 to protect the election process and zealously guard the constitutional right of all citizens to participate in deciding elections in a fair and equal manner free from discrimination, intimidation and fraud. The American Conservative Union is the nation's oldest conservative lobbying organization. We believe in a system in which taxes are simpler, fairer, flatter, more visible, and lower than they are today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703-836-8602</td>
<td><a href="http://www.conservative.org/">http://www.conservative.org/</a></td>
<td>1007 Cameron Street Alexandria, VA 22314</td>
<td><a href="http://www.conservative.org/about/directors.asp">http://www.conservative.org/about/directors.asp</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We are a non-profit (501(c)(3)) organization founded in 1977 by Don Wildmon. The American Family Association represents and stands for traditional family values, focusing primarily on the influence of television and other media – including pornography – on our society.

The Cato Institute seeks to broaden the parameters of public policy debate to allow consideration of the traditional American principles of limited government, individual liberty, free markets and peace.

Christian Coalition of America is a political organization, made up of pro-family Americans who care deeply about becoming active citizens for the purpose of guaranteeing that government acts in ways that strengthen, rather than threaten, families.

The Club for Growth is a national network of over 30,000 men and women, from all walks of life, who believe that prosperity and opportunity come through economic freedom.
Organizes College Students who support the Republican Party

The Competitive Enterprise Institute is a non-profit public policy organization dedicated to advancing the principles of free enterprise and limited government.

A Christian organization that believes in a strong defense department

Regarding national security issues, "Empower America remains committed to a strong and proactive -- but distinctively American -- foreign policy, one that rejects both short-sighted isolationism and imprudent multilateralism.

FRC shapes public debate and formulates public policy that values human life and upholds the institutions of marriage and the family.

The Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Studies is a group of conservatives and libertarians interested in the current state of the legal order.
FreedomWorks fights for lower taxes, less government and more economic freedom for all Americans.

The mission of The Future of Freedom Foundation is to advance freedom by providing an uncompromising moral and economic case for individual liberty, free markets, private property, and limited government.

Heartland's mission is to help build social movements in support of ideas that empower people. Such ideas include parental choice in education, choice and personal responsibility in health care, market-based approaches to environmental protection, privatization of public services, and deregulation in areas where property rights and markets do a better job than government bureaucracies.
The principles of individual, economic, and political freedom; private enterprise; and representative government were fundamental to the vision of the Institution's founder. It looks at events through eyes that favor limited constitutional government, local self-government, private enterprise and individual freedom.

Welcome to the International Society for Individual Liberty (ISIL). ISIL is one of the major pioneers in the creation of the worldwide libertarian movement – today's fastest-growing philosophical/political movement.

IPI's focus is on approaches to governing that harness the strengths of individual liberty, limited government, and free markets.
The Institute of World Politics is a graduate school of statecraft and national security affairs, dedicated to helping develop leaders with a sound understanding of international realities and the ethical conduct of statecraft -- i.e., the use of the various instruments of power in service of national interests and purposes -- based on knowledge and appreciation of American political philosophy and the Western moral tradition.

Judicial Watch, Inc. was established in 1994 to serve as an ethical and legal "watchdog" over our government, legal, and judicial systems and to promote a return to ethics and morality in our nation's public life.

Log Cabin Republicans courageously stand on the front lines of today's most important battleground for gay and lesbian civil rights. We are the nation's leading voice for fairness, inclusion, and tolerance in the GOP.

The Leadership Institute is the premier training ground for tomorrow's conservative leaders.
The Locke Institute seeks to promote a greater understanding of natural rights, its implications for constitutional democracy and for modern society's economic organization. To that end, The Institute encourages theoretical research in the areas of property rights, public choice, law and economics, and the new institutional economics.

Concerned with liberal bias in the media.

The National Federation of Republican Women is a national grassroots political organization with about 1,800 local units in 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam and the Virgin Islands. Committed to preserving the right of all law-abiding individuals to purchase, possess and use firearms for legitimate purposes as guaranteed by the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.
The National Right to Life Committee was founded in 1973 in response to a United States Supreme Court decision released on January 22 of that year, legalizing the practice of human abortion in all 50 states, throughout the entire nine months of pregnancy.

These citizens agree that federal labor law should not promote coercive union power -- and support the protection and enactment of additional state Right to Work laws until the federal sanction for compulsory unionism is eliminated.

NTU was established in 1969 to educate taxpayers, the media, and elected officials on a non-partisan basis on the merits of limited government and low taxes. NTU uses a variety of means to accomplish our work including direct mail, research papers, public speaking, email, advertising, the Internet, and lobbying.
Project 21 is an initiative of The National Center for Public Policy Research to promote the views of African-Americans whose entrepreneurial spirit, dedication to family and commitment to individual responsibility has not traditionally been echoed by the nation's civil rights establishment.

The Progress & Freedom Foundation is a market-oriented think tank that studies the digital revolution and its implications for public policy. Its mission is to educate policymakers, opinion leaders and the public about issues associated with technological change, based on a philosophy of limited government, free markets and individual sovereignty.

The RJC is the national organization of Jewish Republicans. Its mandates include representing the views of our members to Republican decision makers at all levels of government and to articulate Republican ideas in the Jewish community.
The Republican Liberty Caucus (RLC) is a grassroots, nationwide organization affiliated with the Republican Party (GOP). The goal of the RLC is to elect pro-liberty individuals to office.

an organization to foster the principles of the Republican Party in the Hispanic Community, to provide Hispanic Americans with a forum to play an influential role in local, state and national party activities, and to increase the number of Republican Hispanic elected officials.

mobilizes the support of Americans overseas to support Republican candidates in US elections.

The mission of Reason Foundation is to advance a free society by developing, applying, and promoting libertarian principles, including free markets, individual liberty, and the rule of law. We use journalism and public policy to change the frameworks and actions of policymakers, journalists, and opinion leaders.
The Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council (SBE Council) works to influence legislation and policies that help to create a favorable and productive environment for small businesses and entrepreneurship.

Townhall.com is the first truly interactive community on the Internet to bring Internet users, conservative public policy organizations, congressional staff, and political activists together under the broad umbrella of "conservative" thoughts, ideas and actions.

Young America's Foundation is committed to the Reagan legacy and to educating future generations in its principles.
FYI-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 08/14/2005 04:42 PM -----

"Lauren Vincelli"
<Vincelli@rutgers.edu>
08/15/2005 03:01 PM
Please respond to
Vincelli@rutgers.edu

To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc "Tom O'Neill"
rmandel@rci.rutgers.edu, john.weingart@rutgers.edu
Subject Eagleton Institute of Politics - July 2005 - Monthly Progress Report

Ms. Dyson,

Attached please find the July 2005 Progress Report for the project entitled, "Contract to Provide Research Assistance to the EAC for the Development of Voluntary Guidance on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Procedures." If you have any questions regarding any part of this document please contact Tom O'Neill at:

The financial reporting for this project is performed by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting at Rutgers University. A copy of this report was not made available to us in an electronic format. Hard copies of the Progress Report and Financial Report have been Fedex'ed to you this afternoon and should arrive to your attention tomorrow morning. Please let me know if you do not receive this package by tomorrow afternoon.

Thank you for your time, have a great evening.

Best,
Lauren Vincelli

Lauren Vincelli
Business Assistant, Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling
Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University
Carriage House, 185 Ryders Lane
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

On May 24, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission awarded an eight month contract (December 30, 2005) in the amount of $560,002.00 to the Eagleton Institute of Politics (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures.

On November 15, 2005, John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, requested via e-mail, a no-cost extension on this contract (E4014127). Mr. Weingart has requested an extension to complete the work of this contract to February 28, 2006.

In subsequent correspondence, Mr. Weingart notes the following as the reason for the request:

“The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October, voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting, based on Eagleton’s research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication..... The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report of that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid-January”.

He further notes:

“If EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work....

“The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $300,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project”.

013547
Karen Lynn-Dyson, the EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative assigned to this contract has reviewed this request, the rationale and authority for it (FAR 43.103(a)(3)) and finds it to be appropriate. To-date the Eagleton Institute has consistently met its deadlines for major project deliverables and stayed within the project budget. To grant the Eagleton Institute a two month extension on this contract in order to obtain the necessary feedback on major documents it has produced will be within the best interests of the Election Assistance Commission, and thus, the federal government.

EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative finds that to grant the Eagleton Institute a no-cost extension for the modification of its contract with the EAC is within the scope of the original agreement and is recommending that this modification to the contract be made.

Signed

Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Contracting Officer Representative  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Gracia Hillman  
Chair  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

To Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Tamar Nedzar/EAC/GOV@EAC, Nicole Mortellito/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV@EAC
bcc

Subject Re: Fw: No Cost Extension Request

Gavin-

See quote in attached Memorandum for the Record, regarding re-allocation of funds.

Will also send you his e-mail with the full explanation.

Nicole and Tamar-

Please provide Gavin with the paperwork which has been prepared for the Chair's signature

Thanks

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV

Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV

To Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc

Subject Re: Fw: No Cost Extension Request

Karen,

I am not sure I understand what is meant by the term "re-allocation of funds." Any insight?? He seems to be referencing some other request?

Also, I have not seen the paperwork regarding this no cost extension.

GG

Gavin S. Gilmour
Associate General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

12/12/2005 04:31 PM

To Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC

cc

Subject Fw: No Cost Extension Request


Gavin-

Is it correct to say that this paperwork that has just gone to the Chair includes an approval of the re-allocation of funds?

Thanks

K

Eagfeton no-cost extension.doc
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123


"John Weingart"
<johweingart@rutgers.edu>
12/12/2005 03:07 PM

Please respond to john.weingart@rutgers.edu

To klynndyson@eac.gov

cc

Subject Re: No Cost Extension Request

Karen - Does that also include the request to reallocate funds or is that just something that doesn't require EAC approval? Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> > John-
> > > The no-cost extension materials have gone to the Chair for signature
> > and review.
> >

013550
The process should be complete within the week.

Also, EAC staff will be turning their attention to the provisional voting best practices document after Wednesday of this week.

As always, thanks for your patience.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV	 To Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC

12/12/2005 04:50 PM

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

---- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 12/11/2005 04:49 PM ----

"John Weingart"
<john.weingart@rutgers.edu>
11/30/2005 05:05 PM

Please respond to john.weingart@rutgers.edu

To "Karen Lynn-Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
cc "Tom O'Neill"

Subject Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Karen - There were two typos on the copy I just sent. Please use the attached instead. To minimize confusion, I dated this document December 1st (the first one says November 30). Thanks, John

--
John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

Extension Justification.doc
Yes all of your assumptions are correct.

Should these somehow be stated in the Memorandum for the Record?

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen,  
I am assuming that there original proposal included an estimate for public hearing proposals and that they want to shift money from this expense to labor.

Thus I am assuming that you have determined that there will be no public hearing and therefore this shift is appropriate.

Are these assumption correct? Perhaps a quick explanation regarding this processes would be helpful.

GG

Gavin S. Gilmour
Associate General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 12/11/2005 04:49 PM -----

"John Weingart"
<john.weingart@rutgers.edu> 
11/30/2005 05:05 PM
To "Karen Lynn-Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
cc "Tom O'Neill"
Subject Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Karen - There were two typos on the copy I just sent. Please use the attached instead. To minimize confusion, I dated this document December 1st (the first one says November 30). Thanks, John

--
John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

Extension Justification.doc
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
12/19/2005 09:56 AM

To Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

G-

FYI-

See response below.

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

---- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 12/18/2005 09:54 AM ----

"John Weingart"
<john.weingart@rutgers.edu>
12/16/2005 01:25 PM

To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Karen - At this time, we anticipate reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line item and spending approximately $35,500 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,250 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants. There are other additional variances but they are not significant (e.g. less on honoraria, less on travel, and more on general operations such as phone expenses). Let me know if you need additional detail or information.

Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> > John-
> >
> > Quick question-
> > How much money do you anticipate will be re-allocated from the
original line items outlined in the contract to other project costs?

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

*John Weingart* <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>*

11/30/2005 05:05 PM
Please respond to
john.weingart@rutgers.edu

To
"Karen Lynn-Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
cc
"Tom O'Neill"

Subject
Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Karen - There were two typos on the copy I just sent. Please use the
attached instead. To minimize confusion, I dated this document December
1st (the first one says November 30). Thanks, John

--
- -- John Weingart, Associate Director
- Eagleton Institute of Politics
- (732)932-9384, x.290
Gavin -

Just spoke with John Weingart - he explains that it will be the same work and tasks (no new or additional products) and merely work that will now extend for an additional two months rather than ending December 31.

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
John -

I just had a more detailed conversation with our Deputy General Counsel about Eagleton's no-cost extension.

He indicates that we need a bit more information that will accompany the material we will send to the Commissioners for a vote (hopefully next week).

We need to know the number of labor hours, the labor costs and a brief description of the tasks to be performed by each of the staff who will be working on the EAC contract until its completion.

Since we have eliminated the public hearing (a major contract deliverable) it is unclear why staff labor hours and costs will continue at the same level and rate.

As always, thanks for your patience and prompt response.

Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Research Manager  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
tel: 202-566-3123
Thanks for providing this explanation, John.

Once I've had a chance to review it with our contracting folks, I'll be back in touch.

Best wishes for a restful holiday-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen - Our request for a no-cost, reallocation of resources is based on (a) the fact that our personnel costs have already been higher than we anticipated and (b) the reality that keeping the project operating for at least nine months, instead of seven as planned, will require the participants to devote more time than anticipated. While we are not producing more product than originally promised, the time involved in our work continues to increase. Both Provisional Voting and Voter ID have proved to be very dynamic topics requiring us to continually monitor developments and update our data, analysis and evolving work products as we learn of new or revised information. As a result, despite the extension of the schedule, the staff and consultants on this project have had no "down" time. We anticipate this research, monitoring and revising to continue for the months added to the project, necessitating significantly more hours by all members of the project team than anticipated.

Our request asks for changes to three line items which I will address below on the assumption that the EAC response to our already-submitted Provisional Voting draft and to-be-submitted Voter ID draft will be sufficiently timely to enable us to complete our work on both topics by the end of February.

1. Eagleton Institute of Politics personnel: We originally budgeted $110,695 ($15,813 average per month) for Eagleton faculty, staff and graduate student assistants for the seven-month project from May 24,
2005-December 31, 2005. Our actual costs have been approximately $14,500 more than that. In addition, we are anticipating needing another $21,000 for personnel costs in January and February, calculated on the basis of 2/3 of the original monthly estimate. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $110,695 to approximately $146,000.

2. Consultant Services: We originally budgeted $79,500 ($11,357 average per month) for consultant services which we have used to engage Tom O’Neill as the project manager. We anticipate no additional cost for the original contract period of May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005, but do anticipate needing his services during January and February at a slightly reduced rate of $10,125 per month or $20,250 total additional. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $79,500 to $99,750.

3. Moritz School of Law: We originally budgeted $84,744 ($12,106 average per month) for staff and overhead for the May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005 period. We anticipate needing an additional $23,171 ($11,585 average per month) to support their time on this project in January and February. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $84,744 to $107,915.

With these revisions, approximately $22,000 of the EAC contract award to Eagleton would remain not yet allocated, primarily because the cost for the public hearings would have incurred Rutgers University overhead whereas the additional expenditures for consultants and the subcontract with Moritz do not.

I hope this provides you the information you need. While Rutgers is shutting down until January 3rd, I will be checking email at least every day or two.

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> John-
> I just had a more detailed conversation with our Deputy General Counsel about Eagleton's no-cost extension.
> He indicates that we need a bit more information that will accompany the material we will send to the Commissioners for a vote (hopefully next week)
> We need to know the number of labor hours, the labor costs and a brief description of the tasks to be performed by each of the staff who will be working on the EAC contract until its completion.
> Since we have eliminated the public hearing (a major contract deliverable) it is unclear why staff labor hours and costs will continue at the same level and rate.
> As always, thanks for your patience and prompt response.
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/OBV
01/03/2006 01:13 PM
To John.Weingart@rutgers.edu
cc Bornhein@rci.rutgers.edu
bcc Raymundo Martinez/EAC/OBV@EAC; Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/OBV@EAC
Subject Re: No Cost Extension Request

Happy New Year, John-

Connie needs to provide the breakdown of staff costs starting with the November invoice which was submitted. She will need to re-submit this invoice.

For the purposes of the no-cost extension document I need the information from January forward.

I'm told that EAC senior management will be turning their attention to the Provisional Voting Best Practices document this week.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"John Weingart" <Johnwein@rci.rutgers.edu>

Karen - Turns out I could locate Connie's email though most likely she won't see mail until Tuesday: Bornheim@rci.rutgers.edu.

To clarify your phone message, do you need us to provide the number of hours for each staff person and consultant going forward from January 1st onward or going back to the start of the project?

Thanks.

> John-
> A quick request- May I get Connie Bornheimer e-mail address (again). You may recall I had an incorrect one.
> I have received the invoice for November services and cannot process it until it has the breakdown of salaries for particular personnel.
> This request is along the lines of that I have requested from you in order
to extend the contract.

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

---

John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290
John-

Attached please find a copy of a portion of the memo that is part of the paperwork related to the no-cost extension.

While I am the Contracting Officer Representative on this project, I never received your project's cost proposal, and am unable to locate a copy. Otherwise, I would have completed more of the chart.

Please, take a moment to fill in the information on the attached chart, and, if you could, have one of the Eagleton staff send me the cost proposal which originally accompanied the technical proposal.

Thanks so much.

Regards-

K
Mr. Weingart further notes:

“We anticipate reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line items and spending approximately $35,500 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,250 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants”.

**Specifics of the Extension**

The contractor has provided the following breakdown and explanation of the personnel and consultant costs, associated with this extension.

Original Project Personnel costs- $195,439 (May-December)
Original Project labor hours-xxxxx (May-December)

Projected Project Personnel costs-$253,915 (January-February)
Projected Project labor hours-xxxxx (January-February)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Projected Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eagleton Institute of Politics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$110,695</td>
<td>$146,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Projected Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moritz School of Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$84,744</td>
<td>$107,915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we speak- I'm writing up the final memo for the Chairman's signature. Things got a bit complicated since your original proposal did not provide labor hours and costs for the project staff.

Am working through this issue, however. Will keep you posted.
Commissioner Hillman has asked a follow-up question regarding the sharing of EAC’s information, on the Eagleton study on Voter ID requirements, with Tom Hicks.

I have given Sheila the following appendices for possible distribution to Tom Hicks:

1. Summary of Voter ID Requirements by State
2. Court Decisions and Literature on Voter Identification and Related Issues Court decisions
3. Annotated bibliography on Voter Identification Issues

I have not given Sheila, for distribution, these Appendices or parts of the report:

1. Analysis of Effects of Voter ID Requirements on Turnout
2. The Executive Summary and Recommendations
3. Summary of Research
4. State Statutes and Regulations Affecting Voter Identification (electronic version only)

**You'll also recall that I'm awaiting Tom's approval to send to Mike McDonald, various appendices from the Eagleton Provisional Voting report**

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Research Director  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
tel:202-566-3123
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

On May 24, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission awarded an eight month contract (December 30, 2005) in the amount of $560,002.00 to the Eagleton Institute of Politics (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures.

On November 15, 2005, John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, requested via e-mail, a no-cost extension on this contract (E4014127). Mr. Weingart has requested an extension to complete the work of this contract to February 28, 2006.

In subsequent correspondence, Mr. Weingart notes the following as the reason for the request:

"The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October, voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting, based on Eagleton's research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication.... The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report of that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid-January".

He further notes:

"If EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work....

"The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $300,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project".
Karen Lynn-Dyson, the EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative assigned to this contract has reviewed this request, the rationale and authority for it (FAR 43.103(a)(3)) and finds it to be appropriate. To-date the Eagleton Institute has consistently met its deadlines for major project deliverables and stayed within the project budget. To grant the Eagleton Institute a two month extension on this contract in order to obtain the necessary feedback on major documents it has produced will be within the best interests of the Election Assistance Commission, and thus, the federal government.

EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative finds that to grant the Eagleton Institute a no-cost extension for the modification of its contract with the EAC is within the scope of the original agreement and is recommending that this modification to the contract be made.

Signed

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Contracting Officer Representative
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Gracia Hillman
Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
Karen - Our request for a no-cost, reallocation of resources is based on (a) the fact that our personnel costs have already been higher than we anticipated and (b) the reality that keeping the project operating for at least nine months, instead of seven as planned, will require the participants to devote more time than anticipated. While we are not producing more product than originally promised, the time involved in our work continues to increase. Both Provisional Voting and Voter ID have proved to be very dynamic topics requiring us to continually monitor developments and update our data, analysis and evolving work products as we learn of new or revised information. As a result, despite the extension of the schedule, the staff and consultants on this project have had no "down" time. We anticipate this research, monitoring and revising for the months added to the project, necessitating significantly more hours by all members of the project team than anticipated.

Our request asks for changes to three line items which I will address below on the assumption that the EAC response to our already-submitted Provisional Voting draft and to-be-submitted Voter ID draft will be sufficiently timely to enable us to complete our work on both topics by the end of February.

1. Eagleton Institute of Politics personnel: We originally budgeted $110,695 ($15,813 average per month) for Eagleton faculty, staff and graduate student assistants for the seven-month project from May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005. Our actual costs have been approximately $14,500 more than that. In addition, we are anticipating needing another $21,000 for personnel costs in January and February, calculated on the basis of 2/3 of the original monthly estimate. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $110,695 to approximately $146,000.

2. Consultant Services: We originally budgeted $79,50 ($11,357 average per month) for consultant services which we have used to engage Tom O'Neill as the project manager. We anticipate no additional cost for the original contract period of May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005, but do anticipate needing his services during January and February at a slightly reduced rate of $10,125 per month or $20,250 total additional. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $79,500 to $99,750.

3. Moritz School of Law: We originally budgeted $84,744 ($12,106 average per month) for staff and overhead for the May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005 period. We anticipate needing an additional $23,171 ($11,585 average per month) to support their time on this project in January and February. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $84,744 to $107,915.

With these revisions, approximately $22,000 of the EAC contract award to Eagleton would remain not yet allocated, primarily because the cost for the public hearings would have incurred Rutgers University overhead whereas the additional expenditures for consultants and the subcontract with Moritz do not.
I hope this provides you the information you need. While Rutgers is shutting down until January 3rd, I will be checking email at least every day or two.

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> John-
> I just had a more detailed conversation with our Deputy General Counsel about Eagleton's no-cost extension.
> He indicates that we need a bit more information that will accompany the material we will send to the Commissioners for a vote (hopefully next week)
> We need to know the number of labor hours, the labor costs and a brief description of the tasks to be performed by each of the staff who will be working on the EAC contract until its completion.
> Since we have eliminated the public hearing (a major contract deliverable) it is unclear why staff labor hours and costs will continue at the same level and rate.
> As always, thanks for your patience and prompt response.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen - At this time, we anticipate reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line item and spending approximately $35,500 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,250 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants. There are other additional variances but they are not significant (e.g. less on honoraria, less on travel, and more on general operations such as phone expenses). Let me know if you need additional detail or information.

Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> > John-
> >
> > Quick question-
> >
> > How much money do you anticipate will be re-allocated from the original line items outlined in the contract to other project costs?
> >
> > Thanks
> >
> > Karen Lynn-Dyson
> > Research Manager
> > U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> > Washington, DC 20005
> > tel:202-566-3123
> >
> >
> > **"John Weingart" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>**
> >
> > 11/30/2005 05:05 PM
> > Please respond to
> > john.weingart@rutgers.edu
> >
> > To
> > 
> > "Karen Lynn-Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
> >
> > cc
"Tom O'Neil"

Subject Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Karen - There were two typos on the copy I just sent. Please use the attached instead. To minimize confusion, I dated this document December 1st (the first one says November 30). Thanks, John

--
John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Karen - I am writing to summarize our phone conversation initiated by me yesterday in response to receipt of Tom Wilkey's June 29th letter. To close out the contract, we will do the following:

1. Prepare separate monthly reports for April, May and June which each briefly summarize our activities under the contract during that month. These reports, which will not include financial information, will be sent to you by email no later than July 24th.

2. Submit a final invoice for the project no later than September 16th, which is 75 days from the close of the contract rather than the 30 days specified in the June 29th letter. I am attaching our previously-submitted "December 1, 2005 Request for a No-Cost Extension" which noted, at the bottom of page 1, the need for a 75-day closeout period.

3. In my January 13, 2006 letter regarding our No-Cost Extension through February 28th (also attached), I had indicated that we expected to have a closing balance of approximately $10,000. As we discussed yesterday, you appreciate that, with the subsequent No-Cost Extension through June 30th, we have spent the entire contract amount, and you expect us to submit invoices accordingly that will document our use of all remaining funds from the $560,002 contract award.

Please let me know if I have left out any remaining tasks or you have a different interpretation of them. I trust you have by now received all our final work products that were FedExed to you late last week.

Thanks,

John

--
John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Karen - Attached should be the May Progress Report, completing your collection. I hope they are all now present and accounted for. Sorry for the confusion.

John

Karen - I am attaching our final monthly Progress Reports for April, May and June 2006. Please confirm that they have arrived safely, and let me know if they meet the EAC's needs. Thanks, John

John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290

John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290
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INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes our progress from May 1, 2006 through May 31, 2006. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks and progress made.

This Monthly Progress Report is divided into 3 sections: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, and Project Management. Each section references specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract. The Financial Report will be sent separately by the Rutgers Division of Grant and Contract Accounting. Please direct questions or comments about this report to john.weingart@rutgers.edu or by telephone at (732) 932-9384, ext. 290.

PROVISIONAL VOTING

We prepared and delivered a briefing on provisional voting to EAC Advisory Boards on May 23 and 24. We continued revising the provisional voting analysis based on comments made by the Advisory Boards.

VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

We continued to review and revise the voter identification requirement analysis. We also completed a new statistical analysis in response to Peer Review Group comments.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Collecting and merging information and data from myriad sources is a demanding requirement of this research. We have developed two principal mechanisms to facilitate the analysis of the material collected or created in the project: an information system and an internal website for easy access to drafts and reports.
INFORMATION SYSTEM

Description: The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law is being merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which will include a compendium of case law and statutes regarding Provisional Voting and voter identification.

Projections: The entire project team continues to use the Information System which contains the above referenced research, in working toward the preparation for our final reports to the EAC.

INTRANET

Description: All project team members have signed on to the Intranet site, and regularly post drafts, completed materials and spreadsheets online for internal review. The Intranet facilitates the exchange of information and collaboration among project participants.

FINANCIAL REPORT

The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. The contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, (973) 353-6466, dbornhe@rutgers.edu. A combined final invoice will be submitted by September 15, 2006.
Here, I hope, is the April Progress Report that I gather was not attached to my previous email. I will send the May report shortly. - John

> Karen - I am attaching our final monthly Progress Reports for April, May and June 2006. Please confirm that they have arrived safely, and let me know if they meet the EAC's needs. Thanks, John

John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics

John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
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INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes our progress from April 1, 2006 through April 30, 2006. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks and progress made.

This Monthly Progress Report is divided into 3 sections: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, and Project Management. Each section references specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract. The Financial Report will be sent separately by the Rutgers Division of Grant and Contract Accounting. Please direct questions or comments about this report to john.weingart@rutgers.edu or by telephone at [number redacted].

PROVISIONAL VOTING

We completed preparing a briefing on Provisional Voting for presentation to EAC on April 3. Comments made by the Peer Review Group were taken into account in the briefing development.

VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

We briefed the EAC in Washington on April 3 regarding our Provisional Voting report and the analysis of Voter Identification Requirements. Subsequent to this briefing and to a meeting with Peer Review Group, we have made revisions to the Voter Identification analysis.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Collecting and merging information and data from myriad sources is a demanding requirement of this research. We have developed two principal mechanisms to facilitate the analysis of the material collected or created in the project: an information system and an
internal website for easy access to drafts and reports. We have also continued weekly team-conference calls among at least lead project staff at Eagleton and Moritz.

**INFORMATION SYSTEM**

**Description:** The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law is being merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which will include a compendium of case law and statutes regarding Provisional Voting and voter identification.

**Projections:** The entire project team continues to use the Information System which contains the above referenced research, in working toward the preparation for our final reports to the EAC.

**INTRANET**

**Description:** All project team members have signed on to the Intranet site, and regularly post drafts, completed materials and spreadsheets online for internal review. The Intranet facilitates the exchange of information and collaboration among project participants.

**FINANCIAL REPORT**

The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. The contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, [contact information]. In May, DGCA submitted an invoice for the period from March 1, 2006 to April 30, 2006.
Karen - I am attaching our final monthly Progress Reports for April, May and June 2006. Please confirm that they have arrived safely, and let me know if they meet the EAC's needs. Thanks, John

John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
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INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes our progress from June 1, 2006 through June 30, 2006. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks and progress made.

This Monthly Progress Report is divided into 3 sections: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, and Project Management. Each section references specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract. The Financial Report will be sent separately by the Rutgers Division of Grant and Contract Accounting. Please direct questions or comments about this report to john.weingart@rutgers.edu or by telephone at

PROVISIONAL VOTING

Revision of Provisional Voting report continued. We participated in a teleconference on June 6 with EAC on Provisional Voting and Voter ID issues. The final Provisional Voting report was completed. It was submitted to EAC with appendices and supplementary materials on June 28, 2006. This concluded our contract with EAC.

VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

We completed the final Voter ID report and submitted it to EAC with appendices and supplementary materials on June 28, 2006. This was our final work product required under our contract with the EAC.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

As we have completed and submitted our final work products to the EAC, the project team has continued to communicate via frequent conference calls and group emails.
INFORMATION SYSTEM

Description: The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law was merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which includes a compendium of case law and statutes regarding Provisional Voting and voter identification.

FINANCIAL REPORT

The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. The contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, A combined final invoice will be submitted by September 15, 2006.
Guess we better agree on the contents of the letter to Eagleton SOON

Thomas R. Wilkey
Executive Director
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3109 phone
TWilkey@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV on 08/28/2006 09:37 AM -----

"Michael McDonald"
<mmcdon@gmu.edu>
08/28/2006 09:25 AM

To aambrogi@eac.gov, twilkey@eac.gov
cc "Daniel Tokaji" <tokaji.1@osu.edu>
Subject Data request from provisional ballot report

Tom and Adam,

Attached are two papers from Rutgers that appear to use data drawn from the EAC's grant to Rutgers and Ohio State for reports on provisional balloting (from a paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Conference in April) and voter identification (from a paper to be presented at the upcoming American Political Science Association Conference this week). My check of the EAC's website this morning shows that these EAC commissioned reports have not been publicly released.

My requests for the basic legal data contained in these reports' appendices have been refused. It is unfair that Rutgers researchers are allowed to publish scholarly work from this data while it is being held-by the EAC. When I worked on the Election Day Survey; at the EAC's direction, Kim Brace and I did not publish or make these data publicly available until our report was publicly released. Either the same standard must apply to all persons working under EAC grants or, if a new policy is in place, I would request again that these data be released to me for my research on provisional balloting. If not, it gives the appearance and has the effect that the data are being withheld so that Rutgers scholars can publish their EAC subsidized research in scholarly outlets before others like myself have a chance to do so.

Best regards,

-Mike

Dr. Michael P. McDonald
Assistant Professor, George Mason University
Visiting Fellow, Brookings Institution
Hincheny Statement on U.S. Election Assistance Commission's
Release of Report on Voter Identification Issues

Washington, DC - Congressman Maurice Hincheny (D-NY) today released the following report in response to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission's (EAC) release of a report on voter identification issues that was submitted to them by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics, and Ohio State University's Moritz College of Law. Hincheny directly requested the release of the report when EAC Chairwoman Donetta Davidson appeared earlier this month before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services, of which the congressman is a member. Davidson told Hincheny at the hearing that she would provide the subcommittee with the report that is being released to the public today. Hincheny also requested the release of a separate report on voter fraud and intimidation. The Help America Vote Act (HAVA) requires the EAC to conduct and make available to the public studies regarding certain voting issues.

"I am very pleased that following Chairwoman Davidson's appearances before Congress the EAC decided to do the right thing and make public the Eagleton Institute of Politics study on voter identification issues. I hope that this decision signals a new day of transparency and sets a precedent for all future and previous studies and reports submitted to the EAC.

"When Chairwoman Davidson came before our subcommittee a few weeks ago, I also requested that the EAC make public another report about voter fraud and voter intimidation submitted to them by two outside consultants. It is my hope they will release this report to the public as well. The EAC has the responsibility to keep the public informed on any findings it has with regards to voter fraud, intimidation, and any other electoral issues.

"As we work to increase voter turnout and make our democracy function more effectively, it is imperative that potential voters are assured that they will be able to cast their votes fairly and in an environment free of intimidation. To achieve that goal, the EAC must be open with the information it receives in order to help identify voting problems and make recommendations on fixing them."
Dear all,

I wonder how many more requests like this are waiting in the wings? Is there any way we can anticipate these requests? How many reports are completed and outstanding? May I request a briefing?

Thanks.

RER

----- Original Message -----  
From: Gavin S. Gilmour
Sent: 04/17/2007 05:27 PM EDT
To: Donnetta Davidson; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Rosemary Rodriguez; Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Sheila Banks; Juliet Hodgkins; Elieen Kuala; Jeannie Layson; Karen Lynn-Dyson; fms.eacfabre@yahoo.com
Subject: FYI--Letter from Serrano

All,

Today we received a faxed copy of a letter signed by Jose Serrano as Chair of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee. The Chairman urges the EAC to publicly release the full draft version of the Provisional Voting report prepared by Eagleton. The letter states that the Congressman was pleased with our decision to engage our Inspector General and to release the draft version of the Voter ID study (though he was disappointed that we did not adopt it).

Chairman stated in his letter that if we do not decide to release the draft report, he would like an update regarding the study’s status, time line for release and a statement regarding why the EAC would deviate from the “precedent” it has now set in releasing draft studies.

It is my understanding that this report was made public at the Board of Advisor and Standards Board meetings in May 2006. I do not know if any changes were made to the document after that time. Perhaps Karen can provide additional information regarding this concern. It is also my understanding that this document has been released to third parties upon request under FOIA. Additionally, I believe a best practices document was created by the EAC based on the research. That document is on our website. Also, Stephanie informed me (and Karen confirmed) that the study is posted on Eagleton’s website.

A copy of Serrano’s letter is attached.

GG

[attachment "Serrano Letter.pdf" deleted by Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV]

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
All,

Today we received a faxed copy of a letter signed by Jose Serrano as Chair of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee. The Chairman urges the EAC to publicly release the full draft version of the Provisional Voting report prepared by Eagleton. The letter states that the Congressman was pleased with our decision to engage our Inspector General and to release the draft version of the Voter ID study (though he was disappointed that we did not adopt it).

Chairman stated in his letter that if we do not decide to release the draft report, he would like an update regarding the study’s status, time line for release and a statement regarding why the EAC would deviate from the “precedent” it has now set in releasing draft studies.

It is my understanding that this report was made public at the Board of Advisor and Standards Board meetings in May 2006. I do not know if any changes were made to the document after that time. Perhaps Karen can provide additional information regarding this concern. It is also my understanding that this document has been released to third parties upon request under FOIA. Additionally, I believe a best practices document was created by the EAC based on the research. That document is on our website. Also, Stephanie informed me (and Karen confirmed) that the study is posted on Eagleton’s website.

A copy of Serrano’s letter is attached.

GG

Serrano Letter.pdf

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

THIS MESSAGE IS FOR ITS INTENDED RECIPIENT ONLY. IT IS A PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED TO A THIRD PARTY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SENDER.
Thanks, Karen . . . am very interested in any future projects you have (well, most, I'm sure . . . ).

Jan

Quoting klynndyson@eac.gov:

> Dr. Leighley-
> On behalf of the EAC our sincere thanks for your willingness to review the Eagleton paper on Voter Identification. You insights and critique were extremely helpful and provided our agency with just the type of input which was needed.
> I'm please to know of your work and hope that I may be able to call upon your expertise at some point in the near future.
> Regards-
> Karen
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
Hi,

I'm trying to access the conference call but the system says it's full. I will keep trying for a few minutes.

Perhaps this is a problem because I was given two different times for conference calls?

I am currently at [censored] and [censored] if anyone is able to respond.

Jan
That's fine--but I spoke to Aletha a couple hours ago and she said it was at 11.
I will go with 11:30 unless I hear otherwise.

Jan

Quoting klynndyson@eac.gov:

> Greetings-
> Please note that Thursday's call is at 11:30 EDT.
> Thanks
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
>
> Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
> 05/09/2006 09:54 AM
> To
> berinsky@mit.edu, leighley@email.arizona.edu, jonathan.nagler@nyu.edu,
> tom_oneill@verizon.net
> cc
> Aletha Barrington/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV@EAC
> Subject
> Materials for Thursday's 11:30 conference call
>
> All-
> Attached please find the complete packet of materials that will serve as the basis for our conference call on Thursday. You have already received the statistical analysis; the voter ID report was submitted this morning.
> The Eagleton staff have noted that you may find the material contained in Appendix A useful to your review; the other appendices are likely to be less germane.
> The call in information for Thursday:
Thank you again for your assistance.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson

Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen,

I got a response back from everyone but Jay Leighley about their availability for the conference call, do you have a contact number for him?

Aletha Barrington  
Contracts Assistant  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
(202) 566-2209 (office)  
(202) 566-3128 (fax)

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV  
05/08/2006 03:12 PM  
Subject  Verification that Voter ID paper was received

I assume you got verification from Jonathan Nagler, Adam Berinsky and Jan Leighley that they received the paper last Friday.

Also assume you will have a conference call in number to them and to Tom O'Neil by tomorrow, latest.

Thanks

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Research Manager  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
tel:202-566-3123
Good morning Tanisha,

To my understanding Dr. Nagler is out of the office today and I have been informed to contact you with any information for him. I am attaching a copy of the Revised Voter ID Analysis. Will you please see that he receives it today? If you have any questions regarding this document feel free to contact me.

Thanks!

Aletha Barrington
Contracts Assistant
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202) 566-2209 (office)
(202) 566-3128 (fax)

VoterIDAnalysis VerCRev0504.doc
Karen,

Attached is Tim Vercellotti's Voter ID analysis revised to use Citizen Voting Age population as the base for turnout calculations and to take account of comments or issues raised by the EAC and our Peer Review Group. This draft is for distribution to the reviewers who will meet by teleconference on May 11, at, we understand, 11:30 a.m.

You are receiving this at the same time that it is being distributed to the Eagleton-Moritz team so that the new reviewers will have a week to prepare for our conversation on the 11th. Early next week you will receive a revised summary paper on Voter ID that incorporates the new data and findings in Tim's revised analysis. That too will be for distribution to the new reviewers.

Tom O'Neill
Good afternoon everyone,

This is to inform you of a time set-up for the conference call on May 11, 2006 regarding Eagleton Institute/Voter Identification Research Project: it will be at 11:30 am, if everyone is available for this time then its a go, if not please contact me at your earliest convenience.

Thanks!

Aletha Barrington
Contracts Assistant
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202) 566-2209 (office)
(202) 566-3128 (fax)
I just got your phone message. I will still do the review, but I should note that I won't be able to do a full 90 minute phone call on the 11th -- perhaps we could schedule 30 minutes or so for me to be on the phone call.

At 05:36 PM 5/1/2006, you wrote:

Dr. Berinsky-

On behalf of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), thank you in advance for agreeing to assist us with the review of research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics on voter identification. By Friday, May 5, 2006, you will receive, in electronic form, the research paper and relevant data analysis which supports the paper's findings. Through this independent review by a small group of experts familiar with elections data and research we are seeking feedback on:

- The research methodology which was used to support the paper's conclusions
- The specific statistical applications which were used to analyze the data and arrive at various conclusions

If there are alternate methodological and statistical approaches to analyzing the data on voter identification, and if there is other data on voter identification that you think should have been included in the analysis, please be certain to note this in your comments.

On May 11, 2006 EAC will conduct a 60-90 minute phone call with key Eagleton Institute staff responsible for the research, members of Eagleton's peer review group and the EAC-identified reviewers who have been asked to consider the research. Through this dialogue EAC hopes to gather varying perspectives and insights on the research strategies and methods that were employed by Eagleton. As a result of this conversation, EAC anticipates that some revisions will be made to the Eagleton research paper. This paper is scheduled to be presented to EAC's Board of Advisors and Standards Boards in late May.

While we are unable to offer financial compensation for your review of this research we greatly appreciate your willingness to assist us with this important task. We believe that the research findings we will provide on voter identification are important and will most certainly be enhanced by your insights and expertise.
Sincerely,

Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Research Director  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
tel: 202-566-3123

Adam J. Berinsky  
Associate Professor  
Department of Political Science  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
77 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02139 E53-459  
Tel: (617) 253-8190  
Fax: (617) 258-6164  
E-mail: berinsky@mit.edu  
Karen,

Do you have a time for the May 11 teleconference? We're working to arrange the participation of members of our Peer Review Group and that is the key missing piece of information.

Thanks,

Tom O'Neill
I am concerned about the statement that EAC policy precludes us paying them. It is an issue of correctly soliciting and entering into a contract for the procurement of services. Perhaps there is a better way to phrase this, or is it even necessary.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Tom and Julie-
Please take a look at this draft e-mail and let me know if it captures all that it needs to.

Would like to get this out ASAP- appreciate your feedback.

Dear Jonathan Nagler
Dear Jan Leighley
Dear Adam Berinsky

On behalf of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), thank you in advance for agreeing to assist us with the review of research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics on voter identification. By Friday, May 5, 2006, you will receive, in electronic form, the research paper and relevant data analysis which supports the paper's findings. Through this independent review by a small group of experts familiar with elections data and research we are seeking feedback on:

- The research methodology which was used to support the paper's conclusions
- The specific statistical applications which were used to analyze the data and arrive at various conclusions
If there are alternate methodological and statistical approaches to analyzing the data on voter identification, and if there is other data on voter identification that you think should have been included in the analysis, please be certain to note this in your comments.

On May 11, 2006 EAC will conduct a 60-90 minute phone call with key Eagleton Institute staff responsible for the research, members of Eagleton’s peer review group and the EAC-identified reviewers who have been asked to consider the research. Through this dialogue EAC hopes to gather varying perspectives and insights on the research strategies and methods that were employed by Eagleton. As a result of this conversation, EAC anticipates that some revisions will be made to the Eagleton research paper. This paper is scheduled to be presented to EAC’s Board of Advisors and Standards Boards in late May.

While EAC agency policy does not allow us to provide you with financial compensation for your review of this research we greatly appreciate your willingness to assist us with this important task. We believe that the research findings we will provide on voter identification are important and will most certainly be enhanced by your insights and expertise.

Sincerely,

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Then we are good to go good

-------------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 05/01/2006 03:03 PM
To: Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Juliet Thompson-Hodgkins 
Subject: Re: E-mail to Voter ID peer reviewers

It's my understanding that Julie thinks we are "good to go" as long as we don't pay them.

Correct?

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

Did we resolve the contact issues on this?

-------------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 05/01/2006 02:58 PM
To: Thomas Wilkey; Juliet Thompson-Hodgkins
Subject: E-mail to Voter ID peer reviewers

Tom and Julie-

Please take a look at this draft e-mail and let me know if it captures all that it needs to.
Would like to get this out ASAP - appreciate your feedback.

Dear Jonathan Nagler
Dear Jan Leighley
Dear Adam Berinsky

On behalf of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), thank you in advance for agreeing to assist us with the review of research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics on voter identification. By Friday, May 5, 2006, you will receive, in electronic form, the research paper and relevant data analysis which supports the paper’s findings. Through this independent review by a small group of experts familiar with elections data and research we are seeking feedback on:

- The research methodology which was used to support the paper’s conclusions
- The specific statistical applications which were used to analyze the data and arrive at various conclusions

If there are alternate methodological and statistical approaches to analyzing the data on voter identification, and if there is other data on voter identification that you think should have been included in the analysis, please be certain to note this in your comments.

On May 11, 2006 EAC will conduct a 60-90 minute phone call with key Eagleton Institute staff responsible for the research, members of Eagleton’s peer review group and the EAC-identified reviewers who have been asked to consider the research. Through this dialogue EAC hopes to gather varying perspectives and insights on the research strategies and methods that were employed by Eagleton. As a result of this conversation, EAC anticipates that some revisions will be made to the Eagleton research paper. This paper is scheduled to be presented to EAC’s Board of Advisors and Standards Boards in late May.

While EAC agency policy does not allow us to provide you with financial compensation for your review of this research we greatly appreciate your willingness to assist us with this important task. We believe that the research findings we will provide on voter identification are important and will most certainly be enhanced by your insights and expertise.

Sincerely,
As long as we don’t pay them, there is no contract issue.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Hi -- nice to meet you in person, finally!

And thanks for inviting me to your gathering, I enjoyed it and hope I was helpful. Of course, any time you want anything, you do know where to track me down.

As to the potential reviewers of the Eagleton Voter ID study, here are my suggestions, in order:
Jonathan Nagler, New York University
Jan Leighley, University of Arizona
Ben Highton, UC-Davis
Adam Berinsky, MIT
Bernard Grofman, UC-Irvine

All have worked with the CPS turnout/registration data, and are very familiar with this research literature.

If these don't work, or you want more recommendations, let me know.

--

R. Michael Alvarez
626-395-4089
Professor of Political Science
626-405-9841
Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, CA 91125
rma@hss.caltech.edu

Contributor to Election Updates,
http://electionupdates.caltech.edu/blog.html
Karen,

Glad the paper arrived. Sorry it was a bit later than promised, but we reworked the statistical analysis on the basis of some insightful suggestions by the Peer Review Group...that took a few extra days (and nights). Looking back at my email to you, I realize the full statistical analysis was not attached as it should have been. It is appendix to the paper that will be of interest to those who want the details of our methodology. It is attached to this email.

I will be away, without access to email, until late Monday afternoon, but if you need to, you can reach me by cell phone at...

Tom O'Neill
is there a working group for the provisional voting/voter id project?

Amie J. Sherrill
Special Assistant to Chairman Paul S. DeGregorio
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566 3106
Tim O'Rourke, Dean of the Fulton School of Liberal Arts at Salisbury University in Maryland, has agreed to serve on the Peer Review Committee.

Tom O'Neill
Karen:

I received the fax and will pass it around the team. Thanks,

Tom O'Neill
Karen,

I haven't received the fax about the potential new recruit for the Peer Review Group that you mentioned to me yesterday.

We have now completed the materials to be distributed to those attending the meeting at the EAC on September 6. You will receive a hard copy of all the material by express delivery tomorrow. The most important material to get to those attending in advance is the document with the answers to the 6 questions about topics of special interest on provisional voting outlined in our contract. The bulk of the material is backup to this summary report.

Tom O'Neill
Karen,

I have reviewed the Eagleton Peer Review Group recruitment list that you recently provided. Based on what I or Arnie can determine from the bio's provided or an Internet search, it appears that at least 4 of the 7 people who have said yes to be on the group seem to have a liberal perspective, or have had a history of working on that side of the political spectrum. I could only identify one as being a Republican, and a moderate one at that (Verniero). Mike Alvarez has conducted a lot of research into election issues and generally seems to do it in a neutral way. I have been unable to obtain a bio or background information on Tim Storey, who is not an academic. The only person that I could identify on their list as being conservative was Brad Clark, who has declined to participate.

Therefore, based on this information regarding the Peer Review Group, I am not satisfied that they will provide Eagleton with the balanced review that I thought they would receive from such a group. I would urge you to ask them to seek the input of more conservative academics so that whatever study we receive from them will have the benefit of a balanced review. I am going to have Arnie provide you with the background sheet on Professor Tim O'Rourke of Salisbury University in Maryland, whom they may want to consider for this panel. We have some calls into others who could suggest some conservative academics for this review panel.

Thanks.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdeggregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
I only got the original email on the September 6th meeting. Was this meeting confirmed by the Commissioners?

Amie J. Sherrill
Special Assistant to Vice Chairman Paul S. DeGregorio
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC  20005
(202) 566 3106

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
08/19/2005 03:41 PM
To  "Tom O'neill" @GSAEXTERNAL
cc
Subject  Re: Peer Review Group

Tom-

Thank you for sharing this list of your Peer Review Group members, to-date. I will share this list with the Commissioners and will be certain to let your know of their feedback, if any.

I will also be back in touch regarding Eagleton's research around voter fraud and the research project EAC will be undertaking, this fall, around voting fraud and voter intimidation. The EAC is presently in the process of finalizing a work and staff plan for this project and once it is completed, I will be certain to brief you on it.

In the meantime, EAC staff and several of the Commissioners looks forward to meeting with the Eagleton/Moritz team on September 6 at 1:30 PM.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Tom O'neill" <...>

"Tom O'neill"
08/19/2005 02:20 PM
To  klynndyson@eac.gov
cc
Subject: Peer Review Group

Karen,

Attached is a report on the status of recruitment of members of the Peer Review Group. We extended 9 invitations. We have four confirmed members, one reluctant turn-down, one who has yet to respond to an initial inquiry, and are awaiting confirmation from 3 others who initially agreed. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Tom O'Neill

RecruitmentStatus.doc
Karen,

Attached is a report on the status of recruitment of members of the Peer Review Group. We extended 9 invitations. We have four confirmed members, one reluctant turn-down, one who has yet to respond to an initial inquiry, and are awaiting confirmation from 3 others who initially agreed. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Tom O'Neill

RecruitmentStatus.doc
STATUS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP RECRUITMENT
(As of August 17, 2005)

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.  YES/CONFIRMED
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology

Guy-Uriel Charles  YES
Associate Professor, School of Law
University of Minnesota
612-626-9154

Brad Clark  NO
Professor of Law
George Washington University School of Law

Pamela Susan Karlan  YES
Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law
Stanford Law School
650-725-4851

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.  YES/CONFIRMED
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu

Daniel H. Lowenstein  YES
Professor of Law
UCLA
310-825-4841

John F. Manning  NO RESPONSE
Professor
Harvard Law School

Tim Storey  YES/CONFIRMED
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures

Peter G. Verniero, Esq.  YES/CONFIRMED
Counsel
Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
(Former NJ Attorney General and Supreme Court Justice)
Tom: Please put this on the agenda for discussion when we get together on Friday in Denver.

--------

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Paul DeGregorio

From: Paul DeGregorio
Sent: 08/19/2005 11:06 AM
To: Gracia Hillman; Raymundo Martinez; Donetta Davison; twilkey@nycap.rr.com; Juliet Thompson; Karen Lynn-Dyson; Carol Paquette
Subject: Eagleton

In his note regarding the Eagleton contract, Hans has raised some of the same concerns I raised from the beginning of any discussions I had regarding this contract with our staff, and at our first formal meeting with Eagleton. In reviewing their work product from time to time, I continue to have concerns about a lack of balanced input and have repeatedly voiced them with staff and with Eagleton. I did this when the initial peer review group was proposed and again during their presentation at our meeting in Pasadena (the outreach slide in their public presentation showed outreach to seven groups, of which only one could be considered conservative-leaning). Now, as I have just had the opportunity to read their July progress report, it appears that Eagleton seems to be going into a larger analysis of the voter fraud issue than was authorized in the contract. My suspicion is that Dan Tokaji is injecting his views into this to dismiss or diminish the concerns some people may have about voter fraud. I could be wrong, but his previous writings lead me to believe otherwise.

I only found one mention of voter fraud in the contract with Eagleton. It is in Section 3.5 regarding provisional voting, where it discusses "minimizing opportunity for voter fraud." Yet, on page 4 of the July progress report from Eagleton, in describing their work plan for the next month it states: "we will expand upon vote fraud research and examine further the relationship between instances of vote fraud and ensuing election reforms." This clearly seems to be going beyond the mandate we gave them as I thought they were going to be looking at voter fraud relating to provisional voting (as the contract calls for), not voter fraud as it relates to election reforms. While voter fraud was never mentioned in the contract regarding the voter ID issue, page 5 of their July report indicates that their narratives "will include an appraisal of the prevalence and nature of vote fraud." In addition to this, page 6 describes a look into the "relationship between voter ID regime and vote fraud."

Voter fraud is clearly an issue that is perceived differently from the Right and from the Left. I have struggled with determining what a clear definition of voter fraud is myself, and therefore want to obtain various perspectives and good analysis on this issue before I formulate a solid conclusion in my mind. It has been my understanding all along that the whole voter fraud/voter intimidation issue is going to studied by the EAC using a balanced group of consultants—not Eagleton and Moritz, who are likely to focus on just on the number of prosecutions of voter fraud, rather than the complaints made or the fact that many election officials are frustrated that some prosecutors don't take their complaints about voter fraud seriously. I am not convinced at this point that we will get a balanced and objective study from Eagleton/Moritz on voter fraud. I am puzzled on why they seem to be expending a significant portion of their time on this and would want to know if we somehow authorized them to do more research into the voter fraud issue.

On page 7 of their July report Eagleton indicates that communications with the EAC on the Peer Review
Group "were not clear or timely." I would like to know what this refers to. Also, I may have missed it, but I do not recall seeing the final list of who is serving as the Peer Review group.

The August 15th copy of the July report that I received from Karen did not include the attachment of the financial report of expenses incurred. I would like to see that attachment.

Outside of our NIST work, this contract represents our largest single outside expenditure of our operational funds. Any single expenditure of $500,000+ needs to be closely monitored. I, for one, am not going to sign off on any report that appears to have been written from a biased viewpoint, especially one that doesn't appear to be interested in hearing from conservative organizations or right-leaning researchers, or seems to minimize any input from them. I've already had questions from congressional staff and others on why we picked Eagleton and Moritz, as they are perceived by some as biased against Republicans. I assured the critics that we have insisted all along on an objective study from Eagleton. An unbalanced or biased study from them will not only hurt my credibility, but also that of the EAC. I'm not suggesting that we stop their work, but I do want Tom and Julie to inform them in no uncertain terms that we will not accept a report that does not seriously consider all viewpoints on provisional voting and the voter ID issue, and that any study or interpretations they present to us reflect a diversity of opinions on these subjects. We also need for staff to determine whether their considerable work into the voter fraud area is authorized in the contract. We should not be paying for and receiving work we did not authorize.

The contract clearly calls for "alternative approaches" on voter ID requirements and "alternatives" on provisional voting. I agreed to support this contract to Eagleton because I was assured that we would receive a variety of approaches from their work, and not just those from a liberal perspective.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
In his note regarding the Eagleton contract, Hans has raised some of the same concerns I raised from the beginning of any discussions I had regarding this contract with our staff, and at our first formal meeting with Eagleton. In reviewing their work product from time to time, I continue to have concerns about a lack of balanced input and have repeatedly voiced them with staff and with Eagleton. I did this when the initial peer review group was proposed and again during their presentation at our meeting in Pasadena (the outreach slide in their public presentation showed outreach to seven groups, of which only one could be considered conservative-leaning). Now, as I have just had the opportunity to read their July progress report, it appears that Eagleton seems to be going into a larger analysis of the voter fraud issue than was authorized in the contract. My suspicion is that Dan Tokaji is injecting his views into this to dismiss or diminish the concerns some people may have about voter fraud. I could be wrong, but his previous writings lead me to believe otherwise.

I only found one mention of voter fraud in the contract with Eagleton. It is in Section 3.5 regarding provisional voting, where it discusses "minimizing opportunity for voter fraud." Yet, on page 4 of the July progress report from Eagleton, in describing their work plan for the next month it states: "we will expand upon vote fraud research and examine further the relationship between instances of vote fraud and ensuing election reforms." This clearly seems to be going beyond the mandate we gave them as I thought they were going to be looking at voter fraud relating to provisional voting (as the contract calls for), not voter fraud as it relates to election reforms. While voter fraud was never mentioned in the contract regarding the voter ID issue, page 5 of their July report indicates that their narratives "will include an appraisal of the prevalence and nature of vote fraud." In addition to this, page 6 describes a look into the "relationship between voter ID regime and vote fraud."

Voter fraud is clearly an issue that is perceived differently from the Right and from the Left. I have struggled with determining what a clear definition of voter fraud is myself, and therefore want to obtain various perspectives and good analysis on this issue before I formulate a solid conclusion in my mind. It has been my understanding all along that the whole voter fraud/voter intimidation issue is going to be studied by the EAC using a balanced group of consultants—not Eagleton and Moritz, who are likely to focus on just the number of prosecutions of voter fraud, rather than the complaints made or the fact that many election officials are frustrated that some prosecutors don’t take their complaints about voter fraud seriously. I am not convinced at this point that we will get a balanced and objective study from Eagleton/Moritz on voter fraud. I am puzzled on why they seem to be expending a significant portion of their time on this and would want to know if we somehow authorized them to do more research into the voter fraud issue.

On page 7 of their July report Eagleton indicates that communications with the EAC on the Peer Review Group were not clear or timely." I would like to know what this refers to. Also, I may have missed it, but I do not recall seeing the final list of who is serving as the Peer Review group.

The August 15th copy of the July report that I received from Karen did not include the attachment of the financial report of expenses incurred. I would like to see that attachment.

Outside of our NIST work, this contract represents our largest single outside expenditure of our operational funds. Any single expenditure of $500,000+ needs to be closely monitored. I, for one, am not going to sign off on any report that appears to have been written from a biased viewpoint, especially one that doesn’t appear to be interested in hearing from conservative organizations or right-leaning researchers, or seems to minimize any input from them. I’ve already had questions from congressional staff and others on why we picked Eagleton and Moritz, as they are perceived by some as biased against...
Republicans. I assured the critics that we have insisted all along on an objective study from Eagleton. An unbalanced or biased study from them will not only hurt my credibility, but also that of the EAC. I'm not suggesting that we stop their work, but I do want Tom and Julie to inform them in no uncertain terms that we will not accept a report that does not seriously consider all viewpoints on provisional voting and the voter ID issue, and that any study or interpretations they present to us reflect a diversity of opinions on these subjects. We also need for staff to determine whether their considerable work into the voter fraud area is authorized in the contract. We should not be paying for and receiving work we did not authorize.

The contract clearly calls for "alternative approaches" on voter ID requirements and "alternatives" on provisional voting. I agreed to support this contract to Eagleton because I was assured that we would receive a variety of approaches from their work, and not just those from a liberal perspective.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
Karen:

As we discussed on Tuesday morning in the teleconference, we would like to reallocate within the current budget $9,500 to the survey of local election officials. This will raise the budget for the survey to $24,500 from $15,000.

The additional funding will permit us to double the sample of local election officials from 200 to 400. The larger sample will allow more detailed comparisons between the experience of local election officials in states that offered some form of provisional ballot before HAVA and those that did not. This comparison is a topic of special interest identified in the contract.

The increase of $9,500 is based on an estimate made by SRBI, the contractor that will actually administer the interviews. I can furnish you with a copy of the estimate if you like. We believe the additional funds will improve significantly our ability to provide relevant analysis to EAC on this important issue.

Tom O’Neill
Tom-

I will be back to you early next week with EAC's feedback on this.

Our initial reaction is that the group needs to include some local and/or state-level election officials, who have first-hand experience with these issues.

We will get you additional names and reactions by mid-week next week.

Thanks

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen,

As you probably recall, one of the features of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group to look over our findings, conclusions and draft reports before we prepare final drafts for the EAC's review. The EAC asked that before recruiting members of the PRG we submit names for EAC's review. The aim, course, is to assemble a panel that is experienced, informed, and balanced.

Attached is a list of potential PRG members drawn from academia, the law, and non-profit organizations with interests in this area. Please look it over.
Thank you, Karen.

Tom

Tom O'Neill

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2005 11:05 AM
To: t
Cc: cpauette@eac.gov; twilkey@eac.gov
Subject: RE: Peer Review Group

Tom-

I will take up the matter of next steps with the Peer Review Group, with Tom Wilkey, the EAC Executive Director ASAP.

I will have an answer regarding the EAC's suggested next steps on how to proceed on this matter as quickly as possible.

Regards-

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Carol,

I sent you the email on the Peer Review Group because you asked me to. When we discussed the issue in New York, you told me to send to you in writing our response to the Commission's suggestions for a new, more elaborate review process. I believe I copied Karen on that email.

Learning now, almost a week later, that you have taken no action is disheartening. As you know, our schedule is tight, and we need the counsel the Peer Review Group can provide. I hope, therefore, that Karen will take immediate action to resolve the situation so we can begin to recruit the review group in time to assure the quality of the resource design.

Tom O'Neill
Karen, Tom -

I am not taking any action on the email Tom sent a few days ago regarding the Peer Review Group because the Eagleton project is not my responsibility. As I indicated earlier to Karen, I didn't know why this was sent to me since Karen is the Project Manager. I endorse her comment below regarding the need for including her in all correspondence with anyone at the EAC regarding the project.

When I was the Interim Executive Director it was part of my job to stay on top of all EAC project work. I now have other responsibilities at the EAC, and while I am happy to continue involvement in other projects for continuity and transition purposes as needed, that needs to be very limited. My involvement with the Eagleton work has only been from the contracting perspective, and that is the only continuing role I have. Any substantive project activities have to be taken up with Karen.

Carol A. Paquette  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
(202)566-3125  cpaquette@eac.gov

Karen
Lynn-Dys
on/EAC/G
OV

07/12/2005 5:08 PM
  To: "Tom O'Neill"  
  "Paquette, Carol" <cpaquette@eac.gov>, "Foley, Ned" <foley.33@osu.edu>, "reed, ingrid" <reed@rutgers.edu>, "Weingart, John" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>, "Laura Williams" <lauracw@columbus.rr.com>, "Mandel, Ruth" <rmandel@rci.rutgers.edu>
  Subject: Re: Peer Review Group

Tom-

I trust you are in contact with Carol and Julie regarding the information on the Peer Review Group and the July 28 hearing at Cal/Tech that you have requested of them, respectively.

While the EAC is a small agency with relatively few reporting layers, I suggest that for all future
items requiring feedback and decisions from the EAC, that you are certain to carbon copy me on all e-mails.

This will ensure, that as your primary point of contact, I have a record of all communication that has taken place between the contractor and the agency.

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Tom O'Neill"
07/08/2005
03:41 PM

To: Paquette, Carol <cpaquette@eac.gov>
cc: Laura Williams <lauracw@columbus.rr.com>, Weingart, John <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>, reed, ingrid <ireed@rutgers.edu>, Mandel, Ruth <rmandel@rci.rutgers.edu>, Lynn-Dyson, Karren <klynndyson@eac.gov>, Foley, Ned <foley.33@osu.edu>

Subject: Peer Review Group

Carol,

After our discussion in New York, you asked me to put in writing our response to the EAC's suggestions for expanding the number and kinds of groups that would review and comment on our work. I hope after your review of this response, we will be able to quickly recruit a balanced Peer Review Group (PRG) and move ahead as the schedule in our work plan indicates. Attached is a revised list of the members we propose for appointment to the PRG. We will probably not be able to persuade all of them to serve, but the number and range of views included on the
RESPONSE TO EAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW GROUPS

EAC’s Recommendations for the PRG
Karen Lynn-Dyson reported this response from the EAC commissioners to our proposal for the composition of the PRG.

1. Not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG

2. Create a “tiered process” of review in which:
   A. The PRG will prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.
   B. PRG’s analysis would be vetted by a defined/select group of local election officials.
   C. A defined/select group of advocacy organizations would review the comments of the local election officials.
   D. Empanel a final focus group of local election officials, advocates and academics for an overall, interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Project Team Response
Creating three new committees to the review process to supplement the work of the Peer Review Group (PRG) is possible, but would add at least 8 weeks—and possibly 12 weeks—to our completion of the guidance document on provisional voting. We believe this delay would risk limiting the value of this project for the 2006 election. In addition, the change would add at least $30,000 to the cost of our work. (See the attached table showing the possible effect on our work plan, and note the optimistic assumptions such as the ability to hold a hearing the week after Christmas.). If the same groups were to be engaged in reviewing our work on Voter ID, the time for that work would also have to be stretched at a similar increased cost.

This additional cost and the added time might be worthwhile... if the new layers of review were to produce a consensus on how to strengthen the research, sharpen the analysis, and increase the relevance of the Guidance Document. Our team concluded, however, that additional review groups were unlikely to achieve these results.

PRG focuses on quality of research
We believe that our research would be strengthened by a balanced Peer Review Group that will focus on the design of the research and our conduct of it. Based on the EAC’s recommendation, we have revised the composition of the PRG to include additional, well-recognized authorities in the field whose perspective is generally agreed to be conservative.

The PRG will focus on the strength of the research design and the quality of our analysis, not on the politics of our recommendations for the guidance document. The PRG will critique the research design and suggest how to strengthen it. Members of the group will review the quality of our analysis so that we can fill holes and correct errors before we make policy recommendations to the EAC. The PRG may or may not meet as a group. The likelihood is that most comments will come in writing from individual members, most of whose schedules would not permit attendance at meetings. In any case, the PRG members will not gather around a table to come to consensus on the study’s recommendations.

While using the PRG as a forum to reach consensus on the knotty issues involved does not appear practical, the EAC can benefit from the work of other groups in this regard. It is not
necessary for this project to duplicate the deliberative processes of the Carter-Baker Commission, the Century Foundation and the Election Center. The EAC itself as well as the project team can get the benefit of these reports without duplicating this "policy evaluation board" structure as part of this contract.

**Project Team focuses on analysis and recommendations**

Karen reported that the Commissioners believed that the PRG would "prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions." As we see it, the PRG will neither analyze data nor draw conclusions, tentative or otherwise. Its members will review and comment on how the Project Team has designed and carried out the research. Analysis, conclusions and recommendations are the responsibility of the Project Team. We have all seen in the preface to books or articles a sentence or two that read something like this, "The author thanks Mr. X, Ms. Y, and Dr. Z for their review and comment on the manuscript. Their analysis has strengthened the work, but they are in no way responsible for errors or for my conclusions." That is the way we think about the Peer Review Group.

In short, the PRG will help ensure that EAC’s Guidance Document is founded on a solid base of data and analysis. The review and comment on the Preliminary Guidance Document by the EAC’s Board of Advisors and Standards Board will provide participation by important stakeholder groups without the need for the other review committees. This Board is broad-based and represents a key stakeholder group. It also enjoys a significant advantage over a “defined/select” group we might empanel. Any group we define will be open to criticism or charges of bias by representatives of interest groups not represented.

The criticism and charges of bias might be tolerable, but only if we could expect consensus from the “defined/select” group we would appoint. We believe that consensus would be elusive. In empanelling a “defined/select” group, we would naturally look for balance and would appoint members to represent a point of view or an institutional interest. As representatives they would likely feel that they had little choice but to be strong advocates. They would have little incentive to compromise. Our research, as opposed to our policy recommendations, would be better served by the analysis of scholars than by the advocacy of interests.

**Policy judgments**

We regard the EAC itself as responsible for the policy judgments involved in shaping the Guidance Document. We plan, of course, to respond to the EAC’s comments on our preliminary draft, so that the EAC’s comments will shape the Preliminary Guidance Document before it is released for public comment. And further revision will follow the public hearing and comments. The EAC and individual Commissioners can always seek comment informally on our analysis or recommendations. That course appears to us preferable to the creation of a new, more elaborate review process.
Karen -

Please see Tom's email below. I checked his previous email on the peer review group and you were copied. Maybe you didn't get this because of the email problem you were having. Anyhow, I'm not responding to his latest message, just letting it drop.

Carol A. Paquette
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202)566-3125 cpaquette@eac.gov

Carol, 

I sent you the email on the Peer Review Group because you asked me to. When we discussed the issue in New York, you told me to send to you in writing our response to the Commission's suggestions for a new, more elaborate review process. I believe I copied Karen on that email.

Learning now, almost a week later, that you have taken no action is disheartening. As you know, our schedule is tight, and we need the counsel the Peer Review Group can provide. I hope, therefore, that Karen will take immediate action to resolve the situation so we can begin to recruit the review group in time to assure the quality of the resource design.

Tom O'Neill

-----Original Message-----
From: cpaquette@eac.gov [mailto:cpaquette@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2005 6:37 PM
To: klynndyson@eac.gov
Cc: Foley, Ned; reed, ingrid; Weingart, John; Laura Williams; Mandel, Ruth; Tom O'Neill
Subject: Re: Peer Review Group
Karen, Tom -

I am not taking any action on the email Tom sent a few days ago regarding the Peer Review Group because the Eagleton project is not my responsibility. As I indicated earlier to Karen, I didn't know why this was sent to me since Karen is the Project Manager. I endorse her comment below regarding the need for including her in all correspondence with anyone at the EAC regarding the project.

When I was the Interim Executive Director it was part of my job to stay on top of all EAC project work. I now have other responsibilities at the EAC, and while I am happy to continue involvement in other projects for continuity and transition purposes as needed, that needs to be very limited. My involvement with the Eagleton work has only been from the contracting perspective, and that is the only continuing role I have. Any substantive project activities have to be taken up with Karen.

Carol A. Paquette
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202)566-3125 cpaquette@eac.gov

Tom-

I trust you are in contact with Carol and Julie regarding the information on the Peer Review Group and the July 28 hearing at Cal/Tech that you have requested of them, respectively.

While the EAC is a small agency with relatively few reporting layers, I suggest that for all future items requiring feedback and decisions from the EAC, that you are certain to carbon copy me on
all e-mails.

This will ensure, that as your primary point of contact, I have a record of all communication that has taken place between the contractor and the agency.

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
EAC's Recommendations for the PRG

Karen Lynn-Dyson reported this response from the EAC commissioners to our proposal for the composition of the PRG.

1. Not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG

2. Create a “tiered process” of review in which:
   A. The PRG will prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.
   B. PRG’s analysis would be vetted by a defined/select group of local election officials.
   C. A defined/select group of advocacy organizations would review the comments of the local election officials.
   D. Empanel a final focus group of local election officials, advocates and academics for an overall, interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Project Team Response

Creating three new committees to the review process to supplement the work of the Peer Review Group (PRG) is possible, but would add at least 8 weeks—and possibly 12 weeks—to our completion of the guidance document on provisional voting. We believe this delay would risk limiting the value of this project for the 2006 election. In addition, the change would add at least $30,000 to the cost of our work. (See the attached table showing the possible effect on our work plan, and note the optimistic assumptions such as the ability to hold a hearing the week after Christmas.). If the same groups were to be engaged in reviewing our work on Voter ID, the time for that work would also have to be stretched at a similar increased cost.

This additional cost and the added time might be worthwhile... if the new layers of review were to produce a consensus on how to strengthen the research, sharpen the analysis, and increase the relevance of the Guidance Document. Our team concluded, however, that additional review groups were unlikely to achieve these results.

PRG focuses on quality of research

We believe that our research would be strengthened by a balanced Peer Review Group that will focus on the design of the research and our conduct of it. Based on the EAC’s recommendation, we have revised the composition of the PRG to include additional, well-recognized authorities in the field whose perspective is generally agreed to be conservative.

The PRG will focus on the strength of the research design and the quality of our analysis, not on the politics of our recommendations for the guidance document. The PRG will critique the research design and suggest how to strengthen it. Members of the group will review the quality of our analysis so that we can fill holes and correct errors before we make policy recommendations to the EAC. The PRG may or may not meet as a group. The likelihood is that most comments will come in writing from individual members, most of whose schedules would not permit attendance at meetings. In any case, the PRG members will not gather around a table to come to consensus on the study’s recommendations.

While using the PRG as a forum to reach consensus on the knotty issues involved does not appear practical, the EAC can benefit from the work of other groups in this regard. It is not necessary for this project to duplicate the deliberative processes of the Carter-Baker Commission, the Century Foundation and the Election Center. The EAC itself as well as the project team can get the benefit of these reports without duplicating this "policy evaluation
board" structure as part of this contract.

**Project Team focuses on analysis and recommendations**
Karen reported that the Commissioners believed that the PRG would “prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.” As we see it, the PRG will neither analyze data nor draw conclusions, tentative or otherwise. Its members will review and comment on how the Project Team has designed and carried out the research. Analysis, conclusions and recommendations are the responsibility of the Project Team. We have all seen in the preface to books or articles a sentence or two that read something like this, “The author thanks Mr. X, Ms. Y, and Dr. Z for their review and comment on the manuscript. Their analysis has strengthened the work, but they are in no way responsible for errors or for my conclusions.” That is the way we think about the Peer Review Group.

In short, the PRG will help ensure that EAC’s Guidance Document is founded on a solid base of data and analysis. The review and comment on the Preliminary Guidance Document by the EAC’s Board of Advisors and Standards Board will provide participation by important stakeholder groups without the need for the other review committees. This Board is broad-based and represents a key stakeholder group. It also enjoys a significant advantage over a “defined/select” group we might empanel. Any group we define will be open to criticism or charges of bias by representatives of interest groups not represented.

The criticism and charges of bias might be tolerable, but only if we could expect consensus from the “defined/select” group we would appoint. We believe that consensus would be elusive. In empanelling a “defined/select” group, we would naturally look for balance and would appoint members to represent a point of view or an institutional interest. As representatives they would likely feel that they had little choice but to be strong advocates. They would have little incentive to compromise. Our research, as opposed to our policy recommendations, would be better served by the analysis of scholars than by the advocacy of interests.

**Policy judgments**
We regard the EAC itself as responsible for the policy judgments involved in shaping the Guidance Document. We plan, of course, to respond to the EAC’s comments on our preliminary draft, so that the EAC’s comments will shape the Preliminary Guidance Document before it is released for public comment. And further revision will follow the public hearing and comments. The EAC and individual Commissioners can always seek comment informally on our analysis or recommendations. That course appears to us preferable to the creation of a new, more elaborate review process.
Carol,

I sent you the email on the Peer Review Group because you asked me to. When we discussed the issue in New York, you told me to send to you in writing our response to the Commission’s suggestions for a new, more elaborate review process. I believe I copied Karen on that email.

Learning now, almost a week later, that you have taken no action is disheartening. As you know, our schedule is tight, and we need the counsel the Peer Review Group can provide. I hope, therefore, that Karen will take immediate action to resolve the situation so we can begin to recruit the review group in time to assure the quality of the resource design.

Tom O’Neill

-----Original Message-----
From: cpaquette@eac.gov [mailto:cpaquette@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2005 6:37 PM
To: klynndyson@eac.gov
Cc: Foley, Ned; reed, ingrid; Weingart, John; Laura Williams; Mandel, Ruth; Tom O'Neill
Subject: Re: Peer Review Group

Karen, Tom -

I am not taking any action on the email Tom sent a few days ago regarding the Peer Review Group because the Eagleton project is not my responsibility. As I indicated earlier to Karen, I didn’t know why this was sent to me since Karen is the Project Manager. I endorse her comment below regarding the need for including her in all correspondence with anyone at the EAC regarding the project.

When I was the Interim Executive Director it was part of my job to stay on top of all EAC project work. I now have other responsibilities at the EAC, and while I am happy to continue involvement in other projects for continuity and transition purposes as needed, that needs to be very limited. My involvement with the Eagleton work has only been from the contracting perspective, and that is the only continuing role I have. Any substantive project activities have to be taken up with
Karen.

Carol A. Paquette  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
(202)566-3125 cpaquette@eac.gov

Karen
Lynn-Dyson/EAC/G
OV

To: "Tom O'Neill" <GSAEXTERNAL>  
"Paquette, Carol" <cpaquette@eac.gov>, "Foley, Ned" <foley.33@osu.edu>, "reed, ingrid" <ireed@rutgers.edu>, "Weingart, John" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>, "Laura Williams" <lauracw@columbus.rr.com>, "Mandel, Ruth" <rmandel@rci.rutgers.edu>

07/12/2005 5:08 PM

Subject: Re: Peer Review Group Link

Tom-

I trust you are in contact with Carol and Julie regarding the information on the Peer Review Group and the July 28 hearing at Cal/Tech that you have requested of them, respectively.

While the EAC is a small agency with relatively few reporting layers, I suggest that for all future items requiring feedback and decisions from the EAC, that you are certain to carbon copy me on all e-mails.

This will ensure, that as your primary point of contact, I have a record of all communication that has taken place between the contractor and the agency.

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Research Manager  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
tel:202-566-3123
Carol,

After our discussion in New York, you asked me to put in writing our response to the EAC's suggestions for expanding the number and kinds of groups that would review and comment on our work. I hope after your review of this response, we will be able to quickly recruit a balanced Peer Review Group (PRG) and move ahead as the schedule in our work plan indicates. Attached is a revised list of the members we propose for appointment to the PRG. We will probably not be able to persuade all of them to serve, but the number and range of views included on the proposed list should ensure that the resulting group is well-balanced.

Tom

RESPONSE TO EAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW GROUPS

EAC's Recommendations for the PRG
Karen Lynn-Dyson reported this response from the EAC commissioners to our proposal for the composition of the PRG.

1. Not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG

2. Create a "tiered process" of review in which:
   A. The PRG will prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.
B. PRG's analysis would be vetted by a defined/select group of local election officials.
C. A defined/select group of advocacy organizations would review the comments of the local election officials
D. Empanel a final focus group of local election officials, advocates and academics for an overall, interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Project Team Response
Creating three new committees to the review process to supplement the work of the Peer Review Group (PRG) is possible, but would add at least 8 weeks—and possibly 12 weeks—to our completion of the guidance document on provisional voting. We believe this delay would risk limiting the value of this project for the 2006 election. In addition, the change would add at least $30,000 to the cost of our work. (See the attached table showing the possible effect on our work plan, and note the optimistic assumptions such as the ability to hold a hearing the week after Christmas.). If the same groups were to be engaged in reviewing our work on Voter ID, the time for that work would also have to be stretched at a similar increased cost.

This additional cost and the added time might be worthwhile... if the new layers of review were to produce a consensus on how to strengthen the research, sharpen the analysis, and increase the relevance of the Guidance Document. Our team concluded, however, that additional review groups were unlikely to achieve these results.

PRG focuses on quality of research
We believe that our research would be strengthened by a balanced Peer Review Group that will focus on the design of the research and our conduct of it. Based on the EAC's recommendation, we have revised the composition of the PRG to include additional, well-recognized authorities in the field whose perspective is generally agreed to be conservative.

The PRG will focus on the strength of the research design and the quality of our analysis, not on the politics of our recommendations for the guidance document. The PRG will critique the research design and suggest how to strengthen it. Members of the group will review the quality of our analysis so that we can fill holes and correct errors before we make policy recommendations to the EAC. The PRG may or may not meet as a group. The likelihood is that most comments will come in writing from individual members, most of whose schedules would not permit attendance at meetings. In any case, the PRG members will not gather around a table to come to consensus on the study's recommendations.

While using the PRG as a forum to reach consensus on the knotty issues involved does not appear practical, the EAC can benefit from the work of other groups in this regard. It is not necessary for this project to duplicate the deliberative processes of the Carter-Baker Commission, the Century Foundation and the Election Center. The EAC itself as well as the project team can get the benefit of these reports without duplicating this "policy evaluation board" structure as part of this contract.

Project Team focuses on analysis and recommendations
Karen reported that the Commissioners believed that the PRG would "prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions." As we see it, the PRG will neither analyze data nor draw conclusions, tentative or otherwise. Its members will review and comment on how the Project Team has designed and carried out the research. Analysis, conclusions and recommendations are the responsibility of the Project Team. We have all seen in the preface to books or articles a sentence or two that read something like this, "The author thanks Mr. X, Ms. Y, and Dr. Z for their review and comment on the manuscript. Their analysis has strengthened the work, but they are in no way responsible for errors or for my conclusions." That is the way we think
about the Peer Review Group.

In short, the PRG will help ensure that EAC's Guidance Document is founded on a solid base of data and analysis. The review and comment on the Preliminary Guidance Document by the EAC's Board of Advisors and Standards Board will provide participation by important stakeholder groups without the need for the other review committees. This Board is broad-based and represents a key stakeholder group. It also enjoys a significant advantage over a "defined/select" group we might empanel. Any group we define will be open to criticism or charges of bias by representatives of interest groups not represented.

The criticism and charges of bias might be tolerable, but only if we could expect consensus from the "defined/select" group we would appoint. We believe that consensus would be elusive. In empanelling a "defined/select" group, we would naturally look for balance and would appoint members to represent a point of view or an institutional interest. As representatives they would likely feel that they had little choice but to be strong advocates. They would have little incentive to compromise. Our research, as opposed to our policy recommendations, would be better served by the analysis of scholars than by the advocacy of interests.

Policy judgments
We regard the EAC itself as responsible for the policy judgments involved in shaping the Guidance Document. We plan, of course, to respond to the EAC's comments on our preliminary draft, so that the EAC's comments will shape the Preliminary Guidance Document before it is released for public comment. And further revision will follow the public hearing and comments. The EAC and individual Commissioners can always seek comment informally on our analysis or recommendations. That course appears to us preferable to the creation of a new, more elaborate review process.
Karen, Tom -

I am not taking any action on the email Tom sent a few days ago regarding the Peer Review Group because the Eagleton project is not my responsibility. As I indicated earlier to Karen, I didn't know why this was sent to me since Karen is the Project Manager. I endorse her comment below regarding the need for including her in all correspondence with anyone at the EAC regarding the project.

When I was the Interim Executive Director it was part of my job to stay on top of all EAC project work. I now have other responsibilities at the EAC, and while I am happy to continue involvement in other projects for continuity and transition purposes as needed, that needs to be very limited. My involvement with the Eagleton work has only been from the contracting perspective, and that is the only continuing role I have. Any substantive project activities have to be taken up with Karen.

Carol A. Paquette
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202)566-3125 cpaquette@eac.gov

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Tom-

I trust you are in contact with Carol and Julie regarding the information on the Peer Review Group and the July 28 hearing at Cal/Tech that you have requested of them, respectively.

While the EAC is a small agency with relatively few reporting layers, I suggest that for all future items requiring feedback and decisions from the EAC, that you are certain to carbon copy me on all e-mails.

This will ensure, that as your primary point of contact, I have a record of all communication that has taken place between the contractor and the agency.

Thanks
Carol,

After our discussion in New York, you asked me to put in writing our response to the EAC's suggestions for expanding the number and kinds of groups that would review and comment on our work. I hope after your review of this response, we will be able to quickly recruit a balanced Peer Review Group (PRG) and move ahead as the schedule in our work plan indicates. Attached is a revised list of the members we propose for appointment to the PRG. We will probably not be able to persuade all of them to serve, but the number and range of views included on the proposed list should ensure that the resulting group is well-balanced.

Tom

RESPONSE TO EAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW GROUPS

EAC's Recommendations for the PRG
Karen Lynn-Dyson reported this response from the EAC commissioners to our proposal for the composition of the PRG.

1. Not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG

2. Create a "tiered process" of review in which:
   A. The PRG will prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.
   B. PRG's analysis would be vetted by a defined/select group of local election officials.
   C. A defined/select group of advocacy organizations would review the comments of the local election officials.
   D. Empanel a final focus group of local election officials, advocates and academics for an overall,
interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Project Team Response
Creating three new committees to the review process to supplement the work of the Peer Review Group (PRG) is possible, but would add at least 8 weeks—and possibly 12 weeks—to our completion of the guidance document on provisional voting. We believe this delay would risk limiting the value of this project for the 2006 election. In addition, the change would add at least $30,000 to the cost of our work. (See the attached table showing the possible effect on our work plan, and note the optimistic assumptions such as the ability to hold a hearing the week after Christmas.) If the same groups were to be engaged in reviewing our work on Voter ID, the time for that work would also have to be stretched at a similar increased cost.

This additional cost and the added time might be worthwhile... if the new layers of review were to produce a consensus on how to strengthen the research, sharpen the analysis, and increase the relevance of the Guidance Document. Our team concluded, however, that additional review groups were unlikely to achieve these results.

PRG focuses on quality of research
We believe that our research would be strengthened by a balanced Peer Review Group that will focus on the design of the research and our conduct of it. Based on the EAC’s recommendation, we have revised the composition of the PRG to include additional, well-recognized authorities in the field whose perspective is generally agreed to be conservative.

The PRG will focus on the strength of the research design and the quality of our analysis, not on the politics of our recommendations for the guidance document. The PRG will critique the research design and suggest how to strengthen it. Members of the group will review the quality of our analysis so that we can fill holes and correct errors before we make policy recommendations to the EAC. The PRG may or may not meet as a group. The likelihood is that most comments will come in writing from individual members, most of whose schedules would not permit attendance at meetings. In any case, the PRG members will not gather around a table to come to consensus on the study’s recommendations.

While using the PRG as a forum to reach consensus on the knotty issues involved does not appear practical, the EAC can benefit from the work of other groups in this regard. It is not necessary for this project to duplicate the deliberative processes of the Carter-Baker Commission, the Century Foundation and the Election Center. The EAC itself as well as the project team can get the benefit of these reports without duplicating this "policy evaluation board" structure as part of this contract.

Project Team focuses on analysis and recommendations
Karen reported that the Commissioners believed that the PRG would “prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.” As we see it, the PRG will neither analyze data nor draw conclusions, tentative or otherwise. Its members will review and comment on how the Project Team has designed and carried out the research. Analysis, conclusions and recommendations are the responsibility of the Project Team. We have all seen in the preface to books or articles a sentence or two that read something like this, “The author thanks Mr. X, Ms. Y, and Dr. Z for their review and comment on the manuscript. Their analysis has strengthened the work, but they are in no way responsible for errors or for my conclusions.” That is the way we think about the Peer Review Group.

In short, the PRG will help ensure that EAC’s Guidance Document is founded on a solid base of data and analysis. The review and comment on the Preliminary Guidance Document by the EAC’s Board of Advisors and Standards Board will provide participation by important stakeholder groups without the need for the other review committees. This Board is broad-based and represents a key stakeholder group. It also enjoys a significant advantage over a “defined/select” group we might empanel. Any group we define...
will be open to criticism or charges of bias by representatives of interest groups not represented.

The criticism and charges of bias might be tolerable, but only if we could expect consensus from the “defined/select” group we would appoint. We believe that consensus would be elusive. In empanelling a “defined/select” group, we would naturally look for balance and would appoint members to represent a point of view or an institutional interest. As representatives they would likely feel that they had little choice but to be strong advocates. They would have little incentive to compromise. Our research, as opposed to our policy recommendations, would be better served by the analysis of scholars than by the advocacy of interests.

Policy judgments
We regard the EAC itself as responsible for the policy judgments involved in shaping the Guidance Document. We plan, of course, to respond to the EAC’s comments on our preliminary draft, so that the EAC’s comments will shape the Preliminary Guidance Document before it is released for public comment. And further revision will follow the public hearing and comments. The EAC and individual Commissioners can always seek comment informally on our analysis or recommendations. That course appears to us preferable to the creation of a new, more elaborate review process.

PROPOSED MEMBERS:July6.doc
Thanks, Karen. I received both your emails and also had a telephone conversation with Aletha Barrington to fill me in on the details.

Also participating in the conference call on Thursday will be 3 members of our Peer Review Group: Mike Alvarez, Martha Kropf, and Tim O'Rourke.

The Eagleton-Moritz team on the call will include: John Weingart, Dan Tokaji, Tim Vercellotti, Ingrid Reed, and me.

I'm assuming you will guide the conversation and keep us all on time and topic.

Thanks for the schedule with the details of the EAC's review of our work.

Tom O'Neill

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2006 10:05 AM
To: 
Cc: john.weingart@rutgers.edu; tokaji.l@osu.edu
Subject: Re: Voter ID Report and Appendices

Thanks, Tom.

Assume you just got the e-mail I sent to the EAC review team that included the paper, the analysis and the call-in information

Thursday at 11:30

A few items on timelines and materials for May 23-24 meetings:

The Commissioners will review the final Eagleton Voter ID and Provisional Voting reports at their Tuesday, May 16 meeting. At this meeting they will decide how they wish to present these reports to the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Boards.

Your materials that will be distributed to the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Boards must be finalized and ready for our Xeroxing process by Thursday, May 18. I will be in touch along the way to provide input/guidance on what these materials should be, based on the Commissioner's review and decisions.
Regards-

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
hello:

I just got your message by phone:

It would be best to send it to my home address:

61 Clay Street.
Cambridge, MA 02140

Also, in your original phone message you said that there would be an honorarium associated with the review process, but this e-mail states that there will be no compensation for the review. I of course did not expect to be compensated at my market rate for consulting jobs (which is $225 an hour) but I was led to believe that I would be compensated in some manner for my time.

best

adam berinsky

At 05:36 PM 5/1/2006, you wrote:

Dr. Berinsky-

On behalf of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), thank you in advance for agreeing to assist us with the review of research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics on voter identification. By Friday, May 5, 2006, you will receive, in electronic form, the research paper and relevant data analysis which supports the paper’s findings. Through this independent review by a small group of experts familiar with elections data and research we are seeking feedback on:

- The research methodology which was used to support the paper’s conclusions
- The specific statistical applications which were used to analyze the data and arrive at various conclusions

If there are alternate methodological and statistical approaches to analyzing the data on voter identification, and if there is other data on voter identification that you think should have been included in the analysis, please be certain to note this in your comments.
On May 11, 2006 EAC will conduct a 60-90 minute phone call with key Eagleton Institute staff responsible for the research, members of Eagleton's peer review group and the EAC-identified reviewers who have been asked to consider the research. Through this dialogue EAC hopes to gather varying perspectives and insights on the research strategies and methods that were employed by Eagleton. As a result of this conversation, EAC anticipates that some revisions will be made to the Eagleton research paper. This paper is scheduled to be presented to EAC's Board of Advisors and Standards Boards in late May.

While we are unable to offer financial compensation for your review of this research we greatly appreciate your willingness to assist us with this important task. We believe that the research findings we will provide on voter identification are important and will most certainly be enhanced by your insights and expertise.

Sincerely,

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Adam J. Berinsky
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139 E53-459
Tel: (617) 253-8190
Fax: (617) 258-6164
E-mail: berinsky@mit.edu
Did we resolve the contact issues on this?

---------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 05/01/2006 02:58 PM
To: Thomas Wilkey; Juliet Thompson-Hodgkins
Subject: E-mail to Voter ID peer reviewers

Tom and Julie-

Please take a look at this draft e-mail and let me know if it captures all that it needs to.

Would like to get this out ASAP- appreciate your feedback..

Dear Jonathan Nagler
Dear Jan Leighley
Dear Adam Berinsky

On behalf of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), thank you in advance for agreeing to assist us with the review of research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics on voter identification. By Friday, May 5, 2006, you will receive, in electronic form, the research paper and relevant data analysis which supports the paper’s findings. Through this independent review by a small group of experts familiar with elections data and research we are seeking feedback on:

- The research methodology which was used to support the paper’s conclusions
- The specific statistical applications which were used to analyze the data and arrive at various conclusions

If there are alternate methodological and statistical approaches to analyzing the data on voter identification, and if there is other data on voter identification that you think should have been included in the analysis, please be certain to note this in your comments.

On May 11, 2006 EAC will conduct a 60-90 minute phone call with key Eagleton Institute staff responsible for the research, members of Eagleton’s peer review group and the EAC-identified reviewers who have been asked to consider the research. Through this dialogue EAC hopes to
gather varying perspectives and insights on the research strategies and methods that were employed by Eagleton. As a result of this conversation, EAC anticipates that some revisions will be made to the Eagleton research paper. This paper is scheduled to be presented to EAC’s Board of Advisors and Standards Boards in late May.

While EAC agency policy does not allow us to provide you with financial compensation for your review of this research we greatly appreciate your willingness to assist us with this important task. We believe that the research findings we will provide on voter identification are important and will most certainly be enhanced by your insights and expertise.

Sincerely,

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
History: This message has been replied to.

How much of an honorarium and how fast do we get their review.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 04/28/2006 01:13 PM
To: Thomas Wilkey
Subject: Re: Voter ID Paper --Final Draft

Tom-

You'll recall that we discussed the fact that the peer review group who Eagleton has assembled do not have the sufficient technical expertise to give us the expert/technical advice we need on the statistical analysis of the Voter ID piece. Only two persons on Eagleton's peer review group have a requisite research and statistical background and knowledge.

You may also remember that Mike told me that he thought that the paper needed an additional set of eyes and review by academics with a background and expertise in election statistics and analysis. When I initially proposed a review panel of six you said that was too many; we agreed that I would find three persons to do the review and that we would pay them a small honoraria for doing the review.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Sorry I could have told her what a pain her Mother is.
You are right...that will tell us if the data is totally unreliable

----------------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 04/28/2006 02:00 PM
To: Thomas Wilkey
Subject: Re: Voter ID Paper -Final Draft

If we get that many varying opinions from such experts, probably says this work is too controversial to take to a level of serious public review and discussion. That would be a good thing to know, and would save us the embarrassment, I think.

Get some rest. You missed my daughter yesterday- I wanted her to meet my boss.

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen,

Was this part of the contract. I thought there was a peer review group in place,

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 04/28/2006 12:44 PM
To: Tom O'neill
Cc: arapp@rci.rutgers.edu; davander@eden.rutgers.edu; dlinky@rci.rutgers.edu; foley.33@osu.edu; ireed@rutgers.edu; 'Johanna Dobrich' " <jdobrich@eden.rutgers.edu>; joharris@eden.rutgers.edu; john.weingart@rutgers.edu; lauracw@columbus.rr.com; rmandel@rci.rutgers.edu; Tim Vercellotti" <tim.vercellotti@rutgers.edu>; tokaji.1@osu.edu
Subject: Re: Voter ID Paper --Final Draft

Tim, Tom, John, et al--

The EAC has identified three academics who are going to serve as peer reviewers of the Eagleton Voter ID paper and research.

They are Jonathan Nagler of New York University, Jan Leighley, University of Arizona, and Adam Berinsky of MIT.

They are ready to review the documents as soon as they are available.

I would like to them one week to review the material and then have a joint conference call on Thursday, May 11, in which we would all have an opportunity to discuss the research methodology and statistical analysis, along with general comments and suggestions.

If you are able to get to me the paper and the supporting data analysis, I will distribute to the documents ASAP.

Also let me know, if you would, your availability on May 11 to do this conference all.

I anticipate that it will last approximately 90 minutes.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Hello: I just got your message (I'm on leave this year and not in the office much). I would be interested in doing the review, depending on the date of the conference call. As long as it is not on a Tuesday, I could do it.

best

adam berinsky

Adam J. Berinsky
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139 E53-459
Tel: (617) 253-8190
Fax: (617) 258-6164
E-mail: berinsky@mit.edu
Glad to help. I don't want to step on toes, but I'd recommend that you think about some sort of single-blind peer review, of the sort that is employed by many research journals and other organizations (like the NSF or National Academies of Science). I think that if you offer them a modest honoraria (perhaps $100) I think you'll find that the folks on that list would be likely to provide quick and thorough feedback to you.

Again, let me know if there is more that I can do to help.

I'm also willing to do a review for you myself. The issue is that I feel somewhat conflicted, given that I'm on their "peer review" panel. But on the other hand that does mean that I'm very well aware of the background of this project. I'd leave it up to you as to whether you think that a review from me would be appropriate or not.

Mike

On Thu, 6 Apr 2006 klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Mike- Nice to finally meet you in person, as well. Indeed, as discussed,
> I am likely to confer with your peers on a number of matters related to
> research methodology and statistical analyses,
> >
> > Thanks again for providing these names.
> >
> > K
> > Karen Lynn-Dyson
> > Research Manager
> > U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> > Washington, DC 20005
> > tel:202-566-3123
> >
> >
> > "Mike Alvarez" <rma@hss.caltech.edu>
> > 04/05/2006 07:39 PM
> >
> > To
> > klynndyson@eac.gov
> > cc
> >
> > Subject
Hi -- nice to meet you in person, finally!

And thanks for inviting me to your gathering, I enjoyed it and hope I was helpful. Of course, any time you want anything, you do know where to track me down.

As to the potential reviewers of the Eagleton Voter ID study, here are my suggestions, in order:

- Jonathan Nagler, New York University
- Jan Leighley, University of Arizona
- Ben Highton, UC-Davis
- Adam Berinsky, MIT
- Bernard Grofman, UC-Irvine

All have worked with the CPS turnout/registration data, and are very familiar with this research literature.

If these don't work, or you want more recommendations, let me know.

R. Michael Alvarez
626-395-4089
Professor of Political Science
626-405-9841
Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, CA 91125
rma@hss.caltech.edu

Contributor to Election Updates,
http://electionupdates.caltech.edu/blog.html
Thanks for this list, Vice Chair. I've passed it along to Eagleton

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
Tom-

Here is a list that can be included in your outreach efforts.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

-- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 08/03/2005 06:08 PM --

Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV
08/04/2005 01:29 PM

To: Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/GOV, Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
cc: Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject: List of centrist/conservative groups

Here's a list of centrist/conservative groups involved in voting issues that Grant prepared for me. I thought it would be helpful to you.

Paul

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Grant T. Gelner

From: Grant T. Gelner
Sent: 08/04/2005 01:11 PM
To: Paul DeGregorio
Subject: Re: Excel file

Here is the updated excel file. Sorry I didn't get it to you earlier, but I had a four hour front desk shift this morning and was unable to check email from there. Enjoy the cool Oregon weather.

Grant Gelner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. N.W., Suite 1100
Washington DC, 20005
(202) 566-2377
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Webpage</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Contact / Email</th>
<th>About Org</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>770-386-8372</td>
<td><a href="http://www.theadvocates.org/about-us.html">http://www.theadvocates.org/about-us.html</a></td>
<td>The Liberty Building 213 South Erwin Street Cartersville, GA 30120</td>
<td><a href="http://www.theadvocates.org/contact-us.html">http://www.theadvocates.org/contact-us.html</a></td>
<td>The Advocates for Self-Government is a non-profit, non-partisan libertarian educational organization. Founded in 1985 by Marshall Fritz, our current president is Sharon Harris. The American Center For Voting Rights (ACVR) was founded in February 2005 to protect the election process and zealously guard the constitutional right of all citizens to participate in deciding elections in a fair and equal manner free from discrimination, intimidation and fraud. The American Conservative Union is the nation's oldest conservative lobbying organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.962.0311</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ac4vr.com/">http://www.ac4vr.com/</a></td>
<td>1300 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1050 Washington DC, 20005</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ac4vr.com/contact/default.html">http://www.ac4vr.com/contact/default.html</a></td>
<td>We believe in a system in which taxes are simpler, fairer, flatter, more visible, and lower than they are today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703-836-8602</td>
<td><a href="http://www.conservative.org/">http://www.conservative.org/</a></td>
<td>1007 Cameron Street Alexandria, VA 22314</td>
<td><a href="http://www.conservative.org/about/directors.asp">http://www.conservative.org/about/directors.asp</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: "Tom O'neill"@GSAEXTERNAL.

cc

bcc Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV@EAC; Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC; Raymundo Martinez/EAC/GOV@EAC; Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV@EAC; Amie J. Sherrill/EAC/GOV@EAC; Adam Ambrogi/EAC/GOV@EAC; Nicole Mortellito/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV@EAC

Subject: Re: Peer Review Group

Thank you for sharing this list of your Peer Review Group members, to-date. I will share this list with the Commissioners and will be certain to let you know of their feedback, if any.

I will also be back in touch regarding Eagleton’s research around voter fraud and the research project EAC will be undertaking, this fall, around voting fraud and voter intimidation. The EAC is presently in the process of finalizing a work and staff plan for this project and once it is completed, I will be certain to brief you on it.

In the meantime, EAC staff and several of the Commissioners looks forward to meeting with the Eagleton/Moritz team on September 6 at 1:30 PM.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Tom O'neill"

To: klynndyson@eac.gov
cc

Subject: Peer Review Group

Karen,

Attached is a report on the status of recruitment of members of the Peer Review Group. We extended 9 invitations. We have four confirmed members, one reluctant turn-down, one who has yet to respond to an initial inquiry, and are awaiting confirmation from 3 others who initially agreed. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Tom O'Neill
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
10/25/2005 01:13 PM

To: "Tom O'Neill" @GSAEXTERNAL
cc

bcc Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/GOV@EAC; Raymundo Martinez/EAC/GOV@EAC

Subject: Re: EAC input on the Eagleton draft provisional voting document

Tom-

Our legal department has been inundated with legal requests in the last two weeks, so please pardon our delay in getting our written comments on the draft document back to you.

Julie informs me that you should have these in the next several days.

Hope that the work of the Peer Review Group and work on Voter Id is continuing to progress.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Greetings Tom-

I write to get an update on how things are progressing with your peer group and staff work on the development of the draft documents.

I would imagine your October monthly report will come in this week.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Tom O'neill"

Karen,

Thanks. We are aiming to complete drafting the recommendations for Guidance and Best Practice for Provisional Voting in the next 10 days, so the written comments will be most helpful if they arrive in that time. And, of course, we will be revising the analysis documents in line with the comments from the EAC and the PRG during that time period as well.

Tom O'Neill

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2005 1:13 PM
To: klynndyson@eac.gov
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

On May 24, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission awarded an eight month contract (December 30, 2005) in the amount of $560,002.00 to the Eagleton Institute of Politics (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures.

On November 15, 2005, John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, requested via e-mail, a no–cost extension on this contract (E4014127). Mr. Weingart has requested an extension to complete the work of this contract to February 28, 2006.

In subsequent correspondence, Mr. Weingart notes the following as the reason for the request:

“The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October, voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting, based on Eagleton’s research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication…. The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report of that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid-January”.

He further notes:

“If EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work....

“The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $300,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project”.

013685
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
12/12/2005 04:49 PM

To
Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Tamar Nedzar/EAC/GOV@EAC, Nicole Mortellito/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV@EAC
bcc

Subject
Re: Fw: No Cost Extension Request

Gavin-

See quote in attached Memorandum for the Record, regarding re-allocation of funds.

Will also send you his e-mail with the full explanation.

Nicole and Tamar-

Please provide Gavin with the paperwork which has been prepared for the Chair's signature.

Thanks

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV

Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV
12/12/2005 04:41 PM

To
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc

Subject
Re: Fw: No Cost Extension Request

Karen,

I am not sure I understand what is meant by the term "re-allocation of funds." Any insight?? He seems to be referencing some other request?

Also, I have not seen the paperwork regarding this no cost extension.

GG

Gavin S. Gilmour
Associate General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

To Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC

cc

Subject Fw: No Cost Extension Request

Gavin-

Is it correct to say that this paperwork that has just gone to the Chair includes an approval of the re-allocation of funds?

Thanks

K

Eagleton no-cost extension.doc

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123


"John Weingart"
<john.weingart@rutgers.edu>
12/12/2005 03:07 PM
To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc please respond to john.weingart@rutgers.edu
Subject Re: No Cost Extension Request

Karen - Does that also include the request to reallocate funds or is that just something that doesn't require EAC approval? Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> 
> > John-
> >
> > The no-cost extension materials have gone to the Chair for signature
> > and review.
> >
The process should be complete within the week.

Also, EAC staff will be turning their attention to the provisional voting best practices document after Wednesday of this week.

As always, thanks for your patience.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 12/11/2005 04:49 PM -----

"John Weingart"
<johneingart@rutgers.edu>
11/30/2005 05:05 PM
Please respond to
john.weingart@rutgers.edu
To "Karen Lynn-Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
cc "Tom O'Neill"
Subject Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Karen - There were two typos on the copy I just sent. Please use the attached instead. To minimize confusion, I dated this document December 1st (the first one says November 30). Thanks, John

--
John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
12/13/2005 10:23 AM

to Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC

cc

bcc

Subject Re: Fw: Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Yes all of your assumptions are correct.

Should these somehow be stated in the Memorandum for the Record?

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV

Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV
12/13/2005 09:58 AM

to Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC

cc

Subject Re: Fw: Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Karen,

I am assuming that there original proposal included an estimate for public hearing proposals and that they want to shift money from this expense to labor.

Thus I am assuming that you have determined that there will be no public hearing and therefore this shift is appropriate.

Are these assumption correct? Perhaps a quick explanation regarding this processes would be helpful.

GG

Gavin S. Gilmour
Associate General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
12/12/2005 04:50 PM

to Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC

cc

Subject Fw: Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected
Karen - There were two typos on the copy I just sent. Please use the attached instead. To minimize confusion, I dated this document December 1st (the first one says November 30). Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290

Extension Justification.doc
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV To Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC
12/19/2005 09:56 AM cc
bcc
Subject Fw: Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

G-

FYI-

See response below.

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

--- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 12/18/2005 09:54 AM ---

"John Weingart"
<john.weingart@rutgers.edu> To klynndyson@eac.gov
12/16/2005 01:25 PM cc
Please respond to john.weingart@rutgers.edu Subject Re: Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Karen - At this time, we anticipate reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line item and spending approximately $35,500 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,250 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants. There are other additional variances but they are not significant (e.g. less on honoraria, less on travel, and more on general operations such as phone expenses). Let me know if you need additional detail or information.

Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> John-
> > Quick question-
> > How much money do you anticipate will be re-allocated from the
Karen - There were two typos on the copy I just sent. Please use the attached instead. To minimize confusion, I dated this document December 1st (the first one says November 30). Thanks, John

--
John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
12/19/2005 12:26 PM

To: Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
bcc

Subject: Re: Fw: Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Gavin-

Just spoke with John Weingart- he explains that it will be the same work and tasks (no new or additional products) and merely work that will now extend for an additional two months rather than ending December 31.

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
John-

I just had a more detailed conversation with our Deputy General Counsel about Eagleton's no-cost extension.

He indicates that we need a bit more information that will accompany the material we will send to the Commissioners for a vote (hopefully next week)

We need to know the number of labor hours, the labor costs and a brief description of the tasks to be performed by each of the staff who will be working on the EAC contract until its completion.

Since we have eliminated the public hearing (a major contract deliverable) it is unclear why staff labor hours and costs will continue at the same level and rate.

As always, thanks for your patience and prompt response.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Thanks for providing this explanation, John.

Once I've had a chance to review it with our contracting folks, I'll be back in touch.

Best wishes for a restful holiday-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"John Weingart" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>

Karen - Our request for a no-cost, reallocation of resources is based on (a) the fact that our personnel costs have already been higher than we anticipated and (b) the reality that keeping the project operating for at least nine months, instead of seven as planned, will require the participants to devote more time than anticipated. While we are not producing more product than originally promised, the time involved in our work continues to increase. Both Provisional Voting and Voter ID have proved to be very dynamic topics requiring us to continually monitor developments and update our data, analysis and evolving work products as we learn of new or revised information. As a result, despite the extension of the schedule, the staff and consultants on this project have had no "down" time. We anticipate this research, monitoring and revising to continue for the months added to the project, necessitating significantly more hours by all members of the project team than anticipated.

Our request asks for changes to three line items which I will address below on the assumption that the EAC response to our already-submitted Provisional Voting draft and to-be-submitted Voter ID draft will be sufficiently timely to enable us to complete our work on both topics by the end of February.

1. Eagleton Institute of Politics personnel: We originally budgeted $110,695 ($15,813 average per month) for Eagleton faculty, staff and graduate student assistants for the seven-month project from May 24
2005-December 31, 2005. Our actual costs have been approximately $14,500 more than that. In addition, we are anticipating needing another $21,000 for personnel costs in January and February, calculated on the basis of 2/3 of the original monthly estimate. Therefore, we are asking this line item from $110,695 to approximately $146,000.

2. Consultant Services: We originally budgeted $79,500 ($11,357 average per month) for consultant services which we have used to engage Tom O'Neill as the project manager. We anticipate no additional cost for the original contract period of May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005, but do anticipate needing his services during January and February at a slightly reduced rate of $10,125 per month or $20,250 total additional. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $79,500 to $99,750.

3. Moritz School of Law: We originally budgeted $84,744 ($12,106 average per month) for staff and overhead for the May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005 period. We anticipate needing an additional $23,171 ($11,585 average per month) to support their time on this project in January and February. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $84,744 to $107,915.

With these revisions, approximately $22,000 of the EAC contract award to Eagleton would remain not yet allocated, primarily because the cost for the public hearings would have incurred Rutgers University overhead whereas the additional expenditures for consultants and the subcontract with Moritz do not.

I hope this provides you the information you need. While Rutgers is shutting down until January 3rd, I will be checking email at least every day or two.

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
    Eagleton Institute of Politics
    (732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> > John-
> > I just had a more detailed conversation with our Deputy General Counsel about Eagleton's no-cost extension.
> > He indicates that we need a bit more information that will accompany the material we will send to the Commissioners for a vote (hopefully next week)
> > We need to know the number of labor hours, the labor costs and a brief description of the tasks to be performed by each of the staff who will be working on the EAC contract until its completion.
> > Since we have eliminated the public hearing (a major contract deliverable) it is unclear why staff labor hours and costs will continue at the same level and rate.
> > As always, thanks for your patience and prompt response.
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
Happy New Year, John-

Connie needs to provide the breakdown of staff costs starting with the November invoice which was submitted. She will need to re-submit this invoice.

For the purposes of the no-cost extension document I need the information from January forward.

I'm told that EAC senior management will be turning their attention to the Provisional Voting Best Practices document this week.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Research Manager  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
tel:202-566-3123

"John Weingart" <Johnwein@rci.rutgers.edu>

Karen - Turns out I could locate Connie's email though most likely she won't see mail until Tuesday: Bornheim@rci.rutgers.edu.

To clarify your phone message, do you need us to provide the number of hours for each staff person and consultant going forward from January 1st onward or going back to the start of the project?

Thanks.

> John-
> A quick request- May I get Connie Bornheimer e-mail address (again). You may recall I had an incorrect one.
> I have received the invoice for November services and cannot process it until it has the breakdown of salaries for particular personnel.
> This request is along the lines of that I have requested from you in order...
> to extend the contract.
> Thanks
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel: 202-566-3123
>
> --
> John Weingart, Associate Director
> Eagleton Institute of Politics
> (732) 932-9384, x.290
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV  
01/06/2006 02:10 PM  
To John.Weingart@rutgers.edu  
cc  
bcc  
Subject: Re: No Cost Extension Request

John-

Attached please find a copy of a portion of the memo that is part of the paperwork related to the no-cost extension.

While I am the Contracting Officer Representative on this project, I never received your project's cost proposal, and am unable to locate a copy. Otherwise, I would have completed more of the chart.

Please, take a moment to fill in the information on the attached chart, and, if you could, have one of the Eagleton staff send me the cost proposal which originally accompanied the technical proposal.

Thanks so much.

Regards-

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Research Manager  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
tel:202-566-3123
Mr. Weingart further notes:

“We anticipate reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line items and spending approximately $35,500 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,250 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants”.

**Specifics of the Extension**

The contractor has provided the following breakdown and explanation of the personnel and consultant costs, associated with this extension.

Original Project Personnel costs- $195,439 (May-December)  
Original Project labor hours-xxxxx (May-December)

Projected Project Personnel costs-$253,915 (January-February)  
Projected Project labor hours-xxxxx (January-February)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Projected Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eagleton Institute of Politics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$110,695</td>
<td>$146,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Moritz School of Law** |                 |                 |
| Xxxx                    |                 |                 |
| Xxxx                    |                 |                 |
| Xxxx                    |                 |                 |
| Overhead                |                 |                 |
| Total                   | $84,744         | $107,915        |
Carol-

Here is my take on the evaluation criteria for the RFP. Feel free to revise. Let me know next steps in the review process, when you can.

K
EVALUATION CRITERIA

Request for Proposal-Development of voluntary guidance on provisional voting and voter identification procedures

These are the criteria and possible point values that will be sued to evaluate proposals.

1. Appropriateness of research methodology and adequacy of analytical strategy (15 points)
2. Principal Investigator’s relevant experience (10 points)
3. Relevant organizational experience (10 points)
4. Compliance with proposal instructions (5 points)
5. Reasonableness of allocation of resources to work components (10 points)
6. Results of reference checks (5 points)
Tom-

When you get a moment- could you review Eagleton's proposed Peer Review Group roster and offer your thoughts/suggestions.

Thanks

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

------ Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/23/2005 01:44 PM ------

"Tom O'Neill"

06/22/2005 03:29 PM

To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc
Subject Peer Review Group

Karen,

As you probably recall, one of the features of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group to look over our findings, conclusions and draft reports before we prepare final drafts for the EAC's review. The EAC asked that before recruiting members of the PRG we submit names for EAC's review. The aim, course, is to assemble a panel that is experienced, informed, and balanced.

Attached is a list of potential PRG members drawn from academia, the law, and non-profit organizations with interests in this area. Please look it over.

We may conclude that the PRG should also include two or three former government officials now in academia or related fields. We have a conference call with our partners at Moritz planned for tomorrow or Friday to decide a) if former officials should be included in the PRG and b) if so, who they should be. I'll keep you informed of our thinking as it develops.

Tom

PROPOSED MEMBERS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP.doc
PROPOSED MEMBERS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology
rma@hss.caltech.edu
626-395-4422
Alvarez has taught political science at Caltech since 1992. He received his B.A. in political science from Carleton College; his M.A. and Ph.D. from Duke University. Alvarez focuses on the study of electoral politics. He has published many articles on electoral behavior and public opinion. Support for his research has come from the National Science Foundation, The IBM Corporation, the Carnegie Corporation, of New York, and the Knight Foundation. Alvarez edits the Analytical Methods for Social Research book series and is on the editorial boards of a number of academic journals. He is Co-Director of the Caltech-MIT Voting Technology Project.

Deborah Goldberg, Ph.D
Program Director, Democracy Program
Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law
161 Avenue Of The Americas, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10013
212-998-6730
Goldberg supervises the Democracy Program's litigation, scholarship, and public education. She was the principal author of Writing Reform: A Guide to Drafting State & Local Campaign Finance Laws, and was lead counsel to the intervenor in the Supreme Court case Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Government PAC. She serves on the Steering Committee of a coalition to restore voting rights to persons with past felony convictions. Goldberg is a graduate of Harvard Law School. Before joining the Brennan Center, she was in private practice. She holds a Ph.D. in philosophy and taught ethics at Columbia University.

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu
Kropf has been on the faculty at Missouri since 1999. She received her BA Summa Cum Laude, Phi Beta Kappa from Kansas State University and her PhD in Political Science from American University. Her work concentrates on Research Methods, Urban Politics, American Government, and Political Behavior. Before joining the faculty at Missouri, she was Project Coordinator at the University of Maryland Survey Research Center. She has published recent on undervoting in presidential elections, and on invalidated ballots in the 1996 presidential election, and on the incremental process of election reform in Missouri.

Wade Henderson, Esq.
Executive Director
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
1629 K Street, NW, 10th Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Wade Henderson is the Executive Director of the LCCR and Counsel to the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund (LCCREF), and leads the organizations' work on issues involving nationwide election reform. He is a graduate of Howard University and the Rutgers University School of Law. During its over 50 years of existence, LCCR has worked to redefine civil rights issues in broad and inclusive ways. Today, it includes over 180 national organizations. Previously Henderson served as Washington Bureau Director of the NAACP. He began his career as a legislative counsel of the ACLU.

Kay Maxwell
President
League of Women Voters of the U.S.
1730 M Street NW, Suite 1000
Kay J. Maxwell has been a member of the League since 1976. She attended Smith College and earned a B.A. in International Relations from the University of Pennsylvania. She has conducted civic participation training for women leaders in Bosnia, Israel, the West Bank, Rwanda, Kuwait and Jamaica. She has also served as vice president at the International Executive Service Corps (IESC), an international economic development organization. She is a board member of DC Vote, and the New Voters Project.

Tim Storey
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures
7700 East First Place
Denver, CO 80230
303-364-7700
or
444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-5400

Peter G. Veniero, Esq.
Counsel
Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, New Jersey 07102
Tel: 973-643-7000

Verniero chairs the firm's Appellate Practice Group. He earned his B.A. at Drew University, Phi Beta Kappa, and his J.D. (with honors) at the Duke University School of Law. In 1999, he was appointed a justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, where he served for 7 years before re-entering private practice. Before his appointment to the Supreme Court, he served as New Jersey's Attorney General, and in that capacity oversaw the state's election laws. He also served as Chief of Staff and Chief Counsel to Governor Christine Todd Whitman.
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV	 To “Tom O’Neill”@GSAEXTERNAL	 06/23/2005 02:23 PM	 cc
 bcc Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
 Subject Re: Peer Review Group

Tom-

I will be back to you early next week with EAC's feedback on this.

Our initial reaction is that the group needs to include some local and/or state-level election officials, who have first-hand experience with these issues.

We will get you additional names and reactions by mid-week next week.

Thanks

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

“Tom O’Neill”

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

“Tom O’Neill”

To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc
Subject Peer Review Group

Karen,

As you probably recall, one of the features of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group to look over our findings, conclusions and draft reports before we prepare final drafts for the EAC's review. The EAC asked that before recruiting members of the PRG we submit names for EAC's review. The aim, course, is to assemble a panel that is experienced, informed, and balanced.

Attached is a list of potential PRG members drawn from academia, the law, and non-profit organizations with interests in this area. Please look it over.

We may conclude that the PRG should also include two or three former government officials now in academia or related fields. We have a conference call with our partners at Moritz planned for tomorrow or Friday to decide a) if former officials should be included in the PRG and b) if so, who they should be. I'll keep you informed of our thinking as it develops.

Tom
PROPOSED MEMBERS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology
rma@hss.caltech.edu
626-395-4422
Alvarez has taught political science at Caltech since 1992. He received his B.A. in political science from Carleton College; his M.A. and Ph.D. from Duke University. Alvarez focuses on the study of electoral politics. He has published many articles on electoral behavior and public opinion. Support for his research has come from the National Science Foundation, The IBM Corporation, the Carnegie Corporation, of New York, and the Knight Foundation. Alvarez edits the Analytical Methods for Social Research book series and is on the editorial boards of a number of academic journals. He is Co-Director of the Caltech-MIT Voting Technology Project.

Deborah Goldberg, Ph.D.
Program Director, Democracy Program
Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law
161 Avenue Of The Americas, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10013
212-998-6730
Goldberg supervises the Democracy Program’s litigation, scholarship, and public education. She was the principal author of Writing Reform: A Guide to Drafting State & Local Campaign Finance Laws, and was lead counsel to the intervenor in the Supreme Court case Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Government PAC. She serves on the Steering Committee of a coalition to restore voting rights to persons with past felony convictions. Goldberg is a graduate of Harvard Law School. Before joining the Brennan Center, she was in private practice. She holds a Ph.D. in philosophy and taught ethics at Columbia University.

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu
Kropf has been on the faculty at Missouri since 1999. She received her BA Summa Cum Laude, Phi Beta Kappa from Kansas State University and her PhD in Political Science from American University. Her work concentrates on Research Methods, Urban Politics, American Government, and Political Behavior. Before joining the faculty at Missouri, she was Project Coordinator at the University of Maryland Survey Research Center. She has published recent on undervoting in presidential elections, and on invalidated ballots in the 1996 presidential election, and on the incremental process of election reform in Missouri.

Wade Henderson, Esq.
Executive Director
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
1629 K Street, NW, 10th Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Wade Henderson is the Executive Director of the LCCR and Counsel to the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund (LCCREF), and leads the organizations’ work on issues involving nationwide election reform. He is a graduate of Howard University and the Rutgers University School of Law. During its over 50 years of existence, LCCR has worked to redefine civil rights issues in broad and inclusive ways. Today, it includes over 180 national organizations. Previously Henderson served as Washington Bureau Director of the NAACP. He began his career as a legislative counsel of the ACLU.

Kay Maxwell
President
League of Women Voters of the U.S.
1730 M Street NW, Suite 1000
Kay J. Maxwell has been a member of the League since 1976. She attended Smith College and earned a B.A. in International Relations from the University of Pennsylvania. She has conducted civic participation training for women leaders in Bosnia, Israel, the West Bank, Rwanda, Kuwait and Jamaica. She has also served as vice president at the International Executive Service Corps (IESC), an international economic development organization. She is a board member of DC Vote, and the New Voters Project.

Tim Storey
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures
7700 East First Place
Denver, CO 80230
303-364-7700
or
444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-5400

Peter G. Veniero, Esq.
Counsel
Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, New Jersey 07102
Tel: 973-643-7000

Verniero chairs the firm’s Appellate Practice Group. He earned his B.A. at Drew University, Phi Beta Kappa, and his J.D. (with honors) at the Duke University School of Law. In 1999, he was appointed a justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, where he served for 7 years before re-entering private practice. Before his appointment to the Supreme Court, he served as New Jersey’s Attorney General, and in that capacity oversaw the state’s election laws. He also served as Chief of Staff and Chief Counsel to Governor Christine Todd Whitman.
Commissioners-

Enclosed please find a preliminary list of Peer Review Group members, whom Eagleton is considering for their Peer Review Group. Tom Wilkey will be bringing this item to you for discussion and input at Monday's Commissioner's meeting.

Eagleton envisions this Peer Review Group as the body that will review the draft analysis that it will prepare on provisional voting and on voter identification. The Group would also provide comment on the development of alternative approaches to provisional voting and voter identification which Eagleton will develop for the EAC.

I have included the e-mail from the Eagleton Project Director, Tom O'Neil, so that you could get a feel for his approach/philosophy to assembling the Group.

Regards-
K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/23/2005 02:25 PM -----

"Tom O'Neil"
06/22/2005 03:29 PM

Karen,

As you probably recall, one of the features of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group to look over our findings, conclusions and draft reports before we prepare final drafts for the EAC's review. The EAC asked that before recruiting members of the PRG we submit names for EAC's review. The aim, course, is to assemble a panel that is experienced, informed, and balanced.

Attached is a list of potential PRG members drawn from academia, the law, and non-profit organizations with interests in this area. Please look it over.

We may conclude that the PRG should also include two or three former government officials now in
academia or related fields. We have a conference call with our partners at Moritz planned for tomorrow or Friday to decide a) if former officials should be included in the PRG and b) if so, who they should be. I'll keep you informed of our thinking as it develops.

Tom

PROPOSED MEMBERS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP.doc
Tom-

Had a very good review and discussion of the PRG at this morning's Commissioner meeting.

Also, the Commissioners have marked their calendars for a conference call with the Eagleton/Moritz team on July 12 at 9:30 AM.

Several concerns were raised about the composition of the PRG and, after some discussion, I indicated that Eagleton will provide the EAC with a revised participant list, and with a more detailed description of the PRG's mission, goals, objectives, workplan and timelines for accomplishing its work.

The Vice Chair is concerned that there is not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG. I would suggest the team do more research to identify well-recognized conservative academics to put on the Group.

Further, the Commissioners recommend a tiered process in which the PRG will prepare a "dispassionate" analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions. This analysis and these conclusions will then be vetted with a defined/select group of local election officials, and then, with a defined/select group of advocacy organizations.

It was also suggested that a final round of focus group meetings be held with a cross-section of these election officials, advocates and academics for an overall interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Hope this helps clarify concerns; I look forward to sharing your revisions to the PRG with them.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Tom O'Neill"

06/27/2005 05:45 PM
To "Tom O'Neill" GSAEXTERNAL	GSAEXTERNAL
cc Sheila A. Banks/EAC/GOV@EAC; Adam Ambrogi/EAC/GOV@EAC; Aimee Sherrill; Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC; Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject RE: Peer Review Group
Thanks, Karen.

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2005 2:24 PM
To: Tom
Subject: Re: Peer Review Group

Tom-

I will be back to you early next week with EAC's feedback on this.

Our initial reaction is that the group needs to include some local and/or state-level election officials, who have first-hand experience with these issues.

We will get you additional names and reactions by mid-week next week.

Thanks
K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen,

As you probably recall, one of the features of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group to look over our findings, conclusions and draft reports before we prepare final drafts for
the EAC's review. The EAC asked that before recruiting members of the PRG we submit names for EAC's review. The aim, course, is to assemble a panel that is experienced, informed, and balanced.

Attached is a list of potential PRG members drawn from academia, the law, and non-profit organizations with interests in this area. Please look it over.

We may conclude that the PRG should also include two or three former government officials now in academia or related fields. We have a conference call with our partners at Moritz planned for tomorrow or Friday to decide a) if former officials should be included in the PRG and b) if so, who they should be. I'll keep you informed of our thinking as it develops.

Tom
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
06/24/2005 06:35 PM

To: "Tom O'Neill"
cc: Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC

Subject: RE: Peer Review Group

Tom-

I'd like to schedule a conference call among EAC and Eagleton staff for sometime the early part of the week of July 11. Please let me know dates and times on your end and I'll coordinate with staff here.

During the call we can review your monthly report and cover any problems, challenges, needs, etc. that the Eagleton team may have.

Thanks

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Tom O'Neill"

"Tom O'Neill"
06/23/2005 02:43 PM

To: klynndyson@eac.gov
cc: tom_oneill@verizon.net

Subject: RE: Peer Review Group

Thanks, Karen.

Tom

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2005 2:24 PM
To: tom_oneill@verizon.net
Subject: Re: Peer Review Group

Tom-

I will be back to you early next week with EAC's feedback on this.

Our initial reaction is that the group needs to include some local and/or state-level election officials, who have first-hand experience with these issues.
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

Karen,

As you probably recall, one of the features of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group to look over our findings, conclusions and draft reports before we prepare final drafts for the EAC's review. The EAC asked that before recruiting members of the PRG we submit names for EAC's review. The aim, course, is to assemble a panel that is experienced, informed, and balanced.

Attached is a list of potential PRG members drawn from academia, the law, and non-profit organizations with interests in this area. Please look it over.

We may conclude that the PRG should also include two or three former government officials now in academia or related fields. We have a conference call with our partners at Moritz planned for tomorrow or Friday to decide a) if former officials should be included in the PRG and b) if so, who they should be. I'll keep you informed of our thinking as it develops.

Tom
Carol, Julie-

Yes, please do let me know on this. I think we need to have an e-mail exchange with Tom in which we clarify roles and responsibilities along with the proper channels of communication on this project.

For the time being I will give him the benefit of the doubt on this - the next time I might be a little less accommodating.

Thanks!

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Carol A. Paquette/EAC/GOV

Julie -

I don't remember saying much of anything but a few pleasantries to Tom in New York. Did you talk to him about this topic? I'm really at a loss on this. (Maybe I'm having an extended senior moment.)
Carol,

After our discussion in New York, you asked me to put in writing our response to the EAC’s suggestions for expanding the number and kinds of groups that would review and comment on our work. I hope after your review of this response, we will be able to quickly recruit a balanced Peer Review Group (PRG) and move ahead as the schedule in our work plan indicates.

Attached is a revised list of the members we propose for appointment to the PRG. We will probably not be able to persuade all of them to serve, but the number and range of views included on the proposed list should ensure that the resulting group is well-balanced.

Tom

RESPONSE TO EAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW GROUPS

EAC’s Recommendations for the PRG
Karen Lynn-Dyson reported this response from the EAC commissioners to our proposal for the composition of the PRG.

1. Not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG
2. Create a “tiered process” of review in which:
   A. The PRG will prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.
   B. PRG’s analysis would be vetted by a defined/select group of local election officials.
   C. A defined/select group of advocacy organizations would review the comments of the local election officials
   D. Empanel a final focus group of local election officials, advocates and academics for an overall, interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Project Team Response
Creating three new committees to the review process to supplement the work of the Peer Review Group (PRG) is possible, but would add at least 8 weeks—and possibly 12 weeks—to our completion of the guidance document on provisional voting. We believe this delay would risk limiting the value of this project for the 2006 election. In addition, the change would add at least $30,000 to the cost of our work. (See the attached table showing the possible effect on our work plan, and note the optimistic assumptions such as the ability to hold a hearing the week after Christmas.). If the same groups were to be engaged in reviewing our work on Voter ID, the time for that work would also have to be stretched at a similar increased cost.

This additional cost and the added time might be worthwhile... if the new layers of review were to produce a consensus on how to strengthen the research, sharpen the analysis, and increase the relevance of the Guidance Document. Our team concluded, however, that additional review groups were unlikely to achieve these results.

PRG focuses on quality of research
We believe that our research would be strengthened by a balanced Peer Review Group that will
focus on the design of the research and our conduct of it. Based on the EAC's recommendation, we have revised the composition of the PRG to include additional, well-recognized authorities in the field whose perspective is generally agreed to be conservative.

The PRG will focus on the strength of the research design and the quality of our analysis, not on the politics of our recommendations for the guidance document. The PRG will critique the research design and suggest how to strengthen it. Members of the group will review the quality of our analysis so that we can fill holes and correct errors before we make policy recommendations to the EAC. The PRG may or may not meet as a group. The likelihood is that most comments will come in writing from individual members, most of whose schedules would not permit attendance at meetings. In any case, the PRG members will not gather around a table to come to consensus on the study's recommendations.

While using the PRG as a forum to reach consensus on the knotty issues involved does not appear practical, the EAC can benefit from the work of other groups in this regard. It is not necessary for this project to duplicate the deliberative processes of the Carter-Baker Commission, the Century Foundation and the Election Center. The EAC itself as well as the project team can get the benefit of these reports without duplicating this "policy evaluation board" structure as part of this contract.

**Project Team focuses on analysis and recommendations**

Karen reported that the Commissioners believed that the PRG would "prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions." As we see it, the PRG will neither analyze data nor draw conclusions, tentative or otherwise. Its members will review and comment on how the Project Team has designed and carried out the research. Analysis, conclusions and recommendations are the responsibility of the Project Team. We have all seen in the preface to books or articles a sentence or two that read something like this, "The author thanks Mr. X, Ms. Y, and Dr. Z for their review and comment on the manuscript. Their analysis has strengthened the work, but they are in no way responsible for errors or for my conclusions." That is the way we think about the Peer Review Group.

In short, the PRG will help ensure that EAC's Guidance Document is founded on a solid base of data and analysis. The review and comment on the Preliminary Guidance Document by the EAC's Board of Advisors and Standards Board will provide participation by important stakeholder groups without the need for the other review committees. This Board is broad-based and represents a key stakeholder group. It also enjoys a significant advantage over a "defined/select" group we might empanel. Any group we define will be open to criticism or charges of bias by representatives of interest groups not represented.

The criticism and charges of bias might be tolerable, but only if we could expect consensus from the "defined/select" group we would appoint. We believe that consensus would be elusive. In empanelling a "defined/select" group, we would naturally look for balance and would appoint members to represent a point of view or an institutional interest. As representatives they would likely feel that they had little choice but to be strong advocates. They would have little incentive to compromise. Our research, as opposed to our policy recommendations, would be better served by the analysis of scholars than by the advocacy of interests.

**Policy judgments**

We regard the EAC itself as responsible for the policy judgments involved in shaping the
Guidance Document. We plan, of course, to respond to the EAC's comments on our preliminary
draft, so that the EAC's comments will shape the Preliminary Guidance Document before it is
released for public comment. And further revision will follow the public hearing and comments.
The EAC and individual Commissioners can always seek comment informally on our analysis or
recommendations. That course appears to us preferable to the creation of a new, more
elaborate review process.

PROPOSED MEMBERSJuly6.doc
To "Tom O'Neill"@GSAEXTERNAL
cc "Paquette, Carol" <cpaquette@eac.gov>, "Foley, Ned" <foley.33@osu.edu>, "reed, ingrid" <ireed@rutgers.edu>, "Weingart, John" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>, "Laura Paquette, Carol" <cpaquette@eac.gov>, "Foley, Ned" <foley.33@osu.edu>, "reed, ingrid" <ireed@rutgers.edu>, "Weingart, John" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>, "Laura Paquette, Carol" <cpaquette@eac.gov>, "Foley, Ned" <foley.33@osu.edu>, "reed, ingrid" <ireed@rutgers.edu>, "Weingart, John" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>, "Laura Paquette, Carol" <cpaquette@eac.gov>, "Foley, Ned" <foley.33@osu.edu>, "reed, ingrid" <ireed@rutgers.edu>, "Weingart, John" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>, "Laura Paquette, Carol" <cpaquette@eac.gov>, "Foley, Ned" <foley.33@osu.edu>, "reed, ingrid" <ireed@rutgers.edu>, "Weingart, John" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>, "Laura Paquette, Carol" <cpaquette@eac.gov>, "Foley, Ned" <foley.33@osu.edu>, "reed, ingrid" <ireed@rutgers.edu>, "Weingart, John" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>, "Laura Paquette, Carol" <cpaquette@eac.gov>, "Foley, Ned" <foley.33@osu.edu>, "reed, ingrid" <ireed@rutgers.edu>, "Weingart, John" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>, "Laura Paquette, Carol" <cpaquette@eac.gov>, "Foley, Ned" <foley.33@osu.edu>, "reed, ingrid" <ireed@rutgers.edu>, "Weingart, John" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>, "Laura Paquette, Carol" <cpaquette@eac.gov>, "Foley, Ned" <foley.33@osu.edu>, "reed, ingrid" <ireed@rutgers.edu>, "Weingart, John" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>, "Laura Paquette, Carol" <cpaquette@eac.gov>, "Foley, Ned" <foley.33@osu.edu>, "reed, ingrid" <ireed@rutgers.edu>, "Weingart, John" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>, "Laura Paquette, Carol" <cpaquette@eac.gov>, "Foley, Ned" <foley.33@osu.edu>, "reed, ingrid" <ireed@rutgers.edu>, "Weingart, John" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>, "Laura Paquette, Carol" <cpaquette@eac.gov>, "Foley, Ned" <foley.33@osu.edu>, "reed, ingrid" <ireed@rutgers.edu>, "Weingart, John" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>

Subject Re: Peer Review Group

Tom-

I trust you are in contact with Carol and Julie regarding the information on the Peer Review Group and the July 28 hearing at Cal/Tech that you have requested of them, respectively.

While the EAC is a small agency with relatively few reporting layers, I suggest that for all future items requiring feedback and decisions from the EAC, that you are certain to carbon copy me on all e-mails. This will ensure, that as your primary point of contact, I have a record of all communication that has taken place between the contractor and the agency.

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Carol,

After our discussion in New York, you asked me to put in writing our response to the EAC's suggestions for expanding the number and kinds of groups that would review and comment on our work. I hope after your review of this response, we will be able to quickly recruit a balanced Peer Review Group (PRG) and move ahead as the schedule in our work plan indicates. Attached is a revised list of the members we propose for appointment to the PRG. We will probably not be able to persuade all of them to serve, but the number and range of views included on the proposed list should ensure that the resulting group is well-balanced.

Tom
RESPONSE TO EAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW GROUPS

EAC's Recommendations for the PRG
Karen Lynn-Dyson reported this response from the EAC commissioners to our proposal for the composition of the PRG.

1. Not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG

2. Create a "tiered process" of review in which:
   A. The PRG will prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.
   B. PRG's analysis would be vetted by a defined/select group of local election officials.
   C. A defined/select group of advocacy organizations would review the comments of the local election officials
   D. Empanel a final focus group of local election officials, advocates and academics for an overall, interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Project Team Response
Creating three new committees to the review process to supplement the work of the Peer Review Group (PRG) is possible, but would add at least 8 weeks—and possibly 12 weeks—to our completion of the guidance document on provisional voting. We believe this delay would risk limiting the value of this project for the 2006 election. In addition, the change would add at least $30,000 to the cost of our work. (See the attached table showing the possible effect on our work plan, and note the optimistic assumptions such as the ability to hold a hearing the week after Christmas.). If the same groups were to be engaged in reviewing our work on Voter ID, the time for that work would also have to be stretched at a similar increased cost.

This additional cost and the added time might be worthwhile... if the new layers of review were to produce a consensus on how to strengthen the research, sharpen the analysis, and increase the relevance of the Guidance Document. Our team concluded, however, that additional review groups were unlikely to achieve these results.

PRG focuses on quality of research
We believe that our research would be strengthened by a balanced Peer Review Group that will focus on the design of the research and our conduct of it. Based on the EAC's recommendation, we have revised the composition of the PRG to include additional, well-recognized authorities in the field whose perspective is generally agreed to be conservative.

The PRG will focus on the strength of the research design and the quality of our analysis, not on the politics of our recommendations for the guidance document. The PRG will critique the research design and suggest how to strengthen it. Members of the group will review the quality of our analysis so that we can fill holes and correct errors before we make policy recommendations to the EAC. The PRG may or may not meet as a group. The likelihood is that most comments will come in writing from individual members, most of whose schedules would not permit attendance at meetings. In any case, the PRG members will not gather around a table to come to consensus on the study's recommendations.

While using the PRG as a forum to reach consensus on the knotty issues involved does not
appear practical, the EAC can benefit from the work of other groups in this regard. It is not necessary for this project to duplicate the deliberative processes of the Carter-Baker Commission, the Century Foundation and the Election Center. The EAC itself as well as the project team can get the benefit of these reports without duplicating this “policy evaluation board” structure as part of this contract.

Project Team focuses on analysis and recommendations
Karen reported that the Commissioners believed that the PRG would “prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.” As we see it, the PRG will neither analyze data nor draw conclusions, tentative or otherwise. Its members will review and comment on how the Project Team has designed and carried out the research. Analysis, conclusions and recommendations are the responsibility of the Project Team. We have all seen in the preface to books or articles a sentence or two that read something like this, “The author thanks Mr. X, Ms. Y, and Dr. Z for their review and comment on the manuscript. Their analysis has strengthened the work, but they are in no way responsible for errors or for my conclusions.” That is the way we think about the Peer Review Group.

In short, the PRG will help ensure that EAC’s Guidance Document is founded on a solid base of data and analysis. The review and comment on the Preliminary Guidance Document by the EAC’s Board of Advisors and Standards Board will provide participation by important stakeholder groups without the need for the other review committees. This Board is broad-based and represents a key stakeholder group. It also enjoys a significant advantage over a “defined/select” group we might empanel. Any group we define will be open to criticism or charges of bias by representatives of interest groups not represented.

The criticism and charges of bias might be tolerable, but only if we could expect consensus from the “defined/select” group we would appoint. We believe that consensus would be elusive. In empanelling a “defined/select” group, we would naturally look for balance and would appoint members to represent a point of view or an institutional interest. As representatives they would likely feel that they had little choice but to be strong advocates. They would have little incentive to compromise. Our research, as opposed to our policy recommendations, would be better served by the analysis of scholars than by the advocacy of interests.

Policy judgments
We regard the EAC itself as responsible for the policy judgments involved in shaping the Guidance Document. We plan, of course, to respond to the EAC’s comments on our preliminary draft, so that the EAC’s comments will shape the Preliminary Guidance Document before it is released for public comment. And further revision will follow the public hearing and comments. The EAC and individual Commissioners can always seek comment informally on our analysis or recommendations. That course appears to us preferable to the creation of a new, more elaborate review process.
**Role of the Peer Review Group**

Members of the Peer Review Group will review the research design for the project, including the survey of local election officials, the analysis of Voter ID regime on turnout, the state-by-state narrative of developments in provisional voting and voter identification, and the compilation and analysis of statutes, administrative regulations, and case law affecting provisional voting and voter identification. They will also review the report on Analysis and Alternatives. They may review the draft of the Preliminary Guidance Document before it goes to the Board of Advisors for comment.

Members of the group will be respected authorities in their fields and represent a range of opinions and perspectives, although their views on policy will be less important to the study than their views on the quality of the research on which policy recommendations are based.

Ideally, the group would meet once, but even that may not be possible to arrange given the tight time period for the project, the demanding schedules of the members, and their wide dispersal across the county. They will function largely by reviewing written work and making written comments on it. The timing of their involvement is indicated on the work plan.

**R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.**
Professor of Political Science  
California Institute of Technology  
rma@hss.caltech.edu  
626-395-4422  

Alvarez has taught political science at Caltech since 1992. He received his B.A. in political science from Carleton College, his M.A. and Ph.D. from Duke University. Alvarez focuses on the study of electoral politics. He has published many articles on electoral behavior and public opinion. Support for his research has come from the National Science Foundation, The IBM Corporation, the Carnegie Corporation, of New York, and the Knight Foundation. Alvarez edits the Analytical Methods for Social Research book series and is on the editorial boards of a number of academic journals. He is Co-Director of the Caltech-MIT Voting Technology Project.

**Guy-Uriel E. Charles**  
Associate Professor  
School of Law  
University of Minnesota  
342 Mondale Hall  
229-19th Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
612-626-8154  
gcharles@umn.edu

Charles teaches and writes on election law, law and politics, and race. He received his B.A. degree in Political Science, *cum laude* from Spring Arbor University and his J.D. from the University of Michigan Law School, where he was Editor-in-Chief of the *Michigan Journal of Race & Law*. He is completing a PhD in political science from the University of Michigan.
Brad Clark
Professor of Law
George Washington University School of Law

Clark received his B.A. in Political Science from Florida State University and his J.D. from Columbia Law School in 1985. He served as a law clerk to the Judge Robert H. Bork on the US Court of Appeals and went on to clerk for Justice Antonin Scalia on the Supreme Court. He has been on the faculty at George Washington University Law School for 12 years, where he has taught Constitutional Law, Federal Courts, and Civil Procedure.

Pamela Susan Karlan
Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law
Stanford Law School
559 Nathan Abbott Way
Stanford, CA 94305-8610
(650) 725-4851
karlan@stanford.edu

Karlan's principal subjects include legal regulation of the political process. She earned her BA, MA, and JD at Yale University, and was previously a Professor at the University of Virginia. She serves on the California Fair Political Practices Commission and is a Cooperating Attorney with the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund. She has also been a lecturer at the FBI National Academy. Among her publications, she is a co-author of When Elections Go Bad: The Law of Democracy and the Presidential Election of 2000.

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu

Kropf has been on the faculty at Missouri since 1999. She received her BA Summa Cum Laude, Phi Beta Kappa from Kansas State University and her PhD in Political Science from American University. Her work concentrates on Research Methods, Urban Politics, American Government, and Political Behavior. Before joining the faculty at Missouri, she was Project Coordinator at the University of Maryland Survey Research Center. She has published recent on undervoting in presidential elections, and on invalidated ballots in the 1996 presidential election, and on the incremental process of election reform in Missouri.

Daniel H. Lowenstein
Professor of Law
School of Law
University of California, Los Angeles
Box 951476,
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1476
(310) 825-4841

Among other courses, Lowenstein teaches Election Law. His textbook, Election Law has become a standard in the field. He earned his A.B. at Yale and his LL.B. at Harvard, While working for California's Secretary of State he was the main drafter of the Political Reform Act in 1971. He was the first chair of the Fair Political Practices Commission. He has served on the national governing board of Common Cause. He has written on such topics as campaign finance, redistricting, bribery, initiative elections, and political parties.

John F. Manning
Professor
Harvard Law School
Now at Harvard, Manning was appointed Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel by President Bush in 2001. He had been Professor of Law at Columbia Law School. Had had served as Assistant to the Solicitor General of the United States and was an Attorney-Adviser in the Office of Legal Counsel at the Department of Justice during the administrations of President George H. W. Bush and President Reagan. He is a graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School.

Tim Storey
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures
7700 East First Place
Denver, CO 80230
303-364-7700
or
444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-5400

Peter G. Veniero, Esq.
Counsel
Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, New Jersey 07102
Tel: 973-643-7000

Veniero chairs the firm’s Appellate Practice Group. He earned his B.A. at Drew University, Phi Beta Kappa, and his J.D. (with honors) at the Duke University School of Law. In 1999, he was appointed a justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, where he served for 7 years before re-entering private practice. Before his appointment to the Supreme Court, he served as New Jersey’s Attorney General, and in that capacity oversaw the state’s election laws. He also served as Chief of Staff and Chief Counsel to Governor Christine Todd Whitman.

Plus one or two former, senior election officials to be suggested by the EAC
Tom-

I will take up the matter of next steps with the Peer Review Group, with Tom Wilkey, the EAC Executive Director ASAP.

I will have an answer regarding the EAC's suggested next steps on how to proceed on this matter as quickly as possible.

Regards-

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Carol,

I sent you the email on the Peer Review Group because you asked me to. When we discussed the issue in New York, you told me to send to you in writing our response to the Commission's suggestions for a new, more elaborate review process. I believe I copied Karen on that email.

Learning now, almost a week later, that you have taken no action is disheartening. As you know, our schedule is tight, and we need the counsel the Peer Review Group can provide. I hope, therefore, that Karen will take immediate action to resolve the situation so we can begin to recruit the review group in time to assure the quality of the resource design.
Karen, Tom -

I am not taking any action on the email Tom sent a few days ago regarding the Peer Review Group because the Eagleton project is not my responsibility. As I indicated earlier to Karen, I didn't know why this was sent to me since Karen is the Project Manager. I endorse her comment below regarding the need for including her in all correspondence with anyone at the EAC regarding the project.

When I was the Interim Executive Director it was part of my job to stay on top of all EAC project work. I now have other responsibilities at the EAC, and while I am happy to continue involvement in other projects for continuity and transition purposes as needed, that needs to be very limited. My involvement with the Eagleton work has only been from the contracting perspective, and that is the only continuing role I have. Any substantive project activities have to be taken up with Karen.

Carol A. Paquette  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
(202)566-3125 cpaquette@eac.gov

Karen  
Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

07/12/2005 05:08 PM
Tom-

I trust you are in contact with Carol and Julie regarding the information on the Peer Review Group and the July 28 hearing at Cal/Tech that you have requested of them, respectively.

While the EAC is a small agency with relatively few reporting layers, I suggest that for all future items requiring feedback and decisions from the EAC, that you are certain to carbon copy me on all e-mails.

This will ensure, that as your primary point of contact, I have a record of all communication that has taken place between the contractor and the agency.

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Carol,

After our discussion in New York, you asked me to put in writing our response to the EAC's suggestions for expanding the number and kinds of groups that would review and comment on our work. I hope after your review of this response, we will be able to quickly recruit a balanced
Peer Review Group (PRG) and move ahead as the schedule in our work plan indicates. Attached is a revised list of the members we propose for appointment to the PRG. We will probably not be able to persuade all of them to serve, but the number and range of views included on the proposed list should ensure that the resulting group is well-balanced.

Tom

RESPONSE TO EAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW GROUPS

EAC's Recommendations for the PRG
Karen Lynn-Dyson reported this response from the EAC commissioners to our proposal for the composition of the PRG.

1. Not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG

2. Create a “tiered process” of review in which:
   A. The PRG will prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.
   B. PRG’s analysis would be vetted by a defined/select group of local election officials.
   C. A defined/select group of advocacy organizations would review the comments of the local election officials
   D. Empanel a final focus group of local election officials, advocates and academics for an overall, interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Project Team Response
Creating three new committees to the review process to supplement the work of the Peer Review Group (PRG) is possible, but would add at least 8 weeks—and possibly 12 weeks—to our completion of the guidance document on provisional voting. We believe this delay would risk limiting the value of this project for the 2006 election. In addition, the change would add at least $30,000 to the cost of our work. (See the attached table showing the possible effect on our work plan, and note the optimistic assumptions such as the ability to hold a hearing the week after Christmas.). If the same groups were to be engaged in reviewing our work on Voter ID, the time for that work would also have to be stretched at a similar increased cost.

This additional cost and the added time might be worthwhile... if the new layers of review were to produce a consensus on how to strengthen the research, sharpen the analysis, and increase the relevance of the Guidance Document. Our team concluded, however, that additional review groups were unlikely to achieve these results.

PRG focuses on quality of research
We believe that our research would be strengthened by a balanced Peer Review Group that will focus on the design of the research and our conduct of it. Based on the EAC's recommendation, we have revised the composition of the PRG to include additional, well-recognized authorities in the field whose perspective is generally agreed to be conservative.

The PRG will focus on the strength of the research design and the quality of our analysis, not on the politics of our recommendations for the guidance document. The PRG will critique the research design and suggest how to strengthen it. Members of the group will review the quality of our analysis so that we can fill holes and correct errors before we make policy recommendations to the EAC. The PRG may or may not meet as a group. The likelihood is that most comments will come in writing from individual members, most of whose schedules would not permit attendance.
at meetings. In any case, the PRG members will not gather around a table to come to consensus on the study's recommendations.

While using the PRG as a forum to reach consensus on the knotty issues involved does not appear practical, the EAC can benefit from the work of other groups in this regard. It is not necessary for this project to duplicate the deliberative processes of the Carter-Baker Commission, the Century Foundation and the Election Center. The EAC itself as well as the project team can get the benefit of these reports without duplicating this "policy evaluation board" structure as part of this contract.

**Project Team focuses on analysis and recommendations**

Karen reported that the Commissioners believed that the PRG would "prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions." As we see it, the PRG will neither analyze data nor draw conclusions, tentative or otherwise. Its members will review and comment on how the Project Team has designed and carried out the research. Analysis, conclusions and recommendations are the responsibility of the Project Team. We have all seen in the preface to books or articles a sentence or two that read something like this, "The author thanks Mr. X, Ms. Y, and Dr. Z for their review and comment on the manuscript. Their analysis has strengthened the work, but they are in no way responsible for errors or for my conclusions." That is the way we think about the Peer Review Group.

In short, the PRG will help ensure that EAC's Guidance Document is founded on a solid base of data and analysis. The review and comment on the Preliminary Guidance Document by the EAC's Board of Advisors and Standards Board will provide participation by important stakeholder groups without the need for the other review committees. This Board is broad-based and represents a key stakeholder group. It also enjoys a significant advantage over a "defined/select" group we might empanel. Any group we define will be open to criticism or charges of bias by representatives of interest groups not represented.

The criticism and charges of bias might be tolerable, but only if we could expect consensus from the "defined/select" group we would appoint. We believe that consensus would be elusive. In empaneling a "defined/select" group, we would naturally look for balance and would appoint members to represent a point of view or an institutional interest. As representatives they would likely feel that they had little choice but to be strong advocates. They would have little incentive to compromise. Our research, as opposed to our policy recommendations, would be better served by the analysis of scholars than by the advocacy of interests.

**Policy judgments**

We regard the EAC itself as responsible for the policy judgments involved in shaping the Guidance Document. We plan, of course, to respond to the EAC's comments on our preliminary draft, so that the EAC's comments will shape the Preliminary Guidance Document before it is released for public comment. And further revision will follow the public hearing and comments. The EAC and individual Commissioners can always seek comment informally on our analysis or recommendations. That course appears to us preferable to the creation of a new, more elaborate review process.
Tom-

I don’t anticipate a problem with this re-allocation of funds. I will, however, check with our financial officer to be certain that such a re-allocation is permissible.

I will let you know shortly.

Regards-

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Tom O'neill" <tom_oneill@verizon.net>

Karen:

As we discussed on Tuesday morning in the teleconference, we would like to reallocate within the current budget $9,500 to the survey of local election officials. This will raise the budget for the survey to $24,500 from $15,000.

The additional funding will permit us to double the sample of local election officials from 200 to 400. The larger sample will allow more detailed comparisons between the experience of local election officials in states that offered some form of provisional ballot before HAVA and those that did not. This comparison is a topic of special interest identified in the contract.

The increase of $9,500 is based on an estimate made by SRBI, the contractor that will actually administer the interviews. I can furnish you with a copy of the estimate if you like. We believe the additional funds will...
improve significantly our ability to provide relevant analysis to EAC on this important issue.

Tom O'Neill
To: "Tom O'Neill" <Tom_O'Neill@EAC.GOV@GSAEXTERNAL=
cc: Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC

Subject: Re: Composition of the Eagleton Peer Review Group

Tom-

This e-mail will reiterate our conversation of this morning.

After a close review of your e-mail of July 12th, EAC staff determined that it is appropriate for the Eagleton/Moritz team to proceed with the composition of its Peer Review Group as it deems suitable and necessary. EAC staff will assume that your team is satisfied that it has created a politically and ideologically balanced group to review your work.

EAC staff, the Commissioners, the Advisory and Standards Boards will, we are certain, have opportunities to review the findings and analyses that your team creates, at critical junctures during the process.

Enjoy your weekend.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Tom-

Thanks for sharing this information with me and for keeping me apprised of the activities, interests and concerns of the team.

FYI-
I'm not certain who is on board to attend the meeting at Cal Tech; Ruth and the others may wish to find a time that Tom would be available to meet with folks then.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV	 To "Tom O'neill" @GSAEXTERNAL--
07/15/2005 03:25 PM	 cc
bcc
Subject: Re: Invitation to Tom Wilkey

Karen,

For your information, Ruth Mandel, Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, sent the letter below to Tom Wilkey this afternoon. It is an invitation for him to meet with the project team in August at Rutgers.

Have a good weekend.

Tom O'Neill

I'm writing on behalf of my colleagues at the Eagleton Institute of Politics to send congratulations on your appointment as Executive Director of the Election Assistance Commission and to extend a warm
invitation for you to visit the Institute to meet our research team. The Eagleton Institute and our partners at the Moritz College of Law are delighted to have been selected to provide research services to the EAC for developing guidance to the states on provisional voting and voter identification requirements.

The Eagleton and Moritz team conducting the research and analysis would appreciate an opportunity to discuss the project with you so that we can gain a full understanding of your perspective on this work and make our research as useful as possible for you, the EAC, the states, and eventually the voters.

I understand that you continue to travel between New York and Washington, which would make a visit to Eagleton simple to arrange. Since the Rutgers campus in New Brunswick is not far from the Metropark Amtrak station, we could easily pick you up at Metropark and return you at the end of the visit. Our Moritz partners would also attend.

The agenda for such a meeting could include a briefing on our progress, discussion of challenges to be met, and a conversation about your goals for this research. We believe that the earlier in the research process we can arrange to meet, the better for the project.

I hope you agree that a meeting in the near future would be useful, and that you like the idea of a visit to the research site. If so, we can search for convenient dates in the next few weeks, perhaps starting with the possibility that you would be available on August 12, 15, or 16.

We all look forward to continuing our work together on this worthwhile project.

Ruth B. Mandel

Director, The Eagleton Institute of Politics

Board of Governors Professor of Politics
Tom-

EAC contract staff indicate that the reallocation you propose can occur and that all other such reallocations that are made from your project budget for this contract budget can be done at your own discretion.

From a contractual standpoint, EAC's only concern is that Eagleton is able to accomplish all of the activities and provide all of the deliverables that have been set forth in your contract.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
As we speak, I'm writing up the final memo for the Chairman's signature. Things got a bit complicated since your original proposal did not provide labor hours and costs for the project staff.

Am working through this issue, however. Will keep you posted.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Shall we say February 28 at 3:00 PM?

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Tom O'neill" <tom_oneill@verizon.net>

Karen, I’ll survey the group about the best time for a conference call. The 24th does not look like a good time. We have a teleconference with the Peer Review Group on the Voter ID paper scheduled for Feb. 22, and therefore would be hard-pressed to review the précis of your comments in time for a discussion on the 24th. The next week would be more promising, perhaps Tuesday, Feb 28 in the afternoon.

We still plan to deliver the Voter ID paper to you the first week in March.

Tom O'Neill
Commissioner Hillman has asked a follow-up question regarding the sharing of EAC's information, on the Eagleton study on Voter ID requirements, with Tom Hicks.

I have given Sheila the following appendices for possible distribution to Tom Hicks:

1. Summary of Voter ID Requirements by State
2. Court Decisions and Literature on Voter Identification and Related Issues Court decisions
3. Annotated bibliography on Voter Identification Issues

I have not given Sheila, for distribution, these Appendices or parts of the report:

1. Analysis of Effects of Voter ID Requirements on Turnout
2. The Executive Summary and Recommendations
3. Summary of Research
4. State Statutes and Regulations Affecting Voter Identification (electronic version only)

**You'll also recall that I'm awaiting Tom's approval to send to Mike McDonald, various appendices from the Eagleton Provisional Voting report**

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Hi John-

I'm checking to see if you can contact your finance department to determine if EAC has received its final invoice on the Eagleton/Moritz study.

Our financial records show a balance on the contract of $2,910.77

I need to be able to tell our finance folks how this final balance is going to be handled.

Thanks, John.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Thanks for your follow-up on this, John.

I will pass this along to the EAC finance department so they may handle these remaining funds accordingly.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"John Weingart"

"John Weingart"
To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Eagleton/Moritz final invoices

Karen - The invoice your just received is final. The final invoice we received from Ohio State was less than we had anticipated so the remaining balance is for the EAC to use for other projects. Let me know if you need more information.

-- John Weingart, Associate Director

Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Hi John-
> I'm checking to see if you can contact your finance department to determine if EAC has received its final invoice on the Eagleton/Moritz study.
> Our financial records show a balance on the contract of $2,910.77
> I need to be able to tell our finance folks how this final balance is
Go ahead and give him a call later on this afternoon.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"John Weingart"

Karen - While we're writing, I had a call last week from Tom Wilkey saying he would get back to me in response to my letter by last Thursday. Is the best thing for me to call him or do you know if a response is in the works?

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Thanks for your follow-up on this, John.
> I will pass this along to the EAC finance department so they may
> handle these remaining funds accordingly.
> Regards-
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Director
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

>
Tom-

As I believe you are aware, The Eagleton Institute’s Tim Vercellotti’s "Analysis of Effects of Voter ID Requirements on Turnout" was made public at the American Political Science Association meeting and was subsequently referenced on Dan Tokaji’s blog.

We have sent the following:

To Mike McDonald:
Appendix C: Provisional Ballot Litigation by Issue
Appendix D: Provisional Ballot Litigation by State

To Tom Hicks:
Appendix A: Summary of Voter ID Requirements by State
Appendix B: Court Decisions and Litigation on Voter Identification and Related Issue Court Decisions
Appendix D: Annotated Bibliography on Voter Identification Issues

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
10/04/2006 03:02 PM
To Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV@EAC, Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC
bcc Sheila A. Banks/EAC/GOV@EAC; Peter Schulleri/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject Re: Eagleton Response

Karen;
Could you please put a list of items we have released and what has not been released on the two Eagleton Reports.
Karen:

Thanks. I have not heard from Carol about the PRG nor from Julie about plans for the July public meeting. I believe I have sent you copies of my significant emails to them, and will make sure you get all of them in the future.

Tom O'Neill

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2005 5:09 PM
To: Paquette, Carol; Foley, Ned; reed, ingrid; Weingart, John; Laura Williams; Mandel, Ruth
Cc: Paquette, Carol; Foley, Ned; reed, ingrid; Weingart, John; Laura Williams; Mandel, Ruth
Subject: Re: Peer Review Group

Tom-

I trust you are in contact with Carol and Julie regarding the information on the Peer Review Group and the July 28 hearing at Cal/Tech that you have requested of them, respectively.

While the EAC is a small agency with relatively few reporting layers, I suggest that for all future items requiring feedback and decisions from the EAC, that you are certain to carbon copy me on all e-mails.

This will ensure, that as your primary point of contact, I have a record of all communication that has taken place between the contractor and the agency.

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Carol,

After our discussion in New York, you asked me to put in writing our response to the EAC's suggestions for expanding the number and kinds of groups that would review and comment on our work. I hope after your review of this response, we will be able to quickly recruit a balanced Peer Review Group (PRG) and move ahead as the schedule in our work plan indicates. Attached is a revised list of the members we propose for appointment to the PRG. We will probably not be able to persuade all of them to serve, but the number and range of views included on the proposed list should ensure that the resulting group is well-balanced.

Tom

RESPONSE TO EAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW GROUPS

EAC's Recommendations for the PRG
Karen Lynn-Dyson reported this response from the EAC commissioners to our proposal for the composition of the PRG.

1. Not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG

2. Create a "tiered process" of review in which:
   A. The PRG will prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.
   B. PRG's analysis would be vetted by a defined/select group of local election officials.
   C. A defined/select group of advocacy organizations would review the comments of the local election officials
D. Empanel a final focus group of local election officials, advocates and academics for an overall, interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Project Team Response

Creating three new committees to the review process to supplement the work of the Peer Review Group (PRG) is possible, but would add at least 8 weeks—and possibly 12 weeks—to our completion of the guidance document on provisional voting. We believe this delay would risk limiting the value of this project for the 2006 election. In addition, the change would add at least $30,000 to the cost of our work. (See the attached table showing the possible effect on our work plan, and note the optimistic assumptions such as the ability to hold a hearing the week after Christmas.) If the same groups were to be engaged in reviewing our work on Voter ID, the time for that work would also have to be stretched at a similar increased cost.

This additional cost and the added time might be worthwhile... if the new layers of review were to produce a consensus on how to strengthen the research, sharpen the analysis, and increase the relevance of the Guidance Document. Our team concluded, however, that additional review groups were unlikely to achieve these results.

PRG focuses on quality of research

We believe that our research would be strengthened by a balanced Peer Review Group that will focus on the design of the research and our conduct of it. Based on the EAC's recommendation, we have revised the composition of the PRG to include additional, well-recognized authorities in the field whose perspective is generally agreed to be conservative.

The PRG will focus on the strength of the research design and the quality of our analysis, not on the politics of our recommendations for the guidance document. The PRG will critique the research design and suggest how to strengthen it. Members of the group will review the quality of our analysis so that we can fill holes and correct errors before we make policy recommendations to the EAC. The PRG may or may not meet as a group. The likelihood is that most comments will come in writing from individual members, most of whose schedules would not permit attendance at meetings. In any case, the PRG members will not gather around a table to come to consensus on the study's recommendations.

While using the PRG as a forum to reach consensus on the knotty issues involved does not appear practical, the EAC can benefit from the work of other groups in this regard. It is not necessary for this project to duplicate the deliberative processes of the Carter-Baker Commission, the Century Foundation and the Election Center. The EAC itself as well as the project team can get the benefit of these reports without duplicating this "policy evaluation board" structure as part of this contract.

Project Team focuses on analysis and recommendations

Karen reported that the Commissioners believed that the PRG would "prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions." As we see it, the PRG will neither analyze data nor draw conclusions, tentative or otherwise. Its members will review and comment on how the Project Team has designed and carried out the research. Analysis, conclusions and recommendations are the responsibility of the Project Team. We have all seen in the preface to books or articles a sentence or two that read something like this, "The author thanks Mr. X, Ms. Y, and Dr. Z for their review and comment on the manuscript. Their analysis has strengthened the work, but they are in no way responsible for errors or for my conclusions." That is the way we think about the Peer Review Group.

In short, the PRG will help ensure that EAC's Guidance Document is founded on a solid base of...
data and analysis. The review and comment on the Preliminary Guidance Document by the EAC's Board of Advisors and Standards Board will provide participation by important stakeholder groups without the need for the other review committees. This Board is broad-based and represents a key stakeholder group. It also enjoys a significant advantage over a "defined/select" group we might empanel. Any group we define will be open to criticism or charges of bias by representatives of interest groups not represented.

The criticism and charges of bias might be tolerable, but only if we could expect consensus from the "defined/select" group we would appoint. We believe that consensus would be elusive. In empanelling a "defined/select" group, we would naturally look for balance and would appoint members to represent a point of view or an institutional interest. As representatives they would likely feel that they had little choice but to be strong advocates. They would have little incentive to compromise. Our research, as opposed to our policy recommendations, would be better served by the analysis of scholars than by the advocacy of interests.

Policy judgments

We regard the EAC itself as responsible for the policy judgments involved in shaping the Guidance Document. We plan, of course, to respond to the EAC's comments on our preliminary draft, so that the EAC's comments will shape the Preliminary Guidance Document before it is released for public comment. And further revision will follow the public hearing and comments. The EAC and individual Commissioners can always seek comment informally on our analysis or recommendations. That course appears to us preferable to the creation of a new, more elaborate review process.
Julie -

I don't remember saying much of anything but a few pleasantries to Tom in New York. Did you talk to him about this topic? I'm really at a loss on this. (Maybe I'm having an extended senior moment.)

Carol A. Paquette
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202)566-3125  cpaquette@eac.gov

Carol,  

After our discussion in New York, you asked me to put in writing our response to the EAC's suggestions for expanding the number and kinds of groups that would review and comment on our work. I hope after your review of this response, we will be able to quickly recruit a balanced Peer Review Group (PRG) and move ahead as the schedule in our work plan indicates. Attached is a revised list of the members we propose for appointment to the PRG. We will probably not be able to persuade all of them to serve, but the number and range of views included on the proposed list should ensure that the resulting group is well-balanced.

Tom

RESPONSE TO EAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW GROUPS

EAC's Recommendations for the PRG
Karen Lynn-Dyson reported this response from the EAC commissioners to our proposal for the composition of the PRG.

1. Not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG

2. Create a "tiered process" of review in which:
   A. The PRG will prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.
B. PRG's analysis would be vetted by a defined/select group of local election officials.
C. A defined/select group of advocacy organizations would review the comments of the local election officials
D. Empanel a final focus group of local election officials, advocates and academics for an overall, interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Project Team Response
Creating three new committees to the review process to supplement the work of the Peer Review Group (PRG) is possible, but would add at least 8 weeks --and possibly 12 weeks-- to our completion of the guidance document on provisional voting. We believe this delay would risk limiting the value of this project for the 2006 election. In addition, the change would add at least $30,000 to the cost of our work. (See the attached table showing the possible effect on our work plan, and note the optimistic assumptions such as the ability to hold a hearing the week after Christmas.). If the same groups were to be engaged in reviewing our work on Voter ID, the time for that work would also have to be stretched at a similar increased cost.

This additional cost and the added time might be worthwhile... if the new layers of review were to produce a consensus on how to strengthen the research, sharpen the analysis, and increase the relevance of the Guidance Document. Our team concluded, however, that additional review groups were unlikely to achieve these results.

PRG focuses on quality of research
We believe that our research would be strengthened by a balanced Peer Review Group that will focus on the design of the research and our conduct of it. Based on the EAC's recommendation, we have revised the composition of the PRG to include additional, well-recognized authorities in the field whose perspective is generally agreed to be conservative.

The PRG will focus on the strength of the research design and the quality of our analysis, not on the politics of our recommendations for the guidance document. The PRG will critique the research design and suggest how to strengthen it. Members of the group will review the quality of our analysis so that we can fill holes and correct errors before we make policy recommendations to the EAC. The PRG may or may not meet as a group. The likelihood is that most comments will come in writing from individual members, most of whose schedules would not permit attendance at meetings. In any case, the PRG members will not gather around a table to come to consensus on the study's recommendations.

While using the PRG as a forum to reach consensus on the knotty issues involved does not appear practical, the EAC can benefit from the work of other groups in this regard. It is not necessary for this project to duplicate the deliberative processes of the Carter-Baker Commission, the Century Foundation and the Election Center. The EAC itself as well as the project team can get the benefit of these reports without duplicating this "policy evaluation board" structure as part of this contract.

Project Team focuses on analysis and recommendations
Karen reported that the Commissioners believed that the PRG would "prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions." As we see it, the PRG will neither analyze data nor draw conclusions, tentative or otherwise. Its members will review and
comment on how the Project Team has designed and carried out the research. Analysis, conclusions and recommendations are the responsibility of the Project Team. We have all seen in the preface to books or articles a sentence or two that read something like this, “The author thanks Mr. X, Ms. Y, and Dr. Z for their review and comment on the manuscript. Their analysis has strengthened the work, but they are in no way responsible for errors or for my conclusions.” That is the way we think about the Peer Review Group.

In short, the PRG will help ensure that EAC’s Guidance Document is founded on a solid base of data and analysis. The review and comment on the Preliminary Guidance Document by the EAC’s Board of Advisors and Standards Board will provide participation by important stakeholder groups without the need for the other review committees. This Board is broad-based and represents a key stakeholder group. It also enjoys a significant advantage over a “defined/select” group we might empanel. Any group we define will be open to criticism or charges of bias by representatives of interest groups not represented.

The criticism and charges of bias might be tolerable, but only if we could expect consensus from the “defined/select” group we would appoint. We believe that consensus would be elusive. In empanelling a “defined/select” group, we would naturally look for balance and would appoint members to represent a point of view or an institutional interest. As representatives they would likely feel that they had little choice but to be strong advocates. They would have little incentive to compromise. Our research, as opposed to our policy recommendations, would be better served by the analysis of scholars than by the advocacy of interests.

**Policy judgments**

We regard the EAC itself as responsible for the policy judgments involved in shaping the Guidance Document. We plan, of course, to respond to the EAC’s comments on our preliminary draft, so that the EAC’s comments will shape the Preliminary Guidance Document before it is released for public comment. And further revision will follow the public hearing and comments. The EAC and individual Commissioners can always seek comment informally on our analysis or recommendations. That course appears to us preferable to the creation of a new, more elaborate review process.
Carol,

After our discussion in New York, you asked me to put in writing our response to the EAC's suggestions for expanding the number and kinds of groups that would review and comment on our work. I hope after your review of this response, we will be able to quickly recruit a balanced Peer Review Group (PRG) and move ahead as the schedule in our work plan indicates. Attached is a revised list of the members we propose for appointment to the PRG. We will probably not be able to persuade all of them to serve, but the number and range of views included on the proposed list should ensure that the resulting group is well-balanced.

Tom

RESPONSE TO EAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW GROUPS

EAC's Recommendations for the PRG
Karen Lynn-Dyson reported this response from the EAC commissioners to our proposal for the composition of the PRG.

1. Not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG

2. Create a "tiered process" of review in which:
   A. The PRG will prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.
   B. PRG's analysis would be vetted by a defined/select group of local election officials.
   C. A defined/select group of advocacy organizations would review the comments of the local election officials
   D. Empanel a final focus group of local election officials, advocates and academics for an overall, interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Project Team Response
Creating three new committees to the review process to supplement the work of the Peer Review Group (PRG) is possible, but would add at least 8 weeks—and possibly 12 weeks—to our completion of the guidance document on provisional voting. We believe this delay would risk limiting the value of this project for the 2006 election. In addition, the change would add at least $30,000 to the cost of our work. (See the attached table showing the possible effect on our work plan, and note the optimistic assumptions such as the ability to hold a hearing the week after Christmas.). If the same groups were to be engaged in reviewing our work on Voter ID, the time for that work would also have to be stretched at a similar increased cost.
This additional cost and the added time might be worthwhile... if the new layers of review were to produce a consensus on how to strengthen the research, sharpen the analysis, and increase the relevance of the Guidance Document. Our team concluded, however, that additional review groups were unlikely to achieve these results.

**PRG focuses on quality of research**

We believe that our research would be strengthened by a balanced Peer Review Group that will focus on the design of the research and our conduct of it. Based on the EAC's recommendation, we have revised the composition of the PRG to include additional, well-recognized authorities in the field whose perspective is generally agreed to be conservative.

The PRG will focus on the strength of the research design and the quality of our analysis, not on the politics of our recommendations for the guidance document. The PRG will critique the research design and suggest how to strengthen it. Members of the group will review the quality of our analysis so that we can fill holes and correct errors before we make policy recommendations to the EAC. The PRG may or may not meet as a group. The likelihood is that most comments will come in writing from individual members, most of whose schedules would not permit attendance at meetings. In any case, the PRG members will not gather around a table to come to consensus on the study's recommendations.

While using the PRG as a forum to reach consensus on the knotty issues involved does not appear practical, the EAC can benefit from the work of other groups in this regard. It is not necessary for this project to duplicate the deliberative processes of the Carter-Baker Commission, the Century Foundation and the Election Center. The EAC itself as well as the project team can get the benefit of these reports without duplicating this "policy evaluation board" structure as part of this contract.

**Project Team focuses on analysis and recommendations**

Karen reported that the Commissioners believed that the PRG would "prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions." As we see it, the PRG will neither analyze data nor draw conclusions, tentative or otherwise. Its members will review and comment on how the Project Team has designed and carried out the research. Analysis, conclusions and recommendations are the responsibility of the Project Team. We have all seen in the preface to books or articles a sentence or two that read something like this, "The author thanks Mr. X, Ms. Y, and Dr. Z for their review and comment on the manuscript. Their analysis has strengthened the work, but they are in no way responsible for errors or for my conclusions." That is the way we think about the Peer Review Group.

In short, the PRG will help ensure that EAC's Guidance Document is founded on a solid base of data and analysis. The review and comment on the Preliminary Guidance Document by the EAC's Board of Advisors and Standards Board will provide participation by important stakeholder groups without the need for the other review committees. This Board is broad-based and represents a key stakeholder group. It also enjoys a significant advantage over a "defined/select" group we might empanel. Any group we define will be open to criticism or charges of bias by representatives of interest groups not represented.

The criticism and charges of bias might be tolerable, but only if we could expect consensus from the "defined/select" group we would appoint. We believe that consensus would be elusive. In empanelling a "defined/select" group, we would naturally look for balance and would appoint
members to represent a point of view or an institutional interest. As representatives they would likely feel that they had little choice but to be strong advocates. They would have little incentive to compromise. Our research, as opposed to our policy recommendations, would be better served by the analysis of scholars than by the advocacy of interests.

Policy judgments
We regard the EAC itself as responsible for the policy judgments involved in shaping the Guidance Document. We plan, of course, to respond to the EAC's comments on our preliminary draft, so that the EAC's comments will shape the Preliminary Guidance Document before it is released for public comment. And further revision will follow the public hearing and comments. The EAC and individual Commissioners can always seek comment informally on our analysis or recommendations. That course appears to us preferable to the creation of a new, more elaborate review process.
REVISED
PROPOSED MEMBERS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP
July 6, 2005

Role of the Peer Review Group
Members of the Peer Review Group will review the research design for the project, including the survey of local election officials, the analysis of Voter ID regime on turnout, the state-by-state narrative of developments in provisional voting and voter identification, and the compilation and analysis of statutes, administrative regulations, and case law affecting provisional voting and voter identification. They will also review the report on Analysis and Alternatives. They may review the draft of the Preliminary Guidance Document before it goes to the Board of Advisors for comment.

Members of the group will be respected authorities in their fields and represent a range of opinions and perspectives, although their views on policy will be less important to the study than their views on the quality of the research on which policy recommendations are based.

Ideally, the group would meet once, but even that may not be possible to arrange given the tight time period for the project, the demanding schedules of the members, and their wide dispersal across the county. They will function largely by reviewing written work and making written comments on it. The timing of their involvement is indicated on the work plan.

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology
626-395-4422
Alvarez has taught political science at Caltech since 1992. He received his B.A. in political science from Carleton College, his M.A. and Ph.D. from Duke University. Alvarez focuses on the study of electoral politics. He has published many articles on electoral behavior and public opinion. Support for his research has come from the National Science Foundation, The IBM Corporation, the Carnegie Corporation, of New York, and the Knight Foundation. Alvarez edits the Analytical Methods for Social Research book series and is on the editorial boards of a number of academic journals. He is Co-Director of the Caltech-MIT Voting Technology Project

Guy-Uriel E. Charles
Associate Professor
School of Law
University of Minnesota
342 Mondale Hall
229-19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
612-626-9154
Charles teaches and writes on election law, law and politics, and race. He received his B.A. degree in Political Science, cum laude from Spring Arbor University and his J.D. from the University of Michigan Law School, where he was Editor-in-Chief of the Michigan Journal of Race & Law. He is completing a PhD in political science from the University of Michigan.
Brad Clark
Professor of Law
George Washington University School of Law

Clark received his B.A. in Political Science from Florida State University and his J.D. from Columbia Law School in 1985. He served as a law clerk to the Judge Robert H. Bork on the US Court of Appeals and went on to clerk for Justice Antonin Scalia on the Supreme Court. He has been on the faculty at George Washington University Law School for 12 years, where he has taught Constitutional Law, Federal Courts, and Civil Procedure.

Pamela Susan Karlan
Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law
Stanford Law School
559 Nathan Abbott Way
Stanford, CA 94305-8610
(650) 725-4851

Karlan's principal subjects include legal regulation of the political process. She earned her BA, MA, and JD at Yale University, and was previously a Professor at the University of Virginia. She serves on the California Fair Political Practices Commission and is a Cooperating Attorney with the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund. She has also been a lecturer at the FBI National Academy. Among her publications, she is a co-author of When Elections Go Bad: The Law of Democracy and the Presidential Election of 2000.

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu

Kropf has been on the faculty at Missouri since 1999. She received her BA Summa Cum Laude, Phi Beta Kappa from Kansas State University and her PhD in Political Science from American University. Her work concentrates on Research Methods, Urban Politics, American Government, and Political Behavior. Before joining the faculty at Missouri, she was Project Coordinator at the University of Maryland Survey Research Center. She has published recent on undervoting in presidential elections, and on invalidated ballots in the 1996 presidential election, and on the incremental process of election reform in Missouri.

Daniel H. Lowenstein
Professor of Law
School of Law
University of California, Los Angeles
Box 951476,
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1476
(310) 825-4941

Among other courses, Lowenstein teaches Election Law. His textbook, Election Law has become a standard in the field. He earned his A.B. at Yale and his LL.B. at Harvard. While working for California’s Secretary of State he was the main drafter of the Political Reform Act in 1971. He was the first chair of the Fair Political Practices Commission. He has served on the national governing board of Common Cause. He has written on such topics as campaign finance, redistricting, bribery, initiative elections, and political parties.

John F. Manning
Professor
Harvard Law School
Now at Harvard, Manning was appointed Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel by President Bush in 2001. He had been Professor of Law at Columbia Law School. Had served as Assistant to the Solicitor General of the United States and was an Attorney-Adviser in the Office of Legal Counsel at the Department of Justice during the administrations of President George H. W. Bush and President Reagan. He is a graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School.

**Tim Storey**
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures
7700 East First Place
Denver, CO 80230
303-364-7700
or
444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-5400

**Peter G. Veniero, Esq.**
Counsel
Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, New Jersey 07102
Tel: 973-643-7000

Verniero chairs the firm’s Appellate Practice Group. He earned his B.A. at Drew University, Phi Beta Kappa, and his J.D. (with honors) at the Duke University School of Law. In 1999, he was appointed a justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, where he served for 7 years before re-entering private practice. Before his appointment to the Supreme Court, he served as New Jersey’s Attorney General, and in that capacity oversaw the state’s election laws. He also served as Chief of Staff and Chief Counsel to Governor Christine Todd Whitman.

**Plus one or two former, senior election officials to be suggested by the EAC**
Good morning Tanisha,

To my understanding Dr. Nagler is out of the office today and I been informed to contact you with any information for him. I am attaching a copy of the Revised Voter ID Analysis. Will you please see that he receives it today? If you have any questions regarding this document feel free to contact me.

Thanks!

Aletha Barrington
Contracts Assistant
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202) 566-2209 (office)
(202) 566-3128 (fax)
Karen,

John and I reviewed your recent email today, and he asked me to respond.

Important to us is a clear commitment now by the EAC to schedule a presentation of our Voter ID research at the May meeting of the Advisory Board, if its review is required before the paper is published and presented at the EAC’s public meeting in June. Your email made no mention of that June public meeting. Our schedule (submitted with the request for the no-cost extension) –and our previous discussion with you—treats that meeting as the key event that will conclude our research under this contract. Therefore, we also look for an explicit understanding that a presentation of our reports will be included in the agenda for that public meeting.

We can deliver a final report on Provisional Voting by May 5 and will be prepared for whatever role we might play at the May 24 meeting of the Advisory Board.

The team is looking forward to a discussion of Tim Vercellotti’s revised statistical analysis of Voter ID with the academic reviewers you are in the process of identifying during the week of May 8. Knowing the specific date and time of that discussion in the next day or so would facilitate the participation of appropriate members of our Peer Review Group in that conversation.

Tom O'Neill

From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
*Sent:* Tuesday, April 25, 2006 12:09 PM
*To:* john.weingart@rutgers.edu
*Cc:* [redacted]
*Subject:* Re: Eagleton/Moritz Next Steps

John and Tom-

A couple of items related to timing over the next several weeks:

1. Is it possible to get your final report on Provisional Voting by COB May 5? If so, I can get this to the four Commissioners for final review and approval. It will then be ready to present to the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board at the May 24 meeting.
2. As we discussed I have been working to identify a small group of academics (three or so) who will be available to review the Voter ID paper the week of May 8. The focus of the review will be on Tim's research methodology and statistical analysis. I am fairly certain that this review can be done via conference call, preferably on May 11 or May 12. This would assume each of the reviewers will have spent time reviewing the paper, taking extensive notes and summarizing his or her comments. I expect that you all, Tim, Mike Alvarez and any others from your peer review panel, who have an expertise in research and statistics, will be available for the conference call, as well?

3. While I expect you will be able to have your final Voter ID paper to me sometime during the week of May 15, it is not clear whether or not the paper will be presented to the EAC Standards and Advisory Boards the following week. As you know, the paper contains some controversial information, so the Commissioners may elect to spend additional time reviewing the findings among themselves, and before it is formally presented to our Boards.

Let me know if this schedule works for you all.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
Karen,

Tim Vercellotti and I have a proposal to meet your schedule for a conference call on May 11 with Jonathan Nagler, Jan Leighley, and Adam Berinsky, as well as a few members of our Peer Review Group.

Tim’s revision will not be complete until May 4. We propose to send this new analysis immediately to you for distribution to the reviewers that day. I will need several days more to incorporate Tim’s new data in our summary report.

Since the reviewers will be focused on our methodology, they will need several days to digest the new statistical analysis. In the meantime, I will plug the new statistical conclusions into our report. We will send the revised summary report to you for distribution to the reviewers on May 9, after our team has looked it over to ensure that it reflects Tim’s work accurately and that its policy conclusions and recommendations are well supported by the statistical analysis.

The reviewers will then have a couple of days to satisfy themselves about those same issues, and we can meet the tight time schedule.

This schedule is demanding, but meeting it is important to us so that our report is ready to be discussed with the Advisory Board at its meeting on May 24.

Please let me know if this timetable works for you.

Tom O’Neill
How about if we ask Eagleton for an estimate of the percent of costs they would attribute to the Voter ID portion of the study?

That way we can say the Voter ID study cost approximately X dollars. (And deductively, the Prov Vote study cost X dollars.)

----------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Jeannie Layson

----- Original Message -----

From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 03/22/2007 02:23 PM EDT
To: Gracia Hillman
Cc: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Subject: Re: Project allotments

$560,002

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov

Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV

What is the (total) dollar amount of the contract?

----------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----
From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 03/22/2007 10:59 AM EDT
To: Gracia Hillman
Cc: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Subject: Project allotments

Commissioner,
Per your question about how much of the contract was actually spent on voter ID research vs provisional voting... I have yet to find the answer. I have reviewed the RFP and the invoices, but so far, it does not appear that these tasks were tracked separately. Karen and I continue to look into this, but I wanted to let you know what we've found so far.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
I think so, but let's check w/Julie first to make sure that's appropriate.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
No, that has not been said publically. But in anticipation of it being asked, I want to make sure we have the facts straight.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----

From: Gracia Hillman
Sent: 03/22/2007 05:06 PM EDT
To: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Cc: Jeannie Layson
Subject: Re: Project allotments

Well, I certainly wouldn't want us to do anything inappropriate. And I don't know the regs and rules on what we can and cannot ask.

What do you suppose the problem might be with our asking that question?

We received 2 distinct products and we find that it would be helpful for us to know what we spent on each effort. We aren't questioning their record keeping, we aren't asking them to reconstruct or research their records, we aren't asking them for an itemization, just an estimate.

The problem is that EAC is saying we spent 500 thou on the Voter ID study. That is wrong info. We need to stop saying that and I hope that has not been said publically, otherwise we need to correct the record ASAP.

And we also did not spend 500 thou on the Provisional Voting study. So, I guess we just have to say we spent 500 thou for both and when asked what we spent for one, we say we don't know. ??

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Well, I certainly wouldn't want us to do anything inappropriate. And I don't know the regs and rules on what we can and cannot ask.

What do you suppose the problem might be with our asking that question?

We received 2 distinct products and we find that it would be helpful for us to know what we spent on each effort. We aren't questioning their record keeping, we aren't asking them to reconstruct or research their records, we aren't asking them for an itemization, just an estimate.

The problem is that EAC is saying we spent 500 thou on the Voter ID study. That is wrong info. We need to stop saying that and I hope that has not been said publically, otherwise we need to correct the record ASAP.

And we also did not spend 500 thou on the Provisional Voting study. So, I guess we just have to say we spent 500 thou for both and when asked what we spent for one, we say we don't know. ??

-------------------------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
After having read the Eagleton draft report, I have some thoughts and questions:

I am troubled by the concept that Eagleton compared states as if they were equal. They assume that, all factors being equal, that the voter turn out in each state would be equal. I am not at all certain that this is the case. Further, there is no evidence that the statisticians actually compared previous years' turnout in the same state to determine whether 2004 was some sort of anomaly for that state (high or low). Long story short, I am very skeptical of the data that they used to draw conclusions. We should ask questions about what data they used, how they parsed it, why they used the data, what other data could have been used to provide better, more reliable results.

My second concern is how they (statistically speaking) differentiate between a minimum requirement (i.e. state name, photo i.d., etc) and a maximum requirement (i.e., state name, photo i.d., etc.). It makes no sense to me how they could possibly arrive at a different percentage for these requirement levels.

My third issue is the persistent use of the phrases "ballot access" and "ballot integrity" without some definition or some explanation of what those concepts are.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Tim, Tom, John, et.al--

The EAC has identified three academics who are going to serve as peer reviewers of the Eagleton Voter ID paper and research.

They are Jonathan Nagler of New York University, Jan Leighley, University of Arizona, and Adam Berinsky of MIT.
They are ready to review the documents as soon as they are available.

I would like to them one week to review the material and then have a joint conference call on Thursday, May 11, in which we would all have an opportunity to discuss the research methodology and statistical analysis, along with general comments and suggestions.

If you are able to get to me the paper and the supporting data analysis, I will distribute to the documents ASAP.
Also let me know, if you would, your availability on May 11 to do this conference all.

I anticipate that it will last approximately 90 minutes.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Tom-

You'll recall that we discussed the fact that the peer review group who Eagleton has assembled do not have the sufficient technical expertise to give us the expert/technical advice we need on the statistical analysis of the Voter ID piece. Only two persons on Eagleton's peer review group have a requisite research and statistical background and knowledge.

You may also remember that Mike told me that he thought that the paper needed an additional set of eyes and review by academics with a background and expertise in election statistics and analysis. When I initially proposed a review panel of six you said that was too many; we agreed that I would find three persons to do the review and that we would pay them a small honoraria for doing the review.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
$100-$200 each, review next week.

Conference call with Eagleton to discuss results on May 11.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV

How much of an honorarium and how fast do we get their review.

-------------------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 04/28/2006 01:13 PM
To: Thomas Wilkey
Subject: Re: Voter ID Paper --Final Draft

Tom-

You’ll recall that we discussed the fact that the peer review group who Eagleton has assembled do not have the sufficient technical expertise to give us the expert/technical advice we need on the statistical analysis of the Voter ID piece. Only two persons on Eagleton's peer review group have a requisite research and statistical background and knowledge.

You may also remember that Mike told me that he thought that the paper needed an additional set of eyes and review by academics with a background and expertise in election statistics and analysis. When I initially proposed a review panel of six you said that was too many; we agreed that I would find three persons to do the review and that we would pay them a small honoraria for doing the review.

K
Tom and Julie-

Please take a look at this draft e-mail and let me know if it captures all that it needs to.

Would like to get this out ASAP- appreciate your feedback..

Dear Jonathan Nagler
Dear Jan Leighley
Dear Adam Berinsky

On behalf of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), thank you in advance for agreeing to assist us with the review of research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics on voter identification. By Friday, May 5, 2006, you will receive, in electronic form, the research paper and relevant data analysis which supports the paper’s findings. Through this independent review by a small group of experts familiar with elections data and research we are seeking feedback on:

- The research methodology which was used to support the paper’s conclusions
- The specific statistical applications which were used to analyze the data and arrive at various conclusions

If there are alternate methodological and statistical approaches to analyzing the data on voter identification, and if there is other data on voter identification that you think should have been included in the analysis, please be certain to note this in your comments.

On May 11, 2006 EAC will conduct a 60-90 minute phone call with key Eagleton Institute staff responsible for the research, members of Eagleton’s peer review group and the EAC-identified reviewers who have been asked to consider the research. Through this dialogue EAC hopes to gather varying perspectives and insights on the research strategies and methods that were employed by Eagleton. As a result of this conversation, EAC anticipates that some revisions will be made to the Eagleton research paper. This paper is scheduled to be presented to EAC’s Board of Advisors and Standards Boards in late May.

While EAC agency policy does not allow us to provide you with financial compensation for your review of this research we greatly appreciate your willingness to assist us with this important task. We believe that the research findings we will provide on voter identification are important and will most certainly be enhanced by your insights and expertise.
Sincerely,

Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Research Manager  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
tel:202-566-3123
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
05/01/2006 03:03 PM
To Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Juliet E. Thompson-Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC
bcc
Subject Re: E-mail to Voter ID peer reviewers

It's my understanding that Julie thinks we are "good to go" as long as we don't pay them.
Correct?

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV
05/01/2006 03:00 PM
To Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC, Juliet E. Thompson-Hodgkins/EAC/GOV
cc
Subject Re: E-mail to Voter ID peer reviewers

Did we resolve the contact issues on this?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson
  
From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 05/01/2006 02:58 PM
To: Thomas Wilkey; Juliet Thompson-Hodgkins
Subject: E-mail to Voter ID peer reviewers

Tom and Julie-

Please take a look at this draft e-mail and let me know if it captures all that it needs to.

Would like to get this out ASAP- appreciate your feedback...

Dear Jonathan Nagler
Dear Jan Leighley
Dear Adam Berinsky
On behalf of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), thank you in advance for agreeing to assist us with the review of research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics on voter identification. By Friday, May 5, 2006, you will receive, in electronic form, the research paper and relevant data analysis which supports the paper’s findings. Through this independent review by a small group of experts familiar with elections data and research we are seeking feedback on:

- The research methodology which was used to support the paper’s conclusions
- The specific statistical applications which were used to analyze the data and arrive at various conclusions

If there are alternate methodological and statistical approaches to analyzing the data on voter identification, and if there is other data on voter identification that you think should have been included in the analysis, please be certain to note this in your comments.

On May 11, 2006 EAC will conduct a 60-90 minute phone call with key Eagleton Institute staff responsible for the research, members of Eagleton’s peer review group and the EAC-identified reviewers who have been asked to consider the research. Through this dialogue EAC hopes to gather varying perspectives and insights on the research strategies and methods that were employed by Eagleton. As a result of this conversation, EAC anticipates that some revisions will be made to the Eagleton research paper. This paper is scheduled to be presented to EAC’s Board of Advisors and Standards Boards in late May.

While EAC agency policy does not allow us to provide you with financial compensation for your review of this research we greatly appreciate your willingness to assist us with this important task. We believe that the research findings we will provide on voter identification are important and will most certainly be enhanced by your insights and expertise.

Sincerely,

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Dr. Berinsky-

On behalf of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), thank you in advance for agreeing to assist us with the review of research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics on voter identification. By Friday, May 5, 2006, you will receive, in electronic form, the research paper and relevant data analysis which supports the paper’s findings. Through this independent review by a small group of experts familiar with elections data and research we are seeking feedback on:

- The research methodology which was used to support the paper’s conclusions
- The specific statistical applications which were used to analyze the data and arrive at various conclusions

If there are alternate methodological and statistical approaches to analyzing the data on voter identification, and if there is other data on voter identification that you think should have been included in the analysis, please be certain to note this in your comments.

On May 11, 2006 EAC will conduct a 60-90 minute phone call with key Eagleton Institute staff responsible for the research, members of Eagleton’s peer review group and the EAC-identified reviewers who have been asked to consider the research. Through this dialogue EAC hopes to gather varying perspectives and insights on the research strategies and methods that were employed by Eagleton. As a result of this conversation, EAC anticipates that some revisions will be made to the Eagleton research paper. This paper is scheduled to be presented to EAC’s Board of Advisors and Standards Boards in late May.

While we are unable to offer financial compensation for your review of this research we greatly appreciate your willingness to assist us with this important task. We believe that the research findings we will provide on voter identification are important and will most certainly be enhanced by your insights and expertise.

Sincerely,

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Dr. Leighley-

On behalf of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), thank you in advance for agreeing to assist us with the review of research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics on voter identification. By Friday, May 5, 2006, you will receive, in electronic form, the research paper and relevant data analysis which supports the paper’s findings. Through this independent review by a small group of experts familiar with elections data and research we are seeking feedback on:

- The research methodology which was used to support the paper’s conclusions
- The specific statistical applications which were used to analyze the data and arrive at various conclusions

If there are alternate methodological and statistical approaches to analyzing the data on voter identification, and if there is other data on voter identification that you think should have been included in the analysis, please be certain to note this in your comments.

On May 11, 2006 EAC will conduct a 60-90 minute phone call with key Eagleton Institute staff responsible for the research, members of Eagleton’s peer review group and the EAC-identified reviewers who have been asked to consider the research. Through this dialogue EAC hopes to gather varying perspectives and insights on the research strategies and methods that were employed by Eagleton. As a result of this conversation, EAC anticipates that some revisions will be made to the Eagleton research paper. This paper is scheduled to be presented to EAC’s Board of Advisors and Standards Boards in late May.

While we are unable to offer financial compensation for your review of this research we greatly appreciate your willingness to assist us with this important task. We believe that the research findings we will provide on voter identification are important and will most certainly be enhanced by your insights and expertise.

Sincerely,

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Dr. Nagler-

On behalf of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), thank you in advance for agreeing to assist us with the review of research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics on voter identification. By **Friday, May 5, 2006**, you will receive, in electronic form, the research paper and relevant data analysis which supports the paper’s findings. Through this independent review by a small group of experts familiar with elections data and research we are seeking feedback on:

- The research methodology which was used to support the paper’s conclusions
- The specific statistical applications which were used to analyze the data and arrive at various conclusions

If there are alternate methodological and statistical approaches to analyzing the data on voter identification, and if there is other data on voter identification that you think should have been included in the analysis, please be certain to note this in your comments.

On **May 11, 2006** EAC will conduct a 60-90 minute phone call with key Eagleton Institute staff responsible for the research, members of Eagleton’s peer review group and the EAC-identified reviewers who have been asked to consider the research. Through this dialogue EAC hopes to gather varying perspectives and insights on the research strategies and methods that were employed by Eagleton. As a result of this conversation, EAC anticipates that some revisions will be made to the Eagleton research paper. This paper is scheduled to be presented to EAC’s Board of Advisors and Standards Boards in late May.

While we are unable to offer financial compensation for your review of this research we greatly appreciate your willingness to assist us with this important task. We believe that the research findings we will provide on voter identification are important and will most certainly be enhanced by your insights and expertise.

Sincerely,

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Aletha-

Here are the names and e-mail addresses of the three individuals who will participate in the May 11 11:30 am conference call

Adam Berinsky- 
Jonathan Nagler- 
Jan Leighley-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Colleagues-

Attached please find the data analysis on voter identification requirements which the Eagleton Institute of Politics has prepared for the U.S. Election Assistance Commission.

As you will note from Eagleton's Project Manager, Tom O'Neill, the voter id paper which incorporates this analysis, and will be presented to the public in June, is forthcoming early next week.

EAC's Contract's Assistant, Aletha Barrington, will be in touch with each of you to provide specifics regarding the May 11, 11:30 am conference call, in which we will discuss the papers.

In the meantime, many thanks again for agreeing, on such short notice, to lend your expertise to this effort.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen, 

Attached is Tim Vercellotti's Voter ID analysis revised to use Citizen Voting Age population as the base for turnout calculations and to take account of comments or issues raised by the EAC and our Peer Review Group. This draft is for distribution to the reviewers who will meet by teleconference on May 11, at, we understand, 11:30 a.m.

You are receiving this at the same time that it is being distributed to the Eagleton-Moritz team
so that the new reviewers will have a week to prepare for our conversation on the 11th. Early next week you will receive a revised summary paper on Voter ID that incorporates the new data and findings in Tim's revised analysis. That too will be for distribution to the new reviewers.

Tom O'Neill

VoterIDAnalysis_VercRev0504.doc
Introduction

A key area of disagreement in the policy debate over voter identification requirements concerns whether such requirements dampen voter turnout. Opponents of voter identification laws argue that they constitute an institutional barrier to voting, particularly among the poor, African-Americans, Hispanics, the elderly and people with disabilities (Baxter and Galloway 2005, Electionline.org 2002, Jacobs 2005, Young 2006). This argument holds that voter identification requirements create an extra demand on voters, and thus may discourage some of them from participating in elections. Further, critics of voter identification requirements contend that the effect is greater for some specific types of requirements. For example, critics argue that requiring voters to produce government-issued photo identification on Election Day is more demanding than, say, requiring that they state their names at the polling place. Supporters of voter identification requirements, on the other hand, argue that the requirements are necessary to combat voter fraud, safeguard the integrity of the electoral process, and engender faith in the electoral process among citizens (Young 2006).

This report examines the potential variation in turnout rates based on the type of voter identification requirement in place in each state on Election Day 2004. It draws on two sets of data – aggregate turnout data at the county level for each state, as compiled by the Eagleton Institute of Politics, and individual-level survey data included in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. Classification of voter identification requirements comes from a review of state statutes conducted by the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University.

Types of voter identification requirements

Based on research performed for this study by the Moritz College of Law, states had one of five types of requirements in place on Election Day 2004. Upon arrival at polling places, voters had to: state their names (nine states); sign their names (13 states and the District of Columbia); match their signature to a signature on file with the local election board (eight states); provide a form of identification that did not necessarily include a photo (15 states); or provide a photo identification (five states). It was then possible to code the states according to these requirements, and test the assumption that voter identification requirements would pose an increasingly demanding requirement in this order: stating one's name, signing one's name, matching one's signature to a signature on file, providing a form of identification, and providing a form of photo identification.

1 Oregon conducts elections entirely by mail. Voters sign their mail-in ballots, and election officials match the signatures to signatures on file. For the purposes of this analysis, Oregon is classified as a state that requires a signature match.
But election laws in numerous states offer exceptions to these requirements if individuals lack the necessary form of identification, and laws in those states set a minimum standard that a voter must meet in order to vote using a regular ballot (as opposed to a provisional ballot). Thus it is also possible to categorize states based on the minimum requirement for voting with a regular ballot. In 2004 the categories were somewhat different compared to the maximum requirement, in that none of the states required photo identification as a minimum standard for voting with a regular ballot. Four states, however, required voters to swear an affidavit as to their identity (Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, and North Dakota). The five categories for minimum requirements were: state name (12 states), sign name (14 states and the District of Columbia), match one’s signature to a signature on file (six states), provide a non-photo identification (14 states), or swear an affidavit (four states). For the purposes of this analysis I treated the array of minimum identification requirements also in terms of increasing demand on the voter: state name, sign name, match signature, provide non-photo identification, and, given the potential legal consequences for providing false information, swearing an affidavit.

**Estimating turnout among citizens in the voting-age population**

This report examines turnout among U.S. citizens of voting age in both the aggregate-and the individual-level data. Determining citizenship status in the individual-level data simply involved restricting the analyses to individuals who identified themselves as citizens in the November 2004 Current Population Survey. (Those who said they were not citizens did not have the opportunity to answer the supplemental voting questions contained in the Current Population Survey.)

In the aggregate data, determining the percentage of the voting-age population that has U.S. citizenship posed a methodological challenge. The Census Bureau gathers information on the citizenship status of adults ages 18 and older only during the decennial census. While the Census Bureau provides annual estimates of the population to account for changes between decennial censuses, the bureau does not offer estimates for the proportion of the adult population who are citizens as part of the annual estimates. To address this issue I estimated the 2004 citizen voting-age population for each county using a method reported in the analysis of the 2004 Election Day Survey conducted for the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 2005). I calculated the percentage of the 2000 voting-age population who were citizens in 2000, and applied that percentage to the July 1, 2004 estimates for voting-age population in each county. In other words, I assumed that the percentage of the voting-age population that had U.S. citizenship in 2004 was similar to the percentage of the voting-age population who were citizens in 2000.2

---

2 McDonald and Popkin (2001) recommend an even more stringent approach to voter turnout calculations. They point out that voting-age population estimates include adults who are ineligible to vote (such as convicted felons), and the estimates overlook eligible citizens living overseas. While estimates of the voting-eligible population are available at the state level, I was unable to find such estimates for individual counties, which provide the unit of analysis for the aggregate data analyzed here.
Analysis of aggregate data

If one treats maximum voter identification requirements as an ordinal variable, with photo identification as the most demanding requirement, one finds some statistical support for the premise that as the level of required proof increases, turnout declines. Averaging across counties in each state, statewide turnout is negatively correlated with maximum voter identification requirements ($r = -.30, p < .0001$). In considering the array of minimum requirements, with affidavit as the most demanding requirement, voter identification also is negatively correlated with turnout ($r = -.20, p < .0001$). Breaking down the turnout rates by type of requirement reveals in greater detail the relationship between voter identification requirements and voter turnout.

[Table 1 here]

The aggregate data show that 60.9 percent of the estimated citizen voting age population voted in 2004. Differences in voter turnout at the state level in 2004 varied based on voter identification requirements. Taking into account the maximum requirements, an average of 64.6 percent of the voting age population turned out in states that required voters to state their names, compared to 58.1 percent in states that required photo identification. A similar trend emerged when considering minimum requirements. Sixty-three percent of the voting age population turned out in states requiring voters to state their names, compared to 60.1 percent in states that required an affidavit from voters.

Voter identification requirements alone, however, do not determine voter turnout. Multivariate models that take into account other predictors of turnout can paint a more complete picture of the relationship between voter identification requirements and turnout. I estimated the effects of voter identification requirements in multivariate models that also took into account the electoral context in 2004 and demographic characteristics of the population in each county. I coded the voter identification requirements on a scale of one to five, with one representing the least demanding form of identification and five representing the most demanding form of identification. To capture electoral context I included whether the county was in a presidential battleground state (any state in which the margin of victory for the winning candidate was five percent or less), and whether the county was in a state with a competitive race for governor and/or the U.S. Senate (also using the threshold of a margin of victory of five percent or less). Drawing from U.S. Census projections for 2003, I included the percentage of the voting-age population in each county that was Hispanic or African-American to control for ethnicity and race. I controlled for age using the 2003 Census projection for the percentage of county residents age 65 and older, and I controlled for socioeconomic status by including the percentage of individuals who fell below the poverty line in each county in the 2000 Census.

I estimated a series of random intercept models to account for the likelihood that data from counties were correlated within each state (for further explanation of random intercept and other multilevel models, see Bryk and Raudenbush 1992, Luke 2004, Singer 1998). The

---

3 The data analyses provided evidence that there was, indeed, a clustering of data within each state. The intraclass correlation, bounded by 0 and 1, measures the variation between the states. A random intercept model using only the
dependent variable in each model was voter turnout at the county level, with turnout calculated as the percentage of the estimated citizen voting-age population that voted in the 2004 election.

[Table 2 here]

Turning first to an analysis using the maximum identification requirements, those requirements had a small and negative effect on turnout in 2004 controlling for electoral context and demographic factors. Both contextual factors (whether the county was in a state that was a battleground state and whether that state had a competitive race for governor and/or U.S. Senate) increased voter turnout. As the percentage of senior citizens in the county increased, so did turnout. The percentage of African-Americans in the county exerted a positive effect on voter turnout, and the percentage of individuals living below the poverty line had a negative effect. The effect of the percentage of Hispanic adults in the county on turnout fell just short of statistical significance (p = .05).

I then sought to test the hypothesis that voter identification requirements dampen turnout among minorities and the poor, a claim voiced by some critics of the requirements. To test this idea I incorporated a series of interactions between the maximum voter identification requirements and the percentage of African-Americans, Hispanics, and poor individuals in the counties. The interaction involving African-Americans was not significant, but those involving Hispanics and poor individuals were significant. In addition, adding the interactions to the model resulted in the percentage of Hispanics in the population having a direct and negative effect on turnout. The interactions suggest that voter identification requirements have a greater effect for Hispanics and those living below the poverty line. A chi-square test of the difference in the deviance for each model (represented by -2 log likelihood in Table 2), shows that the model with interactions provides a better fit to the data (p < 0.005).

I also estimated the effects of the minimum voter identification requirements holding constant the effects of electoral context and the demographic variables.

[Table 3 here]

The effects of the minimum requirements fell short of statistical significance (p = 0.08). The battleground state variable continued to exert a positive influence on turnout, while the presence of a competitive race for governor and/or U.S. Senate had no statistically significant effect. As in the maximum identification requirement model, as the percentage of the population that is poor increased, turnout declined. As the percentage of elderly increased, so did turnout. The proportion of African-Americans in the population had a positive effect on turnout, while the percentage of Hispanics did not affect turnout.

intercept as a predictor generated an intraclass correlation of .43, indicating considerable variation between the states.

The interactions are labeled in Tables 2 and 3 as VID*African-American, VID*Hispanic, and VID*Poverty. To calculate the effects of voter identification requirements for a specific group, one must add the estimates for voter identification, the group, and the interaction. Doing so for Hispanic adults results in an estimate of -0.13 [-0.03 (voter id) - 0.13 (Hispanic) + 0.03 (voter id X Hispanic)].
Adding interactive effects to the model resulted in a statistically significant and negative effect of minimum voter identification requirements on turnout. The percentage of Hispanic adults in the county had a significant and negative effect on turnout, and the percentage of individuals below the poverty line continued to have a negative effect. Interactions between the percentages of Hispanics and those below the poverty line and minimum voter identification requirements also were significant. The percentage of African-Americans in the county and the interaction between African-Americans and voter identification requirements were not significant. A chi-square test for the difference in fit between the two models showed that the model with interactions provides a better fit to the data (p < .025).

Analysis of the aggregate data at the county level generates some support for the hypothesis that as the demands of voter identification requirements increase, turnout declines. This is particularly so for counties with concentrations of Hispanic residents or individuals who live below the poverty line. But aggregate data cannot fully capture the individual demographic factors that may figure into the decision to turn out to vote. For example, previous research has found that education is a powerful determinant of turnout (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980, but see also Nagler 1991). Married individuals also are more likely to vote than those who are not married (Alvarez and Ansolabehere 2002; Alvarez, Nagler and Wilson 2004; Fisher, Kenny, and Morton 1993). To fully explore the effects of voter identification requirements on turnout, it is important to examine individual-level data as well.

**Individual-level analysis**

Individual-level turnout data exists in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. The Census Bureau conducts the CPS monthly to measure unemployment and other workforce data, but the bureau adds a battery of voter participation questions to the November survey in even-numbered years to coincide with either a presidential or midterm Congressional election.

One of the advantages of the CPS is the sheer size of the sample. The survey’s Voting and Registration Supplement consisted of interviews, either by telephone or in person, with 96,452 respondents. The large sample size permits analyses of smaller groups, such as Black or Hispanic voters or voters with less than a high school education. The analyses reported here are based on reports from self-described registered voters. I omitted those who said they were not registered to vote. I also excluded those who said they cast absentee ballots because the identification requirements for absentee ballots may differ from those required when one votes in person. In addition, I eliminated from the sample respondents who said they were not U.S.

---

5 A reviewer for an earlier version of this paper recommended adding an education variable to the aggregate model. One version of the aggregate model not reported here included the percentage of adults in the county who had at least a college degree. The measure was highly collinear with the percentage of residents living below the poverty line, necessitating removal of the college degree variable from the model.

6 It is important to note that the Census Bureau allows respondents to answer on behalf of themselves and others in the household during the interview. While proxy reporting of voter turnout raises the possibility of inaccurate reports concerning whether another member of the household voted, follow-up interviews with those for whom a proxy report had been given in the November 1984 CPS showed 99 percent agreement between the proxy report and the information given by the follow-up respondent (U.S. Census Bureau 1990).
citizens because the questionnaire design skipped those individuals past the voter registration and turnout questions in the survey.

The dependent variable in these analyses is whether a respondent said he or she voted in the November 2004 election. As in the analysis of aggregate data, I coded voter identification requirements for each respondent’s state of residence on a scale of one to five, with one representing the least demanding requirement (stating one’s name) and five representing the most demanding requirement (photo identification or affidavit).

In addition to the voter identification requirements, the models include two other state-level factors that might have influenced turnout in 2004: whether the state was considered a battleground state in the presidential election, and whether there was a gubernatorial and/or U.S. Senate race in the state (see Alvarez and Ansolabehere 2002, Alvarez et al. 2004, and Kenny et al. 1993 for similar approaches). As in the aggregate data analysis, the threshold that determined whether the state was a battleground state or had a competitive statewide race was a margin of victory of five percent or less. At the individual level, I controlled for gender, age in years, education, household income, and dummy variables representing whether a voter was Black/non-Hispanic, Hispanic, or another non-white race (with white/non-Hispanic voters as the omitted category for reference purposes). Drawing on previous research on voting behavior, I also controlled for whether an individual was employed, or at least a member of the workforce (as opposed to being a full-time student, a homemaker, or retired). Both employment and workforce membership have been shown to be positive predictors of turnout (see Mitchell and Wlezien 1995). Marital status, whether one is a native-born citizen and residential mobility also have emerged as significant predictors of turnout (Alvarez and Ansolabehere 2002, Alvarez et al. 2004, Kenney et al. 1993, Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980). I included in the model variables for whether a respondent was married (coded 1 if yes, 0 otherwise), and whether one was a native-born citizen (coded 1 if yes, 0 otherwise). I measured residential mobility by coding for whether the respondent had moved to a new address in the six months prior to the interview (coded 1 if yes, 0 otherwise).

Results

The dependent variable is whether a respondent said he or she voted in the November 2004 election (coded 1 for yes, 0 for no). I estimated models using probit analysis, which

7 The U.S. Census Bureau reported, based on the November 2004 CPS, that 89 percent of those who identified themselves as registered voters said they voted in 2004 (U.S. Census Bureau 2005). Previous research has shown that, generally speaking, some survey respondents overstate their incidence of voting. Researchers speculate that over-reports may be due to the social desirability that accompanies saying one has done his or her civic duty, or a reluctance to appear outside the mainstream of American political culture (U.S. Census Bureau 1990). It is also possible that voting is an indication of civic engagement that predisposes voters to agree to complete surveys at a higher rate than non-voters (Flanigan and Zingale 2002). Hence the voter turnout rates reported in the CPS tend to be up to 10 percentage points higher than the actual turnout rate for the nation (Flanigan and Zingale 2002). Even with this caveat, however, the CPS serves as a widely accepted source of data on voting behavior.

8 Asian-Americans are included in the “other non-white races” category. In response to a request from officials at the U.S. Election Assistance Commission who had read an earlier version of this paper and were curious about the experiences of Asian-Americans, I ran models using Asian-Americans as a separate category in addition to the models presented here. Voter identification requirements did not have a statistically significant effect on whether Asian-American voters said they turned out in the 2004 election.
calculates the effects of independent variables on the probability that an event occurred – in this case whether a respondent said he or she voted. I estimated the models using robust standard errors to control for correlated error terms for observations from within the same state.

[Table 4 here]

The two models in Table 4 use either the maximum or minimum voter identification requirements in each state. The two models generate virtually identical results. Voter identification requirements exert a statistically significant, negative effect on whether survey respondents said they had voted in 2004. Of the other state factors, only the competitiveness of the presidential race had a significant effect on turnout. In terms of demographic influences, African-American voters were more likely than white voters to say they had cast a ballot, while those of other non-white races were less likely than white voters to say they had turned out. Hispanic voters were not statistically different from white voters in terms of reported turnout. Consistent with previous research, age, education, income, and marital status all were positive predictors of voting. Women also were more likely to say they voted than men. Those who had moved within six months before the interview were less likely to say they had voted.

While the probit models provide statistical support for the influence of voter identification requirements and other variables on turnout, probit coefficients do not lend themselves to intuitive interpretation. Another common approach in studies of election requirements is to examine how the predicted probability of voter turnout would vary as election requirements vary. I used the probit coefficients to calculate the predicted probability of voting at each level of voter identification requirements while holding all other independent variables in the models at their means. I calculated the probabilities taking into account both maximum and minimum requirements, with photo identification serving as the most demanding of the maximum requirements and affidavits as the most demanding minimum requirement.

[Table 5 here]

Allowing the voter identification requirement to vary while holding constant all other variables in the model showed that the predicted probability of turnout ranged from 0.912 for stating one’s name to 0.887 for photo identification under the maximum requirements. In other words, the probability of voting dropped with each level of voter identification requirement, with a total drop of .025, or 2.5 percent, across the five types of identification. When taking into account the minimum requirement for identification, the probability showed a similar decline, with a slightly larger total drop of 3.3 percent.

Among the key variables of interest in the debate over voter identification requirements are race, age, income, and education. Given the large sample size (54,973 registered voters), it

---

9 In the case of dichotomous independent variables, holding them at their mean amounted to holding them at the percentage of the sample that was coded 1 for the variable (Long 1997).
10 The voter turnout percentages may seem disproportionately high compared to the turnout rates reported in the aggregate data analysis. It is important to consider that the turnout rates in the aggregate data were a proportion of all citizens of voting-age population, while the turnout rates for the individual-level data are the proportion of only registered voters who said they voted.
was possible to break the sample into sub-samples along those demographic lines to explore variation in predicted probability by group. I disaggregated the sample by the variable of interest, omitting that variable while I re-ran the probit model with the remaining predictors of voter turnout, including the voter identification requirements. If the analysis showed that the voter identification requirements had a statistically significant effect on turnout, I used the probit coefficients from the model to calculate the predicted probability of voting for each group across the five requirements while holding the other variables in the model constant.

[Table 6 here]

Both the maximum and minimum identification requirements had negative and statistically significant effects for White/Non-Hispanic voters. Allowing the requirements to vary from stating one's name to providing photo identification or an affidavit showed drops of 2.5 percent and 3.2 percent respectively in the predicted probability of voting. The identification requirements had no effect on the probability of Black/Non-Hispanics voting, but the minimum identification requirements had a comparatively sizable effect on voter turnout among Hispanics. The predicted probability of Hispanics voting ranged from 87 percent if stating one's name was the required form of identification to 77.3 percent if a voter would have to provide an affidavit in order to vote, a difference of 9.7 percent.

The effects of voter identification requirements also varied by age, with the greatest variation occurring among voters ages 18 to 24.

[Table 7 here]

Voters in that age group had a predicted probability of 83.9 percent when the maximum requirement was stating one's name, and the probability dropped 8.9 percentage points if voters would have to provide photo identification. The range was from 83.1 percent to 75.4 percent under the minimum requirements. The gap in probability narrowed in older age groups (4.8 percent for the maximum requirements and 5.8 percent for the minimum requirements for those ages 25 to 44; 1.8 percent for the minimum requirements for those ages 45 to 64, and 2.4 percent for the minimum requirements for those ages 65 and older).

Breaking down the 18- to 24-year-old age group by race shed additional light on the effects of voter identification requirements on specific groups.

[Table 8 here]

The gap in predicted probability that White/Non-Hispanic voters in the 18- to 24-year-old category would turn out was 9.2 percent when the identification requirements varied from stating one's name to providing photo identification. The gap was 7.8 percent when taking into account the minimum requirements. The effects of maximum voter identification requirements also were statistically significant for African-Americans in the 18- to 24-year-old age group, with a gap in

---

11 See Nagler 1991 for a similar approach in analyzing the effects of registration closing dates broken down by education levels.
the predicted probability of voting of 10.6 percent. Maximum and minimum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting among Hispanics ages 18 to 24.

Variation also emerged along the lines of income, with the effects of voter identification requirements varying to a greater extent for voters in households below the poverty line compared to those living above the poverty line.\textsuperscript{12}

While the maximum set of requirements did not have a statistically significant effect for voters living below the poverty line, the minimum set of requirements had a significant and negative effect. The probability of voting was .784 for poor voters if they would have to identify themselves by giving their name, and the probability declined to .731 if they would have to provide an affidavit attesting to their identity. Both the maximum and minimum sets of requirements had a significant and negative effect on voters living above the poverty line, but the difference in probability across the effects was narrower (2.3 percent for the maximum requirements and 3.1 percent for the minimum requirements). Given that political discourse about voter identification requirements includes concerns about the effects of the requirements on poor and minority voters, I also ran probit analyses for sub-samples of white and minority voters who fell below the poverty line. The voter identification requirements did not exert statistically significant effects on turnout among poor White/Non-Hispanic and Hispanic voters, but did have a significant effect on Black/Non-Hispanic voters who were below the poverty line.\textsuperscript{13} Allowing the maximum voting requirement to vary from the least to the most demanding, the probability that African-American voters below the poverty line said they had voted dropped by 7.5 percent.

The effects of voter identification requirements varied across education levels as well, with those lowest in education demonstrating the widest variation in probabilities as identification requirements ranged from least to most demanding.

Registered voters who had less than a high school education had a 77.5 percent probability of voting if the maximum requirement would be stating one's name, and a 70.8 percent probability if they would have to provide photo identification under the maximum requirement, a difference of 6.7 percent. The difference from the lowest to the highest requirement among the minimum requirements was 7.4 percent. The difference in probabilities ranged from 3.3 percent for the maximum requirements to 4.5 percent for the minimum requirements for voters with a high school diploma. The range of effects of voter identification requirements was smaller among those with higher levels of education (and non-existent for one category – voters with some college education).

\textsuperscript{12} I coded respondents as being above or below the U.S. Census Bureau's 2004 poverty line based on respondents' reported annual household income and size of the household.

\textsuperscript{13} The lack of significant effects for poor Hispanic voters is in contrast to the results from the aggregate data analysis. The sub-sample of poor Hispanic voters was small (n = 491), which may have contributed to the lack of statistical significance.
Discussion and conclusion

The results presented here provide evidence that as the level of demand associated with voter identification requirements increases, voter turnout declines. This point emerged from both the aggregate data and the individual-level data, although not always for both the maximum and minimum sets of requirements. The overall effect for all registered voters was fairly small, but still statistically significant.

The effects of voter identification requirements were more pronounced for specific subgroups. Hispanic voters and the poor appeared to be less likely to vote as the level of required identification became more demanding, according to both the aggregate and the individual-level data. In the individual-level data, for Hispanic voters, the probability of voting dropped by 9.7 percent across the various levels of minimum identification requirements. Survey respondents living in poor households were 5.3 percent less likely to vote as the requirements varied from stating one’s name to attesting to one’s identity in an affidavit. African-American voters from households below the poverty line were 7.5 percent less likely to vote as the maximum requirements varied from stating one’s name to providing photo identification.

Effects of voter requirements also varied with education. Registered voters who had not graduated from high school were 6.7 percent less likely to say they voted as the maximum requirements ranged from stating one’s name to providing photo identification. When considering the minimum requirements, those with less than a high school education were 7.4 percent less likely to say they voted if the requirement was an affidavit as opposed to stating one’s name. Age was also a key factor, with voters ages 18 to 24 being 7.7 percent to 8.9 percent less likely to vote as the requirements ranged from stating one’s name to providing a photo identification or affidavit. Breaking down the age group by race, the effects were significant for young White/Non-Hispanic and Black/Non-Hispanic voters.

The results shed additional light on the effects of voter identification requirements on two groups often projected as being particularly sensitive to such requirements: African-American voters and elderly voters. The effects on African-American voters were pronounced for two specific sub-samples: African-American voters living below the poverty line and those in the 18- to 24-year-old age group. Also, the elderly, while they would be slightly less likely to vote as requirements ranged from least to most demanding, would not necessarily be affected in the dramatic manner predicted by some opposed to photo identification requirements in particular.

In examining the effects of voter identification requirements on turnout, there is still much to learn. The data examined in this project could not capture the dynamics of how identification requirements might lower turnout. If these requirements dampen turnout, is it because individuals are aware of the requirements and stay away from the polls because they cannot or do not want to meet the requirements?14 Or, do the requirements result in some voters

---

14 The individual-level data offer some insight here. If advance knowledge of the voter identification requirements were to dampen turnout, it is reasonable to expect that advance knowledge of those requirements also could discourage some individuals from registering to vote. I ran the same probit models using voter registration as the dependent variable (coded 1 if the respondent said he or she was registered, and 0 if the respondent was not
being turned away when they cannot meet the requirements on Election Day? The CPS data do not include measures that can answer this question. Knowing more about the “on the ground” experiences of voters concerning identification requirements could guide policy-makers at the state and local level in determining whether and at what point in the electoral cycle a concerted public information campaign might be most effective in helping voters to meet identification requirements. Such knowledge also could help in designing training for election judges to handle questions about, and potential disputes over, voter identification requirements.

registered). Neither the maximum nor minimum array of voter identification requirements had a statistically significant effect on the probability that a survey respondent was registered to vote.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voter Identification Required in the States</th>
<th>Maximum Requirement</th>
<th>Voter Identification Required in the States</th>
<th>Minimum Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Name</td>
<td>64.6 %</td>
<td>State Name</td>
<td>63.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>61.1 %</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>60.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Signature</td>
<td>60.9 %</td>
<td>Match Signature</td>
<td>61.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Non-Photo ID</td>
<td>59.3 %</td>
<td>Provide Non-Photo ID</td>
<td>59.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Photo ID</td>
<td>58.1 %</td>
<td>Swear Affidavit</td>
<td>60.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Turnout for All States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Predictors of 2004 turnout at the county level taking into account maximum voter identification requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Basic Model</th>
<th>Model with Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter ID requirements</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battleground State</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Senate/Governor’s Race</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 65 and Older</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% African-American</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Below poverty line</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID * African-American</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID * Hispanic</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID * Poverty</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>-8638.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients are restricted maximum likelihood estimates. N = 3,111. * p < .05 ** p < .01 (two-tailed tests)
Table 3. Predictors of 2004 turnout at the county level taking into account minimum voter identification requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Basic Model</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model with Interactions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized Estimate</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>Unstandardized Estimate</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter ID requirements</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.02**</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battleground State</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Senate/Governor’s Race</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 65 and Older</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% African-American</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.13**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Below poverty line</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID * African-American</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID * Hispanic</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID * Poverty</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>-8630.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8620.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients are restricted maximum likelihood estimates. N = 3,111. * p < .05 ** p < .01 (two-tailed tests)
Table 4. Probit model of voter turnout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Maximum requirements</th>
<th>Minimum requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter ID requirements</td>
<td>-0.04*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battleground state</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive race</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of workforce</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born citizen</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved within past 6 months</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.48**</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-R-Squared</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

N = 54,973 registered voters

p < .05*  p < .01** (two-tailed tests)

Models were estimated with robust standard errors to correct for correlated error terms within each state.

Table 5. Predicted probability of voter turnout – full model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification Requirement</th>
<th>Maximum requirement</th>
<th>Minimum requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference from lowest to highest</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: 54,973

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies from the lowest to the highest point in the scale, with all other variables held constant.

Table 6. Predicted probability of voter turnout – White and Hispanic voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic voters</th>
<th>Hispanic voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum requirement</td>
<td>Minimum requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference from lowest to highest</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies from the lowest to the highest point in the scale, with all other variables held constant. Maximum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting for Hispanic voters. Maximum and minimum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor for African-American voters.

Table 8. Predicted probability of voter turnout – Age groups by race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic 18 - 24</th>
<th>Black/Non-Hispanic 18 – 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum requirements</td>
<td>Minimum requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference – lowest to highest</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies from the lowest to the highest point in the scale, with all other variables held constant. Minimum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting for Black/Non-Hispanic voters ages 18 to 24. Maximum and minimum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting for Hispanic voters ages 18 to 24.

Table 9. Predicted probability of voter turnout – Voters above and below the poverty line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification Requirement</th>
<th>All voters above the poverty line</th>
<th>All voters below the poverty line</th>
<th>Black/Non-Hispanic voters below the poverty line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum requirement</td>
<td>Minimum requirement</td>
<td>Minimum requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference from lowest to highest</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>49,935</td>
<td>5,038</td>
<td>1,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies from the lowest to the highest point in the scale, with all other variables held constant. Maximum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting for white and Hispanic voters who were below the poverty line. Minimum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting for Black voters below the poverty line.

Table 7. Predicted probability of voter turnout – Age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18 - 24</th>
<th>25 - 44</th>
<th>45 - 64</th>
<th>65 and older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum requirements</td>
<td>Minimum requirements</td>
<td>Maximum requirements</td>
<td>Minimum requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference – lowest to highest</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 5,065 20,066 20,758 9,084

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies from the lowest to the highest point in the scale, with all other variables held constant. Maximum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting for voters ages 45 to 64 and 65 and older.

Table 10. Predicted probability of voter turnout – By education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than high school</th>
<th>High school</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Graduate school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum requirement</td>
<td>Minimum requirement</td>
<td>Maximum requirement</td>
<td>Minimum requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference -- lowest to highest</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4,903</td>
<td>16,361</td>
<td>11,017</td>
<td>5,739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies from the lowest to the highest point in the scale, with all other variables held constant. Maximum and minimum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting for those with some college education.

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV	 To "Tom O'neill"@GSAEXTERNAL
05/08/2006 11:22 AM	 cc Aletha Barrington/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV@EAC
	 bcc
Subject Re: May 11 Conference Call

Tom-

Aletha Barrington, EAC's Contracts Assistant will get you the necessary information ASAP.

Our three reviewers received the revised Eagleton paper on Friday.

Regards-
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Tom O'neill"

Karen, 

Has the 11:30 time for our conference call on May 11 been confirmed? I'd like to pass along the call-in and ID numbers to our participants as soon as possible. Do you have the information available yet?

Tom O'Neill
Tom-

I'd like to be able to include the final report on Provisional Voting in the materials going to EAC Standards Board and Board of Advisors in advance of their meetings.

It cannot be included unless it has been reviewed and approved by the four Commissioners.

I believe you said I would have the final copy of it sometime this week?

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Tom-

Aletha will be sending you precise instructions regarding Thursday's 11:30 AM call ASAP.

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

Karen,  
I plan to send you late today or early tomorrow the revised Voter ID report that will be included in our teleconference on Thursday. Once that is in your hands, I will turn my attention to the Provisional Voting report, and will have that to you before the end of the week.

Has 11:30 been confirmed as the time for the teleconference?

Tom O'Neill

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2006 12:59 PM
To: tom_oneill@verizon.net
Cc: aambrogi@eac.gov; asherrill@eac.gov
Subject: Re: Delivery of the final report on Provisional Voting

Tom-

I'd like to be able to include the final report on Provisional Voting in the materials going to EAC
Standards Board and Board of Advisors in advance of their meetings.

It cannot be included unless it has been reviewed and approved by the four Commissioners.

I believe you said I would have the final copy of it sometime this week?

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
All-

Attached please find the complete packet of materials that will serve as the basis for our conference call on Thursday. You have already received the statistical analysis; the voter ID report was submitted this morning.

The Eagleton staff have noted that you may find the material contained in Appendix A useful to your review; the other appendices are likely to be less germane.

The call in information for Thursday:

Thank you again for your assistance.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EAC
VOTER IDENTIFICATION ISSUES

Report Background
This report to the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) analyzes the effects of voter identification requirements on turnout in the 2004 election and makes recommendations for best practices to evaluate proposals for voter ID requirements. It is based on research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and the Moritz College of Law at Ohio State University under a contract to the EAC, dated May 24, 2005. The research included a review and legal analysis of state statutes, regulations and litigation concerning voter identification and provisional voting, and a statistical analysis of the effects of various requirements for voter identification on turnout in the 2004 election. This report is a companion to a draft report on Provisional Voting submitted to the EAC on November 28, 2005 under the same contract.

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) (Public Law 107-252) authorizes the EAC (Sec. 241, 42 USC 15381) to conduct periodic studies of election administration issues. The purpose of these studies is to promote methods for voting and administering elections, including provisional voting, that are convenient, accessible and easy to use; that yield accurate, secure and expeditious voting systems; that afford each registered and eligible voter an equal opportunity to vote and to have that vote counted; and that are efficient.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Methods
To explore the effects of voter ID requirements on electoral participation in 2004, as measured by turnout, we gathered information on the requirements in effect in the 50 states and the District of Columbia in that year. We assigned each state to one of five categories based on its ID requirements. They are progressively more rigorous based on the demands they make on voters.1 The categories range from "Stating Name" which we judge to be somewhat less demanding than "Signing Name." "Signature Match" requires poll workers to examine the signature and compare it to a sample, which is slightly more demanding that the voter simply signing. "Present ID" requires voters to offer some documentary evidence of their identity.

1 Even the most relaxed provisions for identification at the polls —anything stricter than the honor system used in North Dakota—will impose some burden on particular voters. Harvard Law Review 119:1151
ranging from a utility bill to a passport. It is more demanding than the previous three categories because it requires that the voter remember to bring this documentation to the polls. (Even a simple ID, such as a utility bill, may not be available to some renters or, say, those in group housing.) We regard a government “Photo ID” as the most rigorous requirement. Such identity documents may not be uniformly and conveniently available to all voters.

To examine the potential variation on turnout rates associated with each type of voter ID requirements in effect on Election Day 2004, we drew on two sets of data. These were, first, aggregate turnout data at the county level for each state and, second, the reports of individual voters collected in the November 2004 Current Population Survey by the U. S. Census Bureau. Using two different data sets makes it possible to check the validity of one analysis against the other. It also provides insights not possible using only one of the data sets. The aggregate analysis cannot provide valid estimates on the effects of different ID requirements on particular demographic groups (e.g., the old, the young, African-Americans, the poor, or high school graduates). The Current Population Survey data does permit that kind of analysis, although it has the disadvantage of relying on self-reports by respondents about their registration status and experience in the polling place.

To understand legal issues that have been raised in recent litigation over voter ID requirements, we collected and analyzed the few major cases that have been decided on this issue. The decisions so far suggest the constitutional and other constraints on voter ID requirements.

Findings

Our analysis of data from the 2004 election indicates that the form of identification required of voters affects turnout. Lack of ID can keep voters from the polls or prevent them from casting a regular ballot if they go to the polling place. This finding emerged from both the analysis of aggregate, county-level data and the individual-level data of the Current Population Survey. The overall effect for all registered voters was fairly small, but statistically significant.

Voter turnout in 2004 was lower in states where voter identification requirements were more demanding. The data show a general movement toward lower turnout as voters are required to present levels of proof of their identity.

2 It also seems reasonable to conclude that in states that require an identity document to vote, more voters—those lacking the required ID—will cast provisional ballots. This conclusion is a conjecture because we lack precise information on why voters must cast their ballots provisionally.
The aggregate data show that 60.9 percent of the estimated citizen voting age population turned out in 2004. An average of 64.6 percent turned out in states that required voters to state their names, compared to 58.1 percent in states that required photo identification, a reduction of 6.5 percentage points. That figure, however, probably overstates the effect of voter ID requirements since the inclusion of other factors in the analysis diminishes the extent of influence of voter ID on turnout. After taking account of other factors, the analysis supports the hypothesis that as voter identification requirements increases, turnout declines.

The effects were more pronounced for some specific subgroups. Hispanic voters, the poor and those who did not graduate from high school appear to be less likely to vote as the identification requirement becomes more demanding. The analysis for some other demographic groups illustrate the range of effects predicted for more rigorous voter ID requirements:

Race or Ethnicity
- In the individual-level data for Hispanic voters, the probability of voting dropped by 9.7 percent across the various levels of identification requirements.
- More rigorous ID requirements did not have a statistically significant effect when looking at all African-Americans, but
- African-American voters from households below the poverty line were 7.5 percent less likely to vote as the ID requirements varied from stating one's name to providing photo identification.

Income
- Citizens from poor households were 5.3 percent less likely to vote as the requirements varied from stating one's name to attesting to one's identity in an affidavit.

Education
- Registered voters who had not graduated from high school were 6.7 percent less likely to say they voted as the requirements ranged from stating one's name to providing photo identification.
Age

- Age was also a key factor, with voters ages 18 to 24 being 7.7 percent to 8.9 percent less likely to vote as the requirements ranged from stating one’s name to providing a photo identification or affidavit.
- Turnout by young (18-24) African-American voters in states that required a government-issued photo ID was about 10% less likely to vote than in states where they had only to state their name.
- The elderly, while they would be slightly less likely to vote as the requirements changed from stating name to providing photo ID, would not necessarily be affected in the dramatic manner predicted by opponents of photo identification requirements.

Our analysis of litigation suggests that the courts will look strictly at requirements that voters produce a photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot. The courts have used a balancing test to weigh the legitimate interest in preventing election fraud against the citizen’s right to privacy (protecting social security numbers from public disclosure, for example) and the reasonableness of requirements for identity documents. To provide both the clarity and certainty in administration of elections needed to forestall destabilizing challenges to outcomes, best practice for the states may be to limit requirements for voter identification to the minimum needed to prevent duplicate registration and ensure eligibility.

Evidence on the incidence of vote fraud, especially on the kind of vote fraud that could be reduced by requiring more rigorous voter identification is not now sufficient to evaluate the tradeoffs between ensuring ballot access and ensuring ballot integrity.\(^3\) Assessing the effectiveness of voter ID as a way to protect the integrity of the ballot should logically include an estimate of the nature and frequency of vote fraud. This research does not include consideration of vote fraud nor the possible effectiveness of various voter ID regimes to counter attempts at vote fraud. As a result, our analysis of the effects of voter ID requirements on turnout cannot take into account how many potential voters who did not turn out under comparatively stricter voter ID requirements might have been ineligible or eligible to vote.

The current lack of understanding of precisely how voter ID requirements affect turnout can be remedied by requiring the collection and reporting of data on the reasons potential voters are required to cast a provisional ballot and the reasons for rejecting provisional ballots during the

\(^3\) The EAC has contracted with other researchers to study vote fraud issues.
2006 and subsequent elections. Also useful would be the results of surveys of voters on their experiences in meeting voter ID requirements and on what type of ballot they cast. And, of course, more information is needed on the incidence and varieties of vote fraud, but that inquiry is outside the scope of this report.

A voting system that requires voters to produce an identify document or documents may indeed prevent the ineligible from voting. It may also prevent eligible voters from casting a ballot. If the ID requirement of a ballot protection system blocks ineligible voters from the polls at the cost of preventing eligible voters who lack the required forms of identification, the integrity of the ballot may not have been improved; the harm may be as great as the benefit.

Recommendations for consideration and action by the EAC

The dynamics of Voter ID requirements – how more rigorous voter ID requirements affect the decision by potential voters to go or stay away from the polls -- are not well understood. This lack of understanding should be recognized in the policy process in the states. The debate over voter ID in the states would be improved by additional research sponsored by the EAC.

The EAC should consider the following actions to improve understanding of the relationship between voter ID requirements and the two important goals of ensuring ballot access and ensuring ballot integrity.

1. Encourage or sponsor further research to clarify the connection between Voter ID requirements and the number of potential voters actually able to cast a ballot.

2. Recommend as a best practice the publication of a “Voting Impact Statement” by states as they assess their voter ID requirements to protect the integrity of the ballot. The analysis will help ensure that efforts to increase ballot security have a neutral effect on electoral participation by eligible voters. The Voter Impact Statement would estimate the number and demographics of 1) eligible, potential voters that may be kept from the polls or permitted to cast a provisional ballot by a stricter ID requirement; and 2) and assess the number of ineligible voters who will be prevented from voting by the stricter ID requirements.

---

4 Arizona held its first election with its new, stricter ID requirements on March 14, 2006. In at least one county (Maricopa) election officials handed a survey to voters that asked if they knew about the voter identification law and if they did, how they found out about it. Edythe Jensen, “New Voter ID Law Goes Smoothly in Chandler,” Arizona Republic, March 15, 2006. More surveys of this kind can illuminate the dynamics of voter ID and voting in ways that are not possible now because of insufficient data.
3. Encourage or require the states in the 2006 election and beyond, to collect and report reliable, credible information on the relationship between ballot access and ballot security. EAC should publish an analysis of this information to provide a sound factual basis for the states to consider as they estimate the incidence of the kinds of vote fraud that more stringent ID requirements may prevent. The analysis should describe the dynamics of the voter ID process in preserving the security of the ballot. EAC can also use this information to encourage the states to assess the effectiveness of programs to ensure that all eligible voters have required ID and are permitted to vote in future elections.

   I. Useful information could be supplied by state-sponsored surveys of voters by local election officials. It would make clear why those who cast a provisional ballot were found ineligible to cast a regular ballot. The answers would illuminate the frequency with which ID issues divert voters into the provisional ballot line.

   II. Surveys to ask voters what they know about the voter ID requirements would also provide useful context for evaluating the effect of various voter ID requirements on electoral participation.

   III. Spot checks by state election officials on how the identification process works at polling places could provide information on how closely actual practice tracks statutory or regulatory requirements. Such reports should be available to the public.

4. Encourage states to examine the time period allowed for voters who cast a provisional ballot because they lacked required ID to return with their identification. In eleven states, voters who had to cast a provisional ballot because they lacked the ID required for a regular ballot were permitted to return later with their ID. Their provision of this ID is the critical step in evaluating the ballots. The length of the period in which the voter may return with ID is important. In setting the time period for return, which now varies among the states from the same day to about two weeks, states should consider three factors: the convenience of the voter, the total time allowed to evaluate ballots, and the safe harbor provision in presidential elections.

5. Recommendations to the states from EAC should reflect current judicial trends. Requirements that voters provide some identifying documentation have been upheld, where photo ID is not the only acceptable form. Whether laws requiring photo ID will be upheld is

---

5 Our research on provisional voting reveals that states that provide more than a week to evaluate provisional ballots end up counting substantially more of those ballots than states that provide less than a week.
more doubtful. To date, only one court has considered a law requiring voters to show photo ID (Common Cause v. Billups), and that court concluded that this requirement is likely unconstitutional.
SUMMARY OF RESEARCH

Background and Approach of the Study

Establishing the eligibility of a person to vote has long been part of the electoral process. Voters may have to identify themselves twice in the electoral process: when registering to vote and then when casting a ballot. The pressures felt by the voter arising from the need to check ID, even so simple a check as a signature match, can be greater at the polls on Election Day than at the time of registration. Poll workers may feel under pressure when faced with long lines and limited time.

This analysis focuses on ID requirements on Election Day, but with an appreciation that the ID requirements at time of registration and on Election Day are inter-related. The emphasis in this report is on Voter ID requirements on Election Day and afterwards as election judges evaluate provisional ballots. This is the critical period for the electoral system, the time when ballot access and ballot security are in the most sensitive balance.

The report looks broadly at voter ID issues and goes beyond the rather narrow identification requirements in HAVA. Much of the current debate in state legislatures over voter ID ranges beyond HAVA to require more rigorous documentation of identity for all would-be voters, not just those who had not registered in person and are casting a ballot for the first time. Current controversies in the states over voter ID seems to have been sparked in part by the HAVA requirements, but goes beyond those requirements, and sets the context for the analysis here.

We recognize that the previously technical, rather dull subject of voter ID requirements has become fiercely partisan and divisive in many states. The polarization of the debate has raised the stakes over this issue, making dispassionate analysis both more valuable and more rare.

---

6 As the Carter-Baker Commission noted, photo ID requirements for in-person voting do little to address the problem of fraudulent registration by mail, especially in states that do not require third-party organizations that register voters to verify ID. Commission on Federal Election Reform, pp 46-47.

7 Harvard Law Review 119:1127: "Legislators hoping to stiffen their state antifraud laws have taken their cue from identification provisions buried in HAVA."

8 "Of the various electoral procedure laws passed in the fifty states since the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections and those still being debated in state legislatures and local media, few arouse more potent partisan feelings than voter identification laws." Harvard Law Review 119:1144. John Fund's 2004 book, Stealing Elections: How Voter Fraud Threaten Our Democracy, cites (pages 16 – 17) a Rasmussen Research poll that asked respondents if they were more concerned with voting by ineligible participants or with disenfranchisement of eligible voters. Sixty-two percent of Kerry supporters, but only 18 percent of Bush supporters, worried more about disenfranchisement; 58 percent of Bush supporters, but only 19 percent of Kerry supporters were more concerned with voter fraud.
Voter ID is often described as the critical step in protecting the integrity of the ballot, the process to ensure that the potential voter is eligible and, if eligible, is permitted to cast one ballot and one ballot only. Truly protecting the integrity of the ballot, however, requires a perspective that takes in the entire voting process. It demands more than preventing the ineligible from voting, and should also ensure that all those who are eligible and want to vote can cast a ballot that counts. The protection effort must embrace all forms of voting, including absentee ballots, and consider each step in the process from registration through vote counting.

A voting system that requires voters to produce an identity document or documents may prevent the ineligible from voting. It may also prevent the eligible from casting a ballot. If the ID requirements block ineligible voters from the polls at the cost of preventing eligible voters who cannot obtain or have left at home the required forms of identification, the integrity of the ballot may not have been improved; the harm may be as great as the benefit.

Assessing the effectiveness of voter ID as a way to protect the integrity of the ballot should logically include an estimate of the nature and frequency of vote fraud. The EAC has informed us that it has commissioned a separate analysis of the incidence of vote fraud. Consequently, this research does not include consideration of vote fraud nor the possible effectiveness of various voter ID regimes to counter attempts at vote fraud. As a result, our analysis of the effects of voter ID requirements on turnout cannot take into account how many potential voters who did not turn out under comparatively stricter voter ID requirements might have been ineligible or eligible to vote.

In some states, voters lacking required ID, or who have ID that does not reflect their current address, are able to vote only by casting a provisional ballot. Voter ID requirements that require voters to bring a document to the polls --rather than simply sign their names-- can divert more voters to the provisional ballot. Requiring poll workers to request and check ID, can put stress on the already demanding environment of the polling place. Scrutiny of ID can create lines at the polling places. Further delays can result when voters cast a provisional ballot and fill out the ballot envelope. Voters who cast a provisional ballot because they lack their ID on Election Day, and who then fail to return with the needed document or documents, will have their ballot

---

9 For example, the Florida voter ID law adopted after the 2004 election and pre-cleared by the Department of Justice, permits voters who cannot meet the ID requirements to sign an affidavit on the envelope of a provisional ballot, which will be counted if the signature matches that on the voter's registration form.
rejected. And, of course, the cost of processing provisional ballots is greater than the cost of regular ballots.

Each of these potential consequences of more elaborate voter identification processes can increase the chance of litigation. Long lines will, at best, discourage voters and at worst make voting seem a hassle, an impression that could keep more citizens (even those with ID) from the polls. In conducting this analysis, we were sensitive to the observation that the problem with American elections may well be that too many people do not vote rather than that a few people may vote more than once.

Evaluating the effect of different Voter ID regimes can be most effective when based on clear standards--legal, equitable, practical. The standards outlined here can best be described as the questions policy-makers should ask about Voter ID requirements. We suggest 7 questions that address important dimensions of the problem.

1. Is the Voter ID system designed on the basis of valid and reliable empirical studies of the incidence of the sorts of vote fraud it is designed to prevent?11
2. How effective is the ID requirement in increasing the security of the ballot? How well can it be coordinated with a statewide voter database?12
3. How practical is the requirement? (Can it be administered smoothly by the staff and budget likely to be made available? How much additional training of polling place workers might be required?) Is it simple enough or can it be defined with sufficient clarity that poll workers throughout the state can administer it uniformly and with a minimum of local interpretation made on the fly under the pressure of Election Day?13
4. How cost-effective is the system? Does it demonstrably increase the security of the ballot affordably, measured in both monetary and other costs? To improve

---

10 The EAC's Election Day Study found "improper ID," to be the third most common reason for a provisional ballot to be rejected. "Improper ID" was cited by 7 states responding to the survey, compared to 14 mentions for voting in the wrong precinct. *Election Day Study*, Chapter 6, p. 5.
11 "Often where the battle over voter identification is most heated, real evidence of voter fraud proves scarce: in Georgia, for example, the Secretary of State averred that she had never encountered a single instance of voter impersonation at the polls. State laws might sometimes impose tighter restrictions on in-person voting than on absentee ballots, which yield the greatest incidence of, and provide the easiest avenue for, voter fraud..." *Harvard Law Review* 127:1144 (2006)
12 See the final section of this report for a brief overview of possible effects of a statewide voter database on voter identification issues.
13 In New York, in 2004, disparities in training and voting information were made apparent in a study finding elections officials had wildly varying interpretations of what the state's voter identification requirement actually was. Tova Wang, "Warning Bell in Ohio," December 5, 2005. Website, the Foundation for National Progress.
understanding of the non-monetary component of the costs, conducting a voter impact study might be appropriate. The voter impact study would examine, before the adoption of the regulation, the cost of compliance by the voter (such as the cost in time and money of acquiring a photo ID card), any offsetting benefits to voters, and the possible disparate effects of the regulation on various groups of voters.\textsuperscript{14} A thorough, objective impact statement that demonstrated the nexus between the identification regime and the integrity of the ballot could provide protection against inevitable legal challenges.

5. If a side effect of the Voter ID regulation is likely to reduce turnout, generally or among particular groups, is it possible to take other steps to ameliorate the adverse consequences?\textsuperscript{15}

6. Does it comply with the letter and spirit of Voting Rights Act?\textsuperscript{16}

7. The seventh question is the most difficult to answer. Does the Voter ID requirement have a neutral result on the composition of the qualified and eligible electorate? ID requirements should not be designed to, nor unintentionally, reduce the turnout of particular groups of voters or supporters of one party or another.

\textbf{Voter ID and Turnout}

As of the 2004 election, the states and the District of Columbia could be divided into 5 different Voter ID regimes. These are shown in Table 1, \textit{Voter ID Requirements}. Nine states required that voters give their names; 14 that they sign their names; 8 match the signature to a sample in the registration book; 15 require some form of ID (ranging from a utility bill to a government-issued photo ID), and 5 states in 2004 required a photo ID, although in all those states voters without that credential could cast a regular ballot after signing an affidavit concerning their identity and eligibility or provide other forms of ID.

We recognize the difficulties in summarizing each state's voter ID requirements. The problem is illustrated by the number of footnotes to Table 1 below. The variety of statutory and regulatory details among the states is complex. Moving beyond the statutes and regulations,

\textsuperscript{14} "Absent clear empirical evidence demonstrating widespread individual voter fraud, legislatures need to fashion narrowly tailored voter identification provisions with an eye toward the inevitable and well-grounded constitutional challenges that will arise in the courts. Only as states grow more adept at administering elections will courts likely demonstrate greater willingness to uphold strict identification requirements." Harvard Law Review 127:1144 (2006)

\textsuperscript{15} For example, the Carter-Baker Commission coupled its recommendation for a national voter ID card to a call for an affirmative effort by the states to reach out and register the unregistered, that is, to use the new Voter ID regime as a means to enroll more voters. Similarly, Richard Hasen has suggested combining a national voter ID with universal registration. See his "Beyond the Margin of Litigation: Reforming U.S. Election Administration to Avoid Electoral Meltdown," 62 Washington and Lee Law Review 937 (2005).
we also recognize that the assignment of each state to one category may fail to reflect actual practice at many polling places.

Like any system run by fallible people, the voter ID process is subject to variation in practice. Voters may be confronted with demands for identification different from the directives in state statutes or regulation. Under the pressures of Election Day, there is no sure way to report the wide variety of conditions each voter encounters. It seems reasonable to conclude, however, that while actual practices may vary, the variance is around each state's legal requirement for ID. The analysis of the effect of state requirements on turnout must be viewed with some caution. Nevertheless, we are satisfied that the categories used in this report provide a level of discrimination among voter identification regimes sufficient for the analysis that we have undertaken.

**TABLE 1 -- Voter ID Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Forms of ID Required 2004</th>
<th>Current ID Requirement for First-Time Voters</th>
<th>Current ID Requirements for All Other Voters</th>
<th>Verification Method for Provisional Ballots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Gov-issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Gov-issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>DOB and Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 One state election official told us that, "We have 110 election jurisdictions in Illinois, and I have reason to believe [the voter ID requirements] are administered little bit differently in each one. We wish it weren't that way, but it probably is."

17 See Appendix 1 for a more detailed summary, including citations and statutory language, of the identification requirements in each state.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Sign Name</th>
<th>Provide ID*</th>
<th>Sign Name</th>
<th>Bring ID Later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>No Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn.</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* States applies only HAVA's ID requirement, applicable for first-time voters who registered by mail and did not provide applicable ID at the time of registration.

1 Arizona voters who lack a photo ID may present 2 forms of ID with no photograph.
2 Florida required a photo ID in 2004. Voters without that credential could sign an affidavit concerning their identity and eligibility and cast a regular ballot. Florida subsequently changed its law to require that voters present photo ID to cast a regular ballot, though voters without photo ID may still cast a provisional ballot by signing an affidavit, which ballot should ordinarily be counted.
3 Louisiana required a photo ID in 2004. Voters without that credential could sign an affidavit concerning their identity and eligibility and cast a regular ballot.
4 Pennsylvania requires ID of all first-time voters, whether they registered by mail or in-person.
5 Voters lacking a photo ID could vote by providing another form of ID in 2004.
6 Voters lacking a photo ID could vote by providing another form of ID in 2004.
7 Tennessee voters must provide signature and address. In counties without computerized lists, the signature is compared to the registration card. In counties with computerized lists, the signature is compared to a signature on ID presented with the registration.
8 Texas voters must present a current registration certificate. Those without a certificate can vote provisionally after completing an affidavit.
Effect of Voter ID requirements on Turnout

We examined the potential variation in turnout rates based on the type of voter identification required in each state on Election Day 2004 using two sets of data: aggregate turnout data at the county level for each state, as compiled by the Eagleton Institute of Politics, and individual-level survey data included in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. Classification of voter identification requirements comes from a review of state statutes conducted by the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University.

The Voter ID category assigned to each state is shown in Table 1. We analyzed turnout data for each county according to the voter identification requirements of its state. We also assessed self-reported turnout by the sample interviewed in the November 2004 Current Population Survey of the Census Bureau.  

Voter turnout at the state level in 2004 varied based on voter identification requirements. An average of 64.6 percent of the citizen voting age population turned out in states that required voters to state their names, compared to 58.1 percent in states that required photo identification. Other factors, of course, also influence turnout. Taking those other factors into account in the county-level analysis makes the effect of the voter ID requirement less dramatic. But the analysis supports the hypothesis that as voter identification requirements become more stringent, turnout declines. The effect is particularly noticeable in counties with concentrations of Hispanic residents or of people living below the poverty line.

The individual-level analysis, based on the CPS, produced a similar result. Voter identification requirements exert a statistically significant, negative effect on whether survey respondents said they had voted in 2004. The probability that a respondent to the survey voted dropped with each level of voter identification requirement, with a total drop of 2.5 percent across the five types of identification.

Methods

Based on research performed for this study by the Moritz College of Law, states had one of five types of requirements in place on Election Day 2004. Upon arrival at polling places, voters had

to: state their names (nine states); sign their names (13 states and the District of Columbia); match their signature to a signature on file with the local election board (eight states); provide a form of identification that did not necessarily include a photo (15 states); or provide a photo identification (five states). 19

We coded the states according to these requirements to test the assumption that voter identification requirements would pose an increasingly demanding requirement in this order: stating one’s name, signing one’s name, matching one’s signature to a signature on file, providing a form of identification, and providing a form of photo identification.

Election laws in many states, however, offer exceptions to these requirements if potential voters lack the necessary form of identification, and laws in those states set a minimum standard that a voter must meet in order to vote using a regular ballot (as opposed to a provisional ballot). In recognition of this fact, we also categorized states based on the minimum requirement for voting with a regular ballot.

In 2004 none of the states required photo identification as a minimum standard for voting with a regular ballot. Four states, however, required voters to swear an affidavit as to their identity (Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, and North Dakota The five categories for minimum requirements were: state name (12 states), sign name (14 states and the District of Columbia), match one’s signature to a signature on file (six states), provide a non-photo identification (14 states), or swear an affidavit (four states).

We treated the minimum ID in terms of increasing demand on the voter: state name, sign name, match signature, provide non-photo identification, and, given the potential legal consequences for providing false information, swearing an affidavit.

We examined turnout among U.S. citizens of voting age in both the aggregate and the individual-level data. Determining citizenship status in the individual-level data simply involved restricting the analyses to individuals who identified themselves as citizens in the November 2004 Current Population Survey. (Those who said they were not citizens did not have the

---

19 Oregon conducts elections entirely by mail. Voters sign their mail-in ballots, and election officials match the signatures to signatures on file. For the purposes of this analysis, Oregon is classified as a state that requires a signature match.
opportunity to answer the supplemental voting questions contained in the Current Population Survey.)

The aggregate data posed a greater challenge to determine percentage of the voting-age population that has U.S. citizenship. The Census Bureau gathers information on the citizenship status of adults ages 18 and older only during the decennial census. While the Census Bureau provides annual estimates of the population to account for changes between decennial censuses, the bureau does not offer estimates for the proportion of the adult population who are citizens as part of the annual estimates. To address this issue we estimated the 2004 citizen voting-age population for each county using a method reported. Therefore, we calculated the percentage of the 2000 voting-age population who were citizens in 2000, and applied that percentage to the July 1, 2004 estimates for voting-age population in each county. This method was used in the analysis of the 2004 Election Day Survey conducted for the U.S. Election Assistance Commission.

We classified each state as having one of five types of identification requirements in place on Election Day 2004. Upon arrival at polling places, voters had to either: state their names (9 states); sign their names (13 states and the District of Columbia); match their signature to a signature on file with the local election board (8 states); provide a form of identification that did not necessarily include a photo (15 states); or provide a photo identification (5 states). We then tested the assumption that voter identification requirements would prove to be increasingly demanding on the voter, with providing photo ID the most rigorous. In the statistical analysis, we coded the voter identification requirements on a scale of one to five, with one representing the least demanding form of identification and five representing the most demanding form of identification.

Findings

As the level of required ID proof increases, with photo identification as the most demanding requirement, turnout declines. Averaging across counties in each state, statewide turnout is negatively correlated with maximum voter identification requirements ($r = -.30, p < .0001$). In considering the array of minimum requirements, with affidavit as the most demanding requirement, voter identification also is negatively correlated with turnout ($r = -.20, p < .0001$). Breaking down the turnout rates by type of requirement reveals in greater detail the relationship between voter identification requirements and voter turnout.
Table 2 – Variation in 2004 State Turnout Based on Voter Identification Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voter Identification Required in the States</th>
<th>Mean Voter Turnout for States in that Category</th>
<th>Voter Identification Required in the States</th>
<th>Mean Voter Turnout for States in that Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Name</td>
<td>64.6 %</td>
<td>State Name</td>
<td>63.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>61.1 %</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>60.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Signature</td>
<td>60.9 %</td>
<td>Match Signature</td>
<td>61.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Non-Photo ID</td>
<td>59.3 %</td>
<td>Provide Non-Photo ID</td>
<td>59.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Photo ID</td>
<td>58.1 %</td>
<td>Swear Affidavit</td>
<td>60.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Turnout (All States)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aggregate data show that 60.9 percent of the estimated citizen voting age population voted in 2004. Differences in voter turnout at the state level in 2004 varied based on voter identification requirements. Taking into account the maximum requirements, an average of 64.6 percent of the voting age population turned out in states that required voters to state their names, compared to 58.1 percent in states that required photo identification. A similar trend emerged when considering minimum requirements. Sixty-three percent of the voting age population turned out in states requiring voters to state their names, compared to 60.1 percent in states that required an affidavit from voters.

Voter identification requirements alone do not determine voter turnout. Other factors make a difference in turnout, often a greater difference than the ID requirements. Multivariate models can take into account other predictors of turnout and therefore paint a more complete picture of the relationship between voter identification requirements and turnout. The model used here also took into account such variables as:

- Was the county in a presidential battleground state?
- Was the county was in a state with a competitive race for governor and/or the U.S. Senate?
- Percentage of the voting-age population in each county that was Hispanic or African-American
- Percentage of county residents age 65 and older
- Percentage of county residents below the poverty line

The dependent variable in each model was voter turnout at the county level, with turnout calculated as the percentage of the citizen voting-age population that voted in the 2004 election.
The maximum ID requirements had a small and negative effect on turnout in 2004 controlling for electoral context and demographic factors. Both contextual factors (whether the county was in a state that was a battleground state and whether that state had a competitive race for governor and/or U.S. Senate) increased voter turnout. The more senior citizens and African-Americans in the county, the higher the turnout. The percentage of the population living below the poverty reduced turnout. The effect of the percentage of Hispanic adults in the county on turnout fell just short of statistical significance (p = .05).

The analysis tested the hypothesis that stricter voter ID requirements dampen turnout among minorities. The data revealed no statistically significant effect on turnout for African-Americans in general. But it revealed a significant reduction in turnout for Hispanics and the poor. The analysis using the minimum ID categories produced similar results.

Analysis of the aggregate data at the county level supports the hypothesis that as voter ID requirements grow stricter, turnout declines. This effect is strongest in counties with concentrations of Hispanic residents or families below the poverty line. But aggregate data cannot fully capture the individual demographic factors that may figure into the decision to turn out to vote. For example, previous research has found that education is a powerful determinant of turnout. Married people are more likely to vote than those who are not married. To explore the effects of voter identification requirements on turnout, examining individual-level data is important.

Individual-level Analysis

Information collected for the Census Bureau Current Population Survey in November 2004 makes it possible to examine the influence of voter ID requirements at the individual level. Self-identified registered voters reported their experience at the polls in the survey. Note that the voter turnout rate for the CPS sample, an average of 89%, is much higher than the turnout rates presented in the aggregate data analysis, which average 60.9%. The difference is a result of several factors, including different denominators in calculating the turnout rate – self-reported registered voters in the CPS versus the much larger citizen voting-age population for the

---

20 Education is an important factor in predicting turnout. One version of the aggregate model not reported here included the percentage of adults in the county who had at least a college degree. The measure was highly collinear with the percentage of residents living below the poverty line, necessitating removal of the college degree variable from the model.
aggregate data. Also some survey respondents overstate their incidence of voting. Nevertheless, the CPS serves as a widely accepted source of data on voting behavior. One of the advantages of the CPS is the sheer size of the sample. The survey’s Voting and Registration Supplement consisted of interviews, either by telephone or in person, with 96,452 respondents. The large sample size permits analyses of smaller groups, such as Black or Hispanic voters or voters with less than a high school education. The analyses reported here are based on reports from self-described registered voters. Excluded are those who said they were not registered to vote and those who said they cast absentee ballots because the identification requirements for absentee ballots may differ from those required when one votes in person. Also excluded are respondents who said they were not U.S. citizens. The dependent variable in these analyses is whether a respondent reported voting in the November 2004 election. As in the aggregate analysis, stricter voter ID requirements exert a statistically significant, negative effect on whether survey respondents said they had voted in 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 Predicted probability of voter turnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference from lowest to highest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies from the lowest to the highest point in the scale, with all other variables held constant. Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, Voting and Registration Supplement, November 2004.

21 The Census Bureau allows respondents to answer on behalf of themselves and others in the household during the interview. While proxy reporting of voter turnout raises the possibility of inaccurate reports, follow-up interviews with those for whom a proxy report had been given in the November 1984 CPS showed 99 percent agreement between the proxy report and the information given by the follow-up respondent.

22 The CPS did not ask the voting questions of respondents who were not U.S. citizens. The design of the questionnaire skips those questions for non-citizens.
The influence of voter identification requirements, holding all other variables constant, is shown in Table 3 below. The probability of voting dropped with each level of voter identification requirement, with a total drop of 2.5 percent, across the five types of identification for the maximum requirement and 3.3% for the minimum requirements.\footnote{The voter turnout percentages may seem disproportionately high compared to the turnout rates reported in the aggregate data analysis. It is important to consider that the turnout rates in the aggregate data were a proportion of all citizens of voting-age population, while the turnout rates for the individual-level data are the proportion of only registered voters who said they voted.}

Among the key variables of interest in the debate over voter identification requirements are race, age, income, and education. Given the large sample size (54,973 registered voters), it was possible to break the sample into sub-samples along those demographic lines to explore variation in predicted probability by group.

Both the maximum and minimum identification requirements had negative and statistically significant effects for White/Non-Hispanic voters. Allowing the requirements to vary from stating one's name to providing photo identification or an affidavit showed drops of 2.5 percent and 3.2 percent respectively in the predicted probability of voting. The predicted probability of Hispanics voting ranged from 87 percent if stating one's name was the required form of identification to 77.3 percent if a voter would have to provide an affidavit in order to vote, a difference of 9.7 percent.

The effects of voter identification requirements also varied by age, with the greatest variation occurring among voters ages 18 to 24.

- Turnout in states requiring photo ID was predicted as 8.9 percentage points lower than in states where voters simply stated their names.
- The strictest ID requirements reduced the probability that White/Non-Hispanic voters in the 18- to 24-year-old category would turn out by 7.8 to 9.2 percentage points.
- For African-Americans in the 18- to 24-year-old age group the gap was 10.6 percentage points.

Variation also emerged along the lines of income, with the effects of voter identification requirements varying to a greater extent for voters in households below the poverty line compared to those living above the poverty line.\footnote{Respondents were coded as being above or below the U.S. Census Bureau's 2004 poverty line based on their reported annual household income and size of the household.}
vary from the least to the most demanding, the probability that African-American voters below
the poverty line said they had voted dropped by 7.5 percent.

The effects of voter identification requirements varied across education levels as well.
Registered voters who had less than a high school education had a 77.5 percent probability of
voting if the maximum requirement would be stating one's name, and a 70.8 percent probability
if they would have to provide photo identification under the maximum requirement, a difference
of 6.7 percent. The range of effects of voter identification requirements was smaller among
those with higher levels of education (and non-existent for one category – voters with some
college education).

Conclusions of the Analysis

As the stringency of voter identification requirements increases, voter turnout declines. This
point emerged from both the aggregate data and the individual-level data, although not always
for both the maximum and minimum sets of requirements. The overall effect for all registered
voters was fairly small, but statistically significant.

The effects of voter identification requirements were more pronounced for specific subgroups.
Hispanic voters and the poor appeared to be less likely to vote as the level of required
identification became more demanding, according to both the aggregate and the individual-level
data.

- In the individual-level data, for Hispanic voters, the probability of voting dropped by 9.7
  percent across the various levels of minimum identification requirements.
- Survey respondents living in poor households were 5.3 percent less likely to vote as the
  requirements varied from stating one's name to attesting to one's identity in an affidavit.
- African-American voters from households below the poverty line were 7.5 percent less
  likely to vote as the maximum requirements varied from stating one's name to providing
  photo identification.

Effects of voter requirements also varied with education.
- Registered voters who had not graduated from high school were 6.7 percent less likely
to say they voted as the maximum requirements ranged from stating one's name to
providing photo identification.
• When considering the minimum requirements, those with less than a high school education were 7.4 percent less likely to say they voted if the requirement was an affidavit as opposed to stating one’s name.

Age was also a key factor, with voters ages 18 to 24 being 7.7 percent to 8.9 percent less likely to vote as the requirements ranged from stating one’s name to providing a photo identification or affidavit. Breaking down the age group by race, the effects were significant for young White/Non-Hispanic and Black/Non-Hispanic voters.

The results shed additional light on the effects of voter identification requirements on two groups often projected as being particularly sensitive to such requirements: African-American voters and elderly voters.

• The effects on African-American voters were pronounced for two specific sub-samples, African-American voters living below the poverty line and those in the 18- to 24-year-old age group.

• The elderly, while they would be slightly less likely to vote as requirements ranged from least to most demanding, would not necessarily be affected in the dramatic manner predicted by some opposed to photo identification requirements in particular.

The data examined in this project could not capture the dynamics of how identification requirements might lower turnout. Do potential voters who cannot or do not want to meet the identification requirements simply stay away from the polls? Or, do the requirements result in some voters being turned away when they cannot meet the requirements on Election Day? (Proponents of stricter voter ID requirements might argue that some part of the reduction comes from keeping the truly ineligible from voting.)

Our data alone cannot resolve these questions. Knowing more about the “on the ground” experiences of voters concerning identification requirements could guide policy-makers at the state and local level in determining whether and at what point in the electoral cycle a concerted public information campaign might be most effective in helping voters to meet identification requirements. Such knowledge also could help in designing training for election judges to handle questions about, and potential disputes over, voter identification requirements. It is important to note that the 2004 data do not allow us to draw conclusions about the effect of laws such as those recently passed in Georgia and Indiana, which require government-issued
photo ID. No such laws were in place in 2004, and the five states that then required photo ID at the time allowed voters who signed an affidavit or provided another form of identification to cast a regular ballot.

Litigation Over Voter ID Requirements

A handful of cases have challenged identification requirements in court in recent years. In general, requirements that voters provide some identifying documentation have been upheld, where photo ID is not the only acceptable form. Whether laws requiring photo ID will be upheld is more doubtful. To date, only one court has considered a law requiring voters to show photo ID (Common Cause v. Billups), and that court concluded that this requirement is likely unconstitutional. Cases challenging the mandatory disclosure of voters’ Social Security numbers on privacy grounds have yielded mixed results.

Non-photo identification. For the most part, courts have looked favorably on requirements that voters present some form of identifying documents if the photo identification is not the only form accepted. In Colorado Common Cause v. Davidson, No. 04CV7709, 2004 WL 2360485, at *1 (Colo. Dist. Ct. Oct. 18, 2004), plaintiffs challenged a law requiring all in-person voters to show identification (not just first-time registrants). The court upheld this requirement against a constitutional challenge. Similarly, in League of Women Voters v. Blackwell, 340 F. Supp. 2d 823 (N.D. Ohio 2004), the court rejected a challenge to an Ohio directive requiring first-time voters who registered by mail to provide one of the HAVA-permitted forms of identification, in order to have their provisional ballots counted. Specifically, the directive provided that their provisional ballots would be counted if the voter (a) orally recited his driver’s license number or the last four digits of his social security number or (b) returned to the polling place before it closed with some acceptable identification (including reciting those identification numbers). Id. This was found to be consistent with HAVA.

Photo ID. Since the 2004 election, two states have adopted laws requiring photo identification in order to have one’s vote counted, without an affidavit exception: Georgia and Indiana. Both these requirements were enacted in 2005 and both have been challenged in court. The Georgia law required voters attempting to cast a ballot in person present a valid form of photographic identification. O.C.G.A. § 21-2-417. On October 18, 2005, the District Court granted the Plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction,
enjoining the application of the new identification requirements on constitutional grounds. In granting the injunction, the court held that plaintiffs' claims under both the Fourteenth Amendment (equal protection) and Twenty-Fourth Amendment (poll tax) had a substantial likelihood of succeeding on the merits at trial (Common Cause v. Billups, Prelim. Inj. 96, 104). In January 2006, Georgia enacted a modified version of its photo ID law, which the court has not yet ruled on. In the other state that has enacted a photo ID requirement without an affidavit exception (Indiana), legal challenges have also been filed. (Indiana Democratic Party v. Rokita and Crawford v. Marion County Election Board). Cross-motions for summary judgment are currently pending. Another case of significance, for purposes of photo ID requirements, is American Civil Liberties Union of Minnesota v. Kitimeyer, No. 04-CV-4653, 2004 WL 2428690, at *1 (D. Minn. Oct. 28, 2004). In that case, the court enjoined a Minnesota law that allowed the use of tribal photo ID cards, only for an Indian who lived on the reservation. 2004 WL 2428690, at *1. The Court found no rational basis for distinguishing based on whether or not the cardholder lives on the reservation. Id. at *1, 3. The court’s decision in this case indicates that courts are likely to look strictly on photo ID requirements.

Privacy. In Greidinger v. Davis, 988 F.2d 1344 (4th Cir. 1993), the court struck down on due process grounds a Virginia law requiring disclosure of voters’ social security numbers for voter registration. The social security numbers recorded in voter registration lists had been disclosed to the public and political parties that had requested the lists. The court found that the requirement to give the social security number effectively conditioned rights on the consent to an invasion of privacy. It concluded that this public disclosure of the social security numbers was not necessary to achieve the government’s interest in preventing fraud. On the other hand, in McKay v. Thompson, 226 F.3d 752 (6th Cir. 2000), the court rejected privacy challenges based on both the Constitution and federal statutes, to a Tennessee law requiring social security numbers for voter registration since 1972. 226 F.3d at 755. Second, the NVRA only permits requiring the minimum amount of information necessary to prevent duplicate voter registration and to determine eligibility. The distinction appears to be between the use of Social Security numbers for internal purposes only, which was deemed permissible, and the disclosure of those numbers to the public which was not.

These decisions suggest that the courts will look strictly at requirements that voters produce a photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot. The courts have used a balancing test to weigh the
legitimate interest in preventing election fraud against the citizen's right to privacy (protecting social security numbers from public disclosure, for example) and the reasonableness of requirements for identity documents. To provide both the clarity and certainty in administration of elections needed to forestall destabilizing challenges to outcomes, these early decisions suggest that best practice may be to limit requirements for voter identification to the minimum needed to prevent duplicate registration and ensure eligibility.

Developments since 2004
Since the passage of HAVA, with its limited requirements for voter identification, and following the 2004 election, debate over voter ID has taken place in state legislatures across the country. That debate has not been characterized by solid information on the consequences of tightening requirements for voters to identify themselves before being permitted to cast a regular, rather than a provisional, ballot.

Better information might improve the quality of the debate. Answers to the following key questions are not available in a form that might satisfy those on both sides of the argument.

- What is the overall incidence of vote fraud?
- How does fraud take place in the various stage of the process: registration, voting at the polls, absentee voting, or ballot counting?
- What contribution can tighter requirements for voter ID make to reducing vote fraud?
- What would be the other consequences of increasingly demanding requirements for voters to identify themselves? This is the question addressed, within the limits of the available data, in the analysis in this report.

Answering these questions would provide the information needed for more informed judgment in the states as they consider the tradeoffs among the competing goals of ballot integrity, ballot access, and administrative efficiency. The Carter-Baker Commission recognized the tradeoffs when it tied recommendation for national ID to an affirmative effort by government to identify unregistered voters and make it easy for them to register.

State Voter Databases and Voter ID
With the implementation of the HAVA Computerized Statewide Voter Registration List, an application for voter registration for an election for Federal office may not be accepted or processed unless the application includes a driver's license number or last four digits of the
Social Security number on the voter registration form. This information can be used to verify the identity of the registrant through interfacing with lists maintained by the Motor Vehicle office and Social Security office. If registrants do not have either a driver's license or Social Security number, the State will assign a unique identifier number to that person.

HAVA does not require that the states notify registrants to remedy any failure to provide either of these numbers or to confirm that they have provided a verifiable number. Verification at the time of registration could forestall difficulties at the polling place. HAVA is silent on how the ID might be required at the polling place for new voters whose driving license or Social Security number could not be verified. Errors in recording those numbers are sure to occur.

Some states are wrestling now with these unresolved issues. In New Jersey, for example, pending legislation would require that voters must be able to confirm their registration through a secure access to the SVRL. It also requires voters to present ID at the polls in order to cast a regular ballot if the numbers recorded on the registration have not been verified (or if no verifiable number appears on the registration). It recognizes the HAVA requirement that if the number provided by the voter has not been verified and if the voter does not present ID at the polls, that voter may cast a provisional ballot. The bill does not specify they have to provide ID within 48 hours in order for their vote to count, as is the case with first-time mail-in registrants.

As some states gain experience in this area, the EAC would perform a useful service by making timely recommendations of best practices for all states to consider.

Conclusions

The form of Voter ID required of voters affects turnout. Lack of ID can keep voters from the polls. Or, when they go to the polls, it is reasonable to conclude that stricter Voter ID requirements will divert more voters into the line for provisional ballots. (This conclusion is a conjecture because we lack good data on why voters must cast their ballots provisionally.) The result can be longer lines at the polls and confusion, without a clear demonstration that the security of the ballot is correspondingly increased.  

In this connection, the Brennan Center's response to the Carter-Baker Commission report observes that, "while it might be true that in a close election "a small amount of fraud could make the margin of difference," it is equally true that the rejection of a much larger number of eligible voters could make a much bigger difference in the outcome." Response to the Report of the 2005 Commission on Federal
The dynamics of Voter ID requirements—how the more rigorous Voter ID requirements—affect the decision by potential voters to go or stay away from the polls are not well understood. This lack of understanding should be recognized in the policy process. The debate over voter ID in the states would be improved by additional research sponsored by the EAC. So far as it may be necessary to reduce vote fraud made possible by inadequate voter ID, the research could identify methods to eliminate the need for voters to bring specific identity documents with them to the polls while assuring that each voter who casts a ballot is eligible and votes only once.

One way to break the connection between the benefits of photo ID and the need for the voter to bring identification to the polling place, as recommended elsewhere by one of the authors of this report, Edward Foley: keep the information to verify a voter’s identity in the records at the polling place. Other approaches could be developed. 26

---

26 "A potential solution to this problem is to break the connection with the photo requirement and the obligation to produce identification at the polls. Eligible citizens could be required to provide a photograph at the time they register to vote, and poll workers would match this photograph with the image of the person standing in front of them. Given the availability of digital photography, the photos of registered voters could be stored in electronic poll books and easily "pulled up" with a click of a computer mouse when voters sign in to vote. Of course, to satisfy the concerns of liberals, a requirement to provide a digital photograph at time of registration would have to address the cost and accessibility issues identified earlier."
Appendices

a. Summary of Voter ID Requirements by State (included)
b. Summary of case law on Voter ID issues (included with this draft)
c. Analysis of Effects of Voter ID Requirements on Turnout (furnished separately)
d. Indexed database of major articles on Voter ID Requirements and related topics
e. Compendium of states' legislation, procedures, and litigation (available as an electronic document)
Appendix A
Summary of Voter Identification Requirements By State
Prepared by
Sara A. Sampson, Reference Librarian,
The Ohio State University Moritz College of Law.

Voter ID Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Forms of ID Required 2004</th>
<th>Statutory Language</th>
<th>Statutory Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Alabama   | Provide ID                | (b) Each elector shall provide identification to an appropriate election official prior to voting. A voter required to show identification when voting in person shall present to the appropriate election official either of the following forms of identification:

   (1) A current valid photo identification.
   (2) A copy of a current utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck, or other government document that shows the name and address of the voter.

The term "other government document" may include, but is not limited to, any of the following:

   a. A valid identification card issued by a branch, department, agency, or entity of the State of Alabama, any other state, or the United States authorized by law to issue personal identification.
   b. A valid United States passport.
   c. A valid Alabama hunting or fishing license.
   d. A valid Alabama permit to carry a pistol or revolver.
   e. A valid pilot's license issued by the Federal Aviation Administration or other authorized agency of the United States.
   f. A valid United States military identification card.
   g. A certified copy of the elector's birth certificate.
   h. A valid Social Security card.
   i. Certified naturalization documentation.
   j. A certified copy of court records showing adoption or name change.
   k. A valid Medicaid card, Medicare card, or an Electronic Benefits Transfer Card (formerly referred to as a "food stamp card").

(c) For voters required to show identification when voting by mail, the voter shall submit with the ballot a copy of one of the forms of identification listed in subsection (b).
(e) An individual required to present identification in accordance with this section who is unable to meet the identification requirements of this section shall be permitted to vote by a challenged or provisional ballot, as provided for by law.
(f) In addition, an individual who does not have identification in his or her possession at the polls shall be permitted to vote if the individual is positively identified by two election officials as a voter on the poll list who is eligible to vote and the election official signs the voters list by where the voter signs.

Effective Date: June 24, 2003

| Alaska    | Provide ID                | (a) Before being allowed to vote, each voter shall exhibit to an election official one form of identification, including

   (1) an official voter registration card, driver's license, state identification card, current and valid photo identification, birth certificate, passport, or hunting or fishing license; or
   (2) an original or a copy of a current utility bill, bank statement, paycheck, government check, or other government document; an item exhibited under this

Alaska Stat. § 15.15.225                                                                 |                               |
paragraph must show the name and current address of the voter.

(b) An election official may waive the identification requirement if the election official knows the identity of the voter. The identification requirement may not be waived for voters who are first-time voters who initially registered by mail or by facsimile or other electronic transmission approved by the director under AS 15.07.050, and did not provide identification as required in AS 15.07.060.

(c) A voter who cannot exhibit a required form of identification shall be allowed to vote a questioned ballot.

effective June 17, 2003

| Arizona | Provide ID | B. If a statewide voter registration database is not yet operational, for any person who has registered to vote by mail for the first time in this state after January 1, 2003 or who is reregistering by mail after January 1, 2003 after moving from one county to another county in this state, the person shall comply with the following in order to be issued a ballot:

1. The person shall present either one of the following:

(a) A current form of identification that bears a photograph of the person and the name of the person.

(b) A current utility bill, bank statement, paycheck, government issued check or other government document that shows the name and registration address of the person.

2. If the person does not present a document that complies with paragraph 1, the person is only eligible to vote a provisional ballot as prescribed by § 16-584.

Effective Dec. 1, 2003 |

| Arkansas | Provide ID | 7-5-305. Requirements.

(a) Before a person is permitted to vote, the election official shall:
(1) Request the voter to identify himself in order to verify the existence of his name on the precinct voter registration list;
(2) Request the voter, in the presence of the election official, to state his address and state or confirm his date of birth;
(3) Determine that the voter's date of birth and address are the same as those on the precinct voter registration list;
(4) If the date of birth given by the voter is not the same as that on the precinct voter registration list, request the voter to provide identification as the election official deems appropriate;
(5)(A) If the voter's address is not the same as that on the precinct voter registration list, verify with the county clerk that the address is within the precinct.
(B) If the address is within the precinct, request the voter to complete a voter registration application form for the purpose of updating county voter registration record files.
(C) If the address is not within the precinct, instruct the voter to contact the county clerk's office to determine the proper precinct;
(6) If the voter's name is not the same as that on the precinct voter registration list, request the voter to complete a voter registration application form for purposes of updating county voter registration record files;
(7) Request the voter, in the presence of the election official, to sign his name, including his given name, his middle name or initial, if any, and his last name in the space provided on the precinct voter registration list. If a person is unable to sign his signature or make his mark or cross, the election official shall enter his initials and the voter's date of birth in the space for the person's signature on the precinct voter registration list; and

(8)(A) Request the voter for purposes of identification to provide a valid driver's license, photo identification card issued by a governmental agency, voter card, social security card, birth certificate, United States passport, employee identification card issued by a governmental agency containing a photograph, employee identification card issued in the normal course of business of the employer, student identification card, Arkansas hunting license, or United States military identification card.

(B)(i) If a voter is unable to provide this identification, the election official shall indicate on the precinct voter registration list that the voter did not provide identification.

(ii) Following each election, the county board of election commissioners may review the precinct voter registration lists and may provide the information of the voters not providing identification at the polls to the prosecuting attorney.

(iii) The prosecuting attorney may investigate possible voter fraud; and

(9) Follow the procedures under §§ 7-5-310, 7-5-311, and 7-5-523, if the person is a disabled voter and presents himself or herself to vote.

Effective: July 16, 2003

| California | Sign Name | Any person desiring to vote shall announce his or her name and address in an audible tone of voice, and when one of the precinct officers finds the name in the index, the officer shall in a like manner repeat the name and address. The voter shall then write his or her name and residence address or, if the voter is unable to write, shall have the name and residence address written by another person on a roster of voters provided for that purpose, whereupon a challenge may be interposed as provided in this article. |
| Colorado | Provide ID | (1) Except as provided in subsection (4) of this section, any eligible elector desiring to vote shall show his or her identification as defined in section 1-7-104(19.5), write his or her name and address on the signature card, and give the signature card to one of the election judges,  

***

(4) An eligible elector who is unable to produce identification may cast a provisional ballot in accordance with article 8.5 of this title.

(19.5)(a) "Identification" means:

(I) A valid Colorado driver's license;

(II) A valid identification card issued by the department of revenue in accordance with the requirements of part 3 of article 2 of title 42, C.R.S. ;

(III) A valid United States passport;

(IV) A valid employee identification card with a photograph of the eligible elector issued by any branch, department, agency, or entity of the United States government or of this state, or by any county, municipality, board, authority, or other political subdivision of this state;

(V) A valid pilot's license issued by the federal aviation administration or other authorized agency of the United States;

(VI) A valid United States military identification card with a photograph of the eligible elector;

(VII) A copy of a current utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck, or other government document that shows the name and address of the elector;

(VIII) A valid medicare or medicaid card issued by the United States health care
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>ID Requirement</th>
<th>Date Effective</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>(a) In each primary, election or referendum, when an elector has entered the polling place, the elector shall announce the elector's street address, if any, and the elector's name to the checkers in a tone sufficiently loud and clear as to enable all the election officials present to hear the same. Each elector who registered to vote by mail for the first time on or after January 1, 2003, and has a &quot;mark&quot; next to the elector's name on the official registry list, as required by section 9-23r, shall present to the checkers, before the elector votes, either a current and valid photo identification that shows the elector's name and address or a copy of a current utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck or other government document that shows the name and address of the elector. Each other elector shall (1) present to the checkers the elector's Social Security card or any other preprinted form of identification which shows the elector's name and either the elector's address, signature or photograph, or (2) on a form prescribed by the Secretary of the State, write the elector's residential address and date of birth, print the elector's name and sign a statement under penalty of false statement that the elector is the elector whose name appears on the official checklist. Such form shall clearly state the penalty of false statement. A separate such form shall be used for each elector. If the elector presents a preprinted form of identification under subdivision (1) of this subsection, the checkers shall check the name of such elector on the official checklist. If the elector completes the form under subdivision (2) of this subsection, the assistant registrar of voters shall examine the information on such form and either instruct the checkers to check the name of such elector on the official checklist or notify the elector that the form is incomplete or inaccurate.</td>
<td>Effective May 10, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>(a) A voter, upon entering the room where an election is being held, shall announce his or her name and address and provide proof of identity, whereupon the clerks shall place a mark or make a notation of his or her name upon the election district record. In the event the voter does not have proof of identity with them, he or she shall sign an affidavit of affirmation that he or she is the person listed on the election district record.</td>
<td>Effective: July 9, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>(1) A person shall be entitled to vote in an election in the District of Columbia if he or she is a duly registered voter. A qualified elector shall be considered duly registered in the District if he or she has met the requirements for voter registration and, on the day of the election, either resides at the address listed on the Board's records or files an election day change of address pursuant to this subsection. (2) Each registered voter who changes his or her place of residence from that listed on the Board's records shall notify the Board, in writing, of the new residence address. A change of address shall be effective on the date the notification was mailed as shown by the United States Postal Service postmark. If not postmarked, the notification shall be effective on the date of receipt by the Board. Change of address notifications from registrants shall be accepted pursuant to subsection (g) of this section, except that any registrant who has not notified the Board of his or her current residence address by the deadline established by subsection (g) of this section may be permitted to vote at the...</td>
<td>D.C. Code § 1-1001.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) Each registered voter who votes at a polling place on election day shall affirm his or her residence address as it appears on the official registration roll for the precinct. The act of signing a copy of the official registration roll for the precinct shall be deemed affirmation of the voter's address as it appears on the Board's registration records.

(Effective April 3, 2001)(not added as part of 2005 amendment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>Photo ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 101.043 (1) The precinct register, as prescribed in s. 98.461, shall be used at the polls in lieu of the registration books for the purpose of identifying the elector at the polls prior to allowing him or her to vote. The clerk or inspector shall require each elector, upon entering the polling place, to present a current and valid picture identification as provided in s. 97.0535(3)(a). If the picture identification does not contain the signature of the voter, an additional identification that provides the voter's signature shall be required. The elector shall sign his or her name in the space provided, and the clerk or inspector shall compare the signature with that on the identification provided by the elector and enter his or her initials in the space provided and allow the elector to vote if the clerk or inspector is satisfied as to the identity of the elector.

(2) Except as provided in subsection (3), if the elector fails to furnish the required identification, or if the clerk or inspector is in doubt as to the identity of the elector, such clerk or inspector shall follow the procedure prescribed in s. 101.49.

97.0535 (3)(a) The following forms of identification shall be considered current and valid if they contain the name and photograph of the applicant and have not expired:

1. Florida driver's license.
2. Florida identification card issued by the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles.
3. United States passport.
4. Employee badge or identification.
5. Buyer's club identification.
6. Debit or credit card.
8. Student identification.

(b) The following forms of identification shall be considered current and valid if they contain the name and current residence address of the applicant:

1. Utility bill.
2. Bank statement.
4. Paycheck.
5. Other government document (excluding voter identification card).

Version effective 1/1/2005-12/31/2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>Provide ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (a) Each elector shall present proper identification to a poll worker at or prior to completion of a voter's certificate at any polling place and prior to such person's admission to the enclosed space at such polling place. Proper identification shall consist of any one of the following:
1. A valid Georgia driver's license;
2. A valid identification card issued by a branch, department, agency, or entity of the State of Georgia, any other state, or the United States authorized by law to issue personal identification;
3. A valid United States passport;
4. A valid employee identification card containing a photograph of the elector and issued by any branch, department, agency, or entity of the United States government, this state, or any county, municipality, board, authority, or other entity of this state;
5. A valid employee identification card containing a photograph of the elector and issued by any employer of the elector in the ordinary course of such employer's business;
6. A valid student identification card containing a photograph of the elector from any public or private college, university, or postgraduate technical or professional school located within the State of Georgia;
7. A valid Georgia license to carry a pistol or revolver;
8. A valid pilot's license issued by the Federal Aviation Administration or other authorized agency of the United States;
9. A valid United States military identification card;
10. A certified copy of the elector's birth certificate;
11. A valid social security card;
12. Certified naturalization documentation;
13. A certified copy of court records showing adoption, name, or sex change;
14. A current utility bill, or a legible copy thereof, showing the name and address of the elector;
15. A bank statement, or a legible copy thereof, showing the name and address of the elector;
16. A government check or paycheck, or a legible copy thereof, showing the name and address of the elector;
17. A government document, or a legible copy thereof, showing the name and address of the elector. |

(b) If an elector is unable to produce any of the items of identification listed in subsection (a) of this Code section, he or she shall sign a statement under oath in a form approved by the Secretary of State, separate and distinct from the elector's voter certificate, swearing or affirming that he or she is the person identified on the elector's voter certificate. Such person shall be allowed to vote without undue delay; provided, however, that an elector who registered for the first time in this state by mail and did not provide one of the forms of identification set forth in subsection (a) of this Code section at the time of registration and who is voting for the first time may vote a provisional ballot pursuant to Code Section 21-2-418 upon swearing or affirming that the elector is the person identified in the elector's voter certificate. Such provisional ballot shall only be counted if the registrars are able to verify current and valid identification of the elector as provided in this Code section within the time period for verifying provisional ballots pursuant to Code Section 21-2-419. Falsely swearing or affirming such statement under oath shall be punishable as a felony, and the penalty shall be distinctly set forth on the face of the statement. |


effective June, 2003
(b) The voter shall present valid identification to the official in charge of the pollbook.

Do I Need an I.D. to Vote on Election Day?

Yes. Be sure to have an I.D. with a picture and signature (such as a Hawaii driver's license or state I.D. card) when you go to vote. The NVRAC card is not an acceptable form of identification.

From the 2004 version of the administrative code.


Every person upon applying to vote shall sign the person's name in the poll book prepared for that purpose. This requirement may be waived by the chairperson of the precinct officials if for reasons of illiteracy or blindness or other physical disability the voter is unable to write. Every person shall provide identification if so requested by a precinct official. A poll book shall not contain the social security number of any person.

After signing the poll book and receiving the voter's ballot, the voter shall proceed to the voting booth to vote according to the voting system in use in the voter's precinct. The precinct official may, and upon request shall, explain to the voter the mode of voting.

Last amended 2003.
shall likewise repeat said name, and the voter shall be allowed to enter within the
proximity of the voting booths, as above provided. One of the judges shall give
the voter one, and only one of each ballot to be voted at the election, on the back
of which ballots such judge shall indorse his initials in such manner that they
may be seen when each such ballot is properly folded, and the voter's name shall
be immediately checked on the register list. In those election jurisdictions where
perforated ballot cards are utilized of the type on which write-in votes can be
cast above the perforation, the election authority shall provide a space both
above and below the perforation for the judge's initials, and the judge shall
endorse his or her initials in both spaces. Whenever a proposal for a
constitutional amendment or for the calling of a constitutional convention is to
be voted upon at the election, the separate blue ballot or ballots pertaining
thereto shall, when being handed to the voter, be placed on top of the other
ballots to be voted at the election in such manner that the legend appearing on
the back thereof, as prescribed in Section 16-6 of this Act, shall be plainly
visible to the voter. At all elections, when a registry may be required, if the name
of any person so desiring to vote at such election is not found on the register of
voters, he or she shall not receive a ballot until he or she shall have complied
with the law prescribing the manner and conditions of voting by unregistered
voters. If any person desiring to vote at any election shall be challenged, he or
she shall not receive a ballot until he or she shall have established his right to
vote in the manner provided hereinafter; and if he or she shall be challenged
after he has received his ballot, he shall not be permitted to vote until he or she
has fully complied with such requirements of the law upon being challenged.

Besides the election officer, not more than 2 voters in excess of the whole
number of voting booths provided shall be allowed within the proximity of the
voting booths at one time. The provisions of this Act, so far as they require the
registration of voters as a condition to their being allowed to vote shall not apply
to persons otherwise entitled to vote, who are, at the time of the election, or at
any time within 60 days prior to such election have been engaged in the military
or naval service of the United States, and who appear personally at the polling
place on election day and produce to the judges of election satisfactory evidence
thereof, but such persons, if otherwise qualified to vote, shall be permitted to
vote at such election without previous registration.

### Indiana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Iowa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. The board members of their respective precincts shall have charge of the
ballots and furnish them to the voters. Any person desiring to vote shall sign a
voter's declaration provided by the officials, in substantially the following form:

**VOTER’S DECLARATION OF ELIGIBILITY**

I do solemnly swear or affirm that I am a resident of the ......... precinct, ......... ward or township, city of ........., county of ........., Iowa.

I am a registered voter. I have not voted and will not vote in any other precinct in
said election.

I understand that any false statement in this declaration is a criminal offense
punishable as provided by law.

Signature of Voter

Address

Telephone

Approved:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. One of the precinct election officials shall announce the voter's name aloud for the benefit of any persons present pursuant to section 49.104, subsection 2, 3, or 5. Any of those persons may upon request view the signed declarations of eligibility and may review the signed declarations on file so long as the person does not interfere with the functions of the precinct election officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A precinct election official shall require any person whose name does not appear on the election register as an active voter to show identification. Specific documents which are acceptable forms of identification shall be prescribed by the state commissioner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A precinct election official may require of the voter unknown to the official, identification upon which the voter's signature or mark appears. If identification is established to the satisfaction of the precinct election officials, the person may then be allowed to vote.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From 2004 version of Iowa Annotated Code; effective January 1, 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) A person desiring to vote shall provide to the election board: (1) the voter's name; (2) if required, the voter's address; and (3) the voter's signature on the registration or poll book. A signature may be made by mark, initials, typewriter, print, stamp, symbol or any other manner if by placing the signature on the document the person intends the signature to be binding. A signature may be made by another person at the voter's direction if the signature reflects such voter's intention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Approved April 14, 2004, 2004 Kansas Laws Ch. 93)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117.227 Confirmation of voter's identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election officers shall confirm the identity of each voter by personal acquaintance or by a document, such as a motor vehicle operator's license, Social Security card, or credit card. The election officer confirming the identity shall sign the precinct voter roster and list the method of identification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective: 7/15/02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1. In addition to the forms of identification specifically provided for by KRS 117.227, any identification card that bears both the picture and signature of the voter, or any identification card that has been issued by the county, and which has been approved in writing by the State Board of Elections, shall be acceptable for confirmation of the voter's identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Identification of voters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) A person who desires to vote in a primary or general election shall give his name and address to a commissioner, who shall announce the applicant's name and address to the persons at the polling place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Each applicant shall identify himself, in the presence and view of the bystanders, and present to the commissioners a Louisiana driver's license, a Louisiana special identification card issued pursuant to R.S. 40:1321, or other generally recognized picture identification card. If the applicant does not have a Louisiana driver's license, a Louisiana special identification card, or other generally recognized picture identification card, the applicant shall sign an affidavit, which is supplied by the secretary of state, to that effect before the commissioners who shall place the affidavit in the envelope marked &quot;Registrar of Voters&quot; and attach the envelope to the precinct register, and the applicant...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>The voting procedure is as follows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Name announced. A voter who wishes to vote must state the voter’s name and, upon request, residence address to an election clerk who shall announce the name in a loud, clear voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(In effect at time of 2003 amendment: 2003, c. 584, § 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>10-310. (a) For each individual who seeks to vote, an election judge, in accordance with instructions provided by the local board, shall: (1) locate the individual’s name in the precinct register and locate the preprinted voting authority card and then authorize the individual to vote a regular ballot; (2)(i) if the individual’s name is not found on the precinct register, search the inactive list and if the name is found, authorize the individual to vote a regular ballot; or (ii) if the individual’s name is not on the inactive list, refer the individual for provisional ballot voting under § 9-404 of this article; (3) establish the identity of the voter by requesting the voter to state the month and day of the voter’s birth and comparing the response to the information listed in the precinct register; (4) verify the address of the voter’s residence; (5) if any changes to the voting authority card are indicated by a voter, make the appropriate changes in information on the card or other appropriate form; and (6) have the voter sign the voting authority card and either issue the voter a ballot or send the voter to a machine to vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Each voter desiring to vote at a polling place shall give his name and, if requested, his residence to one of the officers at the entrance to the space within the guard rail, who shall thereupon distinctly announce the same. If such name is found on the voting list, the election officer shall check and repeat the name and shall admit the voter to the space enclosed by the guard rail and, in case official ballots, other than those marked “Challenged Ballots” as provided by section thirty-five A, are used, such voter shall be given one ballot. The use of electronic means such as tape recording equipment or radio broadcasting equipment for the recording or broadcasting of the names of voters not yet checked as having voted shall be prohibited. Last amended in 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5B) Identification. If so authorized by the city or town clerk or registrars of voters, an election officer may request any voter to present written identification. Such requests shall not discriminate in any way, but shall be entirely random, consistent, or based on reasonable suspicion. For the purpose of 950 CMR 52.03(5B), of M.G.L. c. 54, § 76B, and of 950 CMR 52.03(5)(b), suitable written identification includes a driver’s license, recent utility bill, rent receipt on a landlord’s printed letterhead, lease, duplicate copy of a voter registration affidavit, or any other printed identification which contains the voter’s name and address. If voters fail to present suitable written identification when so requested, they must still be allowed to vote, but an election officer or any other person may challenge their right to vote under M.G.L. c. 54, § 85 and 950 CMR 52.03(23).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>(1) At each election, before being given a ballot, each registered elector offering to vote shall identify himself or herself by presenting an official state identification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>The voting procedure is as follows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Name announced. A voter who wishes to vote must state the voter’s name and, upon request, residence address to an election clerk who shall announce the name in a loud, clear voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(In effect at time of 2003 amendment: 2003, c. 584, § 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>10-310. (a) For each individual who seeks to vote, an election judge, in accordance with instructions provided by the local board, shall: (1) locate the individual’s name in the precinct register and locate the preprinted voting authority card and then authorize the individual to vote a regular ballot; (2)(i) if the individual’s name is not found on the precinct register, search the inactive list and if the name is found, authorize the individual to vote a regular ballot; or (ii) if the individual’s name is not on the inactive list, refer the individual for provisional ballot voting under § 9-404 of this article; (3) establish the identity of the voter by requesting the voter to state the month and day of the voter’s birth and comparing the response to the information listed in the precinct register; (4) verify the address of the voter’s residence; (5) if any changes to the voting authority card are indicated by a voter, make the appropriate changes in information on the card or other appropriate form; and (6) have the voter sign the voting authority card and either issue the voter a ballot or send the voter to a machine to vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Each voter desiring to vote at a polling place shall give his name and, if requested, his residence to one of the officers at the entrance to the space within the guard rail, who shall thereupon distinctly announce the same. If such name is found on the voting list, the election officer shall check and repeat the name and shall admit the voter to the space enclosed by the guard rail and, in case official ballots, other than those marked “Challenged Ballots” as provided by section thirty-five A, are used, such voter shall be given one ballot. The use of electronic means such as tape recording equipment or radio broadcasting equipment for the recording or broadcasting of the names of voters not yet checked as having voted shall be prohibited. Last amended in 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5B) Identification. If so authorized by the city or town clerk or registrars of voters, an election officer may request any voter to present written identification. Such requests shall not discriminate in any way, but shall be entirely random, consistent, or based on reasonable suspicion. For the purpose of 950 CMR 52.03(5B), of M.G.L. c. 54, § 76B, and of 950 CMR 52.03(5)(b), suitable written identification includes a driver’s license, recent utility bill, rent receipt on a landlord’s printed letterhead, lease, duplicate copy of a voter registration affidavit, or any other printed identification which contains the voter’s name and address. If voters fail to present suitable written identification when so requested, they must still be allowed to vote, but an election officer or any other person may challenge their right to vote under M.G.L. c. 54, § 85 and 950 CMR 52.03(23).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>(1) At each election, before being given a ballot, each registered elector offering to vote shall identify himself or herself by presenting an official state identification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
identification card issued to that individual pursuant to Act No. 222 of the Public Acts of 1972, being sections 28.291 to 28.295 of the Michigan Compiled Laws, an operator's or chauffeur's license issued to that individual pursuant to the Michigan Vehicle Code, Act No. 300 of the Public Acts of 1949, being sections 257.1 to 257.923 of the Michigan Compiled Laws, or other generally recognized picture identification card and by executing an application showing his or her signature or mark and address of residence in the presence of an election official. If the voter registration cards are used in the precinct, the election official in charge of the precinct registration file shall compare the signature upon the application with the signature upon the registration card. If voter registration lists are used in the precinct, the election inspector shall determine if the name on the application to vote appears on the voter registration list. If the name appears on the voter registration list, the elector shall provide further identification by giving his or her date of birth or other information stated upon the voter registration list. In precincts using voter registration lists, the date of birth may be required to be placed on the application to vote. If the signature or an item of information does not correspond, the vote of the person shall be challenged, and the same procedure shall be followed as provided in this act for the challenging of an elector. If the person offering to vote has signed the registration card or application by making a mark, the person shall identify himself or herself by giving his or her date of birth, which shall be compared with the date of birth stated upon the registration card or voter registration list, or shall give other identification as may be referred to upon the registration card or voter registration list. If the elector does not have an official state identification card, operator's or chauffeur's license as required in this subsection, or other generally recognized picture identification card, the individual shall sign an affidavit to that effect before an election inspector and be allowed to vote as otherwise provided in this act. However, an elector being allowed to vote without the identification required under this subsection is subject to challenge as provided in section 727.

(2) If, upon a comparison of the signature or other identification, it is found that the applicant is entitled to vote, the election officer having charge of the registration list shall approve the application and write his or her initials on the application, after which the number on the ballot issued shall be noted on the application. The application shall serve as 1 of the 2 poll lists required to be kept as a record of a person who has voted. The application shall be filed with the township, city, or village clerk. If voter registration cards are used in the precinct, the date of the election shall be noted by 1 of the election officials upon the precinct registration card of each elector voting at an election. If voter registration lists are used in the precinct, the election official shall clearly indicate upon the list each elector voting at that election. The clerk of a city, village, or township shall maintain a record of voting participation for each registered elector.


(Effective March 31, 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minnesota</th>
<th>Sign Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) An individual seeking to vote shall sign a polling place roster which states that the individual is at least 18 years of age, a citizen of the United States, has resided in Minnesota for 20 days immediately preceding the election, maintains residence at the address shown, is not under a guardianship in which the court order revokes the individual's right to vote, has not been found by a court of law to be legally incompetent to vote or convicted of a felony without having civil rights restored, is registered and has not already voted in the election. The roster must also state: 'I understand that deliberately providing false information is a felony punishable by not more than five years imprisonment and a fine of not</td>
<td>Minn. Stat. § 204C.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
more than $10,000, or both."

(b) A judge may, before the applicant signs the roster, confirm the applicant's name, address, and date of birth.

(c) After the applicant signs the roster, the judge shall give the applicant a voter's receipt. The voter shall deliver the voter's receipt to the judge in charge of ballots as proof of the voter's right to vote, and thereupon the judge shall hand to the voter the ballot. The voters' receipts must be maintained during the time for notice of filing an election contest.

(Effective January 1, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mississippi</th>
<th>Sign Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When any person entitled to vote shall appear to vote, he shall first sign his name in a receipt book or booklet provided for that purpose and to be used at that election only and said receipt book or booklet shall be used in lieu of the list of voters who have voted formerly made by the managers or clerks; whereupon and not before, the initialing manager or, in his absence, the alternate initialing manager shall indorse his initials on the back of an official blank ballot, prepared in accordance with law, and at such place on the back of the ballot that the initials may be seen after the ballot has been marked and folded, and when so indorsed he shall deliver it to the voter, which ballot the voter shall mark in the manner provided by law, which when done the voter shall deliver the same to the initialing manager or, in his absence, to the alternate initialing manager, in the presence of the others, and the manager shall see that the ballot so delivered bears on the back thereof the genuine initials of the initialing manager, or alternate initialing manager, and if so, but not otherwise, the ballot shall be put into the ballot box; and when so done one (1) of the managers or a duly appointed clerk shall make the proper entry on the pollbook. If the voter is unable to write his name on the receipt book, a manager or clerk shall note on the back of the ballot that it was receipted for by his assistance.

(Effective January 1, 1987)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missouri</th>
<th>Provide ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Before receiving a ballot, voters shall identify themselves by presenting a form of personal identification from the following list:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Identification issued by the state of Missouri, an agency of the state, or a local election authority of the state;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Identification issued by the United States government or agency thereof;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Identification issued by an institution of higher education, including a university, college, vocational and technical school, located within the state of Missouri;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) A copy of a current utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck or other government document that contains the name and address of the voter;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Driver's license or state identification card issued by another state; or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Other identification approved by the secretary of state under rules promulgated pursuant to subsection 3 of this section other identification approved by federal law. Personal knowledge of the voter by two supervising election judges, one from each major political party, shall be acceptable voter identification upon the completion of a secretary of state-approved affidavit that is signed by both supervisory election judges and the voter that attests to the personal knowledge of the voter by the two supervisory election judges. The secretary of state may provide by rule for a sample affidavit to be used for such purpose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Last amended in 2002)
| Montana | Provide ID | (1) (a) Before an elector is permitted to receive a ballot or vote, the elector shall present to an election judge a current photo identification showing the elector's name. If the elector does not present photo identification, including but not limited to a valid driver's license, a school district or postsecondary education photo identification, or a tribal photo identification, the elector shall present a current utility bill, bank statement, paycheck, notice of confirmation of voter registration issued pursuant to 13-2-207, government check, or other government document that shows the elector's name and current address. (From 2004 version of the Montana Code Annotated; No updates in 2004, only in 2005 [Unrelated section was amended in 2005]) |
| Nebraska | Sign Name | (1) The clerks of election shall have a list of registered voters of the precinct and a sign-in register at the polling place on election day. The list of registered voters shall be used for guidance on election day and may be in the form of a computerized, typed, or handwritten list or precinct registration cards. Registered voters of the precinct shall place and record their signature in the sign-in register before receiving any ballot. The list of registered voters and the sign-in register may be combined into one document. (Last amended in 2003) |
| Nevada | Match Sig. | 1. Except as otherwise provided in NRS 293.541, if a person's name appears in the election board register or if he provides an affirmation pursuant to NRS 293.525, he is entitled to vote and must sign his name in the election board register when he applies to vote. His signature must be compared by an election board officer with the signature or a facsimile thereof on his original application to register to vote or one of the forms of identification listed in subsection 2. 2. Except as otherwise provided in NRS 293.2725, the forms of identification which may be used individually to identify a voter at the polling place are: (a) The card issued to the voter at the time he registered to vote; (b) A driver's license; (c) An identification card issued by the Department of Motor Vehicles; (d) A military identification card; or |
(e) Any other form of identification issued by a governmental agency which contains the voter's signature and physical description or picture.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Citing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>A person desiring to vote shall, before being admitted to the enclosed space within the guardrail, announce his or her name to one of the ballot clerks who shall thereupon repeat the name; and, if the name is found on the checklist by the ballot clerk, the ballot clerk shall put a checkmark beside it and again repeat the name. The ballot clerk shall state the address listed on the checklist for the voter, and ask if the address is correct; if the address on the checklist is not correct, the ballot clerk shall correct the address in red on the checklist. The voter, if still qualified to vote in the town or ward and unless challenged as provided for in RSA 659:27-33, shall then be allowed to enter the space enclosed by the guardrail. After the voter enters the enclosed space, the ballot clerk shall give the voter one of each ballot to be voted on in that election which shall be folded as it was upon receipt from the secretary of state.</td>
<td>N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. 659:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>19:15-17. Comparison of signatures or statements made openly; provisional ballots for newly registered voters without proper identification</td>
<td>N.J. Stat. Ann. 19:15-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. The comparison of signatures of a voter made upon registration and upon election day, and if the voter alleges his inability to write, the comparison of the answers made by such voter upon registration and upon election day, shall be had in full view of the challengers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. If a voter has registered by mail after January 1, 2003 to vote for the first time in his or her current county of residence and did not provide personal identification when registering pursuant to section 16 of P.L.1974, c. 30 (C.19:31-6.4), the voter shall be permitted to vote starting at the first election held after January 1, 2004 at which candidates are seeking federal office after displaying one of the following items: (1) a current and valid photo identification card; (2) a current utility bill, bank statement, government check or pay check; (3) any other government document that shows the voter's name and current address; or (4) any other identifying document that the Attorney General has determined to be acceptable for this purpose. If the voter does not display one of these documents, the voter shall not be permitted to vote by machine but shall instead be provided with a provisional ballot, pursuant to the provisions of P.L.1999, c. 232 (C.19:53C-1 et seq.). This subsection shall not apply to any voter entitled to vote by absentee ballot under the &quot;Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act&quot; (42 U.S.C. 1973ff-1 et seq.) or to any voter who is provided the right to vote other than in person under section 3 of Pub.L.98-435, the &quot;Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act,&quot; or any other voter entitled to vote otherwise than in person under any other federal law. This subsection shall also not apply to any person who registers to vote by appearing in person at any voter registration agency or to any person whose voter registration form is delivered to the county commissioner of registration or to the Attorney General, as the case may be, through a third party by means other than by mail delivery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Each county commissioner of registration shall collect and maintain, in the manner prescribed by the Attorney General, the information provided pursuant to subsection b. of this section and section 16 of P.L.1974, c. 30 (C.19:31-6.4). Access to the personal identification information provided pursuant to subsection b. of this section and section 16 of P.L.1974, c. 30 (C.19:31-6.4), shall be prohibited, in accordance with subsection a. of section 6 of P.L.2001, c. 404 (C.47:1A-5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>D. The judge assigned to the voter list used for confirmation of registration and voting shall determine that each person offering to vote is registered and, in the</td>
<td>N.M. Stat. Ann §1-5-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Amendment Effective July 9, 2004
case of a primary election, that the voter is registered in a party designated on the primary election ballot. If the person's registration is confirmed by the presence of his name on the voter list or if the person presents a certificate under the seal and signature of the county clerk showing that he is entitled to vote in the election and to vote in that precinct, the judge shall announce to the election clerks the list number and the name of the voter as shown on the voter list.

E. The election clerk shall locate that list number and name on the signature roster and shall require the voter to sign his usual signature or, if unable to write, to make his mark opposite his printed name. If the voter makes his mark, it shall be witnessed by one of the judges of the precinct board. If the signature roster indicates that the voter is required to present a form of identification before voting, the election judge shall ask the voter for a current and valid photo identification or a copy of a current utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck or other government document that shows and matches the name and address of the voter as indicated on the signature roster. If the voter does not provide the required identification, he shall be allowed to vote on a provisional paper ballot.

G. A voter shall not be permitted to vote until he has properly signed his usual signature or made his mark in the signature roster.

(From 2004 version of New Mexico Annotated Statutes, amended in 2005 to require presentation of ID)

New York Match Sig.

1. A person before being allowed to vote shall be required, except as provided in this chapter, to sign his name on the back of his registration poll record on the first line reserved for his signature at the time of election which is not filled with a previous signature, or on the line of the computer generated registration list reserved for his signature. The two inspectors in charge shall satisfy themselves by a comparison of this signature with his registration signature and by comparison of his appearance with the descriptive material on the face of the registration poll record that he is the person registered. If they are so satisfied they shall enter the other information required for the election on the same line with the voter's latest signature, shall sign their names or initials in the spaces provided therefor, and shall permit the applicant to vote. Any inspector or inspectors not satisfied shall challenge the applicant forthwith.

2. If a person who alleges his inability to sign his name presents himself to vote, the board of inspectors shall permit him to vote, unless challenged on other grounds, provided he had been permitted to register without signing his name. The board shall enter the words "Unable to Sign" in the space on his registration poll record reserved for his signature or on the line of the computer generated registration list reserved for his signature at such election. If his signature appears upon his registration record or upon the computer generated registration list the board shall challenge him forthwith, except that if such a person claims that he is unable to sign his name by reason of a physical disability incurred since his registration, the board, if convinced of the existence of such disability, shall permit him to vote, shall enter the words "Unable to Sign" and a brief description of such disability in the space reserved for his signature at such election. At each subsequent election, if such disability still exists, he shall be entitled to vote without signing his name and the board of inspectors, without further notation, shall enter the words "Unable to Sign" in the space reserved for his signature at such election.

3. The voter's signature made by him upon registration and his signature made at subsequent elections shall be effectively concealed from the voter by a blotter or piece of opaque paper until after the voter shall have completed his signature.

4. In any case where a person who has heretofore voted has placed his voting signature on the back of his registration poll record on the first or any succeeding line or lines at the time or times of an election, instead of on the last line of the
space thereon required to be reserved for such voting signatures and on any lines next running upward therefrom, the inspectors of election shall obliterate such misplaced signature or signatures, initial the obliteration and require such voter to sign his name again in the correct place on such registration poll record.

5. Any person who has heretofore registered and who at such time placed his or her registration signature on the back of the registration poll record otherwise than in the space required to be provided therefor at the bottom of such poll record, shall, before being permitted to vote at any election thereafter, subscribe a new registration signature for himself on the last line at the bottom of such poll record, and, at the same time, if the inspectors of election are satisfied that the signatures were made by the same person, obliterate his original registration signature placed elsewhere than on the bottom of such record. Such obliterations may be made by crossing out the signature so as to completely efface the same or by affixing thereover a piece of gummed tape of a size sufficient only to cover such signature and of a type adequate to fully conceal the same.

Last Amended 1986

| North Carolina | Give Name | (a) Checking Registration -- A person seeking to vote shall enter the voting enclosure through the appropriate entrance. A precinct official assigned to check registration shall at once ask the voter to state current name and residence address. The voter shall answer by stating current name and residence address. In a primary election, that voter shall also be asked to state, and shall state, the political party with which the voter is affiliated or, if unaffiliated, the authorizing party in which the voter wishes to vote. After examination, that official shall state whether that voter is duly registered to vote in that precinct and shall direct that voter to the voting equipment or to the official assigned to distribute official ballots. If a precinct official states that the person is duly registered, the person shall sign the pollbook, other voting record, or voter authorization document in accordance with subsection (c) of this section before voting.  

| North Dakota | Provide ID | 16.1-05-07 Poll clerks to check identification and verify eligibility -- Poll clerks to request, correct, and update incorrect information contained in the pollbook.

1. Before delivering a ballot to an individual according to section 16.1-13-22, the poll clerks shall request the individual to show a driver's license issued by the state, another form of identification displaying a photograph of the individual and the individual's date of birth, or another appropriate form of identification prescribed by the secretary of state. If an individual offering to vote fails or refuses to show an appropriate form of identification, the individual may be allowed to vote without being challenged according to section 16.1-05-06 if the individual provides to the election board the individual's date of birth and if a member of the election board or a clerk knows the individual and can personally vouch that the individual is a qualified elector of the precinct. After verifying that the individual's name is contained in the pollbook generated from the central voter file, poll clerks shall verify the individual's residential address and mailing address, if different from the individual's residential address.

(From 2003 version of N.D. Century Code; only amendment to this statute that became effective in 2003 was in 2005)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>When an elector appears in a polling place to vote he shall announce his full name and address to the precinct election officials. He shall then write his name and address at the proper place in the poll lists or signature pollbooks provided therefore, except that if, for any reason, an elector shall be unable to write his name and address in the poll list or signature pollbook, the elector may make his mark at the place intended for his name and a precinct official shall write the name of the elector at the proper place on the poll list or signature pollbook following the elector's mark, upon the presentation of proper identification. The making of such mark shall be attested by the precinct official who shall evidence the same by signing his name on the poll list or signature pollbook as a witness to such mark. The elector's signature in the poll lists or signature pollbooks shall then be compared with his signature on his registration form or a digitized signature list as provided for in section 3503.13 of the Revised Code, and if, in the opinion of a majority of the precinct election officials, the signatures are the signatures of the same person, the clerks shall enter the date of the election on the registration form or shall record the date by such other means as may be prescribed by the secretary of state. If the right of the elector to vote is not then challenged, or, if being challenged, he establishes his right to vote, he shall be allowed to proceed into the voting machine. If voting machines are not being used in that precinct, the judge in charge of ballots shall then detach the next ballots to be issued to the elector from Stub B attached to each ballot, leaving Stub A attached to each ballot, hand the ballots to the elector, and call his name and the stub number on each of the ballots. The clerk shall enter the stub numbers opposite the signature of the elector in the pollbook. The elector shall then retire to one of the voting compartments to mark his ballots. No mark shall be made on any ballot which would in any way enable any person to identify the person who voted the ballot. (Effective at time of last update, 1992 H 182, eff. 4-9-93)</td>
<td>Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 3505.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Each person presenting himself to vote shall announce his name to the judge of the precinct, whereupon the judge shall determine whether said person's name is in the precinct registry. (Last amended in 1990)</td>
<td>Okla. Stat. Ann. tit. 26, § 7-114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persons who have been determined to be eligible to vote shall sign, in the presence of the clerk, the proper precinct registry. Said clerk shall thereupon issue proper ballots to said person. The voter's signature on said precinct registry shall be the best evidence of said voter's having voted at said election. Said precinct registry shall be retained in the office of the county election board for a period of twenty-two (22) months following the election and shall be subject to public inspection during regular office hours. (Last amended in 1990)</td>
<td>Okla. Stat. Ann. tit. 26, § 7-117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>All elections in Oregon are Vote by Mail. An Elections Official will compare the signature on your ballot return envelope to the signature on your voter registration card to verify your identity (<a href="http://www.uhavavote.org/votingguide/votebymail.html">http://www.uhavavote.org/votingguide/votebymail.html</a>) (unknown date, but use of wayback machine shows that this provision on site on following dates: 7/11/04, 10/20/04 and 10/29/04)</td>
<td>Or. Rev. Stat. § 254.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn.</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>(a.3) All electors, including any elector that shows identification pursuant to subsection (a) shall subsequently sign a voter's certificate, and, unless he is a State or Federal employee who has registered under any registration act without declaring his residence by street and number, he shall insert his address therein, and hand the same to the election officer in charge of the district register. Such election officer shall thereupon announce the elector's name so that it may be heard by all members of the election board and by all watchers present in the</td>
<td>25 Pa. Stat. Ann. § 3050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
polling place and shall compare the elector’s signature on his voter’s certificate with his signature in the district register. If, upon such comparison, the signature upon the voter’s certificate appears to be genuine, the elector who has signed the certificate shall, if otherwise qualified, be permitted to vote: Provided, That if the signature on the voter’s certificate, as compared with the signature as recorded in the district register, shall not be deemed authentic by any of the election officers, such elector shall not be denied the right to vote for that reason, but shall be considered challenged as to identity and required to make the affidavit and produce the evidence as provided in subsection (d) of this section.

When an elector has been found entitled to vote, the election officer who examined his voter’s certificate and compared his signature shall sign his name or initials on the voter’s certificate, shall, if the elector’s signature is not readily legible, print such elector’s name over his signature, and the number of the stub of the ballot issued to him or his number in the order of admission to the voting machines, and at primaries a letter or abbreviation designating the party in whose primary he votes shall also be entered by one of the election officers or clerks. As each voter is found to be qualified and votes, the election officer in charge of the district register shall write or stamp the date of the election or primary, the number of the stub of the ballot issued to him or his number in the order of admission to the voting machines, and at primaries a letter or abbreviation designating the party in whose primary he votes, and shall sign his name or initials in the proper space on the registration card of such voter contained in the district register.

(In effect at time of, and unaltered by: 2004, Oct. 8, P.L. 807, No. 97, § 5.1 (changes procedure for first time voters, not established voters))

Rhode Island Make Name

(a) Each person desiring to vote shall state his or her name and residence, including that person’s street address, if he or she has any, to one of the first pair of bi-partisan supervisors, who shall then announce the name and residence in a loud and distinct voice, clear and audible. As each voter’s name is announced, the voter shall be handed a ballot application in the following form:

**BALLOT APPLICATION**

(Poll List)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senatorial District</th>
<th>________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative District</td>
<td>________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting District</td>
<td>________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election</td>
<td>________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I hereby certify that I am a registered and qualified elector in the above voting district of City of

and hereby make application for ballots to be voted at this election.

________________________
(Signature of Voter)

________________________
(Residence Address)

Number Approved ________________

(Supervisor of Election)

(b) The voter shall sign the application in the presence and view of a bipartisan pair. They shall locate the voter's name on the certified voting list for the voting district. Upon finding the voter's name on the certified voting list for the district, they shall initial the ballot application in the place provided next to the word "Approved" and shall enter on the certified list of voters a proper notation that the applicant has voted in the election. They shall then return the ballot application to the voter who shall pass down the line and present it to the clerk. After the voter has handed the approved ballot application to the clerk, the clerk shall provide the voter with the appropriate computer ballot and security sleeve, the warden shall direct the voter to the voting booth which the voter shall use, and unless the voter needs instruction or assistance as provided in this chapter, the voter shall cast his or her vote, and if he or she desires place the voted computer ballot in a security sleeve, and shall proceed to the optical scan precinct count unit and shall personally place his or her voted ballot into the designated ballot slot on the unit, and after doing so, shall leave the enclosure at once. No voter shall remain within the voting booth longer than ten (10) minutes, and if the voter refuses to leave after the lapse of ten (10) minutes, the voter shall be removed from the voting booth by order of the warden. Except for the election officials and the election inspector, not more than two (2) voters in excess of the number of voting booths shall be permitted within the enclosed space at any time.

South Carolina       Photo ID       § 7-13-710. Proof of right to vote; signing poll list; comparison of signatures.       S.C. Code Ann. § 7-13-710

When any person presents himself to vote, he shall produce his valid South Carolina driver's license or other form of identification containing a photograph issued by the Department of Motor Vehicles, if he is not licensed to drive, or the written notification of registration provided for by §§ 7-5-125 and 7-5-180 if the notification has been signed by the elector. If the elector loses or defaces his registration notification, he may obtain a duplicate notification from his county board of registration upon request in person, or by telephone or mail. After presentation of the required identification, his name must be checked by one of the managers on the margin of the page opposite his name upon the registration books, or copy of the books, furnished by the board of registration. The managers shall keep a poll list which must contain one column headed "Names of Voters". Before any ballot is delivered to a voter, the voter shall sign his name on the poll list, which must be furnished to the appropriate election officials by the State Election Commission. At the top of each page the voter's oath appropriate to the election must be printed. The signing of the poll list or the marking of the poll list is considered to be an affirmation of the oath by the voter. One of the managers shall compare the signature on the poll list with the signature on the voter's driver's license, registration notification, or other identification and may require further identification of the voter and proof of his right to vote under this title as he considers necessary. If the voter is unable to write or if the voter is prevented from signing by physical handicap, he may sign his name to the poll list by mark with the assistance of one of the managers.

Last amended: 1968

South Dakota       Photo ID       When a voter is requesting a ballot, the voter shall present a valid form of personal identification. The personal identification that may be presented shall be either:

1. A South Dakota driver's license or nondriver identification card;
2. A passport or an identification card, including a picture, issued by an agency of the United States government;
3. A tribal identification card, including a picture; or
4. An identification card, including a picture, issued by a high school or an accredited institution of higher education, including a university, college, or

S.D. Codified Laws § 12-18-6.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>A voter shall sign an application for ballot, indicate the primary in which the voter desires to vote, if any, and present it to a registrar. The application for ballot shall include thereon a space for the address of the voter's current residence, and the voter shall write or print such address on the application when the voter signs it. The registrar shall compare the signature and information on the application with the signature and information on the duplicate permanent registration record. The registrar shall make a determination whether the voter's address is different from the address on the voter's permanent registration record or if the registration is in inactive status. If the voter has changed residence, or the voter's registration is inactive, the registrar shall follow the procedures for voting pursuant to § 2-7-140. If, upon comparison of the signature and other identification, it is found that the applicant is entitled to vote, the registrar shall initial the application and shall note on the reverse side of the voter's duplicate permanent registration record the date of the election, the number of the voter's ballot application, and the elections in which the voter votes. If the applicant's signature is illegible, the registrar shall print the name on the application. The registrar shall give the voter the ballot application which is the voter's identification for a paper ballot or ballots or for admission to a voting machine. The voter shall then sign the duplicate poll lists without leaving any lines blank on any poll list sheet. (2) In any computerized county, the county election commission shall have the option of using an application for ballot as provided in this section, or using the computerized voter signature list. A computerized voter signature list shall include the voter's name, current address of residence, social security number or registration number, birth date and spaces for the voter's signature, elections voted, ballot number and precinct registrar's initials. The following procedures shall be followed in the case of computerized voter signature lists: (A) The voter shall sign the signature list and indicate the election or elections the voter desires to vote in and verify the voter's address in the presence of the precinct registrar; (B) The registrar shall compare the voter's signature and information on the signature list with other evidence of identification supplied by the voter. If, upon comparison of the signature and other evidence of identification, it is found that the applicant is entitled to vote, the registrar shall initial the signature list; (C) If the applicant's signature is illegible, the registrar shall print the name of the applicant on the voter list; and (D) If a voter is unable to present any evidence of identification specified in subsection (c), the voter shall be required to execute an affidavit of identity on a form provided by the county election commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>A voter must present the voter's voter registration certificate to an election officer at the polling place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Any registered voter desiring to vote shall give his name, and, if requested, his residence, to one of the election judges. If an election judge does not know the person requesting a ballot and has reason to doubt that person's identity, the judge shall request identification or have the voter identified by a known registered voter of the district. If the election judge determines that the voter is registered: (a) the election judge in charge of the official register shall: (i) write the ballot number opposite the name of the voter in the official register; and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ii) direct the voter to sign his name in the election column in the official register;
(b) another judge shall list the ballot number and voter's name in the pollbook; and
(c) the election judge having charge of the ballots shall:
   (i) endorse his initials on the stub;
   (ii) check the name of the voter on the pollbook list with the number of the stub;
   (iii) hand the voter a ballot; and
   (iv) allow the voter to enter the voting booth.

(In effect at time of last update prior to 2005: Laws 2003, c. 37, § 1, eff. May 5, 2003)

| Vermont | Give Name | Vermont Give Name Before a person may be admitted to vote, he or she shall announce his or her name and if requested, his or her place of residence in a clear and audible tone of voice, or present his or her name in writing, or otherwise identify himself or herself by appropriate documentation. The election officials attending the entrance of the polling place shall then verify that the person's name appears on the checklist for the polling place. If the name does appear, and if no one immediately challenges the person's right to vote on grounds of identity or having previously voted in the same election, the election officials shall repeat the name of the person and:
   (1) If the checklist indicates that the person is a first-time voter in the municipality who registered by mail and who has not provided required identification before the opening of the polls, require the person to present any one of the following: a valid photo identification; a copy of a current utility bill; a copy of a current bank statement; or a copy of a government check, paycheck, or any other government document that shows the current name and address of the voter. If the person is unable to produce the required information, the person shall be afforded the opportunity to cast a provisional ballot, as provided in subchapter 6A of this chapter. The elections official shall note upon the checklist a first-time voter in the municipality who has registered by mail and who produces the required information, and place a mark next to the voter's name on the checklist and allow the voter to proceed to the voting booth for the purpose of voting.
   (2) If the voter is not a first-time voter in the municipality, no identification shall be required, the clerk shall place a check next to the voter's name on the checklist and allow the voter to proceed to the voting booth for the purpose of voting.

(Last amended in 2003) |
| Virginia | Provide ID | § 24.2-643. Qualified voter permitted to vote; procedures at polling place; voter identification
A. After the polls are open, each qualified voter at a precinct shall be permitted to vote. The officers of election shall ascertain that a person offering to vote is a qualified voter before admitting him to the voting booth and furnishing an official ballot to him.
B. An officer of election shall ask the voter for his full name and current residence address and repeat, in a voice audible to party and candidate representatives present, the full name and address stated by the voter. The officer shall ask the voter to present any one of the following forms of identification: his Commonwealth of Virginia voter registration card, his social security card, his valid Virginia driver's license, or any other identification card issued by a government agency of the Commonwealth, one of its political subdivisions, or the United States; or any valid employee identification card containing a photograph of the voter and issued by an employer of the voter in the ordinary course of the employer's business.
If the voter's name is found on the pollbook, if he presents one of the forms of | Va. Code. Ann. |
identification listed above, if he is qualified to vote in the election, and if no objection is made, an officer shall enter, opposite the voter's name on the pollbook, the first or next consecutive number from the voter count form provided by the State Board, or shall enter that the voter has voted if the pollbook is in electronic form; an officer shall provide the voter with the official ballot; and another officer shall admit him to the voting booth.

Except as provided in subsection E of this section, if a voter is entitled to vote except that he is unable to present one of the forms of identification listed above, he shall be allowed to vote after signing a statement, subject to felony penalties for false statements pursuant to § 24.2-1016, that he is the named registered voter who he claims to be. A voter who requires assistance in voting by reason of physical disability or inability to read or write, and who requests assistance pursuant to § 24.2-649, may be assisted in preparation of this statement in accordance with that section. The provisions of § 24.2-649 regarding voters who are unable to sign shall be followed when assisting a voter in completing this statement.

(Version in effect as of 2004: effective 4/12/2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Sign Name</th>
<th>29A.44.201.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A voter desiring to vote shall give his or her name to the precinct election officer who has the precinct list of registered voters. This officer shall announce the name to the precinct election officer who has the copy of the inspector's poll book for that precinct. If the right of this voter to participate in the primary or election is not challenged, the voter must be issued a ballot or permitted to enter a voting booth or to operate a voting device. For a partisan primary in a jurisdiction using the physically separate ballot format, the voter must be issued a nonpartisan ballot and each party ballot. The number of the ballot or the voter must be recorded by the precinct election officers. If the right of the voter to participate is challenged, RCW 29A.08.810 and 29A.08.820 apply to that voter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(In effect at time of last update prior to 2005: 2004 c 271 § 136, eff. June 10, 2004)


Any person desiring to vote at any primary or election is required to sign his or her name on the appropriate precinct list of registered voters. If the voter registered using a mark, or can no longer sign his or her name, the election officers shall require the voter to be identified by another registered voter.

The precinct election officers shall then record the voter's name.

Effective date: July 1, 2004

West Virginia | Match Sig. | (a) Any person desiring to vote in an election shall, upon entering the election room, clearly state his or her name and residence to one of the poll clerks who shall thereupon announce the same in a clear and distinct tone of voice. If that person is found to be duly registered as a voter at that precinct, he or she shall be required to sign his or her name in the space marked "signature of voter" on the pollbook prescribed and provided for the precinct. If that person is physically or otherwise unable to sign his or her name, his or her mark shall be affixed by one of the poll clerks in the presence of the other and the name of the poll clerk affixing the voter's mark shall be indicated immediately under the affixation. No ballot may be given to the person until he or she so signs his or her name on the pollbook or his or her signature is so affixed thereon.

* * *

(c) When the voter's signature is properly on the pollbook, the two poll clerks shall sign their names in the places indicated on the back of the official ballot and deliver the ballot to the voter to be voted by him or her without leaving the
election room. If he or she returns the ballot spoiled to the clerks, they shall immediately mark the ballot "spoiled" and it shall be preserved and placed in a spoiled ballot envelope together with other spoiled ballots to be delivered to the board of canvassers and deliver to the voter another official ballot, signed by the clerks on the reverse side required by this subsection. The voter shall thereupon retire alone to the booth or compartment prepared within the election room for voting purposes and there prepare his or her ballot using a ballpoint pen of not less than five inches in length or other indelible marking device of not less than five inches in length. In voting for candidates in general and special elections, the voter shall comply with the rules and procedures prescribed in section five, article six of this chapter.

(In effect at time of last update prior to 2005: Acts 2003, c. 100, eff. 90 days after March 7, 2003)

| Wisconsin | Give Name | 6.79(2)(a) Except as provided in sub. (6), where there is registration, each person, before receiving a voting number, shall state his or her full name and address. Upon the prepared registration list, after the name of each elector, the officials shall enter the serial number of the vote as it is polled beginning with number one. Each elector shall receive a slip bearing the same serial number. A separate list shall be maintained for electors who are voting under s. 6.15, 6.29 or 6.55(2) or (3) and electors who are reassigned from another polling place under s. 5.25(5)(b). Each such elector shall have his or her full name, address and serial number likewise entered and shall be given a slip bearing such number. | Wis. Stat. § 6.79 |

| Wyoming | Give Name | (a) Unless a voter is challenged pursuant to W.S. 22-15-101 through 22-15-109, no identification shall be required when:

(i) Voting in person or by mail after having registered in person; or

(ii) Voting in person or by mail after having registered by mail and having previously voted in a Wyoming federal election. | Wyo. Stat. Ann. § 22-3-118 |

(In effect at time of last update prior to 2005: Effective dates. -- Laws 2004, ch. 94, § 5, makes the act effective immediately upon completion of all acts necessary for a bill to become law as provided by art. 4, § 8, Wyo. Const. Approved March 5, 2004.)
APPENDIX B – Court Decisions and Literature on Voter Identification and Related Issues

Court Decisions

Summary of Relevant Cases:

Challenges Prevailed:

American Civil Liberties Union of Minnesota v. Kiffmeyer, 2004
- Action for temporary restraining order – granted
- Statute: allowed use of tribal identification cards w/ name, address & photo as a valid identification to register to vote only if the voter lives on the reservation to "complete" a mail-in application (which only affected about 600 voters w/ incomplete applications)
- Claim - 14th Amendment EPC: likely to prevail, no rational basis for a distinction between Indians residing on reservations and those not
- Statute: may use certain forms of photo identification lacking address together with a utility bill but not tribal identification cards
- Claim - 14th Amendment EPC: likely to prevail

Greidinger v. Davis, 1993
- Statute: mandated disclosure of SS # as a precondition to voter registration (rationale was voter identification, but the numbers were rarely used to verify identity & were disclosed in voter lists to both political parties and the public upon request)
- Claims:
  - 14th Amendment EPC: no classification (applied strict scrutiny)
  - Substantive due process: law invalid; found that the statute conditioned the fundamental right to vote on the consent to an invasion of privacy; this was found to be a substantial burden (applied strict scrutiny)
    - Compelling interests: preventing voter fraud (deemed compelling)
    - Necessary: fails, preventing voter fraud when allowing names for inspection could be achieved by supplying addresses and DOBs or use of voter registration numbers
    - HOWEVER: Court also made it clear that if the registration scheme kept the SS# for internal use only – it would be valid

Challenges Rejected:

- Sec. of State Directive: provisional ballots issued if first-time voter, who registered by mail and did not provide ID, cannot produce proper ID at the polls AND that the provisional ballot will only be counted if the voter returns to the poll before it closes w/ ID or can recite SS# or DL#
- Claims – Supremacy Clause & HAVA: ruled that HAVA did not specify how the first-time voters' identifications should be verified and this method was not unreasonable or too burdensome

Colorado Common Clause v. Davidson, 2004
- Statute: required all voters to show ID (most types permitted) before voting
- Claims:
  - HAVA: ruled that HAVA did not preempt more strict state laws & allowed States to be more strict as long as consistent with the purpose of HAVA (both HAVA & CO provisions' purposes were to prevent voter fraud)
  - Substantive due process and equal protection
    - No improper discrimination
Preventing voter fraud is a compelling interest since it is irreversible once vote is cast. Only marginally more intrusive than HAVA, many types of identification permitted – thus, valid.

McKay v. Thompson, 2000
- Statute: mandated disclosure of SS # as a precondition to voter registration.
- Claims:
  - Privacy Act, Section 7: ruled that Tennessee voter system exempt from Privacy Act because it is pre-75.
  - NVRA, permitting only min. amt. of info. necessary to prevent duplicate registration and determine eligibility: ruled that NVRA does not specifically forbid the use of SS#s & the Privacy Act specifically permits them pre-75.
  - Substantive due process: ruled that internal use of SS# not a burden.
  - Free Exercise, based on Bible’s supposed prohibition on use of universal identifiers: ruled that law is generally applicable and thus valid.
  - P&I, Article IV: does not protect in-state citizens.
  - P&I, 14th Amend.: no protection for privilege where Congress authorized its infringement.

Kemp v. Tucker, 1975
- Statute: required name, occupation, address, sex, race, height, hair color, eye color, and date of birth be listed on voter registration card for identification purposes.
- Claims:
  - VRA: ruled that race was not made a “qualification” for voting.
  - 15th Amendment: ruled that it did not abridge right to vote on account of race because rejection of application was due to failure to provide information, not race; race only one factor in identification.
  - 14th Amendment EPC: ruled there was no distinction among voters.

Perez v. Rhiddlehoover, 1966
- Statute: date of birth, place of birth, mother’s first or maiden name, color of eyes, sex, race, occupation, and whether owner, tenant or boarder must appear on the registration for identification.
- Claims:
  - VRA: ruled that it was not a “test or device” because it applied equally.
  - 15th Amendment: same reasons.

Cases in Which the Plaintiffs Have Prevailed in Challenging the Statute Requiring Voter Identification:


This was an action just before the November 2004 election for a temporary restraining order, which was granted. The ACLU challenged a Minnesota law allowing the use of tribal identification cards with the name, address, and photograph as a valid identification (equal to a driver's license) for use in “completing” an incomplete mail-in voter registration only if the Indian lives on the reservation. 2004 WL 2428690, at *1. The Court ruled that this distinction would likely violate the Equal Protection Clause because there was no rational basis for differentiating...
between the validity of the identification based on whether or not the cardholder lives on the reservation. *Id.* at *1, 3.

Secondly, the ACLU challenged a second statute which allowed the use of certain photo identification lacking the voter’s address to be used together with a utility bill or bank statement as valid identification for registration. *Id.* at *3. The statute did not, however, permit using a tribal identification for this same purpose. *Id.* The Court ruled that this likely violated the equal protection clause as well. *Id.*

*Greidinger v. Davis,* 988 F.2d 1344 (4th Cir. 1993).

This case challenged a Virginia law requiring the social security number for voter registration, which the State subsequently disclosed to the public and political parties upon request in voter registration lists, which included the social security numbers. Failure to provide the social security number resulted in the denial of the registration application. *Id.* The law was challenged under the Equal Protection Clause and under substantive due process. The Court ruled that this likely violated the equal protection clause as well. *Id.*

*Greidinger v. Davis,* 988 F.2d at 1350.

The law was invalidated under substantive due process. *Id.* at 1355. The Court found that the statutory scheme conditioned the fundamental right to vote on the consent to an invasion of privacy, based on concerns of identity theft. *Id.* at 1353-54. The Court found this to be a substantial burden on the right to vote. *Id.* at 1354. The Court recognized that the government’s interest in preventing voter fraud was compelling. *Id.* However, the Court found that disclosure of the information to the public and political parties was not necessary to achieve that interest. *Id.* Disclosure of addresses or dates of birth would be sufficient to aid the public in distinguishing between two voters with the same name. *Id.* at 1355. The Court did state that required disclosure of the social security number for internal use only would be valid. *Id.* at 1354 n.10.

Cases in Which the Statute or Practice of Voter Identification Has Been Upheld:


The League of Women Voters challenged the Secretary of State’s directive that provisional ballots should be issued to all first-time voters who registered by mail without providing identification who cannot show proper identification at the polls. 340 F. Supp. 2d at 828. The Directive also stated that the provisional ballots would only be counted if the voter orally recited his driver’s license number or the last four digits of his social security number or returned to the polling place before it closed with some acceptable identification, including reciting those identification numbers. *Id.* The Court stated that HAVA only requires verification of eligibility of first time voters registering by mail; it does not say how that should be done. *Id.* at 831. The Court found the burden on the right to vote to be slight. *Id.* The Directive was found valid under HAVA and the Supremacy Clause because the number of uncounted votes would be small, the requirement was reasonable, and there was adequate notice of the requirement on the registration forms. *Id.* at 829-30.


In this case, the validity of three Colorado statutory provisions was challenged. The laws (1) required all in-person voters to show identification (not just first-time registrants); (2) provided that votes cast in the wrong precinct would not be counted; and (3) provided that
provisional ballots would not be counted if the voter applied for an absentee ballot. 2004 WL 2360485, at *1. The plaintiffs also challenged the provisions under HAVA. The identification provision allowed nearly all forms of acceptable identification under HAVA. Id. at *6.

The challenge to the identification requirement failed under both challenges. The Court interpreted HAVA as not intended to preempt state laws and as permitting states to be more strict than, but not inconsistent with, HAVA. Id. at *10. The Court felt that the purpose of both laws was the same, to reduce voter fraud, and thus, both laws could coexist. As to the Constitutional claim, both equal protection and substantive due process, the Court felt that preventing voter fraud, which is impossible to remedy once a vote is cast, is a compelling interest, and the Court also felt that a voter identification requirement for all voters, with many types of acceptable identification, was only marginally more intrusive than HAVA. Id. at 12. The Court also found no improper discrimination between voters. Id. Thus, the provision was upheld.

McKay v. Thompson, 226 F.3d 752 (6th Cir. 2000).

The Sixth Circuit ruled that the Privacy Act, the National Voter Registration Act, Substantive Due Process, the Privileges and Immunities Clauses (Fourteenth Amendment & Article IV), and the First Amendment right to free exercise do not prohibit requiring disclosure of social security numbers as a precondition to voter registration.

The Privacy Act, Section 7, mandates that it is unlawful for a government to deny a right or privilege because of a citizen's refusal to disclose his social security number, unless the disclosure was required for a system established prior to 1975. 226 F.3d at 755 (citing Privacy Act of 1974, Pub. L. No. 93-579 (1974)). Since Tennessee required social security numbers for voter registration since 1972, his challenge was rejected. 226 F.3d at 755. Second, the NVRA only permits requiring the minimum amount of information necessary to prevent duplicate voter registration and to determine eligibility. Id. at 755-56 (citing 42 U.S.C. §1973gg-3(c)(2)(B)). The Court rejected this challenge because the NVRA does not specifically forbid the use of social security numbers, and the Privacy Act, a more specific statute, grandfathered their use if prior to 1975. 226 F.3d at 756.

Finally, the plaintiff's constitutional claims were all rejected. His substantive due process claim was rejected because internal receipt and use of social security numbers does not burden the fundamental right to vote. Id. The free exercise challenge, based on the Bible's supposed prohibition of universal identifiers, was rejected because the law was generally applicable and not directed at particular religious practices. Id. The Privileges and Immunities Clause claim was rejected because the Clause does not apply to citizens of the state. Id. The Fourteenth Amendment Privileges and Immunities claim, based on the right to vote as unique to U.S. citizenship, was rejected because the Clause provides no protection where Congress has authorized the infringement. Id.


A statute was upheld, which required name, occupation, address, sex, race, height, hair color, eye color, and date of birth to be recorded on the voter registration card and allowed registration officials to reject an incomplete application. 396 F. Supp. at 738. Claims were alleged under the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause, the Fifteenth Amendment, and the Voting Rights Act.

As to the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendment claims, the Court reasoned that preventing voter fraud is a compelling goal, and identification provisions are "an essential means of achieving the goal." Id. at 739. The Court also rejected the equal protection claim because the statutes did not create a distinction at all. Id. at 740 n.3. Since race is just one of
several characteristics required, the Court found that it was intended for preventing voter fraud, not some other motive. \textit{Id.} at 740. As to the VRA, the Court rejected the claim that it added race as a qualification for voting as frivolous. \textit{Id.} As to a Fifteenth Amendment claim that it abridged the right to vote on account of race, the Court also made a distinction between rejecting a voter application because of race and rejecting an application because of failure to answer all relevant questions to assist in preventing voter fraud. \textit{Id.} The statute was upheld.


A voter registration requirement was challenged and upheld. The statute stated that date of birth, place of birth, mother's first or maiden name, color of eyes, sex, race, occupation, and whether owner, tenant or boarder must appear on the registration. 186 So.2d at 690. This information was required for identification of voters, especially when voters had the same name, to prevent duplicate voting. It was challenged under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 Section 4(a) which prohibits denying the right to vote for failure to comply with a “test or device.” The Court felt that this requirement was not a test or device for discrimination because it applied equally. \textit{Id.} at 691. The Court also determined that it was not in conflict with the Fifteenth Amendment either. \textit{Id.}


On November 30, 2004, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF) filed suit seeking to halt the implementation of Proposition 200. Proposition 200 created a number of legal requirements to ensure that public benefits are not available to illegal immigrants. In particular, Proposition 200 requires that a person attempting to register to vote provide one of six specific forms of proof of United States citizenship. Compl. 12-13. Also, any person attempting to vote must present either one form of photo identification or two forms of non-photo identification. \textit{Id.} at 13.

The lawsuit alleges two violations that directly relate to the voting identification restrictions. First, the lawsuit alleges a violation of the Twenty-Fourth and Fourteenth amendments in that a voter must pay a poll tax by spending money to purchase the required identification. \textit{Id.} at 20. Second, the lawsuit alleges violation of the Voting Rights Act. \textit{Id.} at 21. The lawsuit was recently dismissed by the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals for a lack of standing. The Circuit Court found that there was no injury-in-fact, meaning that once an injury occurs the suit will likely be refiled. Additionally, it should be noted that the voter identification issue is only a part of the lawsuit, and much of the focus has been on other aspects of Proposition 200.

Current Litigation Concerning Voter ID Issues\textsuperscript{27}

Litigation is filled with uncertainty. Litigation stemming from newly passed voter identification requirements will continue into the foreseeable future. Lawsuits are currently pending over voter identification requirements in Georgia and Indiana. Other states, such as Ohio, are considering new identification requirements that could lead to further litigation. The Georgia lawsuit has already succeeded in getting a preliminary injunction against the law in question, which will likely galvanize interested parties in other states to pursue similar litigation. Of course, if the injunction is eventually overturned at the appellate level it could have a similar chilling affect on future litigation.

This summary major litigation pending in Georgia and Indiana includes a brief assessment of the likelihood of success:

\textsuperscript{27} As of January 2, 2006
Georgia (Common Cause/Georgia v. Billups):

On September 19, 2005, Common Cause of Georgia, in conjunction with several other non-profit organizations, filed suit in Federal District Court against the Georgia Secretary of State and other election officials, challenging the constitutionality of Georgia’s new voter identification requirements. The new law requires all voters attempting to cast a ballot in person to present a valid form of photographic identification. O.C.G.A. § 21-2-417. A voter that is unable to provide proper identification is given a provisional ballot. However, that provisional ballot will be counted only if the voter is able to subsequently present valid identification within two days of the election. Id.

The lawsuit alleges five separate violations of state and federal law. First, the complaint alleges that the identification requirements infringe on the right to vote guaranteed in the Georgia constitution (Compl. 32). In addition, the Plaintiffs claim violations of the Federal Civil Rights Act and Voting Rights Act. (Compl. 36,38). Finally, the lawsuit alleges violations of the Fourteenth and Twenty-Fourth amendments to the U.S. Constitution. The complaint claims that the ID requirements constitute an “undue burden” on the right to vote, in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (Compl. 34). The ID requirement does not apply to most absentee voters, and thus the requirement is also over-broad and not narrowly tailored to address the stated purpose of preventing voter fraud (Compl. 34). The complaint further alleges that the cost of obtaining a photo ID constitutes a poll tax, in violation of the Twenty-Fourth Amendment, and that the cost is also a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment because it applies to voters who choose to vote in person, and not to those who vote absentee (Compl. 34,35).

On October 18, 2005, the District Court granted the Plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction, enjoining the application of the new identification requirements. In granting the injunction, the court held that both federal constitutional claims had a substantial likelihood of succeeding on the merits at trial (Prelim. Inj. 96, 104). The court also held that, while the two federal statutory claims were plausible, they both lacked sufficient evidence at the time to have a substantial likelihood of success. (Prelim. Inj. 109,111,116). Finally, the court held that the Georgia constitutional claim would be barred by the Eleventh Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. (Prelim. Inj. 77).

The Defendants appealed the motion for preliminary injunction to the Eleventh Circuit, and oral argument is scheduled for March 1, 2006. In addition, some news reports have claimed that the Georgia legislature is considering re-visiting the ID requirements in light of the on-going litigation. As for the merits, in granting the preliminary injunction the District Court has already signaled its belief that the federal constitutional claims are likely meritorious. The Eleventh Circuit may have a different view, but for now the case looks to have a reasonable chance of success.

Indiana (Indiana Democratic Party v. Rokita and Crawford v. Marion County Election Board):

The Indiana lawsuit is similar to its Georgia counterpart in content, though not in status. In Indiana separate lawsuits, now joined, were filed by the state Democratic Party and the

---

28 Litigation documents are available at the Election Law @ Moritz website. http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/electionlaw/litigation/index.php
Indiana Civil Liberties Union (ICLU). The Democratic Party's lawsuit is directed against the Indiana Secretary of State, while the ICLU's lawsuit involves the Marion County Board of Elections and the State of Indiana. Like Georgia, Indiana law also requires citizens voting in person to present some form of official photo identification. IC § 3-11-8-25.1. Voters unable to present identification are given a provisional ballot, which is counted if they are able to provide the required identification by Noon on the second Monday following the election. IC § 3-11.7-5-1. Unlike Georgia, Indiana provides state issued identification at no charge. However, there are costs involved in the process, including transportation to the Bureau of Motor Vehicles, and payment for documents such as birth certificates, which are needed to obtain the ID. (Second Am. Compl. 6).

The Democratic Party's complaint raises Fourteenth Amendment claims similar to those in the Georgia lawsuit, including concerns about substantially burdening the right to vote, the enactment of a de-facto poll tax from the costs indirectly associated with obtaining ID, and the lack of applicability to voters who cast an absentee ballot. (Second Am. Compl. 6-9). In addition, the complaint alleges that the substantial burden placed on the right to vote violates the First Amendment protection of expressive or symbolic speech, as well as the freedom of association as applied to Democratic primary elections. (Second Am. Compl. 9-10). Finally, the complaint alleges violations of the Voting Rights Act, National Voter Registration Act, and the Help America Vote Act (Second Am. Compl. 10-11). The ICLU's complaint alleges many of the same violations, but also includes claims of a violation of Indiana's constitutional guarantee of a free and equal election system. (Compl. 15)

The case is currently in the pre-trial phase, with both sides awaiting decisions on their respective motions for summary judgment. The likelihood of success is bolstered by the fact that the Fourteenth amendment constitutional claims have already been found persuasive by at least one other Federal District Court. However, the Indiana law is notably different than its Georgia counterpart in that it provides free identification. While the plaintiffs make a solid argument that related costs still amount to a poll-tax, it is possible that the court could distinguish on this matter.

Unlike the Georgia case, the Indiana lawsuit also claims a violation of the Help America Vote Act. Although the claim is not completely clear, it seems as though the Plaintiffs are arguing that the Indiana statute requires more stringent identification than what is required by HAVA. 42 U.S.C. § 15483(b)(1)-(2). While this is true, it is unclear how this violates the statute. HAVA merely states that certain voters unable to produce HAVA required identification be given a provisional ballot. Id. Indiana law meets this requirement. IC § 3-11-8-25.1. Although Indiana law requires more stringent identification for counting the provisional ballot, HAVA leaves these decisions to state law. 42 U.S.C. § 15482(a).

30 According to an AP article, the Plaintiffs filed some type of brief on December 21—however it is not yet up on the Moritz website and I am unsure how to access it otherwise.
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Law Journals

  - Discusses HAVA a lot
  - Benefits of US adopting Mexican system of identifying voters and voter registration
  - Discusses HAVA, problems of 2000 election, discusses registration & identification
  - Discussion of HAVA requirements and voter ID, problems in 2000
  - Discusses changes in AL to their election law in 2003, including adding voter ID
  - HAVA discussed
  - Discusses challenging elections based on voter fraud & illegal votes
  - Discusses a GA law in 2001 removing hunting & fishing licenses from list of acceptable ID and a failed amendment to limit acceptable ID to photo ID only
  - General discussion of ways voters are verified, what happens when voters are challenged as illegal voters
  - Discusses a photo ID law passed in Michigan in 1997 (later declared violated EPC of 14th amendment)
  - Arguments against photo ID
  - Discusses voter registration as a way to combat fraud & several different ways to do it

Historical articles:

  - Lot of analysis on HAVA and voter ID
  - Little bit of historical
  - Arguments for and against certain types of voter ID laws
• Kimberly C. Delk, What Will it Take to Produce Greater American Voter Participation? Does Anyone Really Know?, 2 LOY. J. PUB. INT. L. 133 (Spring 2001).
  o History of voting & requirements & laws throughout time
  o Future: I-voting & e-registration – improvements in voter ID which would result

Marginaly relevant/limited discussion of Voter ID issues
  o Discusses HAVA & implementation
• Symposium, Disability Law, Equality, and Difference: American Disability Law and the Civil Rights Model, Alabama Section, 55 ALA. L. REV. 1167 (Summer 2004).
  o Discusses an AL law expanding exemptions to ID requirement if 2 poll workers identify them
  o Internet voting
  o Voter ID and Internet voting
  o Costs & Benefits of Internet voting
  o States using or examining Internet voting
  o Discusses illegal ballots, fraudulent registration
  o Anti fraud election reform in Missouri
  o Vote by mail and discusses fraud issues involved
  o Voter fraud arguments against NVRA
  o History of voting and requirements
  o Theory

Political Science Literature


------- "Residential Mobility, Community Mobility, and Voter Turnout." Political Behavior. 22:2 (June 2000).

------- "Voter Registration and Turnout in the United States." Perspectives on Politics. 2:3 (September 2004).


Introduction

A key area of disagreement in the policy debate over voter identification requirements concerns whether such requirements dampen voter turnout. Opponents of voter identification laws argue that they constitute an institutional barrier to voting, particularly among the poor, African-Americans, Hispanics, the elderly and people with disabilities (Baxter and Galloway 2005, Electionline.org 2002, Jacobs 2005, Young 2006). This argument holds that voter identification requirements create an extra demand on voters, and thus may discourage some of them from participating in elections. Further, critics of voter identification requirements contend that the effect is greater for some specific types of requirements. For example, critics argue that requiring voters to produce government-issued photo identification on Election Day is more demanding than, say, requiring that they state their names at the polling place. Supporters of voter identification requirements, on the other hand, argue that the requirements are necessary to combat voter fraud, safeguard the integrity of the electoral process, and engender faith in the electoral process among citizens (Young 2006).

This report examines the potential variation in turnout rates based on the type of voter identification requirement in place in each state on Election Day 2004. It draws on two sets of data – aggregate turnout data at the county level for each state, as compiled by the Eagleton Institute of Politics, and individual-level survey data included in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. Classification of voter identification requirements comes from a review of state statutes conducted by the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University.

Types of voter identification requirements

Based on research performed for this study by the Moritz College of Law, states had one of five types of requirements in place on Election Day 2004. Upon arrival at polling places, voters had to: state their names (nine states); sign their names (13 states and the District of Columbia); match their signature to a signature on file with the local election board (eight states); provide a form of identification that did not necessarily include a photo (15 states); or provide a photo identification (five states).¹ It was then possible to code the states according to these requirements, and test the assumption that voter identification requirements would pose an increasingly demanding requirement in this order: stating one’s name, signing one’s name, matching one’s signature to a signature on file, providing a form of identification, and providing a form of photo identification.

¹ Oregon conducts elections entirely by mail. Voters sign their mail-in ballots, and election officials match the signatures to signatures on file. For the purposes of this analysis, Oregon is classified as a state that requires a signature match.
But election laws in numerous states offer exceptions to these requirements if individuals lack the necessary form of identification, and laws in those states set a minimum standard that a voter must meet in order to vote using a regular ballot (as opposed to a provisional ballot). Thus it is also possible to categorize states based on the minimum requirement for voting with a regular ballot. In 2004 the categories were somewhat different compared to the maximum requirement, in that none of the states required photo identification as a minimum standard for voting with a regular ballot. Four states, however, required voters to swear an affidavit as to their identity (Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, and North Dakota). The five categories for minimum requirements were: state name (12 states), sign name (14 states and the District of Columbia), match one’s signature to a signature on file (six states), provide a non-photo identification (14 states), or swear an affidavit (four states). For the purposes of this analysis I treated the array of minimum identification requirements also in terms of increasing demand on the voter: state name, sign name, match signature, provide non-photo identification, and, given the potential legal consequences for providing false information, swearing an affidavit.

Estimating turnout among citizens in the voting-age population

This report examines turnout among U.S. citizens of voting age in both the aggregate- and the individual-level data. Determining citizenship status in the individual-level data simply involved restricting the analyses to individuals who identified themselves as citizens in the November 2004 Current Population Survey. (Those who said they were not citizens did not have the opportunity to answer the supplemental voting questions contained in the Current Population Survey.)

In the aggregate data, determining the percentage of the voting-age population that has U.S. citizenship posed a methodological challenge. The Census Bureau gathers information on the citizenship status of adults ages 18 and older only during the decennial census. While the Census Bureau provides annual estimates of the population to account for changes between decennial censuses, the bureau does not offer estimates for the proportion of the adult population who are citizens as part of the annual estimates. To address this issue I estimated the 2004 citizen voting-age population for each county using a method reported in the analysis of the 2004 Election Day Survey conducted for the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 2005). I calculated the percentage of the 2000 voting-age population who were citizens in 2000, and applied that percentage to the July 1, 2004 estimates for voting-age population in each county. In other words, I assumed that the percentage of the voting-age population that had U.S. citizenship in 2004 was similar to the percentage of the voting-age population who were citizens in 2000.²

² McDonald and Popkin (2001) recommend an even more stringent approach to voter turnout calculations. They point out that voting-age population estimates include adults who are ineligible to vote (such as convicted felons), and the estimates overlook eligible citizens living overseas. While estimates of the voting-eligible population are available at the state level, I was unable to find such estimates for individual counties, which provide the unit of analysis for the aggregate data analyzed here.
Analysis of aggregate data

If one treats maximum voter identification requirements as an ordinal variable, with photo identification as the most demanding requirement, one finds some statistical support for the premise that as the level of required proof increases, turnout declines. Averaging across counties in each state, statewide turnout is negatively correlated with maximum voter identification requirements ($r = -0.30$, $p < 0.0001$). In considering the array of minimum requirements, with affidavit as the most demanding requirement, voter identification also is negatively correlated with turnout ($r = -0.20$, $p < 0.0001$). Breaking down the turnout rates by type of requirement reveals in greater detail the relationship between voter identification requirements and voter turnout.

[Table 1 here]

The aggregate data show that 60.9 percent of the estimated citizen voting age population voted in 2004. Differences in voter turnout at the state level in 2004 varied based on voter identification requirements. Taking into account the maximum requirements, an average of 64.6 percent of the voting age population turned out in states that required voters to state their names, compared to 58.1 percent in states that required photo identification. A similar trend emerged when considering minimum requirements. Sixty-three percent of the voting age population turned out in states requiring voters to state their names, compared to 60.1 percent in states that required an affidavit from voters.

Voter identification requirements alone, however, do not determine voter turnout. Multivariate models that take into account other predictors of turnout can paint a more complete picture of the relationship between voter identification requirements and turnout. I estimated the effects of voter identification requirements in multivariate models that also took into account the electoral context in 2004 and demographic characteristics of the population in each county. I coded the voter identification requirements on a scale of one to five, with one representing the least demanding form of identification and five representing the most demanding form of identification. To capture electoral context I included whether the county was in a presidential battleground state (any state in which the margin of victory for the winning candidate was five percent or less), and whether the county was in a state with a competitive race for governor and/or the U.S. Senate (also using the threshold of a margin of victory of five percent or less). Drawing from U.S. Census projections for 2003, I included the percentage of the voting age population in each county that was Hispanic or African-American to control for ethnicity and race. I controlled for age using the 2003 Census projection for the percentage of county residents age 65 and older, and I controlled for socioeconomic status by including the percentage of individuals who fell below the poverty line in each county in the 2000 Census.

I estimated a series of random intercept models to account for the likelihood that data from counties were correlated within each state (for further explanation of random intercept and other multilevel models, see Bryk and Raudenbush 1992, Luke 2004, Singer 1998). The

---

1 The data analyses provided evidence that there was, indeed, a clustering of data within each state. The intraclass correlation, bounded by 0 and 1, measures the variation between the states. A random intercept model using only the
dependent variable in each model was voter turnout at the county level, with turnout calculated as the percentage of the estimated citizen voting-age population that voted in the 2004 election.

[Table 2 here]

Turning first to an analysis using the maximum identification requirements; those requirements had a small and negative effect on turnout in 2004 controlling for electoral context and demographic factors. Both contextual factors (whether the county was in a state that was a battleground state and whether that state had a competitive race for governor and/or U.S. Senate) increased voter turnout. As the percentage of senior citizens in the county increased, so did turnout. The percentage of African-Americans in the county exerted a positive effect on voter turnout, and the percentage of individuals living below the poverty line had a negative effect. The effect of the percentage of Hispanic adults in the county on turnout fell just short of statistical significance (p = .05).

I then sought to test the hypothesis that voter identification requirements dampen turnout among minorities and the poor, a claim voiced by some critics of the requirements. To test this idea I incorporated a series of interactions between the maximum voter identification requirements and the percentage of African-Americans, Hispanics, and poor individuals in the counties. The interaction involving African-Americans was not significant, but those involving Hispanics and poor individuals were significant.\(^4\) In addition, adding the interactions to the model resulted in the percentage of Hispanics in the population having a direct and negative effect on turnout. The interactions suggest that voter identification requirements have a greater effect for Hispanics and those living below the poverty line. A chi-square test of the difference in the deviance for each model (represented by -2 log likelihood in Table 2), shows that the model with interactions provides a better fit to the data (\(p < 0.005\)).

I also estimated the effects of the minimum voter identification requirements holding constant the effects of electoral context and the demographic variables.

[Table 3 here]

The effects of the minimum requirements fell short of statistical significance (\(p = 0.08\)). The battleground state variable continued to exert a positive influence on turnout, while the presence of a competitive race for governor and/or U.S. Senate had no statistically significant effect. As in the maximum identification requirement model, as the percentage of the population that is poor increased, turnout declined. As the percentage of elderly increased, so did turnout. The proportion of African-Americans in the population had a positive effect on turnout, while the percentage of Hispanics did not affect turnout.

\(^4\) The interactions are labeled in Tables 2 and 3 as VID*African-American, VID*Hispanic, and VID*Poverty. To calculate the effects of voter identification requirements for a specific group, one must add the estimates for voter identification, the group, and the interaction. Doing so for Hispanic adults results in an estimate of \(-0.13\) \([-0.03 (voter id) - 0.13 (Hispanic) + 0.03 (voter id X Hispanic)\]).
Adding interactive effects to the model resulted in a statistically significant and negative effect of minimum voter identification requirements on turnout. The percentage of Hispanic adults in the county had a significant and negative effect on turnout, and the percentage of individuals below the poverty line continued to have a negative effect. Interactions between the percentages of Hispanics and those below the poverty line and minimum voter identification requirements also were significant. The percentage of African-Americans in the county and the interaction between African-Americans and voter identification requirements were not significant. A chi-square test for the difference in fit between the two models showed that the model with interactions provides a better fit to the data (p < .025).

Analysis of the aggregate data at the county level generates some support for the hypothesis that as the demands of voter identification requirements increase, turnout declines. This is particularly so for counties with concentrations of Hispanic residents or individuals who live below the poverty line. But aggregate data cannot fully capture the individual demographic factors that may figure into the decision to turn out to vote. For example, previous research has found that education is a powerful determinant of turnout (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980, but see also Nagler 1991). Married individuals also are more likely to vote than those who are not married (Alvarez and Ansolabehere 2002; Alvarez, Nagler and Wilson 2004; Fisher, Kenny, and Morton 1993). To fully explore the effects of voter identification requirements on turnout, it is important to examine individual-level data as well.

**Individual-level analysis**

Individual-level turnout data exists in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. The Census Bureau conducts the CPS monthly to measure unemployment and other workforce data, but the bureau adds a battery of voter participation questions to the November survey in even-numbered years to coincide with either a presidential or midterm Congressional election.

One of the advantages of the CPS is the sheer size of the sample. The survey’s Voting and Registration Supplement consisted of interviews, either by telephone or in person, with 96,452 respondents. The large sample size permits analyses of smaller groups, such as Black or Hispanic voters or voters with less than a high school education. The analyses reported here are based on reports from self-described registered voters. I omitted those who said they were not registered to vote. I also excluded those who said they cast absentee ballots because the identification requirements for absentee ballots may differ from those required when one votes in person. In addition, I eliminated from the sample respondents who said they were not U.S.

---

5 A reviewer for an earlier version of this paper recommended adding an education variable to the aggregate model. One version of the aggregate model not reported here included the percentage of adults in the county who had at least a college degree. The measure was highly collinear with the percentage of residents living below the poverty line, necessitating removal of the college degree variable from the model.

6 It is important to note that the Census Bureau allows respondents to answer on behalf of themselves and others in the household during the interview. While proxy reporting of voter turnout raises the possibility of inaccurate reports concerning whether another member of the household voted, follow-up interviews with those for whom a proxy report had been given in the November 1984 CPS showed 99 percent agreement between the proxy report and the information given by the follow-up respondent (U.S. Census Bureau 1990).
citizens because the questionnaire design skipped those individuals past the voter registration and turnout questions in the survey.

The dependent variable in these analyses is whether a respondent said he or she voted in the November 2004 election. As in the analysis of aggregate data, I coded voter identification requirements for each respondent's state of residence on a scale of one to five, with one representing the least demanding requirement (stating one's name) and five representing the most demanding requirement (photo identification or affidavit).

In addition to the voter identification requirements, the models include two other state-level factors that might have influenced turnout in 2004: whether the state was considered a battleground state in the presidential election, and whether there was a gubernatorial and/or U.S. Senate race in the state (see Alvarez and Ansolabehere 2002, Alvarez et al. 2004, and Kenny et al. 1993 for similar approaches). As in the aggregate data analysis, the threshold that determined whether the state was a battleground state or had a competitive statewide race was a margin of victory of five percent or less. At the individual level, I controlled for gender, age in years, education, household income, and dummy variables representing whether a voter was Black/non-Hispanic, Hispanic, or another non-white race (with white/non-Hispanic voters as the omitted category for reference purposes). Drawing on previous research on voting behavior, I also controlled for whether an individual was employed, or at least a member of the workforce (as opposed to being a full-time student, a homemaker, or retired). Both employment and workforce membership have been shown to be positive predictors of turnout (see Mitchell and Wlezien 1995). Marital status, whether one is a native-born citizen and residential mobility also have emerged as significant predictors of turnout (Alvarez and Ansolabehere 2002, Alvarez et al. 2004, Kenney et al. 1993, Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980). I included in the model variables for whether a respondent was married (coded 1 if yes, 0 otherwise), and whether one was a native-born citizen (coded 1 if yes, 0 otherwise). I measured residential mobility by coding for whether the respondent had moved to a new address in the six months prior to the interview (coded 1 if yes, 0 otherwise).

Results

The dependent variable is whether a respondent said he or she voted in the November 2004 election (coded 1 for yes, 0 for no). I estimated models using probit analysis, which

---

7 The U.S. Census Bureau reported, based on the November 2004 CPS, that 89 percent of those who identified themselves as registered voters said they voted in 2004 (U.S. Census Bureau 2005). Previous research has shown that, generally speaking, some survey respondents overstate their incidence of voting. Researchers speculate that over-reports may be due to the social desirability that accompanies saying one has done his or her civic duty, or a reluctance to appear outside the mainstream of American political culture (U.S. Census Bureau 1990). It is also possible that voting is an indication of civic engagement that predisposes voters to agree to complete surveys at a higher rate than non-voters (Flanigan and Zingale 2002). Hence the voter turnout rates reported in the CPS tend to be up to 10 percentage points higher than the actual turnout rate for the nation (Flanigan and Zingale 2002). Even with this caveat, however, the CPS serves as a widely accepted source of data on voting behavior.

8 Asian-Americans are included in the "other non-white races" category. In response to a request from officials at the U.S. Election Assistance Commission who had read an earlier version of this paper and were curious about the experiences of Asian-Americans, I ran models using Asian-Americans as a separate category in addition to the models presented here. Voter identification requirements did not have a statistically significant effect on whether Asian-American voters said they turned out in the 2004 election.
calculates the effects of independent variables on the probability that an event occurred – in this case whether a respondent said he or she voted. I estimated the models using robust standard errors to control for correlated error terms for observations from within the same state.

The two models in Table 4 use either the maximum or minimum voter identification requirements in each state. The two models generate virtually identical results. Voter identification requirements exert a statistically significant, negative effect on whether survey respondents said they had voted in 2004. Of the other state factors, only the competitiveness of the presidential race had a significant effect on turnout. In terms of demographic influences, African-American voters were more likely than white voters to say they had cast a ballot, while those of other non-white races were less likely than white voters to say they had turned out. Hispanic voters were not statistically different from white voters in terms of reported turnout. Consistent with previous research, age, education, income, and marital status all were positive predictors of voting. Women also were more likely to say they voted than men. Those who had moved within six months before the interview were less likely to say they had voted.

While the probit models provide statistical support for the influence of voter identification requirements and other variables on turnout, probit coefficients do not lend themselves to intuitive interpretation. Another common approach in studies of election requirements is to examine how the predicted probability of voter turnout would vary as election requirements vary. I used the probit coefficients to calculate the predicted probability of voting at each level of voter identification requirements while holding all other independent variables in the models at their means. I calculated the probabilities taking into account both maximum and minimum requirements, with photo identification serving as the most demanding of the maximum requirements and affidavits as the most demanding minimum requirement.

Allowing the voter identification requirement to vary while holding constant all other variables in the model showed that the predicted probability of turnout ranged from 0.912 for stating one's name to 0.887 for photo identification under the maximum requirements. In other words, the probability of voting dropped with each level of voter identification requirement, with a total drop of .025, or 2.5 percent, across the five types of identification. When taking into account the minimum requirement for identification, the probability showed a similar decline, with a slightly larger total drop of 3.3 percent.

Among the key variables of interest in the debate over voter identification requirements are race, age, income, and education. Given the large sample size (54,973 registered voters), it

---

9 In the case of dichotomous independent variables, holding them at their mean amounted to holding them at the percentage of the sample that was coded 1 for the variable (Long 1997).
10 The voter turnout percentages may seem disproportionately high compared to the turnout rates reported in the aggregate data analysis. It is important to consider that the turnout rates in the aggregate data were a proportion of all citizens of voting-age population, while the turnout rates for the individual-level data are the proportion of only registered voters who said they voted.
was possible to break the sample into sub-samples along those demographic lines to explore variation in predicted probability by group. I disaggregated the sample by the variable of interest, omitting that variable while I re-ran the probit model with the remaining predictors of voter turnout, including the voter identification requirements. If the analysis showed that the voter identification requirements had a statistically significant effect on turnout, I used the probit coefficients from the model to calculate the predicted probability of voting for each group across the five requirements while holding the other variables in the model constant.

Both the maximum and minimum identification requirements had negative and statistically significant effects for White/Non-Hispanic voters. Allowing the requirements to vary from stating one’s name to providing photo identification or an affidavit showed drops of 2.5 percent and 3.2 percent respectively in the predicted probability of voting. The identification requirements had no effect on the probability of Black/Non-Hispanics voting, but the minimum identification requirements had a comparatively sizable effect on voter turnout among Hispanics. The predicted probability of Hispanics voting ranged from 87 percent if stating one’s name was the required form of identification to 77.3 percent if a voter would have to provide an affidavit in order to vote, a difference of 9.7 percent.

The effects of voter identification requirements also varied by age, with the greatest variation occurring among voters ages 18 to 24.

Voters in that age group had a predicted probability of 83.9 percent when the maximum requirement was stating one’s name, and the probability dropped 8.9 percentage points if voters would have to provide photo identification. The range was from 83.1 percent to 75.4 percent under the minimum requirements. The gap in probability narrowed in older age groups (4.8 percent for the maximum requirements and 5.8 percent for the minimum requirements for those ages 25 to 44; 1.8 percent for the minimum requirements for those ages 45 to 64, and 2.4 percent for the minimum requirements for those ages 65 and older).

Breaking down the 18- to 24-year-old age group by race shed additional light on the effects of voter identification requirements on specific groups.

The gap in predicted probability that White/Non-Hispanic voters in the 18- to 24-year-old category would turn out was 9.2 percent when the identification requirements varied from stating one’s name to providing photo identification. The gap was 7.8 percent when taking into account the minimum requirements. The effects of maximum voter identification requirements also were statistically significant for African-Americans in the 18- to 24-year-old age group, with a gap in

---

11 See Nagler 1991 for a similar approach in analyzing the effects of registration closing dates broken down by education levels.
the predicted probability of voting of 10.6 percent. Maximum and minimum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting among Hispanics ages 18 to 24.

Variation also emerged along the lines of income, with the effects of voter identification requirements varying to a greater extent for voters in households below the poverty line compared to those living above the poverty line.\(^{12}\)

\([\text{Table 9 here}]\)

While the maximum set of requirements did not have a statistically significant effect for voters living below the poverty line, the minimum set of requirements had a significant and negative effect. The probability of voting was .784 for poor voters if they would have to identify themselves by giving their name, and the probability declined to .731 if they would have to provide an affidavit attesting to their identity. Both the maximum and minimum sets of requirements had a significant and negative effect on voters living above the poverty line, but the difference in probability across the effects was narrower (2.3 percent for the maximum requirements and 3.1 percent for the minimum requirements). Given that political discourse about voter identification requirements includes concerns about the effects of the requirements on poor and minority voters, I also ran probit analyses for sub-samples of white and minority voters who fell below the poverty line. The voter identification requirements did not exert statistically significant effects on turnout among poor White/Non-Hispanic and Hispanic voters, but did have a significant effect on Black/Non-Hispanic voters who were below the poverty line.\(^{13}\) Allowing the maximum voting requirement to vary from the least to the most demanding, the probability that African-American voters below the poverty line said they had voted dropped by 7.5 percent.

The effects of voter identification requirements varied across education levels as well, with those lowest in education demonstrating the widest variation in probabilities as identification requirements ranged from least to most demanding.\(^{12}\)

\([\text{Table 10 here}]\)

Registered voters who had less than a high school education had a 77.5 percent probability of voting if the maximum requirement would be stating one’s name, and a 70.8 percent probability if they would have to provide photo identification under the maximum requirement, a difference of 6.7 percent. The difference from the lowest to the highest requirement among the minimum requirements was 7.4 percent. The difference in probabilities ranged from 3.3 percent for the maximum requirements to 4.5 percent for the minimum requirements for voters with a high school diploma. The range of effects of voter identification requirements was smaller among those with higher levels of education (and non-existent for one category – voters with some college education).

\(^{12}\) I coded respondents as being above or below the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2004 poverty line based on respondents’ reported annual household income and size of the household.

\(^{13}\) The lack of significant effects for poor Hispanic voters is in contrast to the results from the aggregate data analysis. The sub-sample of poor Hispanic voters was small (n = 491), which may have contributed to the lack of statistical significance.
Discussion and conclusion

The results presented here provide evidence that as the level of demand associated with voter identification requirements increases, voter turnout declines. This point emerged from both the aggregate data and the individual-level data, although not always for both the maximum and minimum sets of requirements. The overall effect for all registered voters was fairly small, but still statistically significant.

The effects of voter identification requirements were more pronounced for specific subgroups. Hispanic voters and the poor appeared to be less likely to vote as the level of required identification became more demanding, according to both the aggregate and the individual-level data. In the individual-level data, for Hispanic voters, the probability of voting dropped by 9.7 percent across the various levels of minimum identification requirements. Survey respondents living in poor households were 5.3 percent less likely to vote as the requirements varied from stating one’s name to attesting to one’s identity in an affidavit. African-American voters from households below the poverty line were 7.5 percent less likely to vote as the maximum requirements varied from stating one’s name to providing photo identification.

Effects of voter requirements also varied with education. Registered voters who had not graduated from high school were 6.7 percent less likely to say they voted as the maximum requirements ranged from stating one’s name to providing photo identification. When considering the minimum requirements, those with less than a high school education were 7.4 percent less likely to say they voted if the requirement was an affidavit as opposed to stating one’s name. Age was also a key factor, with voters ages 18 to 24 being 7.7 percent to 8.9 percent less likely to vote as the requirements ranged from stating one’s name to providing a photo identification or affidavit. Breaking down the age group by race, the effects were significant for young White/Non-Hispanic and Black/Non-Hispanic voters.

The results shed additional light on the effects of voter identification requirements on two groups often projected as being particularly sensitive to such requirements: African-American voters and elderly voters. The effects on African-American voters were pronounced for two specific sub-samples: African-American voters living below the poverty line and those in the 18- to 24-year-old age group. Also, the elderly, while they would be slightly less likely to vote as requirements ranged from least to most demanding, would not necessarily be affected in the dramatic manner predicted by some opposed to photo identification requirements in particular.

In examining the effects of voter identification requirements on turnout, there is still much to learn. The data examined in this project could not capture the dynamics of how identification requirements might lower turnout. If these requirements dampen turnout, is it because individuals are aware of the requirements and stay away from the polls because they cannot or do not want to meet the requirements? Or, do the requirements result in some voters

---

14 The individual-level data offer some insight here. If advance knowledge of the voter identification requirements were to dampen turnout, it is reasonable to expect that advance knowledge of those requirements also could discourage some individuals from registering to vote. I ran the same probit models using voter registration as the dependent variable (coded 1 if the respondent said he or she was registered, and 0 if the respondent was not
being turned away when they cannot meet the requirements on Election Day? The CPS data do not include measures that can answer this question. Knowing more about the "on the ground" experiences of voters concerning identification requirements could guide policy-makers at the state and local level in determining whether and at what point in the electoral cycle a concerted public information campaign might be most effective in helping voters to meet identification requirements. Such knowledge also could help in designing training for election judges to handle questions about, and potential disputes over, voter identification requirements.

registered). Neither the maximum nor minimum array of voter identification requirements had a statistically significant effect on the probability that a survey respondent was registered to vote.
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Table 1 – Variation in 2004 State Turnout Based on Voter Identification Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Requirement</th>
<th>Minimum Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voter Identification Required in the States</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean Voter Turnout for States in that Category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Name</td>
<td>64.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>61.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Signature</td>
<td>60.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Non-Photo ID</td>
<td>59.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Photo ID</td>
<td>58.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Turnout for All States</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Predictors of 2004 turnout at the county level taking into account maximum voter identification requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Basic Model</th>
<th>Model with Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized Estimate</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter ID requirements</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battleground State</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Senate/Governor’s Race</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 65 and Older</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% African-American</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Below poverty line</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID * African-American</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID * Hispanic</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID * Poverty</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>-8638.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients are restricted maximum likelihood estimates. N = 3,111. * p < .05 ** p < .01 (two-tailed tests)
Table 3. Predictors of 2004 turnout at the county level taking into account minimum voter identification requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Basic Model</th>
<th>Model with Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter ID requirements</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battleground State</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Senate/Governor’s Race</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 65 and Older</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% African-American</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Below poverty line</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID * African-American</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID * Hispanic</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID * Poverty</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>-8630.8</td>
<td>-8620.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients are restricted maximum likelihood estimates. N = 3,111. * p < .05 ** p < .01 (two-tailed tests)
Table 4. Probit model of voter turnout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Maximum requirements</th>
<th>Minimum requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter ID requirements</td>
<td>-0.04*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.12***</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battleground state</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive race</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of workforce</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born citizen</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved within past 6 months</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.48**</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-R-Squared</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

N = 54,973 registered voters

p < .05*  p < .01**  (two-tailed tests)

Models were estimated with robust standard errors to correct for correlated error terms within each state.

Table 5. Predicted probability of voter turnout – full model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification Requirement</th>
<th>Maximum requirement</th>
<th>Minimum requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference from lowest to highest</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: 54,973

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies from the lowest to the highest point in the scale, with all other variables held constant.

Table 6. Predicted probability of voter turnout – White and Hispanic voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic voters</th>
<th>Hispanic voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum requirement</td>
<td>Minimum requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference from lowest to highest</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies from the lowest to the highest point in the scale, with all other variables held constant. Maximum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting for Hispanic voters. Maximum and minimum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor for African-American voters.

Table 7. Predicted probability of voter turnout – Age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18 - 24</th>
<th>25 - 44</th>
<th>45 - 64</th>
<th>65 and older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum requirements</td>
<td>Minimum requirements</td>
<td>Maximum requirements</td>
<td>Minimum requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference -- lowest to highest</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5,065</td>
<td>20,066</td>
<td>20,758</td>
<td>9,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies from the lowest to the highest point in the scale, with all other variables held constant. Maximum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting for voters ages 45 to 64 and 65 and older.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic 18 - 24</th>
<th>Black/Non-Hispanic 18 – 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum requirements</td>
<td>Minimum requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference -- lowest to highest</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,814</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies from the lowest to the highest point in the scale, with all other variables held constant. Minimum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting for Black/Non-Hispanic voters ages 18 to 24. Maximum and minimum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting for Hispanic voters ages 18 to 24.

Table 9. Predicted probability of voter turnout – Voters above and below the poverty line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All voters above the poverty line</th>
<th>All voters below the poverty line</th>
<th>Black/Non-Hispanic voters below the poverty line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum requirement</td>
<td>Minimum requirement</td>
<td>Minimum requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference from lowest to highest</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>49,935</td>
<td>5,038</td>
<td>1,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies from the lowest to the highest point in the scale, with all other variables held constant. Maximum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting for white and Hispanic voters who were below the poverty line. Minimum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting for Black voters below the poverty line.

Table 10. Predicted probability of voter turnout – By education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than high school</th>
<th>High school</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Graduate school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum requirement</td>
<td>Minimum requirement</td>
<td>Maximum requirement</td>
<td>Minimum requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference -- lowest to highest</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4,903</td>
<td>16,361</td>
<td>11,017</td>
<td>5,739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies from the lowest to the highest point in the scale, with all other variables held constant. Maximum and minimum voter identification requirements were not a significant predictor of voting for those with some college education.

Thanks, Tom.

Assume you just got the e-mail I sent to the EAC review team that included the paper, the analysis and the call-in information

Thursday at 11:30

A few items on timelines and materials for May 23-24 meetings:

The Commissioners will review the final Eagleton Voter ID and Provisional Voting reports at their Tuesday, May 16 meeting. At this meeting they will decide how they wish to present these reports to the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Boards.

Your materials that will be distributed to the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Boards must be finalized and ready for our Xeroxing process by Thursday, May 18. I will be in touch along the way to provide input/guidance on what these materials should be, based on the Commissioner's review and decisions

Regards-

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
Greetings-

Please note that Thursday's call is at 11:30 EDT.

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

All-

Attached please find the complete packet of materials that will serve as the basis for our conference call on Thursday. You have already received the statistical analysis; the voter ID report was submitted this morning.

The Eagleton staff have noted that you may find the material contained in Appendix A useful to your review; the other appendices are likely to be less germane.

The call in information for Thursday:

Thank you again for your assistance.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
Tom-

It is my understanding that Adam Ambrogi has been in touch with Ned Foley and, in turn, Dan Tokaji to indicate that you and Dan will present the information on the Voter ID project, while you and Ned will present the information on the Provisional Voting project.

Adam Ambrogi can also clarify your presentations. As I understand it, you will present your Voter ID and Provisional Voting projects to the Standards Board. You will then present your Voter ID and Provisional Voting Projects to the Board of Advisors.

I believe Adventure Travel handles hotel and travel arrangements.

I do not believe accommodations have been made for other members of the project team to attend. I will ask Adam Ambrogi, who is the principal point of contact on these meetings, to clarify this.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
05/10/2006 04:44 PM
To “Tom O'neill” <tom_oneill@verizon.net>@GSAEXTERNAL,
Adam Ambrogi/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
bcc Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject RE: Travel arrangements for the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board meeting

Karen,

As we discussed last week, the Eagleton-Moritz team making the presentations at the advisory board meetings will include others in addition to Ned and me. While Ned and I will handle the briefing on the provisional voting report, the team for the briefing on the Voter ID report will include Dan Tokaji and Tim Vercellotti.

Just to understand what Adventure Travel is to provide: will its services include hotel
reservations and travel, or does it have a more limited mission?

Thanks,

Tom O'Neill

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2006 4:34 PM
To: klynndyson@eac.gov
Cc: Tom O'Neill
Subject: Re: Travel arrangement for the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board meeting

Tom O' Neill and Ned Foley-

As you know you are scheduled to make two presentations to the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board on Tuesday May 23, 2006 from 2:30-4:00 PM (on Provisional Voting) and on Wednesday ,May 24th from 1:40-2:45 PM (on Voter Identification)

If you have not already done so, please make your hotel and travel arrangements through Adventure Travel, Judy Mays

These reservations should be made no later than tomorrow COB.

Please indicate to Judy Mays that you are a contractor, who is scheduled to make a presentation at the meeting.

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Dr. Leighley-

On behalf of the EAC our sincere thanks for your willingness to review the Eagleton paper on Voter Identification. Your insights and critique were extremely helpful and provided our agency with just the type of input which was needed.

I'm pleased to know of your work and hope that I may be able to call upon your expertise at some point in the near future.

 Regards-

Karen
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Dr. Nagler-

On behalf of the EAC, our sincere thanks for your willingness to review the Eagleton paper on Voter Identification. Your insights and critique were extremely helpful and provided our agency with just the type of input which was needed.

I'm pleased to know of your work and hope that I may be able to call upon your expertise at some point in the near future.

Regards-

Karen

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
Dr. Berinsky-

On behalf of the EAC, our sincere thanks for your willingness to review the Eagleton paper on Voter Identification. Your insights and critique were extremely helpful and provided our agency with just the type of input which was needed.

I'm pleased to know of your work and hope that I may be able to call upon your expertise at some point in the near future.

Regards-

Karen

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Jonathan-

Indeed, this is something several of the EAC staff noted.

As the EAC moves forward, I think that including a longitudinal component to our studies, to the extent possible, is a must.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen,  

hi. My own take on this is that we would get a much better idea of the impact of reforms if we had a database of how those reforms changed over time. Looking across states is always going to be problematic.

-jonathan

On Thu, 11 May 2006 klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Dr. Nagler-
> > On behalf of the EAC, our sincere thanks for your willingness to review the> Eagleton paper on Voter Identification. Your insights and critique were> extremely helpful and provided our agency with just the type of input which> was needed.
> > I'm pleased to know of your work and hope that I may be able to call upon> your expertise at some point in the near future.
> >
Electionline.org unsuccessful bidder de-brief.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:51 AM -----

Doug Chapin*
<dchapin@electionline.org>
06/06/2005 07:56 AM

Let's do the afternoon of June 16th. I'll pencil it in for 2pm but feel free to adjust to your schedule(s).

Thanks.

Doug Chapin

Mr Chapin:

Carol has time to do a debrief with you on the afternoon of the 15th, the afternoon of the 16th or any time on the 17th of June. Please advise as to your availability.

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Interim Executive Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
I would like a debrief on this procurement.

Doug Chapin
Director, electionline.org

From: nmortellito@eac.gov [mailto:nmortellito@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2005 2:12 PM
To: Doug Chapin
Subject: Notification to Bidders

Notification to bidders

You are hereby advised that the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has competitively awarded a contract to the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey for research assistance to support the development of guidance on the two topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. Eagleton is partnering with the Moritz College of Law of Ohio State University for this work effort. The amount of this award is $560,002.

EAC appreciates the interest you have expressed in supporting our research agenda by submitting a proposal for this work. Should you wish to receive a de-brief on this procurement, please contact Carol A. Paquette, Interim Executive Director, by email at cpaquette@eac.gov.

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Interim Executive Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:42 AM -----

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV
04/28/2006 12:50 PM

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 04/28/2006 12:44 PM

Tim, Tom, John, et.al--

The EAC has identified three academics who are going to serve as peer reviewers of the Eagleton Voter ID paper and research.

They are Jonathan Nagler of New York University, Jan Leighley, University of Arizona, and Adam Berinsky of MIT.

They are ready to review the documents as soon as they are available.

I would like to them one week to review the material and then have a joint conference call on Thursday, May 11, in which we would all have an opportunity to discuss the research methodology and statistical analysis, along with general comments and suggestions.

If you are able to get to me the paper and the supporting data analysis, I will distribute to the documents ASAP.

Also let me know, if you would, your availability on May 11 to do this conference all.
I anticipate that it will last approximately 90 minutes.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
06/28/2006 10:42 AM

To Darrell D. Lee/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV
cc
bcc

Subject Fw: No-Cost Extension Request

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:40 AM -----

"John Weingart"
04/21/2006 09:52 AM
To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc "Tom O'Neil"

Subject No-Cost Extension Request

Karen - We are requesting a no-cost extension on the EAC contract to the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University to have the contract's concluding date move from March 31, 2006 to June 30, 2006. As I indicated earlier, it would be very helpful if we could receive approval of this request no later than April 28th.

This extension is necessary to enable the following activities:

1. The EAC has informed us that it will assemble a panel of researchers the week of May 8th to review the Eagleton/Moritz draft background report on Voter Identification. The EAC wishes to supplement the review of this draft already conducted by the Peer Review Group called for in the contract. The Eagleton/Moritz research team, as well as at least some of the Peer Review Group will participate in the conference call or meeting of the EAC's reviewers;

2. Eagleton/Moritz will revise the draft Voter Identification report based upon comments made by the two sets of reviewers, and distribute the revised report to the EAC and its Advisory Board in mid-May.

3. Eagleton/Moritz will present its draft reports on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification to the EAC Advisory Board at its May 25th meeting in Washington, D.C.;

4. Eagleton/Moritz will revise both draft reports to take into account comments made by the EAC Advisory Board, and submit printed final reports to the EAC before June 23rd. Eagleton/Moritz will also prepare a PowerPoint presentation for both reports.

5. Eagleton/Moritz will present both reports at the EAC public meeting in Washington, D.C. on June 23rd, thus concluding its work under this contract.
Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Thanks,

John

--

John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
06/28/2006 10:41 AM

To Darrell D. Lee/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: Extension Timeline

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:40 AM -----

Tamar Nedzar/EAC/GOV
04/19/2006 12:23 PM

To Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Re: Fw: Extension Timeline

K (Lynn-Dyson)-

I saw this before. It's helpful for me to know the proposed end-date, but what we need to get Tom's signature--for this project and Cleveland State--is a memorandum to the file explaining why we are granting the extension and modification, respectively.

From what I understand, in addition to other things, we need the memo in the file to explain our thought process if anything is ever challenged. I think that Eagleton wrote the memo for you last time, but if not, I know you gave it to me...

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

K (Lynn-Dyson)-

Is this at all useful or not?
Karen - Tom and I are about to call. Attached is our proposed revised timeline.

--
-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:33 AM -----

"John Weingart"
To "Karen Lynn-Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
01/13/2006 01:22 PM
Please respond to john.weingart@rutgers.edu
Subject No Cost Extensions (with extensions)

Karen - I am attaching a spreadsheet providing the information you have requested (Attachment 1), but I want to highlight a few points which may not be immediately self-evident.

First, the original budget (Attachment 2) we submitted to the EAC, dated March 22nd, did not itemize personnel expenses by each person. In addition, when we actually began work two months after submitting that budget, we decided to reallocate more time to people within Eagleton and hire fewer outside hourlies.

Second, in the figures I sent you in late December we tried to account for all the expenses and projections but overlooked a few things including neglecting to include the honoraria for our peer review team. Hence, the figures we're now sending are different than what I sent in December.

Lastly, we originally discussed a no-cost extension through February, but since we don’t yet have the EAC comments on our draft Provisional Voting material nor an estimate of when they are likely to be ready, I think it is prudent to extend the no-cost extension through March 31st. We would still like to conclude by the end of February, but if you can approve the extension for another month we could avoid going through this process again if everything is not complete six weeks from now.

It is my understanding that Rutgers will soon be sending our December invoice. At this time, I would also like to request that we combine January and February into one invoice the EAC once for that time period.

As you can see, we are currently projecting an ending balance of approximately $10,000. If additional expenses are incurred beyond what is currently projected, we’re confident they will not exceed the
original budget of $560,002.

Thanks and I look forward to hearing from you.

--

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV  
06/28/2006 10:33 AM  

To: Darrell D. Lee/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV  
cc:  
bcc:  

Subject: Fw: No Cost Extension Request

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:32 AM -----

"John Weingart"
<johnweingart@eac.gov>
12/22/2006 05:26 PM

Please respond to
johnweingart@eac.gov

"Tom O'Neill"
<tomoneill@eac.gov>

To: klynndyson@eac.gov
cc: "Tom O'Neill"

Subject: Re: No Cost Extension Request

Karen - Our request for a no-cost, reallocation of resources is based on (a) the fact that our personnel costs have already been higher than we anticipated and (b) the reality that keeping the project operating for at least nine months, instead of seven as planned, will require the participants to devote more time than anticipated. While we are not producing more product than originally promised, the time involved in our work continues to increase. Both Provisional Voting and Voter ID have proved to be very dynamic topics requiring us to continually monitor developments and update our data, analysis and evolving work products as we learn of new or revised information. As a result, despite the extension of the schedule, the staff and consultants on this project have had no "down" time. We anticipate this research, monitoring and revising to continue for the months added to the project, necessitating significantly more hours by all members of the project team than anticipated.

Our request asks for changes to three line items which I will address below on the assumption that the EAC response to our already-submitted Provisional Voting draft and to-be-submitted Voter ID draft will be sufficiently timely to enable us to complete our work on both topics by the end of February.

1. Eagleton Institute of Politics personnel: We originally budgeted $110,695 ($15,813 average per month) for Eagleton faculty, staff and graduate student assistants for the seven-month project from May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005. Our actual costs have been approximately $14,500 more than that. In addition, we are anticipating needing another $21,000 for personnel costs in January and February, calculated on the basis of 2/3 of the original monthly estimate. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $110,695 to approximately $146,000.

2. Consultant Services: We originally budgeted $79,50 ($11,357 average per month) for consultant services which we have used to engage Tom O'Neill as the project manager. We anticipate no additional cost for the
original contract period of May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005, but do anticipate needing his services during January and February at a slightly reduced rate of $10,125 per month or $20,250 total additional. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $79,500 to $99,750.

3. Moritz School of Law: We originally budgeted $84,744 ($12,106 average per month) for staff and overhead for the May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005 period. We anticipate needing an additional $23,171 ($11,585 average per month) to support their time on this project in January and February. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $84,744 to $107,915.

With these revisions, approximately $22,000 of the EAC contract award to Eagleton would remain not yet allocated, primarily because the cost for the public hearings would have incurred Rutgers University overhead whereas the additional expenditures for consultants and the subcontract with Moritz do not.

I hope this provides you the information you need. While Rutgers is shutting down until January 3rd, I will be checking email at least every day or two.

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> John-
> I just had a more detailed conversation with our Deputy General Counsel about Eagleton's no-cost extension.
> He indicates that we need a bit more information that will accompany the material we will send to the Commissioners for a vote (hopefully next week)
> We need to know the number of labor hours, the labor costs and a brief description of the tasks to be performed by each of the staff who will be working on the EAC contract until its completion.
> Since we have eliminated the public hearing (a major contract deliverable) it is unclear why staff labor hours and costs will continue at the same level and rate.
> As always, thanks for your patience and prompt response.
>
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

---- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:31 AM ----

"John Weingart"
<johnweingart@eagleton.edu>
12/22/2005 05:26 PM
Please respond to klynndyson@eac.gov
cc "Tom O'Neill" <blank>
Subject Re: No Cost Extension Request

Karen - Our request for a no-cost, reallocation of resources is based on (a) the fact that our personnel costs have already been higher than we anticipated and (b) the reality that keeping the project operating for at least nine months, instead of seven as planned, will require the participants to devote more time than anticipated. While we are not producing more product than originally promised, the time involved in our work continues to increase. Both Provisional Voting and Voter ID have proved to be very dynamic topics requiring us to continually monitor developments and update our data, analysis and evolving work products as we learn of new or revised information. As a result, despite the extension of the schedule, the staff and consultants on this project have had no "down" time. We anticipate this research, monitoring and revising to continue for the months added to the project, necessitating significantly more hours by all members of the project team than anticipated.

Our request asks for changes to three line items which I will address below on the assumption that the EAC response to our already-submitted Provisional Voting draft and to-be-submitted Voter ID draft will be sufficiently timely to enable us to complete our work on both topics by the end of February.

1. Eagleton Institute of Politics personnel: We originally budgeted $110,695 ($15,813 average per month) for Eagleton faculty, staff and graduate student assistants for the seven-month project from May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005. Our actual costs have been approximately $14,500 more than that. In addition, we are anticipating needing another $21,000 for personnel costs in January and February, calculated on the basis of 2/3 of the original monthly estimate. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $110,695 to approximately $146,000.

2. Consultant Services: We originally budgeted $79,50 ($11,357 average per month) for consultant services which we have used to engage Tom O‘Neill as the project manager. We anticipate no additional cost for the
original contract period of May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005, but do anticipate needing his services during January and February at a slightly reduced rate of $10,125 per month or $20,250 total additional. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $79,500 to $99,750.

3. Moritz School of Law: We originally budgeted $84,744 ($12,106 average per month) for staff and overhead for the May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005 period. We anticipate needing an additional $23,171 ($11,585 average per month) to support their time on this project in January and February. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $84,744 to $107,915.

With these revisions, approximately $22,000 of the EAC contract award to Eagleton would remain not yet allocated, primarily because the cost for the public hearings would have incurred Rutgers University overhead whereas the additional expenditures for consultants and the subcontract with Moritz do not.

I hope this provides you the information you need. While Rutgers is shutting down until January 3rd, I will be checking email at least every day or two.

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> John-
> I just had a more detailed conversation with our Deputy General Counsel about Eagleton's no-cost extension.
> He indicates that we need a bit more information that will accompany the material we will send to the Commissioners for a vote (hopefully next week)
> We need to know the number of labor hours, the labor costs and a brief description of the tasks to be performed by each of the staff who will be working on the EAC contract until its completion.
> Since we have eliminated the public hearing (a major contract deliverable) it is unclear why staff labor hours and costs will continue at the same level and rate.
> As always, thanks for your patience and prompt response.

> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
This e-mail should be a part of the no-cost extension file and/or the financial file you create for the Eagleton contract.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:29 AM -----

"John Weingart"
To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc

12/16/2005 01:25 PM

Subject Re: Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Karen - At this time, we anticipate reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line item and spending approximately $35,500 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,250 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants. There are other additional variances but they are not significant (e.g. less on honoraria, less on travel, and more on general operations such as phone expenses). Let me know if you need additional detail or information.

Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> John-
> 
> Quick question-
> 
> How much money do you anticipate will be re-allocated from the original line items outlined in the contract to other project costs?
Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

*"John Weingart" <

11/30/2005 05:05 PM
Please respond to

To
"Karen Lynn-Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
cc
"Tom O'Neill"
Subject
Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Karen - There were two typos on the copy I just sent. Please use the
attached instead. To minimize confusion, I dated this document December
1st (the first one says November 30). Thanks, John

--
John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290
Hi Gavin,

This is the document I prepared for the no-cost extension.

Thank you,
Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2377
http://www.eac.gov

T.Nedzar@eac.gov sf30.pdf
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 10:22 AM -----

"Tom O'Neill"

To: klynndyson@eac.gov
cc

Subject: Meeting with EAC and Ballot Design

Karen, This email addresses two topics.

1. Meeting with EAC

At the end of August, we will have a draft of the Analysis and Alternatives paper for provisional voting, and we will have developed an outline of the alternatives to be described in the Preliminary Guidance Document (PGD). Before beginning to draft the PGD, we would benefit from a discussion with EAC staff and, perhaps, the commissioners. We would like to explore, through you, the scheduling of a meeting for that purpose, and suggest the date of August 26 at your offices in Washington. Several of us would attend and others might participate by teleconference.

2. Design of Provisional Ballots

In our teleconference a week ago, Tom Wilkey asked if we were collecting actual provisional ballots from around the country to assess their design. A collection of provisional ballots is not a deliverable under our contract, but at your request we have estimated what such an effort might require.
The goal would be to collect ballots, examine them to determine how well they conform to any ballot design criteria established in state legislation or regulations and possibly evaluate them against objective design standards of clarity and ease of use.

If state regulations or legislation specify the detailed design of provisional ballots, collecting a sample ballot and envelope from each state would be feasible. If states have delegated the details of design to county or other levels of government, the collection process would probably not be worth the substantial time and expense involved in contacting more than 3,000 jurisdictions.

**Step One -- Feasibility**

A prudent approach to this work would begin with a feasibility study. It would determine how many states use a uniform provisional ballot throughout the state and how many allow significant variation in design among counties or other jurisdictions. Working with the statutes and regulations now being collected by Moritz, we would also determine if state statutes or regulations specify the details of the design of provisional ballots. This work would provide the information needed to decide if the project is doable at reasonable cost. The feasibility study would probably require 5 to 10 days of research time. On a time-and-materials basis, including overhead charges, the cost of the feasibility analysis would be in the range of $2,500 -- $5,000.

**Step Two -- Collection and Analysis**

If EAC determines on the basis of our feasibility report that the project is feasible, collecting the provisional ballots and envelopes would require 3 – 4 weeks of research, collection and analysis at a cost of $6,000 -- $9,000 (with overhead). The research process would include:

- Determining the appropriate official in each state to contact,
- Sending each official a letter requesting a provisional ballot and envelope as used in federal elections,
- Making up to 3 follow-up calls.
- Compiling and categorizing the ballots
- Comparing the actual ballots to any specifications contained in state statutes or regulations.

The deliverables would be:
- The collection of ballots,
- A compendium of statutory or regulatory specifications of ballot design,
- Classification of ballots according to the major design principles reflected in their layout and appearance.
Possible Step 3 – Evaluation of Provisional Ballot Design

The EAC might also wish to consider a logical, third step. Once the ballots are collected, Eagleton could arrange to evaluate provisional ballots for clarity and user-friendliness. The review could be done by one or more focus groups that Eagleton would empanel, or it could be conducted by a design firm that would review the ballots and make recommendations for principles of good design that could be issued as guidance to the states. We have not identified an individual designer or firm with credentials in this field, but could do so as part of the feasibility study. Eagleton could do the focus group in-house at relatively modest cost.

Please let me know if you would like us to go further with this assignment.

Tom O’Neill
Julie -

I don't remember saying much of anything but a few pleasantries to Tom in New York. Did you talk to him about this topic? I'm really at a loss on this. (Maybe I'm having an extended senior moment.)

Carol A. Paquette
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202)566-3125 cpaquette@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Carol A. Paquette/EAC/GOV on 07/08/2005 05:07 PM ----

Carol,

After our discussion in New York, you asked me to put in writing our response to the EAC's suggestions for expanding the number and kinds of groups that would review and comment on our work. I hope after your review of this response, we will be able to quickly recruit a balanced Peer Review Group (PRG) and move ahead as the schedule in our work plan indicates. Attached is a revised list of the members we propose for appointment to the PRG. We will probably not be able to persuade all of them to serve, but the number and range of views included on the proposed list should ensure that the resulting group is well-balanced.
RESPONSE TO EAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW GROUPS

EAC’s Recommendations for the PRG
Karen Lynn-Dyson reported this response from the EAC commissioners to our proposal for the composition of the PRG.

1. Not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG

2. Create a “tiered process” of review in which:
   A. The PRG will prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions.
   B. PRG’s analysis would be vetted by a defined/select group of local election officials.
   C. A defined/select group of advocacy organizations would review the comments of the local election officials.
   D. Empanel a final focus group of local election officials, advocates and academics for an overall, interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Project Team Response
Creating three new committees to the review process to supplement the work of the Peer Review Group (PRG) is possible, but would add at least 8 weeks—and possibly 12 weeks—to our completion of the guidance document on provisional voting. We believe this delay would risk limiting the value of this project for the 2006 election. In addition, the change would add at least $30,000 to the cost of our work. (See the attached table showing the possible effect on our work plan, and note the optimistic assumptions such as the ability to hold a hearing the week after Christmas.). If the same groups were to be engaged in reviewing our work on Voter ID, the time for that work would also have to be stretched at a similar increased cost.

This additional cost and the added time might be worthwhile... if the new layers of review were to produce a consensus on how to strengthen the research, sharpen the analysis, and increase the relevance of the Guidance Document. Our team concluded, however, that additional review groups were unlikely to achieve these results.

PRG focuses on quality of research
We believe that our research would be strengthened by a balanced Peer Review Group that will focus on the design of the research and our conduct of it. Based on the EAC’s recommendation, we have revised the composition of the PRG to include additional, well-recognized authorities in the field whose perspective is generally agreed to be conservative.

The PRG will focus on the strength of the research design and the quality of our analysis, not on the politics of our recommendations for the guidance document. The PRG will critique the research design and suggest how to strengthen it. Members of the group will review the quality of our analysis so that we can fill holes and correct errors before we make policy recommendations to the EAC. The PRG may or may not meet as a group. The likelihood is that most comments will come in writing from individual members, most of whose schedules would not permit attendance at meetings. In any case, the PRG members will not gather around a table to come to consensus on the study’s recommendations.
While using the PRG as a forum to reach consensus on the knotty issues involved does not appear practical, the EAC can benefit from the work of other groups in this regard. It is not necessary for this project to duplicate the deliberative processes of the Carter-Baker Commission, the Century Foundation and the Election Center. The EAC itself as well as the project team can get the benefit of these reports without duplicating this "policy evaluation board" structure as part of this contract.

Project Team focuses on analysis and recommendations
Karen reported that the Commissioners believed that the PRG would "prepare a dispassionate analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions." As we see it, the PRG will neither analyze data nor draw conclusions, tentative or otherwise. Its members will review and comment on how the Project Team has designed and carried out the research. Analysis, conclusions and recommendations are the responsibility of the Project Team. We have all seen in the preface to books or articles a sentence or two that read something like this, "The author thanks Mr. X, Ms. Y, and Dr. Z for their review and comment on the manuscript. Their analysis has strengthened the work, but they are in no way responsible for errors or for my conclusions." That is the way we think about the Peer Review Group.

In short, the PRG will help ensure that EAC's Guidance Document is founded on a solid base of data and analysis. The review and comment on the Preliminary Guidance Document by the EAC's Board of Advisors and Standards Board will provide participation by important stakeholder groups without the need for the other review committees. This Board is broad-based and represents a key stakeholder group. It also enjoys a significant advantage over a "defined/select" group we might empanel. Any group we define will be open to criticism or charges of bias by representatives of interest groups not represented.

The criticism and charges of bias might be tolerable, but only if we could expect consensus from the "defined/select" group we would appoint. We believe that consensus would be elusive. In empanelling a "defined/select" group, we would naturally look for balance and would appoint members to represent a point of view or an institutional interest. As representatives they would likely feel that they had little choice but to be strong advocates. They would have little incentive to compromise. Our research, as opposed to our policy recommendations, would be better served by the analysis of scholars than by the advocacy of interests.

Policy judgments
We regard the EAC itself as responsible for the policy judgments involved in shaping the Guidance Document. We plan, of course, to respond to the EAC's comments on our preliminary draft, so that the EAC's comments will shape the Preliminary Guidance Document before it is released for public comment. And further revision will follow the public hearing and comments. The EAC and individual Commissioners can always seek comment informally on our analysis or recommendations. That course appears to us preferable to the creation of a new, more elaborate review process.

PROPOSED MEMBERSJuly6.doc
Voting rights and wrongs
By Donna Brazile
THE WASHINGTON TIMES
Published April 16, 2007

Just when civil rights advocates were celebrating recent advances in restoring the voting rights of 5.3 million Americans prohibited from voting in several states because of their felony convictions, along comes the news that the Bush administration has been playing politics with meaningful electoral reform.

Geez, can't they focus on governing without engaging in partisan warfare?

The New York Times has reported that the Election Assistance Commission, a federal agency charged with administering federal elections, "played down the findings of experts who concluded last year that there was little voter fraud around the nation." According to the New York Times' review, the "original report on fraud cites 'evidence of some continued outright intimidation and suppression' of voters by local officials, especially in some American Indian communities, while the final report says only that voter 'intimidation is also a topic of some debate because there is little agreement concerning what constitutes actionable voter intimidation.'"

Just why would the EAC suppress or alter a report that could have helped restore citizens' confidence in our electoral system? Did someone pressure them to disown reports they commissioned? If so, we need to find the guilty parties and bring yet another shameful episode of partisanship to public attention.

As the Times notes, this issue played a "significant role" in the Bush administration's "firing of eight United States attorneys, several of whom, documents now indicate, were dismissed for being insufficiently aggressive in pursuing voter fraud cases." Perhaps disgraced Attorney General Alberto Gonzalez will have the decency to respond to these allegations next week when he testifies on Capitol Hill.

The Election Assistance Commission, according to its own mission statement, is supposed to be a clearinghouse for all "matters that affect the administration of federal elections," providing "information and guidance with respect to laws, procedures and technologies affecting the administration of federal elections." Fair enough, but why did they shove aside a report that could have provided timely guidance to members of Congress trying to address so-called voter fraud by imposing restrictive voter-ID requirements?

The EAC not only refused to accept the reasoned conclusion of its bipartisan consultants, they also refused to release those findings at a time when doing so would have discounted claims of rampant voter fraud that were the justification for the restrictive voter ID law passed last year by the Republican-controlled House of Representatives. Thank God the Senate had no appetite to
take up a similar measure being pushed to address the phantom of voter fraud.

Here we approach another major electoral season and the agency in charge of helping states reform their electoral practices has lost its credibility. Loyola Law professor and election expert Richard Hansen have written that the "EAC needs to remain a credible broker and cannot be timid by what it finds." Mr. Hansen believes that if the evidence supports one side of the debate, that is "not a reason to disown a report and start over." Hmmm, unless it's about politics and helping one side gain an electoral advantage.

Since the 2000 presidential election, states have moved to enact stringent voter ID requirements. According to election experts, as of the November 2006 election, 24 states had enacted some form of voter identification law, up from 11 in 2000.

While state and federal courts have thrown out some restrictive and punitive photo ID laws on the grounds they may lead to disenfranchising poor, elderly or minority citizens otherwise eligible to vote, the drumbeat still rages to put in place more punitive laws. The motives are simple: Suppress the turnout of eligible citizens who may not embrace the political priorities of one of the major political parties. Shameful.

No citizen should vote twice, and felons and others seeking to have their voting rights restored must remain patient while the wheels of justice turn in their favor. But, under the guise of people "stuffing ballot boxes," allowing the dead to vote or undocumented workers attempting to claim citizenship, Republican lawmakers have begun to erect new laws that could severely curtail the right of all eligible citizens to vote and have those votes counted accurately.

Perhaps it's time we all put aside partisan consideration and agree that no eligible citizen should have to pay to vote. As many civil rights advocates will tell you, proof of citizenship requirements can place an undue financial burden on voters. I know because many of my family members who had all their possessions washed away during Hurricane Katrina are still scurrying to replace passports, birth certificates and other proof of citizenship, and the expense is shocking.

We should also agree that no eligible citizen should face intimidation by partisan poll workers or be asked to produce ID at the polling place when state law only requires first-time voters and those who did not list an ID number on their registration forms to do so. It's wrong, and it's illegal.

The Justice Department and the Election Assistance Commission, you are now on notice that civil rights groups are watching your every step, your partisan reports and, yes, your role in destroying one of the most important ingredients of our democracy: the right of all citizens regardless of race, gender, disability, age or class to participate in the electoral process.

Donna Brazile is a political commentator on CNN, ABC and National Public Radio and former campaign manager for Al Gore.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
National
Carnahan urges time, resources to deal with election laws (Comm. Hillman quoted.)
Lawmakers call for e-voting paper trails (Comm. Hillman quoted.)
Commission urges caution on election reform (Comm. Hillman quoted.)
Rodriguez elected EAC vice-chair
Rodriguez elected EAC vice-chair (NALEO press release)
The fraudulance of fraud (Rep. Serrano says our report could be the next Watergate, says WH may have
had a role in editing report.)
A selective view of fraud (Says WH edited our report. I have requested a correction.)
Voter ID laws need measured implementation (EAC fraud report)
What the Senators should ask Gonzalas (EAC fraud report mention)
A really important homework assignment (Action alert to notify the public about DRE dangers, including
contacing me at EAC.)
Millender-McDonald reveals few details

National
Carnahan urges time, resources to deal with election laws
By SAM HANANEL, The Associated Press
Apr 18, 2007 8:07 PM (13 hrs ago)

WASHINGTON - States will need time and resources to comply with any changes that Congress might
order to electronic voting systems, Missouri Secretary of State Robin Carnahan told a congressional
panel on Wednesday.
"Obviously elections are run locally," Carnahan told the House Subcommittee on Information Policy, the
Census, and the National Archives. "If you all take over the election process, that's a big change in our
country and it will take money to do that."

The hearing examined the reliability and security of electronic voting systems that have been put into
place across the country since the failure of paper ballots was exposed in the 2000 election.

Subcommittee chairman William Lacy Clay, D-Mo., said he wants Congress to require a paper trail to
back up electronic voting machines and make the process of testing election software and verifying its
security coding more transparent.

Clay cited results from the 2006 election that show some electronic voting systems still produced
unreliable results, causing distrust among voters.

"It is absolutely vital that we utilize technology that provides an independent, auditable voting record that
can be verified by election officials," Clay said.

Carnahan, a Democrat, said lawmakers need to give states a reasonable time frame to comply if
Congress implements any changes, and guarantee full funding for any mandates that come down. She
also urged lawmakers to gather input from state and local officials before taking action.

Carnahan described Missouri's elections as "fair, accurate and secure," and said the state's use of new
optical scan and touch-screen voting systems was generally a success.

But there were some problems, such as long lines that formed when some polling places ran out of...
ballots. She said there is a need for more training for poll workers unfamiliar with the new technology.

Missouri is one of 27 states that already require paper records for electronic machines.

Gracia Hillman, a member of the U.S Election Assistance Commission, told Clay that only Congress has the authority to order nationwide use of paper voting verification.

Depending on what Congress does, Hillman said, at least 180,000 machines around the country would need to be replaced or upgraded. That could be a "recipe for colossal confusion" if lawmakers try to enact such legislation with only a year-and-a-half before the 2008 election, she said.

Clay also grilled Hillman about reports that EAC officials rewrote the findings of a government-funded report on voter fraud to downplay the pervasiveness of problems with electronic systems. Clay said he has concerns the EAC is improperly politicizing its work.

Hillman said changes in the report drafted by researchers at Rutgers University were made because some conclusions were not supported by the data.

"I do not believe that the EAC could have reached agreement on the conclusions offered by those researchers without being allowed to validate those conclusions," Hillman said.

Avi Rubin, a computer science professor at Johns Hopkins University, testified that an electronic voting system without a backup paper receipt cannot be properly audited.

Lawmakers call for e-voting paper trails
By Grant Gross, IDG News Service
April 18, 2007

U.S. lawmakers on Wednesday called for electronic voting machines to include paper trail backups, while a government auditor said better security measures for the machines are needed.

A still-contested 2006 election for the U.S. House of Representatives in Florida's 13th district is a "prominent example of how, in some instances, electronic voting systems have produced unreliable results, raising concerns among voting-system experts and causing distrust among voters," said Representative William Lacy Clay, chairman of the House Information Policy, Census, and National Archives Subcommittee.

In the Florida House election, more than 18,000 voters failed to cast ballots on e-voting machines, and the Republican candidate won by fewer than 400 votes.

Clay, from Missouri, and other Democrats called for paper trail printouts to be required as a way to audit results from touchscreen DRE (Direct Recording Electronic) machines. But Gracia Hillman, a member of the U.S. EAC (Election Assistance Commission), warned Congress not to rush into paper-trail requirements.

Hillman avoided taking a position on paper trail ballots during a subcommittee hearing. But at least 180,000 DREs across the U.S. would have to be upgraded or replaced if Congress required paper trails, she said.

"When you combine the introduction of new equipment, earlier primaries, and the enormous tasks of recruiting and training poll workers to meet a presidential election year deadline -- which is only a year and a half from now -- you have all of the ingredients of a recipe for colossal confusion," Hillman said.

Robin Carnahan, secretary of state for Missouri, also called on Congress to allow reasonable time frames for changes in e-voting requirements. "Don't do things that create expectations but can't be met by local
election officials," she said.

Carnahan said the 2006 election in Missouri was "fair, accurate and secure." Voters there used optical scan and DRE machines with paper trails.

Other lawmakers seemed skeptical of the need for paper trails. Representative Bill Sali, an Idaho Republican, asked Hillman and Randolph Hite, director of information technology architecture and systems for the U.S. GAO (Government Accountability Office), if they knew of any e-voting machines that had been hacked during an election. Both said they were not aware of any.

But Hite called on state and local elections officials to pay more attention to e-voting security and machine life cycle.

Several groups have "raised significant concerns about the security and reliability of electronic voting systems," Hite said. "Many of these security and reliability concerns are legitimate and thus merit the combined and focused attention of federal, state, and local authorities."

In an extensive GAO review, the agency found that many jurisdictions did not use the most current voting system standards, and many do not consistently monitor election performance. Voting-machine best practices were implemented to "varying degrees," he said.

Security measures for e-voting machines "ranged from rigorous to ad hoc," Hite added. He called on the EAC to work with local and state election authorities to strengthen security measures.

Commission urges caution on election reform
National Journal's Congress Daily AM
An official with the commission charged with overseeing the administration of federal elections urged House lawmakers Wednesday to proceed with caution as they consider sweeping electoral reform legislation.

Election Assistance Commission member Gracia Hillman told the House Oversight and Government Reform Information Policy Subcommittee that earlier primary elections, new equipment and increased poll-worker training demands already stand to complicate the administration of federal elections next year, National Journal's Technology Daily reported.

During a hearing on electronic voting machines, she said lawmakers are right to question the use of certain e-voting machines. A measure sponsored by Rep. Rush Holt, D-N.J., would require all e-voting machines to be backed up by paper trails.

But Hillman said Congress needs to be aware of the confusion that extensive e-voting upgrades might cause. She also urged the panel to consider other electoral issues such as voter registration, participation and disenfranchisement.

Rodriguez elected EAC vice chair
VoteTrust USA
Former Denver City Council President Rosemary E. Rodriguez today was elected vice chair of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) during a public meeting.

As vice chair, she will work with EAC Chair Donetta Davidson as part of the bipartisan leadership team at the commission to set priorities and communicate EAC initiatives.

"My foremost conviction is that all eligible voters should be empowered with simple, unfettered and uncomplicated access to registration and to the voting booth" said Rodriguez. "I look forward to working with my colleagues as we seek practical means to improve elections in this country in ways that most benefit the voters."
Vice Chair Rodriguez joined the EAC in March. She was nominated to EAC by President Bush in 2006 and confirmed by the U.S. Senate in February. She will serve until December 12, 2007, filling the remaining term of Ray Martinez, who resigned in August 2006.

She served on the Denver, Colorado City Council for three years, and was its president from 2005 to 2006. She was director of Boards and Commissions for the mayor's office from 2002 to 2003 and a clerk and recorder for the City and County of Denver from 1997 to 2002. In 1997 she was acting director of the Denver Election Commission where she supervised city elections. She has been active in numerous grass roots civic and voter advocacy organizations, including the Colorado Voter Initiative where she co-chaired a statewide initiative to allow Election Day voter registration. She was also a co-founder and chair of Latinos Vote, a voter registration project to register Latino voters and provide non-partisan election information to the Latino community.

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

Rosemary Rodriguez elected EAC vice-chair
NALEO Press Release
Los Angeles, CA - The National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO), the nation’s preeminent Latino leadership organization, congratulates Commissioner Rosemary Rodriguez on her election today to serve as Vice-Chair of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). Commissioner Rodriguez, who is a former NALEO Educational Fund Board member, joined the EAC in March 2007, and was elected Vice-Chair by her fellow Commissioners at a meeting held in Kansas City, Missouri. The EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created to provide guidelines and resources to states for federal election reform.

Commissioner Rodriguez comes to her position with over a decade of experience in public service where she gained extensive expertise with many different aspects of election administration. In the 1990’s, she was actively involved in educating community members about the need for representative districts during redistricting, and in 2001, she was appointed to the Colorado Reapportionment Commission and served as its Chair. For several years, she served as the City of Denver’s Clerk and Recorder, where she was responsible for supervising candidate filings, voter registration and the dissemination of official election information. As Clerk and Recorder, she was a member of Denver’s Election Commission, which directs city-wide elections.

Commissioner Rodriguez also served as a member of the Denver City Council since 2003, and in 2005, she was elected by her peers to serve a one-year term as Council President. Through her experiences in public service, Commissioner Rodriguez developed a thorough understanding of the challenges that voters face in gaining access to the electoral process. As a board member of the NALEO Educational Fund, she was involved in efforts to further Latino political participation through the organization’s U.S. citizenship promotion work and non-partisan voter engagement project Voces de Pueblo.

“Rosemary Rodriguez brings a wealth of knowledge on election issues to the Election Assistance Commission,” said John Bueno, NALEO President and former President Pro-Tem for the City of Pontiac, Michigan. “Throughout her career, she has demonstrated a strong commitment to ensuring that all voters have a voice on Election Day, and she will provide the Commission with invaluable perspectives and expertise. NALEO congratulates Commissioner Rodriguez on her election,” concluded Mr. Bueno.

The EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA).

It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource information regarding election administration. In addition to Commissioner Rodriguez, the members of the EAC are Chair Donnetta Davidson, Gracia Hillman, and Caroline Hunter. Commissioner Rodriguez succeeds former Commissioner Raymundo Martinez III, who resigned in August 2006.

The fraudulance of fraud
By Joel Bleifuss
In Our Times

On April 6, 2006, in Washington, D.C., Karl Rove gave a speech to the Republican National Lawyers Association and issued this dire warning:

We are, in some parts of the country, I'm afraid to say, beginning to look like we have elections like those run in countries where the guys in charge are, you know, colonels in mirrored sunglasses. I mean, it's a real problem, and I appreciate all that you're doing in those hot spots around the country to ensure that the ballot—the integrity of the ballot—is protected, because it's important to our democracy.

When Rove talks about protecting "ballot integrity," that is shorthand for disenfranchising Democratic Party voters. Over the last several years, the Justice Department, with the help of White House...
operatives, has sought to boost GOP electoral fortunes by orchestrating a national campaign against voter fraud. But the administration overreached on Dec. 7, when President George W. Bush fired eight U.S. attorneys, a political scandal that some say could become this president’s Watergate.

When Republicans talk about "voter fraud" they are referring to illegal voting by individuals, as opposed to "vote fraud"—systematic attempts to steal an election by an organized group of partisans. This emphasis on voter fraud has convinced eight states to pass laws requiring voters to present official photo identification in order to cast a ballot—laws that studies have shown suppress Democratic turnout among voters who are poor, black, Latino, Asian-American or disabled.

Understanding that one way to win closely contested elections is to keep Democratic voters away from the polls, the Republican Party has tried to stoke public fears of voter fraud. On Feb. 15, 2005, the U.S. Senate Republican Policy Committee issued a report, "Putting an End to Voter Fraud," which said, "Voter fraud continues to plague our nation's federal elections, diluting and canceling out the lawful votes of the vast majority of Americans." To remedy the situation, the Senate Republicans advised Congress to "require that voters at the polls show photo identification."

But voting experts maintain that voter fraud is not a national problem. In March, Lorraine C. Minnite, a professor of political science at Columbia University, released "The Politics of Voter Fraud," a report she prepared for Project Vote, an advocacy group based in Arkansas. She writes:

The claim that voter fraud threatens the integrity of American elections is itself a fraud. It is being used to persuade the public that deceitful and criminal voters are manipulating the electoral system. ... The exaggerated fear of voter fraud has a long history of scuttling efforts to make voting easier and more inclusive, especially for marginalized groups in American society. With renewed partisan vigor, fantasies of fraud are being spun again to undo some of the progress America has made lowering barriers to vote.

This is borne out by a study from the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, which found that in the 2004 election, voters in states that required documentation of identity were 2.7 percent less likely to vote than voters in states where documentation was not required. Specifically, the study, commissioned by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, found that Latinos were 10 percent less likely to vote, Asian-Americans 8.5 percent less likely to vote and blacks 5.7 percent less likely to vote.

What's more, despite GOP claims to the contrary, voter fraud is a very rare occurrence. In 2002 the Justice Department established the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative to ferret out fraudulent voters. On Oct. 4, 2005, Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, with great fanfare, proclaimed, "We've made enforcement of election fraud and corrupting offenses a top priority." Yet according to an April 12 New York Times article, only 120 people have been charged with the crime over the past five years, leading to 86 convictions. Furthermore, the Times noted, federal attorneys say that most of the transgressions have been mistakes by immigrants and felons who simply misunderstood eligibility requirements.

The extent of voter fraud is further complicated by the fact that earlier this year the Election Assistance Commission changed the conclusions of a report it had commissioned. The original report by outside election experts concluded, "There is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud." The commission deleted that sentence and replaced it with, "There is a great deal of debate on the pervasiveness of fraud."

Rep. José Serrano (D.-N.Y.), who chairs the House Appropriations subcommittee that oversees the commission, is disturbed by this apparently politically motivated substitution. He told In These Times:

This possibly could be another Watergate. We have to ask the questions, "Why was this report doctored, and how does this play into the larger picture of voter suppression and intimidation?" By directing public attention to voter fraud you divert attention from the fact that Americans in certain communities are not able to cast their votes properly and that their votes are not being counted. Is this something that this small new agency thought of by themselves or did they get marching orders from somewhere else, perhaps as far up as the White House?

Firing prosecutors
It appears that, under Rove's direction the White House has been planning to use U.S. attorneys to fan national fears of voter fraud. In his speech to the GOP lawyers, Rove listed 11 states that would play a pivotal role in the 2008 elections. Since 2005, Bush has appointed new U.S. attorneys in nine of those states: Florida, Colorado, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, Arkansas and New Mexico.

What's more, the firings of U.S. attorneys in New Mexico, Arkansas and Washington appear directly related to this Republican plan to exploit the issue of voter fraud and suppress Democratic turnout.

In Arkansas, Bush fired a sitting U.S. attorney in order to appoint Rove protégé Tim Griffin. (See "The Talented Mr. Griffin" by Greg Palast on page 31.)

In Washington, fired U.S. Attorney John McKay had refused to prosecute alleged voter fraud in the 2004 Washington governor's race, in which Democrat Chris Gregoire beat Republican Dino Rossi by 129 votes.

On March 6, McKay testified before the Senate that after the election Republicans pressured him to open an investigation. He said his office had examined the allegations of voter fraud and decided there was not enough evidence to pursue a case.

"Had anyone at the Justice Department or the White House ordered me to pursue any matter criminally in the 2004 governor's election, I would have resigned," McKay told the Seattle Times. "There was no evidence, and I am not going to drag innocent people in front of a grand jury."

In New Mexico, David C. Iglesias was equally suspect in the eyes of the GOP. Recall that in 2000, Gore beat Bush by 377 votes in New Mexico. Consequently, in 2004, Democrat-affiliated groups initiated voter registration campaigns in New Mexico. As a result, two boys, age 13 and 15, received voter cards in the mail. Iglesias responded by setting up a bipartisan task force to investigate. This didn't satisfy attorney Mickey D. Barnett, who represented the 2004 Bush-Cheney campaign in New Mexico. He told Iglesias he should bring federal charges against a canvasser who forged their signatures, which he refused to do.

In a New York Times op-ed, Iglesias wrote:

What the critics, who don't have any experience as prosecutors, have asserted is reprehensible--namely that I should have proceeded without having proof beyond a reasonable doubt. The public has a right to believe that prosecution decisions are made on legal, not political grounds.

Manufacturing voter fraud

The issue of fraudulent voters undermining American democracy did not spontaneously erupt. To promote national concern about voter fraud, in March 2005 GOP operatives with ties to the White House established a 501(c)4 organization called the American Center for Voting Rights Legislative Fund (ACVR). The group went public by establishing a Web site, ac4vr.com. (The site has since been taken down for unknown reasons.)

According to its 990 tax forms, ACVR is based in Midlothian, Va., and its executive director is Robin DeJarnette, who is also the founder and executive director of the Virginia Conservative Action PAC. However, according to the registration form for its Internet domain name, the group's address is a mailbox at a UPS Store in Dallas. The chairman of ACVR is Brian Lunde, a former Democratic National Committee official from Texas, who in 2004 was head of Democrats for Bush.

ACVR specializes in issuing studies that purport to document a host of voter fraud cases, like the report titled: "Democrat operatives far more involved in voter intimidation and suppression in 2004 than Republicans."

On March 21, 2005, four days after ACVR went public, Rep. Bob Ney (R-Ohio), then chair of the Committee on House Administration, opened hearings on 2004 election irregularities. One person who testified was ACVR National Counsel Mark "Thor" Hearne II, who described himself as "a longtime advocate of voter rights and an attorney experienced in election law." In the aftermath of the 2000
presidential campaign, Hearne was dispatched to Florida as a Republican observer in Broward County's manual recount, and in 2004 he worked as the national general counsel for Bush/Cheney '04 Inc.

In his testimony, Hearne described ACVR as "committed to defending the rights of voters and working to increase public confidence in the fairness of the outcome of elections." And he submitted to the committee a copy of the ACVR's "Ohio Election Report," of which he was the lead author. That report read in part:

This Democratic voter registration effort was not limited to registration of legal voters but, criminal investigations and news reports suggest, that this voter registration effort also involved the registration of thousands of fictional voters such as the now infamous Jive F. Turkey, Sr., Dick Tracy and Mary Poppins. Those individuals registering these fictional voters were reportedly paid not just money to do but were, in at least one instance, paid in crack cocaine.

And in testimony on Dec. 7, 2006, the same day the prosecutors were fired, Hearne told the Election Assistance Commission: "Recent press reports suggest that voter registration fraud remains a significant issue in the recent mid-term elections."

The press contact for ACVR is Jim Dyke, who was the communications director of the Republican National Committee during the 2004 election. In the fall of 2005 he was working in the White House trying to get Harriet Miers on the Supreme Court, before moving on to work in Vice President Dick Cheney's office. Brad Friedman of BradBlog.com reported that according internet records, Dyke registered the ACVR Internet domain name, ac4vr.com, in December 2004. Those records have since disappeared from public view. (The source of ACVR's funding is also mysterious. According to the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review, "When asked to name any contributors to his nonprofit, Hearne claimed he did not know but said Lunde did. When Lunde was asked, he claimed he did not know but said Hearne did.")

Dyke is a good friend of his fellow Arkansan Tim Griffin, the new U.S. attorney in Arkansas. In 2004, both worked at the Republican National Committee helping Bush get re-elected. Dyke has been a vocal defender of Griffin's appointment as U.S. Attorney. "He has a real passion for the law," Dyke told the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette.

Rounding out the GOP operatives is Pat Rogers, who sits on the board of ACVR. An attorney for the Republican Party in New Mexico, he has been a vocal critic of fired U.S. Attorney Iglesias. According to the Albuquerque Tribune, Rogers is on the short list to replace Iglesias.

Rove's role

Minnite, who did the study on voter fraud, has read through the reports prepared by ACVR and presented by Hearne at various official hearings. She noticed that the claims follow a predictable script. "It all starts to look the same," she says. "There is a pattern in the way the documents that claim to show voter fraud are put together. It is usually a compilation of news reports on allegations. There is no follow up, no research done, no analysis."

"As I delved into it, I was faced with the question: 'Why do people think there is a lot of fraud when there isn't any real evidence?' I think people are being manipulated by politics, which takes the form of these reports that are dumped on the public. It is as if you get a big enough pile maybe you will convince people that the volume of fraud is quite large and that we have a serious problem."

Wisconsin provides a case in point. At a March 13 press conference, White House Counsel Dan Bartlett identified Wisconsin as one of the states from which the White House had "received complaints about U.S. attorneys."

In 2005, U.S. Attorney Steve Biskup, who was appointed by Bush, investigated these allegations of voter fraud and reported that he found no evidence on which to press charges.

It turns out that early in 2005, Republican officials in Wisconsin prepared a report titled "Fraud in Wisconsin 2004: A Timeline/Summary." The document, which was found in White House and Justice Department records released by the House Judiciary Committee, was written by Chris Lato, the former
communications director for the state Republican Party, on orders from Rick Wiley, the party's executive director. The 30-page report, which covers Aug. 31, 2004 to April 1, 2005, contains 65 entries detailing voter fraud. The final example is titled: "RPW [Republican Party of Wisconsin] News Release: Evidence of Election Fraud Piles Up."

The information contained in this Wisconsin compilation, made its way into a 78-page report released on July 21, 2005, by ACVR: "Vote Fraud, Intimidation & Suppression in the 2004 Presidential Election." In the introduction, the ACVR's Hearne and Lunde wrote that the report "documents hundreds of incidents and allegations from around the country.... [T]housands of Americans were disenfranchised by illegal votes cast on Election Day 2004 .... [P]aid Democrat operatives were far more involved in voter intimidation and suppression activities than were their Republican counterparts.... [R]equired government-issued photo ID at the polls ... will help assure ... that no American is disenfranchised by illegal votes."

And who was behind this trail of misinformation? On April 7, Daniel Bice, a columnist for the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, reported that a source familiar with the document told him, "The report was prepared for Karl Rove. Rick [Wiley] wanted it so he could give it to Karl Rove."

On April 6, 2006, in Washington, at the aforementioned speech to Republican Party attorneys, Rove began with a joke: "I ran into [ACVR's] Thor Hearne as I was coming in. He was leaving; he was smart, and he was leaving to go out and enjoy the day." Rove then told the assembled party lawyers, "We have, as you know, an enormous and growing problem with elections in certain parts of America today."

Rove should know. He helped grow the problem.

A Selective View of Fraud

By: Joe Conason
New York Observer

Even as Alberto Gonzales rehearses his excuses for the strange dismissal of eight United States Attorneys, which he will perform in public at a Senate hearing this week, he is looking like a marginal player in this scandal. The Attorney General fumbled his role, but in keeping with his Presidential nickname (Fredo), he probably never understood the broader scheme originating in the Bush White House.

Developed by deputy chief of staff Karl Rove, the President's top political aide, that scheme was evidently designed to advance his objective of discouraging minority voters and others with the bad habit of supporting Democratic candidates. In Republican parlance, such attempts to hamper registration, intimidate citizens and reduce turnout in targeted communities are lauded as "combating voter fraud." Several of the fired U.S. Attorneys had angered party operatives, including Mr. Rove, because they had shown so little enthusiasm for trumping up fraud cases against Democrats.

Following the 2004 election, David Iglesias, then serving as the U.S. Attorney in New Mexico, set up a task force to investigate Republican allegations of fraud. Those accusations boiled down to a single case where a woman had created a handful of phony registrations. (She did so for financial reasons, rather than out of any desire to manipulate the election.) When Mr. Iglesias declined prosecution for lack of airtight evidence, local Republicans began to demand his replacement with a more pliable and less professional prosecutor—a demand eventually fulfilled by Mr. Rove and President Bush.

In Wisconsin, by contrast, U.S. Attorney Steven Biskupic prosecuted voter-fraud allegations regardless of merit, winning big headlines when he indicted 14 black Milwaukee residents for casting ballots illegally. Nine of those cases were either tossed out or lost in court—an awful result compared with the normal conviction rate of over 90 percent. But at least the mediocre Mr. Biskupic—who convicted of a Democratic state official was just overturned on appeal—managed to remain in the good graces of the White House and keep his job.

The Republican cry of "voter fraud" is a specious complaint, amplified by right-wing hacks to conceal the
fact that in recent years, the most sustained efforts to interfere with orderly elections and voting rights can be traced to the Republican National Committee.

Harassing minority voters with bogus claims of fraud is a venerable tradition in the G.O.P., as anyone familiar with the career of the late Supreme Court Chief Justice William Rehnquist would know. Back in the early 60's, when Rehnquist was just another ambitious young lawyer in Arizona, he ran a partisan campaign to confront black and Hispanic voters over their "qualifications." Along with many of today's generation of Republican leaders, he was a stalwart of the Goldwater campaign in 1964, which garnered its handful of electoral votes in the South by opposing the Voting Rights Act.

Then came Richard Nixon's Southern strategy of nurturing racist grievances to build Republican majorities—around the time that a young operative named Karl Rove was rising in the party. Under his leadership, the G.O.P. has repeatedly been disgraced by conspiracies to diminish voter participation.

In 2002, Republican operatives used a telemarketing firm to illegally jam Democratic phone banks in New Hampshire to win the U.S. Senate seat now held by John Sununu. In 2004, Florida state officials sent armed officers into certain Orlando neighborhoods to scare elderly black registrants, while Republicans sought to challenge minority voters en masse in communities in Kentucky, Nevada, South Carolina, Pennsylvania and Ohio, and paid for the destruction of Democratic voter registrations in Nevada and Oregon.

Actual voter fraud of the kind decried in Republican propaganda is rare, according to nonpartisan experts. Although the White House recently rewrote a careful federal study by the Election Assistance Commission to hide that basic fact, it remains true that very few individuals intentionally seek to fabricate a registration or cast an illegal ballot. There are exceptions, of course—most notably illustrated by Republican celebrity Ann Coulter.

When the far-right columnist and television personality registered to vote in Palm Beach, Fla., in 2005, she wrote down the address of her realtor's office rather than her own home address. She then signed the form, despite its plain warning that falsifying any information on it would make her liable to felony prosecution—and which she, as a lawyer, surely understood. According to Palm Beach County election officials, she also voted in the wrong precinct the following year, disregarding a poll worker who explained her error. (Coulter fans can view her dubious voter-registration form online at www.bradblog.com.)

If proved, those acts would be crimes punishable by prison terms of up to five years, but Ms. Coulter has stonewalled the ongoing investigation. (She says the Palm Beach officials are syphilitic and mentally defective.) No charges have been filed so far, perhaps because her lawyer is a prominent Republican who worked on Bush v. Gore in 2000—and whom the President then appointed as U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Florida. He must know a lot about voter fraud.

Voter ID laws need measured implementation
The controversy over laws that require citizens to present identification in order to vote returned to national attention last week with a prominent report cataloging steps that the Election Assistance Commission took to lessen the splash of a study examining voter fraud in the United States. Where the original study concluded that there is "widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud," the version revised by the EAC finds that "there is a great deal of debate" about the prevalence of voter fraud and made other adjustments to temper the findings.

Voter ID laws tend to invite rancor because partisans on both sides of the aisle believe any changes could affect the outcome of various elections. Republicans generally express concern that lax requirements open the door for elections to be stolen by duplicate voters and the like, while Democrats point to a lack of evidence about the extent of fraud and fear that identification requirements dissuade a large number of poor and minority voters—traditionally Democratic constituencies—from voting. Many people in these demographics, the argument goes, do not have drivers' licenses or comparable
identification and can experience difficulty in acquiring them. Further, even the identifications that some states provide for free require documentation—birth certificates or the like—that themselves can require high fees. In this way, ID requirements are compared to modern poll taxes.

A balanced take on the situation is made more difficult by a terrible paucity of convincing evidence regarding both the extent of fraud and the degree to which ID requirements depress turnout. Timothy Vercellotti and David Anderson have released a study suggesting a small negative influence on turnout, but they will be the first to admit that good evidence is hard to come by and that their conclusions are hardly definitive. Similarly, Tova Wang, Spencer Overton, and others point to the fact that relatively few examples of voter fraud have been reported, but skeptics can always respond with the valid concern that fraud, being a criminal activity, is undetectable whenever it is successful. We only know about fraud when it is caught; who knows how much fraud escapes our attention? And even if fraud is uncommon today, could it not become a problem tomorrow?

Aside from the difficulty of balancing integrity and accessibility, proponents of voter ID laws argue that identification requirements will help to restore the flagging confidence in election administration and that the standards are needed to bring U.S. practices on par with the rest of the world; most advanced democracies require identification of some kind (though the onus of providing the ID oftentimes lies on the government).

Perhaps there are a few items within the debate upon which both sides of the aisle can agree. First, voter ID laws would not prevent all kinds of fraud or even the most consequential. Requiring an ID might prevent impersonation of other individuals at the polling places, but it would not, for example, prevent the stuffing of ballot boxes, either in the old, literal sense or the modern electronic equivalent: the subversion of machine software through hacking.

Second, it is difficult to perpetrate fraud—at least the kind of fraud that IDs are designed to prevent—in the volume that would be necessary to swing an election. Impersonating a voter would require either falsifying registration forms to place fictional voters on the rolls or stealing the persona of someone who had already registered. In the first case, an election thief would typically have to contrive fake addresses, a kind of fraud that could well be discovered if perpetrated on a large scale. Similarly, stealing the identity of a real person would require an assurance that the victim had not already voted. Otherwise, a fraudulent voter could be caught red-handed.

Furthermore, in-person fraud would require the perpetrators to travel to enough polling stations on Election Day so as to cast a significant number of fraudulent votes. How many polling places could a single person visit in one day? Fifteen? Perhaps twenty? Such a small number of fraudulent votes is unlikely to change the outcome of an election, and so it seems that any successful scheme would have to employ a group of individuals. Of course, as the number of perpetrators increases, so does the probability of being caught. How many of even the most avid partisans would undertake the formidable risk of jail time in order to marginally increase the likelihood of their favored candidate winning? In many ways, the kind of fraud that an ID requirement would prevent is akin to the counterfeiting of nickels and dimes: high risk for low reward.

Finally, any effort to neutralize voter fraud without a sober consideration of absentee voting would be sorely incomplete. Absentee voting, which routinely constitutes 30 percent or more of the votes cast in some states (such as California), requires no proof of ID and is very much the Achilles heel of election security. Because a single individual could theoretically acquire hundreds of absentee ballots and complete them in private, it is the method most likely to facilitate wholesale voter fraud. If fraud through impersonation is analogous to counterfeiting nickels and dimes, absentee voting could be the equivalent of counterfeiting $100 bills. It is for this reason that efforts to encourage absentee voting, such as allowing absentee voting without an excuse, should be considered with great caution.

Nevertheless, if the states do want to employ some kind of ID requirement, they should take steps to minimize the possibility that ID laws will prevent legitimate votes from being cast. For instance, Virginia allows ID-less voters to cast a ballot as long as they are registered and sign an affidavit affirming their
identity. It is a practice not altogether satisfactory to hard-liners on either side, but a reasonable middle
ground between security and accessibility. Administrators might even consider strengthening this
practice by allowing ID-less voters to check a box indicating that they do not own an acceptable
identification. If checked, that individual would receive an ID application in the mail. He or she could then
submit the application along with a utility bill or other proof of identity in order to receive a free voter
identification card. To reinforce the affidavit’s status as a short-term fix, voters who habitually show up to
Election Day without an ID might eventually lose the privilege of identifying by affidavit.

There remains room for spirited debate about the merits of voter ID laws. One could plausibly favor them
for reasons of confidence and facility of recordkeeping while still denying that large-scale fraud exists at
all. Still, hastily implemented ID laws could disenfranchise legitimate voters to a far greater degree than
they would prevent illegitimate voting. For this reason, lawmakers who genuinely seek to administer
elections with an eye towards inclusiveness as well as integrity should consider the imposition of greater
requirements with the utmost care.

Timothy J. Ryan can be reached at tryanna@aei.org. This piece originally appeared in the AEI-Brooking
Election Reform Project Newsletter.

What the Senators Should Ask Gonzalas

By Mark A.R. Kleiman

There are really only two questions the Senate Judiciary Committee needs to ask Alberto Gonzales today:

1. Why are you such a lying turkey?
2. When are you going to resign?

But that would make for an unduly short hearing, so here are a few more questions, just to fill in the time:

1. In your prepared testimony released over the weekend, you assert that you had no advance role in
planning for the Pearl Harbor Day massacre. An email sent last year by your assistant, Kyle Sampson,
says otherwise. Can you explain the discrepancy?

2. If you were concerned about the performance of the U.S. Attorneys who were fired, why didn’t you or
anyone from DoJ HQ write them to document those concerns and ask for plans of improvement? Isn’t that
normal management practice?

3. If you were concerned about the performance of the U.S. Attorneys who were fired, why did the Director
of the Executive Office of U.S. Attorneys not know anything about those concerns until the firings
happened?

4. Did anyone in the White House, directly or indirectly, ever express concern about Carol Lam’s
corruption investigations? Who? When? What was said?

5. Do you agree with the theory offered by U.S. Attorney Biskupic than anytime political considerations
enter into the award of a public contract, that constitutes misappropriation of funds? Has the Public Integrity Section considered or brought such cases against any Bush Administration officials? Why not? And if you don't think that theory is legally sound, why does Mr. Biscupic still have a job?

6. Is it true that Karl Rove and/or Pete Domenici asked you to fire David Iglesias? If so, what were their stated reasons? Is it true that you refused to fire him without a direct order from the president? Did you ever discuss Mr. Iglesias's tenure with the president? Did he instruct you to fire Mr. Iglesias?

7. No doubt you've seen the letter sent by an anonymous group of DoJ career staff, charging that the Honors Program hiring process has been politicized, and that summa cum laude graduates of Harvard and Yale Law Schools chosen by the operating divisions as potential new hires were denied interviews on the orders of the Deputy Attorney General's office because their resumes indicated liberal political leanings or experience working for Democratic legislators. What inquiries have you made into the truth of those allegations? When can you have us a full report, with the names of the candidates redacted?

8. When was it decided that the Civil Rights Division would give preference in hiring to attorneys with no experience in civil rights law? Why? Is it helpful for fewer than half of the new hires to have relevant experience, compared to the historical average of more than three-quarters?

Or is it simply that less experienced attorneys generally aren't as likely as career professionals to resist political interference?

9. During your tenure, the Department has moved away from prosecuting cases of voter intimidation and suppression and toward prosecuting cases of "voter fraud." But you have yet to develop a case where there was any concerted effort to steal a federal election by having ineligible people vote, and in fact a high proportion of the "vote fraud" indictments brought have ended in acquittals. A consultant's report to the Election Assistance Commission found no evidence of any widespread vote fraud, but did find systematic voter suppression and intimidation. Why, in the face of this evidence, do the Department and the White House and the RNC continue to insist that "voter fraud" is a serious problem. If it is, why can't you seem to find any?

10. In your view, does the theory of the unitary executive bar the Justice Department from prosecuting White House officials for contempt of Congress if they refuse to comply with Congressional subpoenas?

11. After Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty testified before this committee that the U.S. Attorney for Arkansas, Bud Cummins, had been let go for purely political reasons, Brian Roehrkasse of your public affairs staff, who was traveling with you in Argentina, sent an email to your chief of staff, Kyle Sampson, saying that you were unhappy with that testimony. Were you unhappy about it because it was false, or
because it was true? If you thought it was false -- if you thought, that is, that the Deputy Attorney General of the United States had testified falsely before this committee -- why did you not notify the committee, or insist that Mr. McNulty notify the committee, about the error? If you didn't think it was false, what was the basis of your concern? Did you think it inappropriate for the Deputy Attorney General to tell the truth under oath?

12. There are conflicting stories about the role of the junior senator from Minnesota, Mr. Coleman, in the appointment of Rachel Paulose as U.S. Attorney. It would have been normal for the only senator of the President's party from the affected state to be consulted. Did you, or to your knowledge anyone in DoJ or the White House, ever discuss Ms. Paulose's appointment with Senator Coleman? If so, what was his advice?

13. What was your role in inserting the provision allowing the president to appoint replacement U.S. Attorneys without Senate confirmation into the USA PATRIOT Act reauthorization? To your knowledge, who first came up with that proposal? At what point did you first consider using that provision in connection with the Pearl Harbor Day massacre? How did it happen that Mr. Tolman, formerly the Chief Counsel to this committee who (according to the senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Specter, then the Chairman) oversaw the somewhat surreptitious insertion of that provision into the law, then became United States Attorney for Utah? Why did the Department oppose the repeal of that provision after the Pearl Harbor Day massacre? What communications have you had with the senator from Arizona, Mr. Kyl, about his placing of a hold on that repeal proposal even after DoJ reversed its stated position?

14. Why wasn't Monica Goodling dismissed immediately after she asserted her right against self-incrimination in connection with the Pearl Harbor Day massacre? Would that not be consistent with the Department's pressure on corporations to fire employees who refuse to cooperate in investigations?

Mark Kleiman is Professor of Public Policy and Director of the Drug Policy Analysis Program at UCLA. He blogs for The Reality-Based Community.

A really important homework assignment

By Joan Brunwasser
Op-Ed News

A Really Important Homework Assignment
By Joan Brunwasser, Voting Integrity Editor, OpEdNews April 18, 2007

I am better at writing than doing, talking than doing, virtually anything than actually doing. I'm probably not the only one, but it sometimes makes a mockery of my so-called activism.

My heart is in the right place, but I was born in the wrong generation. High-tech is just not me. If I had been around in the early twentieth century, I would have been a hold-out for the horse and buggy, flustered by those whippersnappers flashing by in their horseless wonders. Paper and pencil are my
preferred means of communication, which is why you'll never catch me with a PDA. My sore rear end is a result of my work at OpEdNews, not from surfing the web.

One of the perks of my role as voting integrity editor is that I've been able to connect and establish a rapport with many of the people who have been driving the election integrity movement over the last few years. I do my best to be fair, and I have no particular axe to grind, so people are pretty patient about my technological shortcomings. OpEdNews does its best to include as many of the activists and their work as possible, and we've done a pretty good job at it.

Brad Friedman is one of my cyber-buddies. I have gotten a great education on election integrity from BradBlog.com. His daily exposés are, for me, what I imagine a cup of coffee is for caffeine addicts. I need my fix to feel like I'm on top of things. We have corresponded for quite a while, and even once had a freewheeling phone conversation with the potential of turning into an interview (except for the fact that I don't know how to do interviews and my computer ate the file of the transcript that he sent me). I am grateful to him for teaching me how to insert links so that my articles would look more professional, even though I wasn't a particularly quick study.

I often feel like a cheerleader (finally, sort of fulfilling my aspirations as a junior high schooler). People do great work, and I commend them for it by posting their articles at OpEdNews to give them more exposure. But, in terms of being able to follow exactly what they're saying or actually follow through on their calls to action, there's the rub. And I don't think I'm the only one, either.

I've had an idea for a while about developing a prototype so that people could print it up and have it in front of them when they made calls to their secretaries of state to enlist their support for election reform. It's a project that is on my friend Nancy (of the Election Defense Alliance) Tobi's list, but the truth is that she is so busy with everything else she's doing, she hasn't been able to get to it yet. Nancy believes that our congressional representatives need to hear from their constituents, and that we all need to begin identifying which ones are on our side and which are not. We need to be strategic in order to win. (Stay tuned for your next assignment. Our template for contacting your congressional reps is in the works.)

In the meantime, there I am, full of good intentions. But, have I picked up the phone and called my own Secretary of State, Jesse White? No, I shamefacedly admit, I have not. And if I haven't, I venture to guess that most people haven't either.

Why haven't I? I'm uncomfortable doing it because I don't feel that I really get all the issues yet, which makes me tentative. That's why I thought of this how-to template that would lay out the issues in a very straightforward, easy-to-follow format. That way, I could just clutch it in front of me when I made my phone call.

I wrote Brad about his article on the latest electronic voting machine/EAC scandal - click here "Exclusive: ES&S Touch-Screen Voting Systems Found Vulnerable to 'Serious' Viral Vote-Flipping Attack; US Election Assistance Commission Refuses to Issue Warning" - which reads in part,

The vulnerability is said to allow for a single malicious user to introduce a virus into the system which "could potentially steal all the votes in that county, without being detected," according to a noted computer scientist and voting system expert who has reviewed the findings.

I commended Brad (and co-author Michael Richardson) on the post. This is what he wrote me when I asked what we can be doing.

[Make] noise, noise, noise. Any way possible. You're media! Call the EAC [Election Assistance Commission] and see if they have any explanation for that article!

When they give you the same old song and dance, report it again! Call a couple of the SoS offices at the affected states and ask them if they know their systems were found to have been vulnerable to viruses from a single person that could flip an entire county's election undetectedly, and ask them why they didn't
know about it, since the EAC did, and if they think the EAC should have let them know. Etc.

Advance the story, report it. We could use ya, teammate!

So, here's what I did. I went online and got the telephone number of the EAC, (toll-free 866-747-1471) and the name of the director (Jeannie Layson).

Then, I went online again and got the link for the complete roster of all 50 states (http://www.nass.org/sos/soscontact.html) with the Secretaries of States and their phone and fax numbers, snail mail and e-mail addresses. In short, more information than you or I will ever need.

Then, I printed up a copy of the original article from April 16th by Michael Richardson and Brad Friedman (http://www.bradblog.com/?p=4396#more-4396) as well as an update that lists the 16 states affected by this newly discovered "virus vulnerability" (http://www.bradblog.com/?p=4416). So now I'm all set with everything I need.

Unfortunately, it's too late today to call. But, tomorrow, I will take all of my pieces and:

1. Call the EAC and ask them about the article and why they take no responsibility for contacting and warning the states affected by this serious breach. (Keep in mind that this incompetent group is about to be made a permanent fixture on the political landscape if HR 811 is passed.) I will note any comment, or refusal to comment.

2. Then, I will call as many of the 16 secretaries of state as I can to ask what they think about this article, which I will offer to fax or email to them. (I'm assuming that after one or two calls, it will be pretty easy and the words will just roll off my tongue.)

3. Then, I will contact my own secretary of state (thankfully, Illinois is not on this list, but we have plenty of our own problems) and discuss how we can work together on spreading the word about the problems with the EAC, electronic voting and HR 811.

4. Then, I will write another OpEdNews piece and tell you how it went!

Hopefully, you will all take heart from this boiled-down, step-by-step template and be empowered to follow the steps yourselves. Let me know where you got and what they said. Trust me when I say that this kind of approach can make a difference. In the meantime, we will be creating dozens - hopefully even hundreds or thousands - of citizen journalists who are stepping forward to do the job so disastrously abandoned by the mainstream corporate press.

I almost forgot the last step:

5. I will take my shoes off, put my feet up, and heave a big sigh of relief. Thanks, Brad, for making me do this. I feel a lot better now. And it wasn't even as hard as I thought it would be.

Authors Bio:

Joan Brunwasser of Citizens for Election Reform is a citizen activist working hard to restore and preserve free and fair elections. She started a lending library project to distribute the "Invisible Ballots" DVD in mid-September 2005. In the following eighteen months, she loaned the DVD to almost 3,200 'borrowers' in 37 states, DC, Puerto Rico, Canada, Holland, England, Ireland and Japan. Since the DVD's release in spring 2004, there have been numerous studies and hacks, all of them critical of electronic voting. Her new focus is on raising public awareness about what's wrong with our elections and how to achieve a fair, secure and transparent election system. She welcomes your help in spreading the word. She has been the Voting Integrity Editor for Op Ed News since December 2005.
Millender-McDonald reveals few details

After feeling ill earlier this month, House Administration Chairwoman Juanita Millender-McDonald (D) visited at least one doctor in Washington, D.C., and returned home to California prior to the April recess for several more sessions with physicians before informing House Democratic leaders Friday that she is suffering from cancer.

According to Millender-McDonald's chief of staff, Bandele McQueen, the Congresswoman, who has closely guarded information regarding her health over the years, has not even told her Capitol Hill staff what type of cancer she is suffering from or how aggressive it might be.

"We appreciate the concerns folks have for the Congresswoman, but at this point we don't have any more information on the type of cancer or the type of treatment," McQueen said.

Millender-McDonald's official leave of absence, granted by Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md.), extends through May 25.

"She's not going into the office this week or anything, but by being in the district she will have the ability, whether it's working from home or going into the office, to continue to conduct the business of the 37th," said McQueen. "But right now the main focus is making sure that she's well. Hence she's asked for this leave of absence. ... She is hoping to return as soon as possible."

However, McQueen added, "I would be lying to you if my concern is her return to Congress. My concern is her return to good health."

He added that Millender-McDonald has medical staff attending to her at home on an hourly basis, but he dismissed rumors that it was any kind of hospice situation.

On Wednesday, Millender-McDonald was elected, in absentia, to serve as vice chairwoman of the Joint Committee on the Library at the panel's organizational hearing.

During that session, several Members on both sides of the aisle expressed their sympathy and wishes for a speedy recovery, including Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), the newly elected chairwoman of the Library of Congress panel.

Immediately afterward, the Joint Committee on Printing held its organizational hearing, in which House Administration Vice Chairman Robert Brady (D-Calif.) was elected chairman of the joint panel (Feinstein will serve as his vice chairwoman). While the Printing gavel has in the past fallen to the chairman of the House Administration Committee, the decision that Brady would run the committee in the 110th Congress was made with input from the Democratic leadership well before Millender-McDonald announced her illness, according to Brady's chief of staff.

Meanwhile Brady will be leading the House Administration Committee during Millender-McDonald's absence, although he stressed on Wednesday that "I'm just keeping things warm until the lady comes back."

But while giving his remarks at the joint committee's meeting, House Administration ranking member Vernon Ehlers (R-Mich.) – who also is serving on both joint panels and led the Library committee in the 109th Congress – jokingly referred to Brady as "Mr. Mayor" in reference to his ongoing campaign for mayor of Philadelphia.

The primary for that election will be held more than a week before Millender-McDonald is due to return from her leave of absence.

When asked about the joke after the hearing, Ehlers simply noted that Brady will have "a very busy life" chairing the committee while seeking another office.

"But," he added, "it's Speaker [Nancy] Pelosi's (D-Calif.) appointment and he's going to have to decide if
he wants to do it" while he's actively campaigning.

But even prior to this week's news about Millender-McDonald's illness, Republican committee staff have raised concerns about the panel's inaction in certain areas of jurisdiction including the Capitol Visitor Center project and Smithsonian Institution. Meanwhile, other House and Senate committees have been holding hearings on those subjects.

Earlier this month, Ehlers wrote a letter to Millender-McDonald criticizing Democratic leaders for not yet appointing Members to serve on the Franking Commission, which oversees House lawmakers' official mail. Ehlers pointed to a rise in unsolicited e-mail as "evidence of the toll that a lack of oversight has taken."

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Ms. Bertelson and Mr. Horrigan,
Thank you so much for speaking with me. Here's information about the vote fraud/voter intimidation project:

The vote fraud and voter intimidation project began in Sept. 2004. As I said, the statement that this project had been five years in the making is incorrect -- that predates the creation of the EAC. Commissioners were appointed in Dec. 2003, and the agency's first year of operations was 2004 with a $1.2 million operating budget.

Also, any assertion that the administration edited the final report, Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Further Study, is absolutely false. And just to be clear, at no point in this process did the administration play any role at any time during the life of this project. As we discussed, EAC contracted with two consultants to do two things: define "vote fraud" and "voter intimidation" and provide recommendations for future study based on their review of court cases, literature and interviews with 24 people who have experience in these areas. On page 24 of the final report, there are links to appendices which contain the consultants' bios, as well as interview summaries, and all of the court cases and literature they reviewed. EAC advisory boards were briefed on this project at a public meeting in May 2006.

EAC staff reviewed every article, every court case and every interview for accuracy, as we have a responsibility to do. This review process was conducted within the agency by EAC staff. After the staff reviewed the document and edited it for accuracy, added information reflecting which recommendations the commission should adopt, it presented its recommended report to the commission. The commission adopted the final report at a public meeting in December 2006. This meeting was also webcast.

Since the adoption of the final report, the Commission's actions have been questioned by Members of Congress, the media and others. Yesterday, EAC Chair Donetta Davidson requested that the inspector general conduct a review surrounding the circumstances of this project and the voter ID research project. Go here to read the Commission's statement, the memo to the IG and the letters we've received from Congress.

Criticism is fair and healthy. However, I request that criticism be based on facts. It is not factual to state that it took five years to complete this project. And it is not factual to state that the administration played any role -- editing or otherwise -- in this project.

I request a correction that clarifies both of the above points. Also, I think it would be fair to point out that the chair has asked the IG to look into the process. You could link to the IG memo and let readers see our point of view, and the point of view of those who are critical of EAC decisions.

I thank both of you for your consideration in this matter. And again, let me reiterate the fair and professional treatment EAC has received from the reporters in the DC bureau. We look forward to answering any questions the editorial board or the news side of your organization has about EAC or its decisions or actions. Please don't hesitate to call me if I can be of assistance in the future.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
I'll check on the status of the response and I'll let them know about the hearing. Thanks again...

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----
From: "Ambrogi, Adam (Rules)" [Adam_Ambrogi@rules.senate.gov]
Sent: 04/16/2007 05:54 PM AST
To: Jeannie Layson
Subject: RE: Donetta requests IG review

Thanks, Jeannie— I appreciate the 'head's up.' I had heard that from Bryan's list serve a couple of minutes before your email. I will make sure that Howard has seen the release and memo. I will forward it to Senator Durbin's Appropriations staff as well. When you have an estimated timeline for the Commission's projected response to Sens. Durbin and Feinstein, please let me know.

Also- I've been asked to let you all know that Chairman Feinstein has set a tentative date of June 13th for a hearing on the Election Assistance Commission. Beyond the tentative date—there are no other details.

I hope that you're doing ok— drop me a line or call if there's anything else that's new.

Best,
Adam

Adam D. Ambrogi
Counsel
Senate Committee on Rules and Administration
Russell Senate Office Building, Room 325B
Washington, D.C. 20510
202-224-0279

Just wanted to make sure you knew that Donetta has requested that the IG review the circumstances surrounding the voter ID and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research projects. Info is attached. Let me know if you have questions or need more info... Howard Gantman is on our distribution list, so he should have received this as well.
Hope all is well with you...

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
I figured...

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
"Hicks, Thomas" <Thomas.Hicks@mail.house.gov>

too late.:)

Thomas Hicks, JD
Committee on House Administration
1309 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6167
202-225-2061 (phone)
202-225-7664 (fax)

From: jlayson@eac.gov [mailto:jlayson@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2007 3:57 PM
To: Hicks, Thomas
Subject: FYI

Just wanted to give you a heads up that Donetta requested the IG review circumstances surrounding voter ID and vote fraud & intimidation projects.

Go here for more info.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
EAC Requests Review of Voter ID, Vote Fraud and Voter Intimidation Research Projects

WASHINGTON - U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Chair Donetta Davidson today issued a formal request to the commission's inspector general to conduct a review of the commission's contracting procedures, including a review of two recent projects focusing on voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation. The chair's memo to the inspector general is attached (to view the memo and attachments, click here).

"The actions taken by the commission regarding these research projects have been challenged, and the commissioners and I agree that it is appropriate and necessary to ask the inspector general to review this matter," said EAC Chair Davidson.

Chair Davidson has requested that the inspector general specifically review the circumstances surrounding the issuance and management of the voter identification research project and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research project.

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering
The IG’s request contains the following information, which is what was in the earlier version of the press release.

This report was the culmination of research conducted by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov, who were tasked with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the consultants were responsible for “creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and working group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort.”

---

What language did we use in the request to our IG?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

---

Original Message

From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 04/16/2007 12:01 PM EDT
To: Caroline Hunter
Cc: Donetta Davidson; Gracia Hillman; Juliet Hodgkins; Rosemary Rodriguez; Thomas Wilkey
Subject: Re: IG Press Release
payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary E. Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

###
Sorry bout that... is this sentence acceptable to everyone? It's the last sentence in the fifth paragraph. Revised press release is attached.

"EAC staff reviewed the consultants’ material, and found inconsistencies in their conclusions and the data they submitted. The material in the final report was motivated by a responsibility, especially as a federal agency, to issue findings only when they are supported by data that can enable EAC to firmly defend its conclusions."

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
chunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

I was referring to the fraud study and why we did not release the contractor's report

To Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV
cc Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV@EAC, ghillman@eac.gov, Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subj Re: IG Press Release
It's in there... first sentence in the fourth paragraph: "Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions."

Please let me know if that is sufficient.

Jeannie Layson  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 202-566-3100  
www.eac.gov

Caroline C. Hunter  
Commissioner  
Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3107  
chunter@eac.gov  
www.eac.gov
Commissioners,
Per the chair's request, I have drafted the following press release to communicate the commission's decision to ask the IG to review our contract procedures. Please let me know if this is okay with all of you. I would like this to go out ASAP, so if you could get back to me with any comments before noon, I would appreciate it. Sorry for the short turnaround, but I think circumstances demand that this get out immediately. Thank you.

After you give me the okay on the press release, I will send everything to staff before releasing it.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Since it's Donetta's statement, I think she should have her consent is important. I don't see a need to defend our actions in this release but simply to announce that we have asked the IG to take a look.

---

Rosemary E. Rodriguez  
Commissioner  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: 202-566-3104  
Facsimile: 202-566-3127  
www.eac.gov  
rrodriguez@eac.gov

---

Sorry bout that... is this sentence acceptable to everyone? It's the last sentence in the fifth paragraph. Revised press release is attached.

"EAC staff reviewed the consultants' material, and found inconsistencies in their conclusions and the data they submitted. The material in the final report was motivated by a responsibility, especially as a federal agency, to issue findings only when they are supported by data that can enable EAC to firmly defend its conclusions."

---

EAC IGRequest 04-16-07FINAL.doc  
Jeannie Layson  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 202-566-3100  
www.eac.gov  
Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV
I was referring to the fraud study and why we did not release the contractor's report.

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
chunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
04/16/2007 11:33 AM

To Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC

It's in there... first sentence in the fourth paragraph: "Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions."

Please let me know if that is sufficient.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV

Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV
04/16/2007 11:28 AM

To Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV@EAC

cc Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV@EAC, ghillman@eac.gov,
Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E.
Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R.
Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
Could we pls add a sentence about why we did not adopt the fraud report - ie- had conclusions that were not supported by the underlying research.

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
hunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

Jeannie Layson /EAC/GOV
04/16/2007 11:13 AM

To Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV, ghillman@eac.gov, Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC, Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC

Commissioners,
Per the chair’s request, I have drafted the following press release to communicate the commission’s decision to ask the IG to review our contract procedures. Please let me know if this is okay with all of you. I would like this to go out ASAP, so if you could get back to me with any comments before noon, I would appreciate it. Sorry for the short turnaround, but I think circumstances demand that this get out immediately. Thank you.

After you give me the okay on the press release, I will send everything to staff before releasing it.

EAC IGRequest 04-16-07.doc

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
EAC Requests Review of Voter ID, Vote Fraud and Voter Intimidation Research Projects

For Immediate Release
April 16, 2007

WASHINGTON – U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Chair Donetta Davidson today issued a formal request to the commission’s inspector general to conduct a review of the commission’s contracting procedures, including a review of two recent projects focusing on voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation. The chair’s memo to the inspector general is attached.

“The actions taken by the commission regarding these research projects have been challenged, and the commissioners and I agree that it is appropriate and necessary to ask the inspector general to review this matter,” said EAC Chair Davidson.

Chair Davidson has requested that the inspector general specifically review the circumstances surrounding the issuance and management of the voter identification research project and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research project.

Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions. The commission declined to adopt the report, but released all of the data to the public. The report and the research, conducted by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics, are available at www.eac.gov.

At a public meeting in December 2006, the commission adopted Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Further Study, available at www.eac.gov. This report was the culmination of research conducted by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov, who were tasked with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the consultants were responsible for “creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and working group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort.” EAC staff reviewed the consultants’ material, and found inconsistencies in their conclusions and the data they submitted. The material in the final report was motivated by a responsibility, especially as a federal agency, to issue findings only when they are supported by data that can enable EAC to firmly defend its conclusions.

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.
I was referring to the fraud study and why we did not release the contractor's report.

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
chunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

Jeannie Layson /EAC/GOV
04/16/2007 11:33 AM

It's in there... first sentence in the fourth paragraph: "Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions."

Please let me know if that is sufficient.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV

Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV
04/16/2007 11:28 AM
Could we pls add a sentence about why we did not adopt the fraud report - ie- had conclusions that were not supported by the underlying research.

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
chunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Jeannie Layson /EAC/GOV

Jeannie Layson /EAC/GOV
04/16/2007 11:13 AM
To Donetta L. Davidson /EAC/GOV, ghillman@eac.gov, Caroline C. Hunter /EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez /EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Thomas R. Wilkey /EAC/GOV@EAC, Juliet E. Hodgkins /EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject IG Press Release

Commissioners,
Per the chair's request, I have drafted the following press release to communicate the commission's decision to ask the IG to review our contract procedures. Please let me know if this is okay with all of you. I would like this to go out ASAP, so if you could get back to me with any comments before noon, I would appreciate it. Sorry for the short turnaround, but I think circumstances demand that this get out immediately. Thank you.

After you give me the okay on the press release, I will send everything to staff before releasing it.

EAC IGRequest 04-16-07.doc

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
EAC Requests Review of Voter ID, Vote Fraud and Voter Intimidation Research Projects

For Immediate Release
April 16, 2007

WASHINGTON – U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Chair Donetta Davidson today issued a formal request to the commission’s inspector general to conduct a review of the commission’s contracting procedures, including a review of two recent projects focusing on voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation. The chair’s memo to the inspector general is attached.

“The actions taken by the commission regarding these research projects have been challenged, and the commissioners and I agree that it is appropriate and necessary to ask the inspector general to review this matter,” said EAC Chair Davidson.

Chair Davidson has requested that the inspector general specifically review the circumstances surrounding the issuance and management of the voter identification research project and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research project.

Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions. The commission declined to adopt the report, but released all of the data to the public. The report and the research, conducted by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics, are available at www.eac.gov.

At a public meeting in December 2006, the commission adopted Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Further Study, available at www.eac.gov. This report was the culmination of research conducted by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov, who were tasked with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the consultants were responsible for “creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and working group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort.”

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

###

Deliberative Process Privilege
Commissioners,
Per the chair's request, I have drafted the following press release to communicate the commission's decision to ask the IG to review our contract procedures. Please let me know if this is okay with all of you. I would like this to go out ASAP, so if you could get back to me with any comments before noon, I would appreciate it. Sorry for the short turnaround, but I think circumstances demand that this get out immediately. Thank you.

After you give me the okay on the press release, I will send everything to staff before releasing it.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
EAC Requests Review of Voter ID, Vote Fraud and Voter Intimidation Research Projects

For Immediate Release
April 16, 2007

WASHINGTON – U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Chair Donetta Davidson today issued a formal request to the commission’s inspector general to conduct a review of the commission’s contracting procedures, including a review of two recent projects focusing on voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation. The chair’s memo to the inspector general is attached.

“The actions taken by the commission regarding these research projects have been challenged, and the commissioners and I agree that it is appropriate and necessary to ask the inspector general to review this matter,” said EAC Chair Davidson.

Chair Davidson has requested that the inspector general specifically review the circumstances surrounding the issuance and management of the voter identification research project and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research project.

Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions. The commission declined to adopt the report, but released all of the data to the public. The report and the research, conducted by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics, are available at www.eac.gov.

At a public meeting in December 2006, the commission adopted Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Further Study, available at www.eac.gov. This report was the culmination of research conducted by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov, who were tasked with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the consultants were responsible for “creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and working group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort.”

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

###

Deliberative Process Privilege 013959
Commissioners,

The chair has asked me to provide you with the memo she just submitted to Curtis Crider, requesting a review of our contracting procedures surrounding the voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation research projects. She has asked me to write a press release about this decision, which I will send to you shortly. She requests that we incorporate the commission's request into the letter to the advisory boards and to Congresswoman Lofgren. She also requests that we respond to Sen. Feinstein's letter, letting her know that we are working to comply with her request, but we wanted to alert her to the action we've taken.

I am going to circulate this to the staff so everyone will be aware of this action. Please let me know if you have any questions, and I will have a press release for your review shortly. Attached to the press release will be this memo, letters from Members of Congress regarding this issue, and the recent statements from Congressmen Hinchey and Serrano.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
April 16, 2007

MEMORANDUM

To: EAC Inspector General Curtis Crider
Fr: EAC Chair Donetta Davidson
Cc: Commissioners Rodriguez, Hillman and Hunter, Tom Wilkey, and Julie Hodgkins
RE: EAC requests review of contracting procedures

On Friday, April 13, each of my three colleagues -- Rosemary Rodriguez, Gracia Hillman, and Caroline Hunter -- agreed with my recommendation that we issue the following formal request to the Commission’s Office of Inspector General to review the circumstances surrounding two recent EAC research projects -- vote fraud and voter intimidation and voter identification.

Background
The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) is an independent, bipartisan Commission created by the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002.

EAC develops guidance to meet HAVA requirements, adopts voluntary voting system guidelines, accredits voting system test laboratories, certifies voting systems and audits the use of HAVA funds. HAVA also directs EAC to maintain the national mail voter registration form developed in accordance with the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) of 1993.

The Commission serves as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. It is under the Commission’s clearinghouse role that research projects are conducted with the goal of providing information that will lead to improvements in election administration, as well as inform the public about how, where and when we vote.

The voter identification research was conducted by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics ("Contractor"). The contract, awarded in May 2005, required the Contractor to perform a review and legal analysis of state legislation, administrative procedures and court cases, and to perform a literature review on other research and data available on the topic of voter identification requirements. Further, the Contractor was asked to analyze the problems and challenges of voter identification, to hypothesize alternative approaches and to recommend various policies that could be applied to these approaches. Last month, the commission voted
unanimously not to adopt the report, citing concerns with its methodology, but voted to release all of the data provided by the Contractor.

The vote fraud and voter intimidation research was conducted by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov ("Consultants"). The contracts, awarded in September 2005, issued to these Consultants tasked them with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the Consultants were responsible for "creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and Working Group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort."

**Review Request**
The actions taken by the Commission regarding both the voter identification and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research projects have been challenged. Specifically, Members of Congress, the media, and the public have suggested that political motivations may have been part of the Commission’s decision making process regarding these two projects. Also, the Commission has been criticized for the amount of taxpayer dollars that were spent on these two projects, as well as how efficiently these projects were managed.

The Commission takes these allegations very seriously, and we request that you fully review the following issues and provide the Commission and the Congress with a report of your findings as soon as possible. The Commission stands ready to assist you in these efforts and will provide whatever information, including memos, emails and other documents you will need. Cooperating with your review will be the staff’s top priority.

1. Current Commission policy regarding awarding and managing research contracts.
2. Issuance and management of the vote fraud and voter intimidation contract.
3. Circumstances surrounding the receipt of information from Consultants regarding the vote fraud and voter intimidation project.
4. Circumstances surrounding staff efforts to write a final report for Commission consideration.
5. Identification of staff members who assisted in the editing and collaboration of the final vote fraud and voter intimidation report for Commission consideration.
6. Staff and/or Commissioner collaboration with political entities or other federal agencies regarding the vote fraud and voter intimidation project.
7. Circumstances surrounding Commission discussion and deliberation of final adoption of *Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendation for Further Study*.
8. Issuance and management of the voter identification contract.
9. Circumstances surrounding the receipt of information from Contractor regarding the voter identification report.
10. Identification of staff members who assisted in the editing, collaboration, and recommendation to the Commission regarding final adoption of the voter identification report.
11. Staff and/or Commissioner collaboration with political entities or other federal agencies regarding the voter identification project.

12. Circumstances surrounding Commission deliberation whether to adopt a final voter identification report.

For your information, I have attached statements and related correspondence from Members of Congress, and a statement issued by the Commission regarding the criticism.

It is our hope that your findings will instruct us how to move forward in a more efficient, effective and transparent manner. The Commission takes its mandates under HAVA very seriously, and this small Commission has an enormous amount of work to conduct, including testing and certifying voting equipment, providing guidance and assistance to election officials, and auditing the proper use of the $3.1 billion that was distributed under HAVA.

We look forward to your findings so that we may take the actions necessary to improve the way we conceive research projects, manage research contracts, and make decisions regarding the final release of data provided to the Commission from a third party.
Hello everyone,
I'm sure you have read the article in today's NYT about the voter fraud report this agency issued. Today, Congressmen Hinchey and Serrano have issued the following statement. Very shortly, EAC will post and distribute the attached statement to articulate our role and approach to conducting research and the steps we will take to improve our process. Please let me know if you have any questions about this, as I am sure we will all receive phone calls today about this issue. You may also direct people with questions to the statement that will be on the website. I will keep everyone informed as this situation evolves.


For Immediate Release
April 11, 2007

Hinchey, Serrano Urge Non-Partisanship, Greater Transparency at Election Assistance Commission

Washington, DC - Today, Congressmen Maurice Hinchey (NY-22) and José E. Serrano (NY-16) urged the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to act with greater transparency and without partisanship. The comments from the congressmen came as the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government released a draft version of an EAC report on voter fraud and intimidation that shows significant changes were made to the findings of outside experts before the final report was released.

"The EAC has an obligation to be forthright with the American people and operate transparently and in a non-partisan manner," said Congressman Hinchey, who requested the draft report from EAC Commissioner Donetta L Davidson during subcommittee hearing last month. "The draft report was commissioned with taxpayer dollars upon a mandate from Congress so that we could learn more about voter fraud and intimidation. The need for this report is even more clear when we see the way in which the Bush administration is carrying out the electoral process and how this system is sliding towards corruption. In hiding a draft report from the public that is significantly different from the final version, the EAC has created a lot more questions than it has answered while stunting debate on the issue. In order for our democracy to function properly it is essential that our elections are free of any corruption and that includes ensuring that the EAC does not work to benefit one political party over the other. To achieve that goal we must have all the facts and opinions on the table not just..."
some of them. The EAC must never limit discussion and debate."

"The EAC is charged with helping to ensure our elections are trustworthy and administered fairly," said Congressman Serrano, who is Chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee that oversees the EAC budget. "I’m concerned if changes were made to the report on voter fraud because of partisan bias rather than impartial analysis. When you read the draft report side-by-side with the final version, it is clear that important conclusions of the experts who wrote the draft report were excluded from the final product. Among the excluded information is an analysis that undermines the notion that voter fraud is rampant.

"I am concerned that the EAC did not publicly release the taxpayer-funded draft report, and I worry that political considerations may have played a role. We cannot have a politicized EAC, or one that yields to outside pressure. Our democracy, and the American people’s faith in it, is far more important than a short-term political advantage."

The draft report was written by outside experts under contract with the EAC. The final report was entitled "Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study" and was issued on December 7, 2006.

The EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by the 2002 Help America Vote Act in order to disburse funds to the states for the purchase of voting systems, certify voting technologies, develop guidelines and serve as an information resource for election administration.
EAC Statement Regarding Research and Contracting Policies

Commission to Review Internal Procedures

For Immediate Release
April 11, 2007

WASHINGTON — The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) directs the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to serve as a national clearinghouse and resource by, among other things, conducting studies with the goal of improving the administration of federal elections. To fulfill this mandate, the EAC has entered into contracts with a variety of persons and entities. Reports adopted by the EAC, a bipartisan federal entity, are likely to be cited as authoritative in public discourse. Prior to the EAC's adopting a report submitted by a contractor, the EAC has the responsibility to ensure its accuracy and to verify that conclusions are supported by the underlying research.

The Commission takes input and constructive criticism from Congress and the public very seriously. We will take a hard look at the way we do business. Specifically, we will examine both the manner in which we have awarded contracts and our decision-making process regarding the release of research and reports. The EAC takes its mandates very seriously, and we will continue to move forward in a bipartisan way to improve the way America votes.

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

###
Laura,

The fraud and intimidation research contract was for $147,106, and the voter ID and provisional voting research contract was $560,002. Voter ID was only part of the contract. It also tasked Eagleton to provide information about provisional voting practices. In Oct. 2006, the Commission issued provisional voting best practices.

Please let me know if you need anything else, and I'll send you the statement as soon as it's ready to go.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
I would very much like to explore the possibility of reconsidering the decision to release the Fraud Report. How can I get this on our agenda?

Rosemary E. Rodriguez
Commissioner
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-566-3104
Facsimile: 202-566-3127
www.eac.gov
rrodriguez@eac.gov

Despite requests, the Election Assistance Commission is refusing to release a report written months ago that reportedly pokes holes in the widespread myth that voter fraud is rampant in America. EAC Chairman Paul S. DeGregorio Thursday denied a request by People For the American Way Foundation (PFAWF) to make the taxpayer-funded findings available to the public in time for the November elections, now less than three weeks away. PFAWF President Ralph G. Neas said the information should be released immediately and questions whether the report is being suppressed for political reasons.

The existence of the report was revealed days ago by USA Today, which reported that instances in which non-eligible persons attempt to pass themselves off as voters and somehow cast fraudulent votes are exceedingly rare. PFAWF’s sister advocacy organization, People For the American Way, has launched a petition drive asking the commissioners to release the report, since it will refute rampant allegations of voter fraud which have led to restrictive voting requirements.

“As we approach the elections, the last thing election officials need is to labor under the false impression that ineligible people are trying to pass themselves off as qualified voters at the polls. They should be focusing on ways to keep the path to the ballot box clear for as many eligible voters as possible, instead of looking for nonexistent fraud that will slow down the process and possibly even discourage eligible voters,” said PFAW President Ralph G. Neas. “We need to raise confidence in our elections process, not allow harmful myths to stand – especially when the government has findings available to refute them.”

Neas sent a letter on behalf of PFAW Foundation to the EAC earlier this week asking that the report be made available to the public, but on Thursday the EAC denied the request. The report was written by by Tova Wang, an elections scholar at the Century Foundation think tank, and Job Serebrov, an Arkansas attorney, and has been in the hands of the EAC commissioners for more
than four months.

Neas said the report has critical implications for election legislation around the country. During the past few years, a number of states have passed legislation to combat supposed “voter fraud” through overly restrictive identification requirements and other impediments to the ballot box. According to USA Today, the report found such voter fraud to be exceedingly rare.

“We have plenty of problems to deal with. We’ve all seen long lines, unreliable voting equipment, purges that wrongly remove eligible voters from the roll. It turns out the problem is not that bad people are trying to vote, but that too many qualified voters are discouraged from voting. This report apparently confirms what common sense has told us for years – we need to make it easier for eligible voters to cast a vote that counts, not harder,’ said Neas. “Instead of fighting nonexistent fraud, these restrictive new laws will discourage voters – people like senior citizens, students and disabled voters who may not have drivers’ licenses or other forms of ID required by these new laws. That’s just wrong, and is clearly not supported by the evidence.”

Neas said the new laws are often politically motivated. The misleadingly-named right-wing group the American Center for Voting Rights has supported extremely restrictive laws by pointing to supposed voting fraud.

“Any law that disadvantages certain groups of voters – like senior citizens and students – should be suspect. If the voters are disadvantaged, which political parties and candidates stand to gain? The same question should be asked about the reason the release of this report has been delayed. Is there a political motivation?” he asked. “Has this study been buried because anti-voter activists like the American Center for Voting Rights find its conclusions inconvenient? That’s unacceptable. The Commissioners of the EAC have had this report for months, even as they have testified before Congress on critical legislation that could have been informed by the report’s findings. It’s unconscionable.”

Laws passed in several states this year raise barriers to the ballot box that would prevent poor, elderly, and minority voters from casting a ballot. PFAW’s sister organization, People For the American Way Foundation, has challenged laws in Ohio, Missouri, and Arizona; in all three, the laws were either struck down or stayed until after the November election. Yet restrictions still in effect in a number of states could harm voters. One such provision, stringent ID requirement, has been likened to a modern day poll tax.
Said Neas, “All American citizens have a vested interest in having fair and open elections. This report contains valuable information that can help us do that. The EAC should release the report immediately, no matter what the political implications may be and hold public hearings to discuss the findings.”


Laura Strickler, Producer  
*CBS Evening News, Washington*  
Office: 202-457-1597  
Blackberry: 646-460-6175  
Fax: 202-457-1577  
Cell: 917-499-6459  
stricklerl@cbsnews.com
On the money as far as I am concerned

Need you to let me know if this response is okay ASAP:

EAC staff presented a status report about this research project to our advisory boards at a public meeting in May. Since then, we've received a draft from the consultants and EAC staff is currently reviewing the data to ensure it is accurate and complete. After we've completed this process, we'll release a final report.
Hey Jeannie - thanks for all of your help yesterday -
got any response/thoughts on this?
Thanks

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
CONTACT: Drew Courtney or Josh Glasstetter
October 20, 2006
at 202-467-4999 / media@pfaw.org


Despite requests, the Election Assistance Commission is refusing to release a report written months ago that reportedly pokes holes in the widespread myth that voter fraud is rampant in America. EAC Chairman Paul S. DeGregorio Thursday denied a request by People For the American Way Foundation (PFAWF) to make the taxpayer-funded findings available to the public in time for the November elections, now less than three weeks away. PFAWF President Ralph G. Neas said the information should be released immediately and questions whether the report is being suppressed for political reasons.

The existence of the report was revealed days ago by USA Today, which reported that instances in which non-eligible persons attempt to pass themselves off as voters and somehow cast fraudulent votes are exceedingly rare. PFAWF’s sister advocacy organization, People For the American Way, has launched a petition drive asking the commissioners to release the report, since it will refute rampant allegations of voter fraud which have led to restrictive voting requirements.

“As we approach the elections, the last thing election officials need is to labor under the false
impression that ineligible people are trying to pass themselves off as qualified voters at the polls. They should be focusing on ways to keep the path to the ballot box clear for as many eligible voters as possible, instead of looking for nonexistent fraud that will slow down the process and possibly even discourage eligible voters,” said PFAW President Ralph G. Neas. “We need to raise confidence in our elections process, not allow harmful myths to stand – especially when the government has findings available to refute them.”

Neas sent a letter on behalf of PFAW Foundation to the EAC earlier this week asking that the report be made available to the public, but on Thursday the EAC denied the request. The report was written by by Tova Wang, an elections scholar at the Century Foundation think tank, and Job Serebrov, an Arkansas attorney, and has been in the hands of the EAC commissioners for more than four months.

Neas said the report has critical implications for election legislation around the country. During the past few years, a number of states have passed legislation to combat supposed “voter fraud” through overly restrictive identification requirements and other impediments to the ballot box. According to USA Today, the report found such voter fraud to be exceedingly rare.

“We have plenty of problems to deal with. We’ve all seen long lines, unreliable voting equipment, purges that wrongly remove eligible voters from the roll. It turns out the problem is not that bad people are trying to vote, but that too many qualified voters are discouraged from voting. This report apparently confirms what common sense has told us for years – we need to make it easier for eligible voters to cast a vote that counts, not harder,” said Neas. “Instead of fighting nonexistent fraud, these restrictive new laws will discourage voters – people like senior citizens, students and disabled voters who may not have drivers’ licenses or other forms of ID required by these new laws. That’s just wrong, and is clearly not supported by the evidence.”

Neas said the new laws are often politically motivated. The misleadingly-named right-wing group the American Center for Voting Rights has supported extremely restrictive laws by pointing to supposed voting fraud.

“Any law that disadvantages certain groups of voters – like senior citizens and students – should be suspect. If the voters are disadvantaged, which political parties and candidates stand to gain? The same question should be asked about the reason the release of this report has been delayed. Is there a political motivation?” he asked. “Has this study been buried because anti-voter
activists like the American Center for Voting Rights find its conclusions inconvenient? That’s unacceptable. The Commissioners of the EAC have had this report for months, even as they have testified before Congress on critical legislation that could have been informed by the report’s findings. It’s unconscionable.”

Laws passed in several states this year raise barriers to the ballot box that would prevent poor, elderly, and minority voters from casting a ballot. PFAW’s sister organization, People For the American Way Foundation, has challenged laws in Ohio, Missouri, and Arizona; in all three, the laws were either struck down or stayed until after the November election. Yet restrictions still in effect in a number of states could harm voters. One such provision, stringent ID requirement, has been likened to a modern day poll tax.

Said Neas, “All American citizens have a vested interest in having fair and open elections. This report contains valuable information that can help us do that. The EAC should release the report immediately, no matter what the political implications may be and hold public hearings to discuss the findings.”


Laura Strickler, Producer
CBS Evening News, Washington
Office: 202-457-1597
Blackberry: 646-460-6175
Fax: 202-457-1577
Cell: 917-499-6459
stricklerl@cbsnews.com
Bryan,

This article slamming the EAC ran in a major Washington newspaper on Tuesday (the link is http://www.spokesmanreview.com/opinion/story.asp?ID=156039, and the text is included below). All I've heard about the report is what USA Today mentioned, plus Tom Wilkey told me that the report is currently being worked on for a near-future release.

I'm planning to respond to this article on the issue of whether voter fraud is widespread, and wanted to also defend the EAC's actions, which I think were wise. It sounds like the news editors just conjectured what happened, as they indicated no attempt to find out for sure why the report was withheld.

In responding to them, it would be nice to have your side of the story to help me accurately explain what happened. Can you give me any comments on why the report was held? Was it because the EAC was trying to help those who are "peddling suspicions of voter fraud"?

Any thoughts you have would be helpful.

Cordially,

Jonathan

Jonathan Bechtle, J.D.
Director, Voter Integrity Project
Evergreen Freedom Foundation
(360) 956-3482
www.effwa.org

"...because freedom matters!"
Editorial

Our view: Fraudulent fears
Shame on hiding report finding low voter fraud

October 24, 2006

Proponents of stringent election laws designed to stop fraud surely don't want to hear that there's little evidence of chicanery. That's probably why the results of a federal study on the matter, which was delivered in May, were kept quiet.

Many states have adopted restrictions on voter registration and polling place practices, and the U.S. House of Representatives passed a photo-identification bill aimed at poll-site voting. The Senate is expected to take up the issue next year.

The premise behind all of this legislation is that fraud is widespread. But the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, which was established by Congress to ensure voting integrity, commissioned a study that questions that assumption. USA Today obtained the study four months after its completion and recently reported on the findings:

"There is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling-place fraud, or at least much less than is claimed, including voter impersonation, 'dead' voters, non-citizen voting and felon voters."

That's an awfully inconvenient summation for those who back stricter voting laws and consistently assert that there's rampant fraud while providing scant proof.

Voter fraud is a highly politicized issue. The congressional bill on photo IDs drew the support of 98 percent of Republicans and the opposition of 98 percent of Democrats. And voters in Washington state lived through the partisan wrangling after the razor-thin victory by Chris Gregoire in the 2004 gubernatorial election, when mistakes were quickly relabeled "fraud."

When a favorite candidate loses a close race, partisans attack the system of voting. It happened in Florida in 2000 and in Washington state in 2004. What's interesting about the federal commission's study is that it points to the system that most reforms would not touch as having the highest potential for fraud.

Absentee balloting is more susceptible to manipulation, the report states, via coercion and forgery. But it's polling places that have been placed under heavy scrutiny by reformers.
The lack of focus on mail-in balloting is probably a political calculation, because it's popular. Most counties in Washington state have moved to that system.

Politicians can get more mileage hyping the possibility of votes by illegal immigrants and felons, but their solutions can serve to discourage voting by honest citizens.

Unfortunately, the federal commission has played into the hands of those peddling suspicions by choosing not to release its report to the public.

The public deserves to know what is happening with its election systems as it weighs the merit of various reform proposals. But a commission that was formed to zero in on real problems has undermined its credibility by sitting on a report that highlights them.
tom,
who should get these emails? There's a petition out there, asking us to release the fraud report, so someone needs to be the point person on these.


Joyce Wilson /EAC/GOV
10/23/2006 11:47 AM
To Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Fw: EAC Commissioned Report on Voter Fraud

Jeannie, please respond, if appropriate or forward to proper person. If not you, please let me know the person that would handle responding to such inquiries. Thanks!

Joyce H. Wilson
Staff Assistant
US Election Assistance Commission
202-566-3100 (office)
202-566-3128 (fax)


"Mike Marsolek"
10/20/2006 04:58 PM
To HAVAinfo@eac.gov
cc
Subject EAC Commissioned Report on Voter Fraud

Honorable EAC Commissioners,

I ask you to release the EAC commissioned report on voting fraud. Regardless of political persuasion, voting is the bedrock upon which our representative democracy is built. Because of this your responsibilities are great. Currently there has been a rush of litigation intended to protect against voter fraud. There are real concerns that these protections will decrease voter turnout, and likely decrease turnout disproportionately in minority groups. This will obviously affect the parties differently, thereby creating a tense environment and adding to the strife in our society today. It is important, you can not disagree, that any laws regulating voting practices are only created and passed with honorable intentions, since if the voting process itself is compromised the whole of our representative democracy is as well.

I respect you are in difficult circumstances, but it is better for the country to know the results of
an objective report than to be litigated under subjective pretenses and in a disenfranchising manner. All people in this country who are citizens deserve to vote, and this report can help ensure that they continue to have that right free of trappings whose intentions are not true. Thank you for your work and time.

Sincerely,
Dr. Michael D. Marsolek
Dear Mr. Whitener:

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me this morning. As you know, I was calling to request a copy of the complete report regarding voter fraud written by Tova Wang and Job Serebov. I am sending this in accordance with your request that I email our request for a copy of that report to you and that I "cc" Ms. Layson on the email.

I'd very much appreciate obtaining a copy of this report today. In the event that you can send it electronically or fax it, my contact information is below. If not, please let me know when and where I may pick it up.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Judith E. Schaeffer
Deputy Legal Director
People For the American Way Foundation
jschaeffer@pfaw.org.
202-467-2381 (ph.)
202-293-2672 (fax)
Agenda
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this should've been sent by amie early today.

----------
Adam D. Ambrogi
Special Assistant to Commissioner Ray Martinez III
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3105

To Juliet E. Thompson-Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC
c
bcc
Subject Agenda
MEMORANDUM

TO: MEMBERS OF EAC STANDARDS BOARD
FROM: PEGGY NIGHSWONGER, CHAIR, EXECUTIVE BOARD
       RAY MARTINEZ, EAC COMMISSIONER
DATE: APRIL 28, 2006
SUBJECT: UPCOMING MEETING OF STANDARDS BOARD, MAY 23-24, 2006

The next meeting of the EAC Standards Board (to be held jointly with the EAC
Board of Advisors) will be held in Washington, D.C. on Tuesday, May 23 and
Wednesday, May 24, 2006 at the Hamilton Crown Plaza hotel. We hope you will be
able to attend this important meeting, which will focus on consideration and discussion of
a number of ongoing election administration research projects currently underway by the
EAC. Additionally, there will also be an update and discussion regarding recent work
conducted by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) on the voluntary
evoting system guidelines. (Please see the draft agenda attached for additional information.)

As was the case with our previous meetings of the EAC Standards Board, the EAC will
pay the cost of travel, hotel and a Federal per diem for any member of the Standards Board
wishing to attend the May 2006 meeting. Upon receipt of this memorandum, please
contact the EAC's travel agent, Adventure Travel, at (877) 472-6718 to make your travel
arrangements. Additionally, if you have any questions or need assistance in making your
travel plans, please call (email address is
________________________________________). 

Thank you in advance for your willingness to join us in Washington, D.C. We look
forward to seeing you soon.
Tuesday, May 23, 2006

NOON – 1:15 P.M.  LUNCHEON

Brief Welcoming Remarks
Commissioner Ray Martinez III

EAC Staff Presentations:
* Design for Democracy (improvements to ballot design, national voter registration mail-in form and polling place signage) (Karen Lynn-Dyson);
* Legal On-Line Information Clearinghouse (Julie Thompson-Hodgkins);
* Public Access Portals (Edgard Cortes);
* Katrina Voting Assistance Relief (Edgardo Cortes).

1:15 – 1:30 P.M.  BREAK

1:30 – 2:30 P.M.  STANDARDS BOARD PLENARY SESSION
Session Chaired by Peggy Nighswonger
Chair, Executive Board

- Appointment of Parliamentarian
- Adoption of Agenda
- Review of Meeting Book Materials
- Presentation of Proposed Permanent Bylaws
  Kevin Kennedy, Executive Director, State Elections Board, Wisconsin
  Joanne Armbruster, Atlantic County Superintendent of Elections, New Jersey
- Election of Executive Board Vacancy
2:30 – 4:00 P.M. DISCUSSION: DRAFT REPORT ON PROVISIONAL VOTING

Presentors:
Thomas O’Neil: Project Manager, EAC Provisional Vote Study
Edward Foley: Director, Election Law@Moritz (The Ohio State University)
EAC Resource Person: Julie Thompson-Hodgkins

4:00 – 4:15 P.M. BREAK

4:15 – 5:30 P.M. DISCUSSION: DRAFT REPORT ON POLL WORKER RECRUITMENT, TRAINING AND RETENTION (INCLUDING COLLEGE POLL WORKERS)

Presentors:
Jennifer Collins-Foley, EAC Consultant
Dora Rose, Center for Election Integrity, Cleveland State University
EAC Resource Person: Karen Lynn-Dyson

NOTE: Attendees on their own for dinner.

Wednesday, May 24, 2006

8:00 – 8:30 A.M. CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST

8:30 – 9:15 A.M. BRIEFING: PROPOSED MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

Presentors:
Connie Schmidt, EAC Consultant
Brit Williams, EAC Consultant
EAC Resource Person: Brian Hancock

9:15 – 10:00 A.M. BRIEFING: DRAFT REPORT ON VOTE COUNT/RECOUNT

Presentors:
Dr. Thad Hall, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Utah
Doug Chapin, EAC Consultant
EAC Resource Person: Julie Thompson-Hodkins, EAC

10:00 – 10:15 A.M. BREAK

10:30 – 11:00 A.M. DISCUSSION: DRAFT REPORT ON IMPROVING DATA COLLECTION

Presentors:
Karen Lynn-Dyson, Research Director, EAC
Laiza Otero, Research Associate, EAC

11:00 – 11:55 P.M. BRIEFING: DRAFT REPORT ON VOTER FRAUD/VOTER INTIMIDATION
Presentors:
Job Serebrov, Associate, The Nixon Law Firm
Tova Wang, Democracy Fellow, The Century Foundation
EAC Resource Person: Juliet Thompson, EAC General Counsel

NOON – 1:30 P.M. JOINT LUNCHEON
EAC Activities Update
Brief Remarks by: Chairman Paul DeGregorio
Commissioner Gracia Hillman

Presentation: General Update on NIST/TGDC Activities
Introduction of Speakers: Commissioner Donetta Davidson

1:40 – 2:45 P.M. DISCUSSION: DRAFT REPORT ON VOTER IDENTIFICATION
Presentors:
Thomas O'Neil: Project Manager, EAC Voter I.D. Study
Edward Foley, Director, Election Law@Moritz, The Ohio State University
EAC Resource Person: Juliet Thompson-Hodkins

2:45 – 3:00 P.M. BREAK

3:00 – 5:00 P.M. STANDARDS BOARD PLENARY SESSION
Session Chaired by Peggy Nighswonger, Chair, Executive Board
Discussion and consideration of Standards Board business.

5:00 P.M. ADJOURN
I have taken a look at the agendas. My questions start with assignment as resource person. Is Peggy going to be present for the Vote Fraud and Intimidation presentation? I have not been the person refereeing between Job and Tova, nor am I up to date on what their findings and work are. If I am just there to support the meeting, that's great, but Peggy should be there to make any substantive comments. I suffer from a similar problem with regard to the Eagleton presentation (other than what I gathered from their presentation a few weeks ago).

Perhaps what I need to know is what is the "resource person" supposed to do?

As a second question, do we know whether this lunch on Tuesday is "set". The hotel contract will have to be amended to include this lunch. I don't want to move forward on setting that up if it is not approved by the two Boards or it is otherwise not going to occur.

Third issue is that last time the Standards Board wanted a parliamentarian -- not volunteering, but that should be considered in terms of how our staff is assigned.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Amie J. Sherrill/EAC/GOV

Amie J. Sherrill/EAC/GOV
04/25/2006 03:45 PM
To jthompson@eac.gov@EAC, Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
cc
Subject BoA agenda

May 2006 Board of Advisors Agenda.doc
Amie J. Sherrill
Special Assistant to Chairman Paul S. DeGregorio
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566 3106
Julie, in response to your questions:

The first response is that we've placed you as a resource person for only the ID, Provisional ballot, and then your presentation on legal clearinghouse website. So that's changed. The EAC reference person is not supposed to really interact, but be able to respond to the Board if they have questions regarding EAC processes in conducting the research. The panelists should start and lead the discussion. (i.e. for the breakout sessions on VVSG, I only answered procedural questions from the crowd). The ID and PV issues are inherently legal, so we wanted you to be on hand to explain those items.

As to the second issue, I'm copying Ray, because I believe that the lunch has the Executive Board's approval to alter the contract to provide for a lunch. They had requested an earlier start that day, and this is an effort to accommodate that request. If he disagrees, then I can do what is necessary to get approval for that lunch officially.

Third issue, we may need a parliamentarian for the SB, however, that role might be filled by Bill Campbell as the new role of secretary, or as one of the other SB members appointed. Do you believe we need a line in the first plenary session to appoint the parliamentarian? Maybe Gavin's interested? Ray, any thoughts?

Thanks,
Adam

I have taken a look at the agendas. My questions start with assignment as resource person. Is Peggy going to be present for the Vote Fraud and Intimidation presentation? I have not been the person refereeing between Job and Tova, nor am I up to date on what their findings and work are. If I am just there to support the meeting, that's great, but Peggy should be there to make any substantive comments. I suffer from a similar problem with regard to the Eagleton presentation (other than what I gathered from
their presentation a few weeks ago).

Perhaps what I need to know is what is the "resource person" supposed to do?

As a second question, do we know whether this lunch on Tuesday is "set". The hotel contract will have to be amended to include this lunch. I don't want to move forward on setting that up if it is not approved by the two Boards or it is otherwise not going to occur.

Third issue is that last time the Standards Board wanted a parliamentarian -- not volunteering, but that should be considered in terms of how our staff is assigned.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Amie J. Sherrill/EAC/GOV

Amie J. Sherrill/EAC/GOV
04/25/2006 03:45 PM
To jthompson@eac.gov@EAC, Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
cc
Subject BoA agenda
Dear Commissioners:

This is to let you know that the Working Group for our Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation preliminary research project is scheduled to meet in EAC's large conference room the afternoon of Thursday, May 18. I will provide more information about this meeting to you later.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
To help guide our thoughts for those of us working on the 1 PM meeting on what materials will be available for the SB/BOA meeting, I have drawn up a "comment" version of the SB agenda, which indicates, for each agenda item present, what materials will be available, and when. This is a preliminary agenda, and I realize we'll discuss these issues at the meeting today, but I thought it would be better to see this in written form, so we can identify potential problem areas. I'd like to work from this, modify this document, as we make our determinations as when, and in what form we will be providing materials to the Boards.

Again-- you all are the experts as to what stage these projects are at-- so I apologize if there's missing or incomplete information here.

Thanks,
Adam

---

Adam D. Ambrogi
Special Assistant to Commissioner Ray Martinez III
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3105
U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
Standards Board Meeting Agenda
Washington, D.C.
May 23 – 24, 2006

Tuesday, May 23, 2006

NOON – 1:15 P.M. LUNCHEON

Brief Welcoming Remarks
Commissioner Ray Martinez III

EAC Staff Presentations:
Design for Democracy (improvements to ballot design, national voter registration mail-in form and polling place signage) (Karen Lynn-Dyson)
Legal On-Line Information Clearinghouse (Julie Thompson-Hodgkins)
Public Access Portals (Edgardo Cortes)
Katrina Voting Assistance Relief (Edgardo Cortes)

1:15 – 1:30 P.M. BREAK

1:30 – 2:30 P.M. STANDARDS BOARD PLENARY SESSION
Session Chaired by Peggy Nighswonger
Chair, Executive Board

- Appointment of Parliamentarian
- Adoption of Agenda
- Review of Meeting Book Materials
- Presentation of Proposed Permanent Bylaws
- Election of Executive Board Vacancy

2:30 – 4:00 P.M. DISCUSSION: DRAFT REPORT ON PROVISIONAL VOTING

Presenters:
Thomas O’Neill: Provisional Voting/Voter Identification Study
Edward Foley: Director, Election Law@Moritz (The Ohio State University)
EAC Resource Person: Julie Thompson-Hodgkins

4:00 – 4:15 P.M. BREAK

4:15 – 5:30 P.M. DISCUSSION: DRAFT REPORT ON POLL WORKER RECRUITMENT, TRAINING AND RETENTION (INCLUDING COLLEGE POLL WORKERS)

Presenters:
Jennifer Collins-Foley, Pollworker Institute
Abby Horn, Cleveland State University
EAC Resource Person: Karen Lynn-Dyson

NOTE: Attendees on their own for dinner.

Wednesday, May 24, 2006

8:00 – 8:30 A.M. CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST

8:30 – 9:15 A.M. BRIEFING: PROPOSED MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

Presenters:
Connie Schmidt, EAC Consultant
Brit Williams, EAC Consultant
EAC Resource Person: Brian Hancock

Comment [Aa7]: CS, BW and BH to meet on Wednesday to determine what of their materials may be ready for distribution. Current potentials: 3 pg. overview briefing of guideline principals, and 20 pg. chapter on security principals.

9:15 – 10:00 A.M. BRIEFING: DRAFT REPORT ON VOTE COUNT/RECOUNT

Presenters:
Dr. Thad Hall, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Utah
Doug Chapin, EAC Consultant
EAC Resource Person: Peggy Sims

Comment [Aa8]: Draft report completed, according to KLD, too technical at this point, but able to be released.

10:00 – 10:15 A.M. BREAK

10:30 – 11:00 A.M. DISCUSSION: DRAFT EAC ELECTION DAY SURVEY

Presenters:
Karen Lynn-Dyson, Research Director, EAC
Laiza Otero, Research Associate, EAC

Comment [Aa9]: LO and JT are currently in consultation regarding the form of the document. Will likely be ready in draft form for distribution immediately prior to SB meeting.

11:00 – 11:55 P.M. BRIEFING: DRAFT REPORT ON VOTING FRAUD/VOTER INTIMIDATION

Presenters:
Job Serebrov, Associate, The Nixon Law Firm
Tova Wang, Democracy Fellow, The Century Foundation

Comment [Aa10]: There is legal research prepared, but not compiled in a format that would be usable by SB members. Because of the close proximity to the working group meeting, final report is not yet written.
EAC Resource Person: Peggy Sims

**NOON – 1:30 P.M.  JOINT LUNCHEON**

**EAC Activities Update**

Brief Remarks by:  Chairman Paul DeGregorio  
Vice-Chairman Ray Martinez III  
Commissioner Gracia Hillman

**Presentation: General Update on NIST/TGDC Activities**

Introduction of Speaker: Commissioner Donetta Davidson

Presenters:  
John Wack, NIST

**1:40 – 2:45 P.M.  DISCUSSION: DRAFT REPORT ON VOTER IDENTIFICATION**

Presenters:  
Thomas O’Neill, Provisional Voting/Voter Identification Study  
Edward Foley, Director, Election Law@Moritz, The Ohio State University  
EAC Resource Person: Julie Thompson-Hodgkins

**2:45 – 3:00 P.M.  BREAK**

**3:00 – 5:00 P.M.  STANDARDS BOARD PLENARY SESSION**

Session Chaired by Peggy Nighswonger, Chair, Executive Board

Discussion and consideration of Standards Board business.

**5:00 P.M.  ADJOURN**
Attached, please find draft letter to be sent to the Commissioners. Any comments or corrections, please make them and send them back to Amie and myself. We hope to send this email by 3 PM today, so please take a look quickly – for your projects.

Commissioners:

Peggy, Edgardo, Karen, Laiza, Adam and Amie met this afternoon to discuss what materials will be ready to present to the Standards Board and Board of Advisors members during the meetings later this month. Listed below is what we have determined to be available for their review and feedback. Please review this list and offer your feedback.

Also, attached is an updated SB agenda with "comments" on work product for each project to be discussed.

**Design for Democracy** - exhibits to be on display for board member review and feedback; Ric Grefe will be present with KLD to discuss the processes used to get to these specific examples; Preliminary Design Report (dated April 10, 2006) to be delivered electronically to the members for their review prior to the meeting

**Legal Information Clearinghouse** - demo version of the website will be available to show

**Public Access Portals** - there is a conference scheduled for June 16-18; a tentative agenda and, if desired, a list of participants will be made available to the members for their review and feedback; also future steps can also be outlined for their feedback

**Katrina Voting Assistance Relief** - due to the limited amount of information that we can offer, we propose eliminating this topic and substituting discussions on our Language Working Group meetings

**Language Working Groups** - the members will be updated on our two working group meetings and the information received at both, as well as our next steps

**Provisional Voting** - a draft of the final report is to be delivered to the 4 C's by 5/11 for their review and feedback; product following 4C review will be available 5/17 for electronic distribution to board members

**Poll Worker R T & R (including College Pollworker)** - reports as they stand now are not ready to be presented, according the KLD; Peggy and Karen to communicate to project managers the need for a report by 5/11 for review by the 4 C's

**Proposed Management Guidelines** - Connie, Brit, and Brian to determine on 5/10 what materials are ready for presentation to board members; currently a 3 page overview briefing of guideline principles and a 20 page chapter on security principles have been prepared

**Vote Count/Recount** - materials to be delivered to board members include the public testimony given by Thad Hall and Doug Chapin at our Seattle public meeting and several case studies outlining examples

**EAC Election Day Survey** - draft report with changes/updates highlighted and website application clips to be presented (Ready).
Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation - a summary of the preliminary research and a recap of the discussions of the May 18 working group meeting offering brainstorming ideas, not advice.

NIST/TGDC activities - Allan Eustis states that NIST is working to provide their summary of materials to be provided, and that they will get that to us ASAP.

Voter Identification - a PowerPoint presentation outlining the process and a summary of findings. Peer review group to occur May 11th, with final Draft due the 15th. At this time, Commissioners can determine whether Draft Report is ready to submit to the SB and BOA.
Adam:

J.R. Perez's resume is attached, and I have forwarded my last explanatory email to Job in answer to his concerns. I will tell Tova not to contact Ray, but that she may talk with you about this issue. Thanks! ---Peggy

Perez bio 5_5_06.doc

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 05/09/2006 02:45 PM ---

As you may recall, the Commissioners directed me to find a nonpartisan local election official to serve on the Working Group. The three of us discussed the desirability of having a Hispanic. I proposed that I find someone from Texas because of that State's colorful history of voting fraud and their innovative approaches to combat it. In those Texas counties that hire Election Administrators to run elections, rather than having elected officials do so (Tax Assessor for voter registration; County Clerk for balloting), the Election Administrator is hired by the County Election Commission and is supposed to perform his or her duties in a nonpartisan manner. (See attached excerpts from Texas Election Code regarding election administrator hiring and restrictions on partisan activity.) Any experienced Texas election official will be familiar with voting fraud and voter intimidation schemes used in that State. Mr. Perez has over 13 years experience as a county Election Administrator in Texas. You won't find many news articles mentioning him because he has kept his nose clean. (The Texas press, as in many other parts of the country, prefers to report bad news.) Mr. Perez is plugged into the association of Texas election officials and the two largest organizations of election officials in this country: the International Association of Clerks, Recorders, Election Officials and Treasurers (IACREOT); and The Election Center. He is a past President and past Chairman of the Legislative Committee for the Texas Association of Election Administrators. He currently serves on IACREOT's Election Officials Committee, which plans the educational sessions for election officials that are conducted at that organization's conferences. His peers in IACREOT and The Election Center have selected his submissions on web presentations (IACREOT) and his professional practices papers (Election Center) for awards. Mr. Perez also has access to information from other States through his membership in IACREOT and The Election Center. He also has a sense of humor, which you will note if you access the staff web page on the Guadalupe County Elections web site and hear the Mission Impossible theme .. something that might be useful in the upcoming meeting.

Guadalupe County is small but growing. In 2004, the county had over 65 thousand registered voters (a number more than doubled the number of registered voters in 1988). A third of the county's population claims Hispanic or Latino origin, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. The county is in south central Texas and is bordered by Comal, Hays, Cladwell, Gonzales, Wilson, and Bexar counties. In the 1980s, the county was predominately a farming community; but in recent years, many people have moved from
San Antonio (Bexar County) to Guadalupe County, preferring to live in Guadalupe County and work in Bexar County.

--- Peggy

Peggy:

What political party is Perez with? How political is he? Is the position in Texas neutral or political? Who appointed Perez?

As to Pat I will contact him but I can’t promise anything. If Pat can’t come, who is getting knocked off Tova’s list?

Job
We are still on for 4 PM. Ray is out of the office due to a family emergency, so I suggest you NOT contact him. You may contact his Special Assistant, Adam Ambrogi (aambrogi@eac.gov or [redacted]), who also hails from Texas. --- Peggy

"Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>

We are still doing the 4 pm call, right? We can discuss it more then. Would it be OK if I see if Ray knows this person? Thanks. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2006 10:14 AM
Cc: wang@tcf.org
Subject: Re: Working Group-Perez

As you may recall, the Commissioners directed me to find a nonpartisan local election official to serve on the Working Group. The three of us discussed the desirability of having a Hispanic. I proposed that I find someone from Texas because of that State's colorful history of voting fraud and their innovative approaches to combat it. In those Texas counties that hire Election Administrators to run elections, rather than having elected officials do so (Tax Assessor for voter registration; County Clerk for balloting), the Election Administrator is hired by the County Election Commission and is supposed to perform his or her duties in a nonpartisan manner. (See attached excerpts from Texas Election Code regarding election administrator hiring and restrictions on partisan activity.)

Any experienced Texas election official will be familiar with voting fraud and voter intimidation schemes used in that State. Mr. Perez has over 13 years experience as a county Election Administrator in Texas. You won't find many news articles mentioning him because he has kept his nose clean. (The Texas press, as in many other parts of the country, prefers to report bad news.) Mr. Perez is plugged into the association of Texas election officials and the two largest organizations of election officials in this country: the International Association of Clerks, Recorders, Election Officials and Treasurers (IACREOT); and The Election Center. He is a past President and past Chairman of the Legislative Committee for the Texas Association of Election Administrators. He currently serves on IACREOT's Election Officials Committee, which plans the educational sessions for election officials that are conducted at that organization's conferences. His peers in IACREOT and The Election Center have selected his submissions on web presentations (IACREOT) and his professional practices papers (Election Center) for awards. Mr. Perez also has access to information from other States through his membership in IACREOT and The Election Center. He also has a sense of humor, which you will note if you access the staff
web page on the Guadalupe County Elections web site and hear the Mission Impossible theme...something that might be useful in the upcoming meeting.

Guadalupe County is small but growing. In 2004, the county had over 65 thousand registered voters (a number more than doubled the number of registered voters in 1988). A third of the county's population claims Hispanic or Latino origin, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. The county is in south central Texas and is bordered by Comal, Hays, Caldwell, Gonzales, Wilson, and Bexar counties. In the 1980s, the county was predominately a farming community; but in recent years, many people have moved from San Antonio (Bexar County) to Guadalupe County, preferring to live in Guadalupe County and work in Bexar County.

--- Peggy

--- Peggy

05/08/2006 11:30 PM

To psims@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Working Group

Peggy:

What political party is Perez with? How political is he? Is the position in Texas neutral or political? Who appointed Perez?

As to Pat I will contact him but I can't promise anything. If Pat can't come, who is getting knocked off Tova's list?

Job
Adam:

Regarding the Vote Count/Recount contract, I am trying to schedule a teleconference with Thad for tomorrow. We will discuss preparations for his presentation, among other things. He may suggest additional materials, other than the testimony, that may be acceptable to us.

Regarding the Vote Fraud/Voter Intimidation project, I don't think the materials will include a written recap of the Working Group meeting, scheduled for May 18, if we have to have the materials to you NLT COB May 17. I can provide a verbal recap at the meeting. I may be able to pull together a written recap after May 18, but it won't be available much earlier than the week of the meetings.

Let me know if you have any questions. --- Peggy

Attached, please find draft letter to be sent to the Commissioners. Any comments or corrections, please make them and send them back to Arnie and myself. We hope to send this email by 3 PM today, so please take a look quickly--for your projects.

Commissioners:

Peggy, Edgardo, Karen, Laiza, Adam and Amie met this afternoon to discuss what materials will be ready to present to the Standards Board and Board of Advisors members during the meetings later this month. Listed below is what we have determined to be available for their review and feedback. Please review this list and offer your feedback.

Also, attached is an updated SB agenda with "comments" on work product for each project to be discussed.

Design for Democracy - exhibits to be on display for board member review and feedback; Ric Grefe will be present with KLD to discuss the processes used to get to these specific examples; Preliminary Design Report (dated April 10, 2006) to be delivered electronically to the members for their review prior to the meeting.
Legal Information Clearinghouse - demo version of the website will be available to show

Public Access Portals - there is a conference scheduled for June 16-18; a tentative agenda and, if desired, a list of participants will be made available to the members for their review and feedback; also future steps can also be outlined for their feedback

Katrina Voting Assistance Relief - due to the limited amount of information that we can offer, we propose eliminating this topic and substituting discussions on our Language Working Group meetings

Language Working Groups - the members will be updated on our two working group meetings and the information received at both, as well as our next steps

Provisional Voting - a draft of the final report is to be delivered to the 4 C's by 5/11 for their review and feedback; product following 4C review will be available 5/17 for electronic distribution to board members

Poll Worker R T & R (including College Pollworker) - reports as they stand now are not ready to be presented, according the KLD; Peggy and Karen to communicate to project managers the need for a report by 5/11 for review by the 4 C's

Proposed Management Guidelines - Connie, Brit, and Brian to determine on 5/10 what materials are ready for presentation to board members; currently a 3 page overview briefing of guideline principles and a 20 page chapter on security principles have been prepared

Vote Count/Recount - materials to be delivered to board members include the public testimony given by Thad Hall and Doug Chapin at our Seattle public meeting and several case studies outlining examples

EAC Election Day Survey - draft report with changes/updates highlighted and website application clips to be presented (Ready).

Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation - a summary of the preliminary research and a recap of the discussions of the May 18 working group meeting offering brainstorming ideas, not advice

NIST/TGDC activities - Allan Eustis states that NIST is working to provide their summary of materials to be provided, and that they will get that to us ASAP.

Voter Identification - a PowerPoint presentation outlining the process and a summary of findings. Peer review group to occur May 11th, with final Draft due the 15th. At this time, Commissioners can determine whether Draft Report is ready to submit to the SB and BOA.
Adam-

This is fine and accurate as far as I can tell.

I assume Julie is comfortable with the fact that she is the EAC resource staff person for the Eagleton presentations.

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Commissioners:

Peggy, Edgardo, Karen, Laiza, Adam and Amie met yesterday afternoon to discuss what materials will be ready to present to the Standards Board and Board of Advisors members during the meetings later this month. Listed below is what the Research Team has determined to be available for their review and feedback. It looks like much of the information needed will be able to be sent to Adventure travel for their preparation in binders on May 17th.

Please review this list and offer your feedback.

Also, attached is an updated SB agenda with "comments" on work product for each project to be discussed.

**Design for Democracy** - exhibits to be on display for board member review and feedback; Ric Grefe will be present with KLD to discuss the processes used to get to these specific examples; Preliminary Design Report (dated April 10, 2006) to be delivered electronically to the members for their review prior to the meeting

**Legal Information Clearinghouse** - Information about contract, potentially a demo website to show members functionality (tentative).

**Public Access Portals** - there is a conference in June; a tentative agenda will be made available to the members for their review and feedback; also future steps can also be outlined for their feedback; we will include a timeline for when draft documents will be submitted so we can send them out via email for feedback before finalizing the project.

**Katrina Voting Assistance Relief** - due to the limited amount of information that we can offer, EC strongly proposes eliminating this topic and substituting discussions on our Language Working Group meetings

**Language Working Groups** - the members will be updated on our two working group meetings and the information received at both, as well as our next steps for development of programs

**Provisional Voting** - a draft of the final report is to be delivered to the 4 C's by 5/11 for their review and feedback; product following 4C review will be available 5/17 for electronic distribution to board members

**Poll Worker R T & R (including College Pollworker)** - reports as they stand now are not ready to be presented, according the KLD; Peggy and Karen to communicate to project managers the need for a report by 5/11 for review by the 4 C's

**Proposed Management Guidelines** - Connie, Brit, and Brian to determine on 5/10 what materials are ready for presentation to board members; currently a 3 page overview briefing of guideline principles and a 20 page chapter on "security principles" have been prepared

**Vote Count/Recount** - materials to be delivered to board members include the public testimony given by Thad Hall and Doug Chapin at our Seattle public meeting and several case studies outlining examples. Peggy will discuss on 5/10 with Prof. Hall regarding other materials that may be presented.

**EAC Election Day Survey** - draft report with changes/updates highlighted and website application clips to
Tom-

It is my understanding that Adam Ambrogi has been in touch with Ned Foley and, in turn, Dan Tokaji to indicate that you and Dan will present the information on the Voter ID project, while you and Ned will present the information on the Provisional Voting project.

Adam Ambrogi can also clarify your presentations. As I understand it, you will present your Voter ID and Provisional Voting projects to the Standards Board. You will then present your Voter ID and Provisional Voting Projects to the Board of Advisors.

I believe Adventure Travel handles hotel and travel arrangements.

I do not believe accommodations have been made for other members of the project team to attend. I will ask Adam Ambrogi, who is the principal point of contact on these meetings, to clarify this.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen,  

As we discussed last week, the Eagleton-Moritz team making the presentations at the advisory board meetings will include others in addition to Ned and me. While Ned and I will handle the briefing on the provisional voting report, the team for the briefing on the Voter ID report will include Dan Tokaji and Tim Vercellotti.
be presented (Ready).

Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation - a summary of the preliminary research and initial feedback from the May 18 working group meeting offering brainstorming ideas, not formal advice.

NIST/TGDC activities - Allan Eustis states that NIST is working to provide their summary of materials to be provided, and that they will get that to us ASAP.

Voter Identification - a PowerPoint presentation outlining the process and a summary of findings. Peer review group to occur May 11th, with final Draft due the 15th. At this time, Commissioners can determine whether Draft Report is ready to submit to the SB and BOA.
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Adam D. Ambrogi
Special Assistant to Commissioner Ray Martinez III
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3105
Just to understand what Adventure Travel is to provide: will its services include hotel reservations and travel, or does it have a more limited mission?

Thanks,

Tom O'Neill

-----Original Message-----
From: klyndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klyndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2006 4:34 PM
To: klyndyson@eac.gov
Cc: [redacted] Tom O'neill
Subject: Re: Travel arrangement for the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board meeting

Tom O' Neill and Ned Foley-

As you know you are scheduled to make two presentations to the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board on Tuesday May 23, 2006 from 2:30-4:00 PM (on Provisional Voting) and on Wednesday, May 24th from 1:40-2:45 PM (on Voter Identification)

If you have not already done so, please make your hotel and travel arrangements through Adventure Travel, Judy Mays

These reservations should be made no later than tomorrow COB.

Please indicate to Judy Mays that you are a contractor, who is scheduled to make a presentation at the meeting.

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
These are the only publicly released agendas yet-- The discussion, and modification that was done last week as to what products are being produced are not reflected-- but will in the final version. These were distributed because of numerous Staff questions as to time and place issues.

We'll forward around the final draft info when available.

Peggy- any word yet on what's up for Voting Fraud issue for the meeting(I know you have that WG in two days, but....)?
Thanks,
Adam

-------------------
Adam D. Ambrogi
Special Assistant to Commissioner Ray Martinez III
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3105

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV 05/16/2006 11:43 AM
To Adam Ambrogi/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Amie J. Sherrill/EAC/GOV@EAC, twilkey@eac.gov, Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC, ecortes@eac.gov
Subject Re: Standards and Advisory Board Agendas

These agendas still indicate that draft reports on the Vote Count/Recount and the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research projects will be presented for consideration. In neither case is this true. Reports from these projects are unavailable or not ready for prime time.

Thad Hall and Doug Chaping will have a PowerPoint presentation on the Vote Count/Recount project (and we can make copies of their testimony in Seattle available) and I will have a status report on the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation project for the boards. --- Peggy
Dear Staff
While the final version will be sent later this week, attached is the current agendas for the Standards and Advisory Boards, so the staff will know when (or if) they have to be present.

Thanks,
Adam Ambrogi

Adam D. Ambrogi
Special Assistant to Commissioner Ray Martinez III
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3105
U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
Board of Advisors Meeting Agenda
Washington, D.C.
May 23 – 24, 2006

Tuesday, May 23, 2006

Noon – 1:15 P.M.  LUNCHEON

Brief Welcoming Remarks
EAC Chairman Paul DeGregorio
Board of Advisors Chair Beverly Kaufman

EAC Staff Presentations:
Katrina Voting Assistance Relief (Edgardo Cortes);
Public Access Portals (Edgardo Cortes);
Legal On-Line Information Clearinghouse (Julie Thompson-Hodgkins);
Design for Democracy (improvements to ballot design, national voter registration mail-in form and polling place signage) (Karen Lynn-Dyson)

NOTE: The EAC Standards Board will be meeting simultaneously.

1:15 – 1:30 P.M.  BREAK

1:30 – 2:30 P.M.  BOARD OF ADVISORS PLENARY SESSION
Session Chaired by Beverly Kaufman, Chair

• Appointment of Parliamentarian
• Call of Roll and Appointment of Proxy Committee
• Appointment of Resolutions Committee
• Review of Meeting Book Materials
• Report of Proxy Committee to establish voting strength
• Adoption of Agenda
• Adoption of Minutes of August 2005 Meeting
2:30 – 4:00 P.M. PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT ON POLL WORKER RECRUITMENT, TRAINING AND RETENTION (INCLUDING COLLEGE POLL WORKERS)

Presenters:
Jennifer Collins-Foley, Pollworker Institute
Abby Horn, Cleveland State University
Resource Person: Karen Lynn-Dyson, EAC

4:00 – 4:15 P.M. BREAK

4:15 – 5:30 P.M. PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT ON VOTE COUNT/RECOUNT

Presenters:
Dr. Thad Hall, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Utah
Doug Chapin, EAC Consultant
Resource Person: Julie Thompson-Hodgkins, EAC

NOTE: Attendees on their own for dinner.

Wednesday, May 24, 2006

8:00 – 8:30 A.M. CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST

8:30 – 9:15 A.M. PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT ON PROVISIONAL VOTING

Presenters:
Thomas O’Neill: Project Manager, Provisional Voting / Voter Identification Research Project
Edward Foley: Director, Election Law@Moritz (The Ohio State University)
Resource Person: Julie Thompson-Hodgkins, EAC

9:15 – 10:00 A.M. BRIEFING ON PROPOSED MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

Presenters:
Connie Schmidt, EAC Consultant
Brit Williams, EAC Consultant
Resource Person: Brian Hancock, EAC

10:00 – 10:15 A.M. BREAK

10:30 – 11:00 A.M. PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT ON VOTING FRAUD/VOTER INTIMIDATION

Presenters:
Job Serebrov, Associate, The Nixon Law Firm
11:00 – 11:55 A.M. PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT ON VOTER IDENTIFICATION

Presenters:
Thomas O’Neill: Project Manager, Provisional Voting / Voter Identification Research Project
Edward Foley, Director, Election Law@Moritz, The Ohio State University

Resource Person: Juliet Thompson-Hodgkins, EAC

NOON – 1:30 P.M. JOINT LUNCHEON

EAC Activities Update

Brief Remarks by: Chairman Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman Ray Martinez, III
Commissioner Gracia Hillman

Presentation: General Update on NIST/TGDC Activities

Introduction of Speakers: Commissioner Donetta Davidson

Presentors:
John Wack, NIST

1:40 – 2:45 P.M. PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT EAC ELECTION DAY SURVEY

Presenters:
Karen Lynn-Dyson, Research Director, EAC
Laiza Otero, Research Associate, EAC

Resource Person: Brian Hancock, EAC

2:45 – 3:00 P.M. BREAK

3:00 – 5:00 P.M. BOARD OF ADVISORS PLENARY SESSION
Session Chaired by Beverly Kaufman, Chair

- Election of Officers
- Report of Resolutions Committee
  Chaired by Vice Chairman Chris Thomas
- Other Business

5:00 P.M. ADJOURN
Tuesday, May 23, 2006

Noon – 1:15 P.M.  LUNCHEON

Brief Welcoming Remarks
Commissioner Ray Martinez III

EAC Staff Presentations:
Design for Democracy (improvements to ballot design, national voter registration mail-in form and polling place signage) (Karen Lynn-Dyson);
Legal On-Line Information Clearinghouse (Julie Thompson-Hodgkins);
Public Access Portals (Edgardo Cortes);
Katrina Voting Assistance Relief (Edgardo Cortes).

1:15 – 1:30 P.M.  BREAK

1:30 – 2:30 P.M.  STANDARDS BOARD PLENARY SESSION
Session Chaired by Peggy Nighswonger
Chair, Executive Board

- Appointment of Parliamentarian
- Adoption of Agenda
- Review of Meeting Book Materials
- Presentation of Proposed Permanent Bylaws
- Election of Executive Board Vacancy

2:30 – 4:00 P.M.  DISCUSSION: DRAFT REPORT ON PROVISIONAL VOTING

Presenters:
Thomas O’Neill: Provisional Voting/Voter Identification Study
Edward Foley: Director, Election Law@Moritz (The Ohio State University)
EAC Resource Person: Julie Thompson-Hodgkins

4:00 – 4:15 P.M.  BREAK

4:15 – 5:30 P.M.  DISCUSSION: DRAFT REPORT ON POLL WORKER RECRUITMENT, TRAINING AND RETENTION (INCLUDING COLLEGE POLL WORKERS)

Presenters:
Jennifer Collins-Foley, Pollworker Institute
Abby Horn, Cleveland State University
EAC Resource Person: Karen Lynn-Dyson

NOTE: Attendees on their own for dinner.

Wednesday, May 24, 2006

8:00 – 8:30 A.M.  CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST

8:30 – 9:15 A.M.  BRIEFING: PROPOSED MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

Presenters:
Connie Schmidt, EAC Consultant
Brit Williams, EAC Consultant
EAC Resource Person: Brian Hancock

9:15 – 10:00 A.M.  BRIEFING: DRAFT REPORT ON VOTE COUNT/RECOUNT

Presenters:
Dr. Thad Hall, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Utah
Doug Chapin, EAC Consultant
EAC Resource Person: Peggy Sims

10:00 – 10:15 A.M.  BREAK

10:30 – 11:00 A.M.  DISCUSSION: DRAFT EAC ELECTION DAY SURVEY

Presenters:
Karen Lynn-Dyson, Research Director, EAC
Laiza Otero, Research Associate, EAC

11:00 – 11:55 P.M.  BRIEFING: DRAFT REPORT ON VOTING FRAUD/VOTER INTIMIDATION

Presenters:
Job Serebrov, Associate, The Nixon Law Firm
Tova Wang, Democracy Fellow, The Century Foundation
NOON - 1:30 P.M.  JOINT LUNCHEON

EAC Activities Update

Brief Remarks by: Chairman Paul DeGregorio
Vice-Chairman Ray Martinez III
Commissioner Gracia Hillman

Presentation: General Update on NIST/TGDC Activities

Introduction of Speaker: Commissioner Donetta Davidson

Presenters:
John Wack, NIST

1:40 – 2:45 P.M.  DISCUSSION: DRAFT REPORT ON VOTER IDENTIFICATION

Presenters:
Thomas O’Neill, Provisional Voting/Voter Identification Study
Edward Foley, Director, Election Law@Moritz, The Ohio State University
EAC Resource Person: Julie Thompson-Hodgkins

2:45 – 3:00 P.M.  BREAK

3:00 – 5:00 P.M.  STANDARDS BOARD PLENARY SESSION

Session Chaired by Peggy Nighswonger, Chair, Executive Board

Discussion and consideration of Standards Board business.

5:00 P.M.  ADJOURN
Adam and Amie:

Attached are the status report on the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project and two versions of the PowerPoint presentation from our Vote Count/Recount contractor (one with the first slide labeled for the EAC Standards Board; the other with the first slide labeled for the Board of Advisors). --- Peggy

EAC Boards VF-VI Status Report.doc  Best Practices STANDARDS.ppt  Best Practices Advisors.ppt
U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Status Report on the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Research Project

May 17, 2006
INTRODUCTION

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the tasks listed in the statute is the development of:

- nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office [section 241(b)(6)]; and
- ways of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)].

EAC's Board of Advisors recommended that the agency make research on these matters a high priority.

FOCUS OF CURRENT RESEARCH

In September 2005, the Commission hired two consultants with expertise in this subject matter, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, to:

- develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;
- perform background research (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;
- establish a project working group, in consultation with EAC, composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation;
- provide the description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation and the results of the preliminary research to the working group, and convene the working group to discuss potential avenues for future EAC research on this topic; and
- produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future research, if any;

As of the date of this report, the consultants have drafted a definition of election fraud, reviewed relevant literature and reports, interviewed persons from government and private sectors with subject matter expertise, analyzed news reports of alleged election fraud, reviewed case law, and established a project working group.
DEFINITION OF ELECTION FRAUD

The consultants drafted a definition of election fraud that includes numerous aspects of voting fraud (including voter intimidation, which is considered a subset of voting fraud) and voter registration fraud, but excludes campaign finance violations and election administration mistakes. This draft will be discussed and probably refined by the project working group, which is scheduled to convene on May 18, 2006.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The consultants found many reports and books that describe anecdotes and draw broad conclusions from a large array of incidents. They found little research that is truly systematic or scientific. The most systematic look at fraud appears to be the report written by Lori Minnite, entitled "Securing the Vote: An Analysis of Election Fraud". The most systematic look at voter intimidation appears to be the report by Laughlin McDonald, entitled "The New Poll Tax". The consultants found that books written about this subject all seem to have a political bias and a pre-existing agenda that makes them somewhat less valuable.

Moreover, the consultants found that reports and books make allegations but, perhaps by their nature, have little follow up. As a result, it is difficult to know when something has remained in the stage of being an allegation and gone no further, or progressed to the point of being investigated or prosecuted or in any other way proven to be valid by an independent, neutral entity. This is true, for example, with respect to allegations of voter intimidation by civil rights organizations, and, with respect to fraud, John Fund’s frequently cited book, "Stealing Elections".

Consultants found that researchers agree that measuring something like the incidence of fraud and intimidation in a scientifically legitimate way is extremely difficult from a methodological perspective and would require resources beyond the means of most social and political scientists. As a result, there is much more written on this topic by advocacy groups than social scientists.

Other items of note:

- There is as much evidence, and as much concern, about structural forms of disenfranchisement as about intentional abuse of the system. These include felon disenfranchisement, poor maintenance of databases and identification requirements.

- There is tremendous disagreement about the extent to which polling place fraud, e.g. double voting, intentional felon voting, noncitizen voting, is a serious problem. On balance, more researchers find it to be less of a problem than is commonly described in the political debate; but some reports say it is a major problem, albeit hard to identify.
• There is substantial concern across the board about absentee balloting and the opportunity it presents for fraud.

• Federal law governing election fraud and intimidation is varied and complex and yet may nonetheless be insufficient or subject to too many limitations to be as effective as it might be.

• Deceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004.

• Voter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities, although the American Center for Voting Rights uniquely alleges it is focused on Republicans.

Recommendations

The consultants recommend that subsequent EAC research include a follow up study of allegations made in reports, books and newspaper articles. They also suggest that the research should focus on filling the gap between the lack of reports based on methodical studies by social or political scientists and the numerous, but less scientific, reports published by advocacy groups.

INTERVIEWS

The consultants jointly selected experts from the public and private sector for interviews. The consultants’ analysis of their discussions with these members of the legal, election official, advocacy, and academic communities follows.

Common Themes

• There is virtually universal agreement that absentee ballot fraud is the biggest problem, with vote buying and registration fraud coming in after that. The vote buying often comes in the form of payment for absentee ballots, although not always. Some absentee ballot fraud is part of an organized effort; some is by individuals, who sometimes are not even aware that what they are doing is illegal. Voter registration fraud seems to take the form of people signing up with false names. Registration fraud seems to be most common where people doing the registration were paid by the signature.

• There is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud, or at least much less than is claimed, including voter impersonation, “dead” voters, noncitizen voting and felon voters. Those few who believe it occurs often enough to be a concern say that it is impossible to show the extent to which it happens, but do point to instances in the press of such incidents. Most people believe that false registration forms have not resulted in polling place fraud,
although it may create the perception that vote fraud is possible. Those who believe there is more polling place fraud than reported/investigated/prosecuted believe that registration fraud does lead to fraudulent votes. Jason Torchinsky from the American Center for Voting Rights is the only interviewee who believes that polling place fraud is widespread and among the most significant problems in the system.

- Abuse of challenger laws and abusive challengers seem to be the biggest intimidation/suppression concerns, and many of those interviewed assert that the new identification requirements are the modern version of voter intimidation and suppression. However there is evidence of some continued outright intimidation and suppression, especially in some Native American communities. A number of people also raise the problem of poll workers engaging in harassment of minority voters. Other activities commonly raised were the issue of polling places being moved at the last moment, unequal distribution of voting machines, videotaping of voters at the polls, and targeted misinformation campaigns.

- Several people – including representatives from the Department of Justice (DOJ) - indicate that, for various reasons, DOJ is bringing fewer voter intimidation and suppression cases now, and has increased its focus on matters such as noncitizen voting, double voting, and felon voting. While DOJ’s Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, focuses on systemic patterns of malfeasance, the Election Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, has increased prosecutions of individual instances of felon, alien, and double voting at the same time as it maintains an aggressive pursuit of systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process.

- The problem of badly kept voter registration lists, with both ineligible voters remaining on the rolls and eligible voters being taken off, remains a common concern. A few people are also troubled by voters being on registration lists in two states. They said that there was no evidence that this had led to double voting, but it opens the door to the possibility. There is great hope that full implementation of the new requirements of HAVA – done well, a major caveat – will reduce this problem dramatically.

**Common Recommendations:**

- Many of those interviewed recommend better poll worker training as the best way to improve the process; a few also recommended longer voting times or voting on days other than election day (such as weekends) but fewer polling places so only the best poll workers would be employed.

- Many interviewed support stronger criminal laws and increased enforcement of existing laws with respect to both fraud and intimidation. Advocates from across the spectrum expressed frustration with the failure of the Department of Justice to pursue complaints.
o With respect to DOJ’s Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, John Tanner indicated that fewer cases are being brought because fewer are warranted – it has become increasingly difficult to know when allegations of intimidation and suppression are credible since it depends on one’s definition of intimidation, and because both parties are doing it. Moreover prior enforcement of the laws has now changed the entire landscape – race based problems are rare now. Although challenges based on race and unequal implementation of identification rules would be actionable, Mr. Tanner was unaware of such situations actually occurring and his office has not pursued any such cases.

o Craig Donsanto of DOJ’s Election Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, says that while the number of election fraud related complaints have not gone up since 2002, nor has the proportion of legitimate to illegitimate claims of fraud, the number of cases DOJ is investigating and the number of indictments his office is pursuing are both up dramatically. Since 2002, DOJ has brought more cases against alien voters, felon voters and double voters than ever before. Mr. Donsanto would like more resources so that his agency can do more and would like to have laws that make it easier for the federal government to assume jurisdiction over voter fraud cases.

- A couple of interviewees recommend a new law that would make it easier to criminally prosecute people for intimidation even when there is not racial animus.

- Several advocate expanded monitoring of the polls, including some associated with the Department of Justice.

- Almost everyone hopes that administrators will maximize the potential of statewide voter registration databases to prevent fraud.

- Challenge laws, both with respect to pre-election day challenges and challengers at the polls, need to be revised by all states to ensure they are not used for purposes of wrongful disenfranchisement and harassment.

- Several people advocate passage of Senator Barak Obama’s “deceptive practices” bill.

- There is a split on whether it would be helpful to have nonpartisan election officials – some indicated they thought even if elections officials are elected as non partisan officials, they will carry out their duties in biased ways nonetheless. However, most agree that elections officials pursuing partisan agendas are a problem that must be addressed in some fashion. Suggestions included moving election responsibilities out of the secretary of states’ office; increasing transparency in the process; and enacting conflict of interest rules.

- A few recommend returning to allowing use of absentee ballots “for cause” only if it were politically feasible.
• A few recommend enacting a national identification card, including Pat Rogers, an attorney in New Mexico, and Jason Torchinsky from ACVR, who advocates the proposal in the Carter-Baker Commission Report.

• A couple of interviewees indicated the need for clear standards for the distribution of voting machines

NEWS ARTICLES

Consultants conducted a Nexis search of related news articles published between January 1, 2001 and January 1, 2006. A systematic, numerical analysis of the data collected during this review is currently being prepared. What follows is an overview of these articles provided by the consultants.

Absentee Ballots

According to press reports, absentee ballots are abused in a variety of ways:

• Campaign workers, candidates and others coerce the voting choices of vulnerable populations, usually elderly voters.

• Workers for groups and individuals have attempted to vote absentee in the names of the deceased.

• Workers for groups, campaign workers and individuals have attempted to forge the names of other voters on absentee ballot requests and absentee ballots and thus vote multiple times.

It is unclear how often actual convictions result from these activities (a handful of articles indicate convictions and guilty pleas), but this is an area in which there have been a substantial number of official investigations and actual charges filed, according to news reports where such information is available. A few of the allegations became part of civil court proceedings contesting the outcome of the election.

While absentee fraud allegations turn up throughout the country, a few states have had several such cases. Especially of note are Indiana, New Jersey, South Dakota, and most particularly, Texas. Interestingly, there were no articles regarding Oregon, where the entire system is vote by mail.
Voter Registration Fraud

According to press reports, the following types of allegations of voter registration fraud are most common:

- Registering in the name of dead people;
- Fake names and other information on voter registration forms;
- Illegitimate addresses used on voter registration forms;
- Voters being tricked into registering for a particular party under false pretenses; and
- Destruction of voter registration forms depending on the party the voter registered with.

There was only one self evident instance of a noncitizen registering to vote. Many of the instances reported included official investigations and charges filed, but few actual convictions, at least from the news reporting. There have been multiple reports of registration fraud in California, Colorado, Florida, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, South Dakota and Wisconsin.

Voter Intimidation and Suppression

This is the area which had the most articles, in part because there were so many allegations of intimidation and suppression during the 2004 election. Most of these remained allegations and no criminal investigation or prosecution ensued. Some of the cases did end up in civil litigation.

This is not to say that these alleged activities were confined to 2004 – there were several allegations made during every year studied. Most notable were the high number of allegations of voter intimidation and harassment reported during the 2003 Philadelphia mayoral race.

A very high number of the articles were about the issue of challenges to voters' registration status and challengers at the polling places. There were many allegations that planned challenge activities were targeted at minority communities. Some of the challenges were concentrated in immigrant communities.

However, the tactics alleged varied greatly. The types of activities discussed also include the following:

- Photographing or videotaping voters coming out of polling places;
- Improper demands for identification;
• Poll watchers harassing voters;
• Poll workers being hostile to or aggressively challenging voters;
• Disproportionate police presence;
• Poll watchers wearing clothes with messages that seemed intended to intimidate; and
• Insufficient voting machines and unmanageably long lines.

Although the incidents reported on occurred everywhere, not surprisingly, many came from “battleground” states. There were several such reports out of Florida, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

“Dead Voters and Multiple Voting”

There were a high number of articles about people voting in the names of the dead and voting more than once. Many of these articles were marked by allegations of big numbers of people committing these frauds, and relatively few of these allegations turning out to be accurate according to investigations by the newspapers themselves, elections officials, and criminal investigators. Often the problem turned out to be a result of administrative error, poll workers mis-marking voter lists, a flawed registration list and/or errors made in the attempt to match names of voters on the list with the names of the people who voted. In a good number of cases, there were allegations that charges of double voting by political leaders were an effort to scare people away from the voting process.

Nonetheless there were a few cases of people actually being charged and/or convicted for these kinds of activities. Most of the cases involved a person voting both by absentee ballot and in person. A few instances involved people voting both during early voting and on Election Day, which calls into question the proper marking and maintenance of the voting lists. In many instances, the person charged claimed not to have voted twice on purpose. A very small handful of cases involved a voter voting in more than one county and there was one substantiated case involving a person voting in more than one state. Other instances in which such efforts were alleged were disproved by officials.

In the case of voting in the name of a dead person, the problem lay in the voter registration list not being properly maintained, i.e. the person was still on the registration list as eligible to vote, and a person took criminal advantage of that. In total, the San Francisco Chronicle found five such cases in March 2004; the AP cited a newspaper analysis of five such persons in an Indiana primary in May 2004; and a senate committee found two people to have voted in the names of the dead in 2005.
As usual, there were a disproportionate number of such articles coming out of Florida. Notably, there were three articles out of Oregon, which has one hundred percent vote-by-mail.

**Vote Buying**

There were a surprising number of articles about vote buying cases. A few of these instances involved long-time investigations concentrated in three states (Illinois, Kentucky, and West Virginia). There were more official investigations, indictments and convictions/pleas in this area.

**Deceptive Practices**

In 2004 there were numerous reports of intentional disinformation about voting eligibility and the voting process meant to confuse voters about their rights and when and where to vote. Misinformation came in the form of flyers, phone calls, letters, and even people going door to door. Many of the efforts were reportedly targeted at minority communities. A disproportionate number of them came from key battleground states, particularly Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. From the news reports found, only one of these instances was officially investigated, the case in Oregon involving the destruction of completed voter registration applications. There were no reports of prosecutions or any other legal proceeding.

**Non-citizen Voting**

There were surprisingly few articles regarding noncitizen registration and voting – just seven all together, in seven different states across the country. They were also evenly split between allegations of noncitizens registering and noncitizens voting. In one case, charges were filed against ten individuals. In another case, a judge in a civil suit found there was illegal noncitizen voting. Three instances prompted official investigations. Two cases, from this Nexis search, remained just allegations of noncitizen voting.

**Felon Voting**

Although there were only thirteen cases of felon voting, some of them involved large numbers of voters. Most notably, of course, are the cases that came to light in the Washington gubernatorial election contest (see Washington summary) and in Wisconsin (see Wisconsin summary). In several states, the main problem was the large number of ineligible felons that remained on the voting list.

**Election Official Fraud**

In most of the cases in which fraud by elections officials is suspected or alleged, it is difficult to determine whether it is incompetence or a crime. There are several cases of ballots gone missing, ballots unaccounted for and ballots ending up in a worker’s possession. In two cases workers were said to have changed peoples’ votes. The one
instance in which widespread ballot box stuffing by elections workers was alleged was in Washington State. The judge in the civil trial of that election contest did not find that elections workers had committed fraud. Four of the cases are from Texas.

**Recommendation**

The consultants recommend that subsequent EAC research should include a Nexis search that specifically attempts to follow up on the cases for which no resolution is evident from this particular initial search.

**CASE LAW RESEARCH**

After reviewing over 40,000 cases from 2000 to the present, the majority of which came from appeals courts, the consultants found comparatively few applicable to this study. Of those that were applicable, the consultants found that no apparent thematic pattern emerges. However, it appears to them that the greatest areas of fraud and intimidation have shifted from past patterns of stealing votes to present problems with voter registration, voter identification, the proper delivery and counting of absentee and overseas ballots, provisional voting, vote buying, and challenges to felon eligibility.

**Recommendation**

Because so few cases provided a picture of these current problems, consultants suggest that subsequent EAC research include a review of state trial-level decisions.

**PROJECT WORKING GROUP**

Consultants and EAC worked together to select members for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group that included election officials and representatives of advocacy groups and the legal community who have an interest and expertise in the subject matter. (See Attachment A for a list of members.) The working group is scheduled to convene at EAC offices on May 18, 2006 to consider the results of the preliminary research and to offer ideas for future EAC activities concerning this subject.

**FINAL REPORT**

After convening the project working group, the consultants will draft a final report summarizing the results of their research and the working group deliberations. This report will include recommendations for future EAC research related to this subject matter. The draft report will be reviewed by EAC and, after obtaining any clarifications or corrections deemed necessary, will be made available to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors for review and comment. Following this, a final report will be prepared.
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Best Practices in Vote Counts, Recounts, and Challenges

Presentation to EAC Standards Board
May 24, 2006
Research Team

- Thad Hall, University of Utah
- R. Michael Alvarez, Caltech
- Kim Brace, Election Data Services
- Doug Chapin, electionline.org
Requirement for Study

- Section 241 of the HAVA requires the EAC to conduct a study examining vote counting and recounting.
- Identify methodology for studying best practices
- Examine election laws and regulations in all 50 states and the District
Study Overview

- Identified best practice methodologies
- Developed criteria for evaluating practices
- Presented the most common practices for vote counting and recounting.
- Identified "benchmark" practices that exceed the most common practices in states.
- Identified best practices for vote counts and recounts that have been implemented.
Criteria for Studying Vote Counting and Recounting
GAO Best Practice Methodology

- Document existing process
- Research literature; talk to practitioners and experts
- Select comparative entities for review
- Collect data from selected entities
- Identify barriers to change
- Compare/contrast processes; develop implementation recommendations
Best Practice Study

- Researched existing literature on vote counting
- Developed baseline of existing activity
- Developed benchmarks for practices that exceed baseline
- Identified potential best practices for review by the EAC Commissioners
- States and localities have to do the hard work: Implementation
International Principles for Vote Counting

IFES, (IDEA), and the United Nations election project states:

to establish and maintain public confidence in the electoral process, vote counting systems and procedures should incorporate the [eight] fundamental principles of vote counting in a democratic election.
Eight Principles for Vote Counting

- Transparency
- Secrecy
- Security
- Timeliness
- Professionalism
- Accountability
- Accuracy
- Equality
Common International Practice

- All ballots should be reconciled against the number of voters who cast ballots.
- Ballots are initially counted at the precinct where the vote was cast.
- There are explicit legal requirements for securing ballots.
- Recounts are allowed by request; five countries conduct 100 percent audits.
- Convenience voting is everywhere.
Evaluating State Practices in Statute and Regulation
Developing National Baseline

- Survey of state laws and regulations
  - Security
  - Pre-election procedures
  - Election ballot procedures
  - End of Election Procedures
  - Definition of “What Constitutes A Vote”
- Counting and Accounting
- Recounting
- Challenges
Developing National Baseline

- Survey of state laws and regulations
  - Identified Specific Questions
  - Reviewed Survey with EAC, Election Officials, and Outside Experts
- Collected Data
  - Statutory or Regulatory Language
  - Legal Citation
Key Findings

- Three issues with great variation in coherence and completeness
  - Ballot Accounting
  - Ballot Security
  - What Constitutes a Vote
Survey Next Steps

- Each report is being carefully reviewed and edited

- Submit surveys to states for review

- States will have interactive online survey form to note problems
Benchmarking Election Law
Benchmarking

- Common in public and private sectors
- How does your performance stack up to similar organizations? OR
- How does your performance stack up to a pre-selected target?

- GOAL: Think about your practices.
Benchmarking Practices

- Using the survey data, we have identified most common practices.
- For many activities, we will propose "benchmark" practices:
  - Clearer,
  - More detailed, or
  - More comprehensive.
Benchmarking Example:
Ballot Accounting

- Most Common Practice: No Standard
- Benchmark: The counting board shall count all ballots to ensure that the total number of ballots corresponds with the total number of names in the poll book. If [they] cannot reconcile... [they] shall submit... a written report stating how many ballots were missing or in excess and any reason ...for the discrepancy.
Benchmarking Limitations

- Not all activities can be benchmarked
- Some activities reflect political and cultural decisions by the state. For example:
  -Absentee voting
  -Handling of recounts and challenges
Best Practices in Election Law
What are Best Practices

- Best practices refer to the processes, practices, and systems identified in... organizations that performed exceptionally well and are widely recognized as improving an organization’s performance and efficiency in specific areas.
Effective Best Practices

- Address a complete process
- Have been carefully charted
- Often come from organizations with similar characteristics
Best Practices in Vote Counts, Recounts, and Challenges

Presentation to
EAC Board of Advisors
May 23, 2006
Research Team

- Thad Hall, University of Utah
- R. Michael Alvarez, Caltech
- Kim Brace, Election Data Services
- Doug Chapin, electionline.org
Requirement for Study

- Section 241 of the HAVA requires the EAC to conduct a study examining vote counting and recounting.
- Identify methodology for studying best practices
- Examine election laws and regulations in all 50 states and the District
Study Overview

- Identified best practice methodologies
- Developed criteria for evaluating practices
- Presented the most common practices for vote counting and recounting.
- Identified “benchmark” practices that exceed the most common practices in states.
- Identified best practices for vote counts and recounts that have been implemented.
Criteria for Studying Vote Counting and Recounting
GAO Best Practice Methodology

- Document existing process
- Research literature; talk to practitioners and experts
- Select comparative entities for review
- Collect data from selected entities
- Identify barriers to change
- Compare/contrast processes; develop implementation recommendations
International Principles for Vote Counting

IFES, (IDEA), and the United Nations election project states:

to establish and maintain public confidence in the electoral process, vote counting systems and procedures should incorporate the [eight] fundamental principles of vote counting in a democratic election.
Eight Principles for Vote Counting

- Transparency
- Secrecy
- Security
- Timeliness
- Professionalism
- Accountability
- Accuracy
- Equality
Common International Practice

- All ballots should be reconciled against the number of voters who cast ballots.
- Ballots are initially counted at the precinct where the vote was cast.
- There are explicit legal requirements for securing ballots.
- Recounts are allowed by request; five countries conduct 100 percent audits.
- Convenience voting is everywhere.
Evaluating State Practices in Statute and Regulation
Developing National Baseline

- Survey of state laws and regulations
  - Security
  - Pre-election procedures
  - Election ballot procedures
  - End of Election Procedures
  - Definition of “What Constitutes A Vote”
  - Counting and Accounting
  - Recounting
  - Challenges
Developing National Baseline

- Survey of state laws and regulations
  - Identified Specific Questions
  - Reviewed Survey with EAC, Election Officials, and Outside Experts

- Collected Data
  - Statutory or Regulatory Language
  - Legal Citation
Key Findings

- Three issues with great variation in coherence and completeness
  - Ballot Accounting
  - Ballot Security
  - What Constitutes a Vote
Survey Next Steps

- Each report is being carefully reviewed and edited

- Submit surveys to states for review

- States will have interactive online survey form to note problems
Benchmarking Election Law
Benchmarking

- Common in public and private sectors
- How does your performance stack up to similar organizations? OR
- How does your performance stack up to a pre-selected target?

- GOAL: Think about your practices.
Benchmarking Practices

- Using the survey data, we have identified most common practices
- For many activities, we will propose "benchmark" practices
  - Clearer,
  - More detailed, or
  - More comprehensive
Benchmarking Example: 
Ballot Accounting

- Most Common Practice: No Standard
- Benchmark: The counting board shall count all ballots to ensure that the total number of ballots corresponds with the total number of names in the poll book. If [they] cannot reconcile... [they] shall submit... a written report stating how many ballots were missing or in excess and any reason ...for the discrepancy.
Benchmarking Limitations

- Not all activities can be benchmarked
- Some activities reflect political and cultural decisions by the state. For example:
  - Absentee voting
  - Handling of recounts and challenges
Best Practices in Election Law
What are Best Practices

- Best practices refer to the processes, practices, and systems identified in organizations that performed exceptionally well and are widely recognized as improving an organization's performance and efficiency in specific areas.
Effective Best Practices

- Address a complete process
- Have been carefully charted
- Often come from organizations with similar characteristics
Best Practices Examined

- What Constitutes a Vote
- Accounting
- Auditing
- Security
- Transparency

- Issues in Challenges and Recounts
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background and Methodology

This report to the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) presents recommendations for best practices to improve the process of provisional voting. It is based on research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and the Moritz College of Law at Ohio State University under contract to the EAC, dated May 24, 2005.

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA, Public Law 107-252) authorizes the EAC (SEC. 241, 42 USC 15381) to conduct periodic studies of election administration issues. The purpose of these studies is to promote methods for voting and administering elections, including provisional voting, that are convenient, accessible and easy to use; that yield accurate, secure and expeditious voting systems; that afford each registered and eligible voter an equal opportunity to vote and to have that vote counted; and that are efficient. Section 302(a) of HAVA required states to establish provisional balloting procedures by January 2004. The process HAVA outlined left considerable room for variation among the states, arguably including such critical questions as who qualifies as a registered voter eligible to cast a provisional ballot that will be counted and in what jurisdiction (precinct or larger unit) the ballot must be cast in order to be counted.

The general requirement for provisional voting is that, if a registered voter appears at a polling place to vote in an election for Federal office, but either the potential voter's name does not appear on the official list of eligible voters for the polling place, or an election official asserts that the individual is not eligible to vote, that potential voter must be permitted to cast a provisional ballot. In some states, those who should receive a provisional ballot include, in the words of the EAC's Election Day Survey, "first-time voters who registered by mail without identification and cannot provide identification, as required under HAVA. . ." HAVA also provides that those who vote pursuant to a court order keeping the polls open after the established closing hour shall vote by provisional ballot. Election administrators are required by HAVA to notify individuals of their opportunity to cast a provisional ballot.

---

1 The Election Center's National Task Force Report on Election Reform in July 2001 had described provisional ballots as providing "voters whose registration status cannot be determined at the polls or verified at the election office the opportunity to vote. The validity of these ballots is determined later, thus ensuring that no eligible voter is turned away and those truly ineligible will not have their ballots counted." It recommended "in the absence of election day registration or other solutions to address registration questions, provisional ballots must be adopted by all jurisdictions." See www.electioncenter.org.

2 The 2004 election saw at least a dozen suits filed on the issue of whether votes cast in the wrong precinct but the correct county should be counted. One federal circuit court decided the issue in Sandusky County Democratic Party v. Blackwell, 387 F.3d565 (6th Cir. 2004), which held that votes cast outside the correct precinct did not have to be counted. The court relied on the presumption that Congress must be clear in order to alter the state-federal balance; thus Congress, the court concluded would have been clearer had it intended to eliminate state control over polling location (387 F.3d at 578). An alternative argument, that HAVA's definition of "jurisdiction" incorporates the broader definition in the National Voting Rights Act, however, has not been settled by a higher court. But for now states do seem to have discretion in how they define "jurisdiction" for the purpose of counting a provisional ballot.

3 The definition of who was entitled to a provisional ballot could differ significantly among the states. In California, for example, the Secretary of State directed counties to provide voters with the option of voting on a provisional paper ballot if they felt uncomfortable casting votes on the paperless e-voting machines. "I don't want a voter to not vote on Election Day because the only option before them is a touch-screen voting machine. I want that voter to have the confidence that he or she can vote on paper and have the confidence that their vote was cast as marked," Secretary Shelley said. See http://wired.com/news/evote/0,2645,63298,00.html. (Our analysis revealed no differences in the use of provisional ballots in the counties with these paperless e-voting machines. In Ohio, long lines at some polling places resulted in legal action directing that voters waiting in line be given provisional ballots to enable them to vote before the polls closed. (Columbus Dispatch, November 3, 2004.)
Our research began in late May 2005. It focused on six key questions raised by the EAC.
1. How did the states prepare for the onset of the HAVA provisional ballot requirement?
2. How did this vary between states that had previously had some form of provisional ballot and those that did not?
3. How did litigation affect implementation?
4. How effective was provisional voting in enfranchising qualified voters?
5. Did state and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots?
6. Did local election officials have a clear understanding of how to implement provisional voting?

To answer those questions, we:
1. Surveyed 400 local (mostly county) election officials to learn their views about the administration of provisional voting and to gain insights into their experience in the 2004 election.
2. Reviewed the EAC's Election Day Survey, news and other published reports in all 50 states to understand the local background of provisional voting and develop leads for detailed analysis.4
3. Analyzed statistically provisional voting data from the 2004 election to determine associations between the use of provisional voting and such variables as states' experience with provisional voting, use of statewide registration databases, counting out-of-precinct ballots, and use of different approaches to voter identification.
4. Collected and reviewed the provisional voting statutes and regulations in all 50 states.
5. Analyzed litigation affecting provisional voting or growing out of disputes over provisional voting in all states.

Our research is intended to provide EAC with a strategy to engage the states in a continuing effort to strengthen the provisional voting process and increase the consistency with which provisional voting is administered, particularly within a state. As EAC and the states move forward to assess and adopt the recommendations made here, provisional voting merits continuing observation and research. The situation is fluid. As states, particularly those states that did not offer a provisional ballot before 2004, gain greater experience with the process and as statewide voter databases are adopted, the provisional voting process will demand further, research-based refinement.

KEY FINDINGS

Variation among the states
In the 2004 election, nationwide about 1.9 million votes, or 1.6% of turnout, were cast as provisional ballots. More than 1.2 million, or just over 63%, were counted. Provisional ballots accounted for a little more than 1% of the final vote tally. These totals obscure the wide variation in provisional voting among the states.5

4 Attachment 1 provides detailed information on how this study classifies the states according to the characteristics of their provisional voting procedures. It also describes how the data used in the statistical analysis may differ from the data in the Election Day Survey, which became available as our research was concluding.
5 HAVA allows the states considerable latitude in how to implement provisional voting, including deciding who beyond the required categories of voters should receive provisional ballots and how to determine which provisional ballots should be counted.
Six states accounted for two-thirds of all the provisional ballots cast.\(^6\)

The percentage of provisional ballots in the total vote varied by a factor of 1,000 -- from a high of 7\% in Alaska to Vermont's 0.006\%.

The portion of provisional ballots cast that were counted ranged from 96\% in Alaska to 6\% in Delaware.

States with voter registration databases counted, on average, 20\% of the provisional ballots cast.

States without databases counted ballots at more than twice that rate: 44\%.\(^7\)

States that provided more time to evaluate provisional ballots counted a greater proportion of those ballots. Those that provided less than one week counted an average of 35.4\% of their ballots, while states that permitted more than 2 weeks, counted 60.8\%.

An important source of variation among states was a state's previous experience with provisional voting. The share of provisional ballots in the total vote was six times greater in states that had used provisional ballots before than in states where the provisional ballot was new. In the 25 states that had some experience with provisional voting before HAVA, a higher portion of the total vote was cast as provisional ballots and a greater percentage of the provisional ballots cast were counted than in the 18 new to provisional balloting.\(^8\)

**Variation within states**

Within states, too, there was little consistency among different jurisdictions. Of the 20 states for which we have county-level provisional ballot data, the rate of counting provisional ballots varied by as much as 90\% to 100\% among counties in the same state. This suggests that additional factors (including the training of election judges or poll workers) beyond statewide factors, such as experience or the existence of voter registration databases, also influence the use of provisional ballots.

- In Ohio some counties counted provisional ballots not cast in the assigned precinct even though the state's policy was to count only those ballots cast in the correct precinct.
- Some counties in Washington tracked down voters who would otherwise have had their provisional ballots rejected because they had failed to complete part of their registration form, gave them the chance to correct those omissions, and then counted the provisional ballot.

Resources available to administer provisional voting varied considerably among and within states. Differences in demographics and resources result in different experiences with provisional voting. For example, the Election Day Survey found that staffing problems appeared to be particularly acute for jurisdictions in the lowest income and education categories. Small, rural jurisdictions and large, urban jurisdictions tended to report higher rates of an inadequate number of poll workers within polling places or precincts.

- Jurisdictions with lower education and income tend to report more inactive voter registrations, lower turnout, and more provisional ballots cast.

---

\(^6\) California, New York, Ohio, Arizona, Washington, and North Carolina. The appearance of Arizona, Washington and North Carolina on this list shows that the number of provisional ballots cast depends on factors other than the size of the population.

\(^7\) As the Carter-Baker Commission report put it, "provisional ballots were needed half as often in states with unified databases as in states without." Report on the Commission on Federal Election Reform, "Building Confidence in U. S. Elections," September 2005, p. 16.

\(^8\) See the appendix for our classification of "old" and "new" states and explanation of why the total is less than 50.
Jurisdictions with higher levels of income and education reported higher average numbers of poll workers per polling place or precinct and reported lower rates of staffing problems per precinct.

In precincts located in districts where many voters live in poverty and have low levels of income and education, the voting process, in general, may be managed poorly. Provisional ballots cannot be expected to work much better. In these areas, the focus should be on broader measures to improve the overall functionality of struggling voting districts, although improving the management of provisional balloting may help at the margin.

The lessons of litigation
Successful legal challenges highlight areas where provisional voting procedures were wanting. A flurry of litigation occurred around the country in October 2004 concerning the so-called "wrong precinct issue" — whether provisional ballots cast by voters in a precinct other than their designated one would be counted for statewide races. Most courts, including the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (the only federal appeals court to rule on the issue), rejected the contention that HAVA requires the counting of these wrong-precinct provisional ballots. This litigation was significant nonetheless.

First, the Sixth Circuit decision established the precedent that voters have the right to sue in federal court to remedy violations of HAVA.
Second—and significantly—the litigation clarified the right of voters to receive provisional ballots, even though the election officials were certain they would not be counted. The decision also defined an ancillary right—the right to be directed to the correct precinct. There voters could cast a regular ballot that would be counted. If they insisted on casting a provisional ballot in the wrong precinct, they would be on notice that it would be a symbolic gesture only.
Third, these lawsuits prompted election officials to take better care in instructing precinct officials on how to notify voters about the need to go to the correct precinct in order to cast a countable ballot.

States move to improve their processes
Shortly after the 2004 election, several states came to the conclusion that the administration of their provisional voting procedures needed to be improved, and they amended their statutes. The new legislation highlights areas of particular concern to states about their provisional voting process.

Florida, Indiana, Virginia, and Washington have clarified or extended the timeline to evaluate the ballots.
Colorado, New Mexico, North Carolina, and Washington have passed legislation focused on improving the efficacy and consistency of the voting and counting process.
Colorado, Arkansas, and North Dakota took up the issue of counting provisional ballots cast in the wrong precinct.

The wide variation in the implementation of provisional voting among and within states suggests that EAC can help states strengthen their processes. Research-based recommendations for best, or at least better, practices that draw on the experience gained in the 2004 election can be useful in states’ efforts to achieve greater consistency in the administration of provisional voting. The important effect of experience on the administration of the provisional ballot process indicates that the states have much they can learn from each other.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BEST PRACTICES

State efforts to improve the provisional voting process have been underway since the 2004 election. By recommending best practices, the EAC will offer informed advice while respecting diversity among the states.

Take a quality-improvement approach
Defining what constitutes a successful provisional voting system is difficult. Defining quality requires a broad perspective about how well the system works, how open it is to error recognition and correction, and how well provisional voting processes are connected to the registration and voter identification regimes. A first step is for states to recognize that improving quality begins with seeing the provisional voting process as a system and taking a systems approach to regular evaluation through standardized metrics with explicit goals for performance. EAC can facilitate action by the states by recommending as a best practice that:

- Each state collect data systematically on the provisional voting process to permit evaluation of its voting system and assess changes from one election to the next. The data collected should include: provisional votes cast and counted by county; reasons why provisional ballots were not counted, measures of variance among jurisdictions, and time required to evaluate ballots by jurisdiction.

Emphasize the importance of clarity
Above all else, the EAC should emphasize the importance of clarity in the rules by which each state governs provisional voting. As state legislators and election officials prepare for the 2006 election, answers to the questions listed in the recommendation section of this report could be helpful. Among those questions are:

- Does the provisional voting system distribute, collect, record, and tally provisional ballots with sufficient accuracy to be seen as procedurally legitimate by both supporters and opponents of the winning candidate?
- Do the procedural requirements of the system permit cost-efficient operation?
- How great is the variation in the use of provisional voting in counties or equivalent levels of voting jurisdiction within the state? Is the variation great enough to cause concern that the system may not be administered uniformly across the state?

Court decisions suggest areas for action
The court decisions following the 2004 election also suggest procedures for states to incorporate into their procedures for provisional voting. EAC should recommend to the states that they:

- Promulgate clear standards for evaluating provisional ballots, and provide training for the officials who will apply those standards.
- Provide effective materials to be used by local jurisdictions in training poll workers on such procedures as how to locate polling places for potential voters who show up at the wrong place.
- Make clear that the only permissible requirement to obtain a provisional ballot is an affirmation that the voter is registered in the jurisdiction and eligible to vote in an election for federal office. Poll workers need appropriate training to understand their duty to give such voters a provisional ballot.

Assess each stage of the provisional voting process
Beyond the procedures suggested by court decisions, states should assess each stage of the provisional voting process. They can begin by assessing the utility and clarity of the information for voters on their websites and by considering what information might be added to sample ballots mailed to voters before elections. The better voters understand their rights and obligations, the easier the system will be to manage, and the more legitimate the appearance of the process.

Avoiding error at the polling place will allow more voters to cast a regular ballot and all others who request it to cast a provisional ballot. Our recommendations for best practices to avoid error at the polling place include:

- The layout and staffing of the multi-precinct polling place is important. States should ensure that training materials distributed to every jurisdiction make poll workers familiar with the options available to voters.
- The provisional ballot should be of a design or color sufficiently different from a regular ballot to avoid confusion over counting and include take-away information for the voter on the steps in the ballot evaluation process.
- Because provisional ballots offer a fail-safe, supplies of the ballots at each polling place should be sufficient for all the potential voters likely to need them. Best practice would be for states to provide guidelines (as do Connecticut and Delaware) to estimate the supply of provisional ballots needed at each polling place.

The clarity of criteria for evaluating voter eligibility is critical to a sound process for deciding which of the cast provisional ballots should be counted.

- State statutes or regulations should define a reasonable period for voters who lack the HAVA-specified ID or other information bearing on their eligibility to provide it in order to facilitate the state's ability to verify that the person casting the provisional ballot is the same one who registered. At least 11 states allow voters to provide ID or other information one to 13 days after voting. Kansas allows voters to proffer their ID by electronic means or by mail, as well as in person.
- More provisional voters have their ballots counted in those states that count ballots cast outside the correct precinct. While HAVA arguably leaves this decision up to the states, pointing out the effect of the narrower definition on the portion of ballots counted could be useful to the states in deciding this question. States should be aware, however, of the additional burden placed on the ballot-evaluation process when out-of-precinct ballots are considered. And tradeoffs are involved if out-of-precinct voters are unable to vote for the local offices that might appear on the ballot in their district of residence.
- If a state does require voters to appear at their assigned precinct, where the same polling site serves more than one precinct, a voter's provisional ballot should count as long as the voter cast that ballot at the correct polling site even if at the wrong precinct within that location. While the best practice might be for poll workers to direct the voter to correct precinct poll workers' advice is not always correct, and the voter should be protect against ministerial error.
- Officials should follow a written procedure, and perhaps a checklist, to identify the reason why a provisional ballot is rejected. Colorado's election rules offer particularly clear guidance to the official evaluating a provisional ballot.

In verifying provisional ballots, the time by which election officials must make their eligibility determinations is particularly important in presidential elections because of the need to certify electors to the Electoral College. Our research did not identify an optimum division of the five weeks available.
The best practice here is for states to consider the issue and make a careful decision about how to complete all steps in the evaluation of ballots and challenges to those determinations within the five weeks available.

After the election, timely information to voters about the disposition of their provisional ballot can enable voters to determine if they are registered for future elections and, if not, what they need to do to become registered.

- Best practice for the states is to establish mechanisms to ensure that voters casting provisional ballots are informed whether they are now registered for future elections and, if not, what they need to do to become registered.

**Final observation**

The detailed examination of each stage in the provisional voting process can lay the foundation each state needs to improve its system. Efforts to improve provisional voting may be most effective as part of a broader effort by state and local election officials to strengthen their systems. Collecting and analyzing data about those systems will enable states to identify which aspects of the registration and electoral system are most important in shunting voters into the provisional ballot process. Responsible officials can then look to their registration system, identification requirements or poll worker training as ways to reduce the need for voters to cast their ballots provisionally.
Provisional Voting in 2004

In the 2004 election, nationwide about 1.9 million votes, or 1.6% of turnout, were cast as provisional ballots. More than 1.2 million or just over 63% were counted. Provisional ballots accounted for a little more than 1% of the final vote tally.

These totals obscure the wide variation in provisional voting among the states. Six states accounted for two-thirds of all the provisional ballots cast. State by state, the percentage of provisional ballots in the total vote varied by a factor of 1,000 -- from a high of 7% in Alaska to Vermont's 0.006%. The portion of provisional ballots cast that were actually counted also displayed wide variation, ranging from 96% in Alaska to 6% in Delaware. States with voter registration databases counted, on average, 20% of the provisional ballots cast. Those without databases counted provisional ballots at more than twice that rate, 44%.

An important source of variation was a state's previous experience with provisional voting. The share of provisional ballots in the total vote was six times greater in states that had used provisional ballots before than in states where the provisional ballot was new. In the 25 states that had some experience with provisional voting before HAVA, a higher portion of the total vote was cast as provisional ballots and a greater percentage of the provisional ballots cast were counted than in the 18 new to provisional balloting.

- The percentage of the total vote cast as provisional ballots averaged more than 2% in the 25 experienced states. This was 4 times the rate in states new to provisional voting, which averaged 0.47%.
- The experienced states counted an average of 58% of the provisional ballots cast, nearly double the proportion in the new states, which counted just 33% of cast provisional ballots.
- The combined effect of these two differences was significant. In experienced states 1.53% of the total vote came from counted provisional ballots. In new states, provisional ballots accounted for only 0.23% of the total vote.

Those voting with provisional ballots in experienced states had their ballots counted more frequently than those in the new states. This experience effect is evidence that there is room for improvement in provisional balloting procedures, especially in those states new to the process. That conclusion gains support from the perspectives of the local election officials revealed in the survey conducted as a part of this research. Local (mostly county level) election officials from "experienced" states were more likely to:

9 HAVA allows the states considerable latitude in how to implement provisional voting, including deciding who beyond the required categories of voters should receive provisional ballots and how to determine which provisional ballots should be counted.
10 California, New York, Ohio, Arizona, Washington, and North Carolina. The appearance of Arizona, Washington and North Carolina on this list shows that the number of provisional ballots cast depends on factors other than the size of the population.
11 See the appendix for our classification of "old" and "new" states and explanation of why the total is less than 50.
12 To compensate for the wide differences in vote turnout among the 50 states the average figures here are calculated as the mean of the percent cast or counted rather than from the raw numbers of ballots cast or counted.
13 Managing the provisional voting process can strain the capacity election administrators. For example, Detroit, counted 123 of the 1,350 provisional ballots cast there in 2004. A recent study concluded that Detroit's "6-day time limit to process provisional ballots was very challenging and unrealistic. To overcome this challenge, the entire department's employees were mobilized to process provisional ballots." (emphasis added.) GAO Report-05-997, "Views of Selected Local Officials on Managing Voter Registration and Ensuring Citizens Can Vote," September 2005.
• Be prepared to direct voters to their correct precincts with maps;
• Regard provisional voting as easy to implement;
• Report that provisional voting sped up and improved polling place operations
• Conclude that the provisional voting process helped officials maintain accurate registration databases.

Officials from "new" states, on the other hand, were more likely to agree with the statement that provisional voting created unnecessary problems for election officials and poll workers.

If experience with provisional voting does turn out to be a key variable in performance, that is good news. As states gain experience with provisional ballots their management of the process could become more consistent and more effective over subsequent elections. Further information from the EAC on best practices and the need for more consistent management of the election process could sharpen the lessons learned by experience. The EAC can facilitate the exchange of experience among the states and can offer all states information on more effective administration of provisional voting.

Concluding optimistically that experience will make all the difference, however, may be unwarranted. Only if the performance of the "new" states was the result of administrative problems stemming from inexperience will improvement be automatic as election officials move along the learning curve. Two other possibilities exist. Our current understanding of how provisional voting worked in 2004 is not sufficient to determine unambiguously which view is correct.

1. "New" states may have a political culture different from "old" states. That is, underlying features of the "new" states political system may be the reason they had not adopted some form of provisional voting before HAVA. The "new" states may strike a different balance among the competing objectives of ballot access, ballot security and practical administration. They may ascribe more responsibility to the individual voter to take such actions as registering early, finding out where the right precinct is, or re-registering after changing address. They may value keeping control at the local level, rather than ceding authority to state or federal directives. The training they offer poll workers about provisional ballots may not be as frequent or effective as in other states. If the inconsistent performance in the "new" states arises out of this kind of political culture, improving effectiveness in the use of the provisional ballots -- as measured by intrastate consistency in administration--- will be harder and take longer to achieve.

2. "Old" states may devote fewer resources to updating their registration files or databases because they consider provisional ballots as a reasonable fail safe way for voters with registration problems a way to cast a ballot. The adoption of statewide voter registration databases in compliance with HAVA therefore may reduce the variation in the use of provisional ballots among the states.

Other influences decreasing consistency among the states include:

---

14 Despite differing political cultures among states and the latitude HAVA provides states, the statute does, indeed impose some degree of uniformity on issues that Congress thought essential. For example, before HAVA, took effect, "no state gave the voter the right to find out the status of their ballot after the election." Now all offer that opportunity. See Bali and Silver, "The Impact of Politics, Race and Fiscal Strains on State Electoral Reforms after Election 2000," manuscript, Department of Political Science, Michigan State University. Resisting HAVA's mandates through foot-dragging lacks any legitimate foundation in law or policy.
• The more rigorous the verification requirements, the smaller the percentage of provisional ballots that were counted. Some states verified provisional ballots by comparing the voter’s signature to a sample, some matched such identifying data as address, birth date, or social security number, others required voters who lacked ID at the polling place to return later with the ID to evaluate the provisional ballot, and some required provisional voters to execute an affidavit.  
  - In the 4 states that simply matched signatures, nearly 3.5% of the total turnout consisted of provisional ballots, and just under three-fourths of those ballots (73%) were counted.  
  - In the 14 states that required voters to provide such additional information as address or date of birth just over 1.5% of the total turnout consisted of provisional ballots, and 55% of those ballots were counted.  
  - In the 14 states that required an affidavit (attesting, for example, that the voter was legally registered and eligible to vote in the jurisdiction) just over one-half of a percent (0.6%) of turnout came from provisional ballots, and less than one-third of those (30%) were counted. (But note that HAVA requires all voters to certify that they are eligible and registered in order to cast a provisional ballot, which is functionally an affidavit. The 14 states described here used an explicit affidavit form.)  
  - In the 10 states that required voters to return later with identifying documents just under 1.5% of the total turnout came from provisional ballots, and more than half (52%) of these were counted. Voters apparently found this requirement less onerous than the affidavit, even though it required a separate trip to a government office.

• Voter registration databases provided information that reduced the number of provisional ballots counted. In states using provisional voting for the first time, states with registered-voter databases counted only 20% of the ballots that were cast. States without such databases counted more than double that rate (44%). As HAVA’s requirement for adoption of statewide databases spreads across the country, this variation among states is likely to narrow. Real-time access to a continually updated, statewide list of registered voters should reduce the number of provisional ballots used and reduce the percentage counted since most of those who receive them will be less likely to be actually registered in the state.

• States that counted out-of-precinct ballots counted 56% of the provisional ballots cast. States that counted ballots cast only in the proper precinct counted an average of 42% of provisional ballots.  

15 See Table 2 in Appendix 2 for information on the verification method used in each state.  
16 The Election Day Survey found that states using statewide voter registration databases reported a lower incidence of casting provisional ballots than states without voter registration databases, suggesting that better administration of voter registration rolls might be associated with fewer instances where voters would be required to cast a provisional ballot due to a problem with their voter registration.  
17 The Election Day Survey concluded that: “Jurisdictions with jurisdiction-wide provisional ballot acceptance reported higher rates of provisional ballots cast, 2.09 percent of registration or 4.67 percent of ballots cast in polling places, than those with in-precinct-only acceptance, 0.72 and 1.18 percent, respectively. Predictably, those jurisdictions with more permissive jurisdiction-wide acceptance reported higher rates of counting provisional ballots, 71.50 percent, than other jurisdictions, 52.50 percent.”
In experienced states, the disparity was even more pronounced: 52% of provisional ballots cast were counted in states requiring in-district ballots, while 70% were counted in those allowing out-of-precinct ballots.

- If all states had counted out-of-precinct ballots, perhaps 290,000 more provisional ballots would have been counted across the country.\(^{18}\)

- States that provide a longer the time to evaluate provisional ballots counted a higher proportion of those ballots.\(^{19}\)
  - Fourteen states permitted less than one week to evaluate provisional ballots, 15 states permitted between one and two weeks, and 14 states permitted greater than two weeks\(^{20}\).
  - Those states that permitted less than one week counted an average of 35.4% of their ballots.
  - States that permitted between one and two weeks counted 47.1%.
  - States that permitted more than 2 weeks, counted 60.8% of the provisional ballots cast\(^{21}\).
  - The effect of allowing more time for evaluation is felt most strongly in states where more than 1% of the overall turnout was of provisional ballots. In states where provisional ballots were used most heavily, those that permitted less than one week to evaluate ballots counted 58.6% while those that permitted one to two weeks counted 65.0% of ballots, and those states that permitted greater than three weeks verified the highest proportion of provisional ballots, at 73.8%.

Variation Within States
Not only was there little consistency among states in the use of provisional ballots, there was also little consistency within states. This was true in both new and old states. Of the 20 states for which we have county-level provisional ballot data, the rate of counting provisional ballots varied by as much as 90% to 100% among counties in the same state. This suggests that additional factors beyond statewide factors, such as verification requirements or the time provided for ballot evaluation, also influence the provisional voting process. Reacting to the lack of consistency within states, the Carter-Baker Commission) recommended that "states, not counties or municipalities, should establish uniform procedures for the verification and counting of provisional ballots, and that procedure should be applied uniformly throughout the state."\(^{22}\)

Election Line reported that:

\(^{18}\) This estimate is a rough approximation. States that recognize out-of-precinct ballots counted, on average, 56% of the provisional votes cast. Applying that ratio to the 1.9 million provisional ballots cast nationwide would result in 1.1 million provisional ballots that would have been counted if all states accepted out-of-precinct votes. States that did not recognize out-of-precinct ballots counted 42% of the provisional ballots cast, or about 813,000 ballots, for a difference of about 290,000 votes.

\(^{19}\) See Appendix __, Relationship Between Time Allotted to Verify Provisional Ballots and the Level of Ballots that are Verified, David Andersen, The Eagleton Institute of Politics

\(^{20}\) Many thanks to Ben Shepler, of the Moritz College of Law, for assembling complete data on the time requirements states permitted for the counting of provisional ballots.

\(^{21}\) 43 states are included in this analysis, including Washington D.C. The 7 election-day registration states are omitted, as is Mississippi, which never provided data on provisional ballots. North Carolina is also omitted from the regressions, as it does not have a statewide policy on how it verifies provisional ballots.

\(^{22}\) Recommendation 2.3.2 of the Report of the Commission on Federal Election Reform, “Building Confidence in U.S. Elections,” September 2005, p.16. The report also observed that, “...different procedures for counting provisional ballots within and between states led to legal challenges and political protests. Had the margin of victory for the presidential contest been narrower, the lengthy dispute that followed the 2000 election could have been repeated.”
In Ohio some counties counted provisional ballots not cast in the assigned precinct even though the state's policy was to count only those ballots cast in the correct precinct. Some counties in Washington tracked down voters who would otherwise have had their provisional ballots rejected because they had failed to complete part of their registration form, gave them the chance to correct those omissions, and then counted the provisional ballot. This would probably not have come to light except for the sharp examination caused by the very close election for governor.

Resources available to administer provisional voting varied considerably among and within states. The result is that differences in demographics and resources result in different experiences with provisional voting. For example, the Election Day Survey found that:

- Jurisdictions with lower education and income tend to report more inactive voter registrations, lower turnout, and more provisional ballots cast.
- Jurisdictions with higher levels of income and education reported higher average numbers of poll workers per polling place or precinct and reported lower rates of staffing problems per precinct.
- Staffing problems appeared to be particularly acute for jurisdictions in the lowest income and education categories. Small, rural jurisdictions and large, urban jurisdictions tended to report higher rates of an inadequate number of poll workers within polling places or precincts.
- Predominantly non-Hispanic, Black jurisdictions reported a greater percentage of polling places or precincts with an inadequate number of poll workers. Predominantly non-Hispanic, Native American jurisdictions reported the second highest percentage of staffing problems.

The conclusions to be drawn from these findings are clear. In voting districts with lower education levels, poverty, and inadequately staffed polling places, the voting process is unlikely to function well. More people will end up casting provisional ballots. That makes the provisional voting process especially important in such districts. But if jurisdictions struggle with regular voting, how well are they likely to do with the more complicated provisional balloting process? In precincts were the voting process, in general, is managed poorly, provisional ballots cannot be expected to work much better. In these areas, the focus should be on broader measures to improve the overall functionality of struggling voting districts, although improving the management of provisional balloting may help at the margin.

Effectiveness of Provisional Voting

The certainty of our conclusions about the effectiveness of provisional voting is limited because of the complexity of the problem and a lack of important information. An ideal assessment of how well provisional ballots worked in 2004 would require knowing the decisions of local officials in 200,000 precincts on how to inform voters about provisional voting; their performance in providing a provisional ballot to those qualified to receive one, and their decisions whether to count a provisional ballot. Information needed about the eligibility or registration status of provisional voters is also not available.

We see no automatic correlation between the quality of a state's voting system and either the number of provisional ballots cast or counted. Low numbers could reflect accurate statewide voting data and good voter education. Or they could suggest that provisional ballots were not
made easily available. High numbers could be seen as signifying an effective provisional voting system or a weak registration process. But we do know that in 2004 provisional ballots allowed 1.2 million citizens to vote, citizens who would otherwise have been turned away from the polls.

Since we do not know the total number of registered voters who might have voted but could not makes a precise, quantitative estimate of the effectiveness of provisional voting impossible. The Cal Tech – MIT Voting Technology Project, however, estimated that 4 – 6 million votes were lost in the 2000 presidential election for the reasons shown in Table 1 below. The estimate is an approximation, but it may provide data good enough for a general assessment of the size of the pool of potential voters who might have been helped by the provisional ballot process.

### Estimates of Votes Lost In 2000 Presidential Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Votes Lost (Millions)</th>
<th>Cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5 – 2</td>
<td>Faulty equipment and confusing ballots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 – 3</td>
<td>Registration mix-ups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>Polling place operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Absentee ballot administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Cal Tech – MIT Voting Technology Project Estimates

4 – 6 million votes are lost in presidential elections due to the causes shown in the table. Registration mix-ups (e.g., name not on list) and polling place operations (e.g., directed to wrong precinct) are the causes most likely to be remedied by provisional voting.

The table shows that the universe of voters who could be helped by provisional voting might be 2.5 – 3 million voters. In 2004, about 1.2 million provisional voters were counted. A rough estimate, then, of the effectiveness of provisional voting in 2004, then, might be 40% to 50% (ballots counted/votes lost)\(^{23}\). Whatever the precise figure, it seems reasonable to conclude that there is considerable room for improvement in the administration of provisional voting.

### Legislative Response

Indeed, several states\(^ {24} \) came to the conclusion that the administration of their provisional voting procedures needed to be improved and amended their statutes after the 2004 election. State legislation adopted since the election points to particular areas of concern.

---

\(^{23}\) Another interpretation of the data should be considered. The Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS) developed the category of "registration mix-ups" to assess the states' registration systems. After each election the CPS asks people if they were registered and if they voted. The CPS gives breakdowns of reasons why people did not vote. Survey responders tend to deflect blame when answering questions about voting. In the narrow context of provisional ballots, "registration problems" would cover only voters who went to the polls where the determination that they were not registered was wrong or they were registered, but in the wrong precinct. If they were in the wrong precinct, provisional voting can help them in only 17 states. In 2004, only 6.8% of those not voting and registered blamed registration problems, while 6.9% reported so in 2000.

\(^{24}\) Twelve states made statutory or regulatory changes: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, North Carolina, Virginia and Wyoming. See Table 4 in Appendix 2.
Not enough time to examine and count the provisional ballots. Florida, Indiana, Virginia, and Washington all have clarified or extended the timeline to evaluate the ballots. But taking more time can prove a problem, particularly in presidential elections with the looming deadline to certify the vote for the Electoral College.\textsuperscript{25}

Lack of uniform rules for counting ballots and effective training of the election officials in interpreting and applying those rules to determine the validity of ballots. Colorado, New Mexico, North Carolina, and Washington have all passed legislation focused on improving the efficacy and consistency of the voting and counting process.

**Litigation**

Successful legal challenges to the process highlight areas where provisional voting procedures were wanting. A flurry of litigation occurred around the country in October 2004 concerning the so-called “wrong precinct issue” — whether provisional ballots cast by voters in a precinct other than their designated one would be counted for statewide races. These lawsuits were largely unsuccessful in their stated goal: most courts, including the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (the only federal appeals court to rule on the issue), rejected the contention that HAVA requires the counting of these wrong-precinct provisional ballots.

This litigation was significant nonetheless.

- First, the Sixth Circuit decision established the precedent that voters have the right to sue in federal court to remedy violations of HAVA.

- Second—and significantly—the litigation clarified the right of voters to receive provisional ballots, even though the election officials were certain they would not be counted. The decision also defined an ancillary right—the right to be directed to the correct precinct. There voters could cast a regular ballot that would be counted. If they insisted on casting a provisional ballot in the wrong precinct, they would be on notice that it would be a symbolic gesture only.

- Third, these lawsuits prompted election officials to take better care in instructing precinct officials on how to notify voters about the need to go to the correct precinct in order to cast a countable ballot—although the litigation regrettably came too late to be truly effective in this regard. In many states, on Election Day 2004, the procedures in place for notifying voters about where to go were less than ideal, reflecting less-than-ideal procedures for training poll workers on this point.

There was also pre-election litigation over the question whether voters who had requested an absentee ballot were entitled to cast a provisional ballot. In both cases (one in Colorado and one, decided on Election Day, in Ohio), the federal courts ruled that HAVA requires that these voters receive a provisional ballot. Afterwards, it is for state officials under state law to

\textsuperscript{25} The resources available to evaluate and count provisional ballots within a tight schedule may not be easily available. The General Accounting Office reports that Detroit, where 1,350 provisional ballots were cast and 123 counted, found the 6-day time frame for processing provisional ballots “very challenging and unrealistic. To overcome this challenge, the entire department’s employees were mobilized to process provisional ballots.” The report also found that in Los Angeles County, “staff had to prepare duplicate ballots to remove ineligible or invalid contests when voters cast their ballots at the wrong precinct. To overcome this challenge, staffing was increased to prepare the duplicate ballots.” In a close, contested election, “duplicate” ballots would doubtless receive long and careful scrutiny.” See Appendix 7, GAO, “Views of Selected Local Election Officials on Managing Voter Registration and Ensuring Eligible Citizens Can Vote,” September 2005. (GAO Report-05-997)
determine whether these provisional ballots will be counted, in part by determining if these provisional voters already had voted an absentee ballot (in which case one ballot should be ruled ineligible, in order to avoid double voting). These decisions confirm the basic premise that provisional ballots should be available whenever voters believe they are entitled to them, so that their preferences can be recorded, with a subsequent determination whether these preferences count as valid votes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Because every provisional ballot counted represents a voter who, if the system had worked perfectly, should have voted by regular ballot, the advent of statewide registration databases is likely to reduce the use provisional ballots. The one area in which such databases may not make a difference is for those who voted by provisional ballot because they did not bring required identification documents to the polling place. The statewide voter registration database will facilitate verifying that ballot, but the voter will still have vote provisionally. Beyond that exception, even with statewide registries in every state, provisional voting will remain an important failsafe, and voters should have confidence that the failsafe will operate correctly.

The wide variation in the implementation of provisional voting among and particularly within states suggests that EAC can help states strengthen their processes. Research-based recommendations for best, or at least better, practices based on the experience gained in the 2004 election can be useful in states’ efforts to achieve greater consistency in the administration of provisional voting.

Recommendations for Best Practices
Recent legislative activity shows that state efforts to improve the provisional voting process are underway. Those states, as well as others that have not yet begun to correct shortcomings that became apparent in 2004, can benefit from considering the best practices described here. By recommending best practices, the EAC will offer informed advice while respecting diversity among the states. One way to strengthen the recommendations and build a constituency for them would be for EAC to ask its advisory committee members to recommend as best practices procedures that have worked in their states.

Self-evaluation of Provisional Voting –4 Key Questions
The first need to achieve greater consistency within each state is to think about provisional voting systematically. As legislators, election officials, and citizens in the states prepare for the 2006 election, they should ask themselves these questions about their provisional voting systems.

1. Does the provisional voting system distribute, collect, record, and tally provisional ballots with sufficient accuracy to be seen as procedurally legitimate by both supporters and opponents of the winning candidate? Does the tally include all votes cast by properly registered voters who correctly completed the steps required?

2. Is the provisional voting system sufficiently robust to perform well under the pressure of a close election when ballot evaluation will be under scrutiny and litigation looms?

3. Do the procedural requirements of the system permit cost-efficient operation? Are the administrative demands of the system reasonably related to the staff and other resource requirements available?
4. How great is the variation in the use of provisional voting in counties or equivalent levels of voting jurisdiction within the state? Is the variation great enough to cause concern that the system may not be administered uniformly across the state?

If the answers to these questions leave room for doubt about the effectiveness of the system or some of its parts, the EAC’s recommendation of best practices should provide the starting point for a state’s effort to improve its provisional voting system.

**Best Practices For Each Step In The Process**

We examined each step of the provisional voting process to identify specific areas where the states should focus their attention to reduce the inconsistencies noted in our analysis. We offer recommendations in each area appropriate to the responsibilities that HAVA assigns the EAC for the proper functioning of the provisional voting process.

**The Importance of Clarity**

The EAC should emphasize above all else the importance of clarity in the rules governing every stage of provisional voting. As the Century Foundation’s recent report observed, “Close elections increasingly may be settled in part by the evaluating and counting of provisional ballots. . . To avoid post election disputes over provisional ballots—disputes that will diminish public confidence in the accuracy and legitimacy of the result—well in advance of the election, states should establish, announce, and publicize clear statewide standards for every aspect of the provisional ballot process, from who is entitled to receive a provisional ballot to which ones are counted.”

Litigation surrounding the 2004 election resulted in decisions that, if reflected in state statutes or regulations and disseminated in effective training for poll workers, can increase the clarity of provisional ballot procedures, increase predictability, and bolster confidence in the system. By taking the following steps, states can incorporate those court rulings into their procedures.

- Promulgate, ideally by legislation, clear standards for evaluating provisional ballots, and provide training for the officials who will apply those standards. For example, in Washington State, the court determined that an election official’s failure in evaluating ballots to do a complete check against all signature records is an error serious enough to warrant recanvassing. Clear direction by regulation or statute on what records to use in evaluating ballots could have saved precious time and effort and increased the reliability of the provisional voting system.

- States should provide poll workers standard information resources for the training of poll workers by local jurisdictions. Training materials might include, for example, maps or databases with instruction on how to locate polling places for potential voters who show up at the wrong place. Usable and useful information in the hands of poll workers can protect voters from being penalized by ministerial errors at the polling place.


27 See *Washington State Republican Party v. King County Division of Records*, 103 P3d 725, 727-728 (Wash. 2004)

28 See *Panio v. Sunderland* 824 N.E.2d 488, 490 (NY, 2005) See also Order, *Hawkins v. Blunt*, No.04-4177-CV-C-RED (W.D. Mo. October 12, 2004). While rejecting the notion that all ballots cast in the wrong precinct should be counted, the court ruled that provisional votes cast in the wrong precinct should be thrown out provided that the voter had been directed to the correct precinct. This meant that provisional votes cast in the wrong precinct (and even the
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- State training materials provided to local jurisdictions should make clear that the only permissible requirement to obtain a provisional ballot is an affirmation that the voter is registered in the jurisdiction and eligible to vote in an election for federal office. Recent legislation in Arizona indicates that recommendations should emphasize HAVA's requirement that persons appearing at the polling place claiming to be registered voters cannot be denied a ballot because they do not have identification with them. Poll workers may need appropriate training to understand their duty to give such voters a provisional ballot.

A. Registration and Pre-Election Information for Voters

Providing crisp, clear information to voters before the election is important to the success of the provisional voting process. The better voters understand their rights and obligations, the easier the system will be to manage, and the more legitimate the appearance of the process. States can begin by assessing the utility and clarity of the information for voters on their websites and by considering what information might be added to sample ballots mailed to voters before elections. Best practices in this area would include:

1. If states require identification at the time of registration, the kind of IDs required should be stated precisely and clearly and be publicly and widely available in a form that all voters can understand. For example, "You must bring your driver's license. If you don't have a driver's license, then you must bring an ID card with your photograph on it and this ID card must be issued by a government agency."

2. The process to re-enfranchise felons should be clear and straightforward. To avoid litigation over the registration status of felons, best practice should be defined as making re-enfranchisement automatic, or no more burdensome than the process required for any new registrant.

3. State or county websites for voters should offer full, clear information on boundaries of precincts, location of polling places, requirements for identification, and other necessary guidance that will facilitate registration and the casting of a regular ballot. An 800 number should also be provided. Models are available: the statewide databases in Florida and Michigan provide voters with provisional voting information, registration verification and precinct location information.

B. At the Polling Place

wrong polling place) would count if there were no evidence that the voter had been directed to a different polling place. The court placed a duty upon election officials to make sure the voters were in the correct locations. Note that this question would not arise in a state that counted ballots cast in the wrong polling place but within the correct county.


30 The Florida Democratic Party v. Hood, 342 F. Supp. 2d 1073, 1075-76 (N.D. Fla. 2004). The court explained that provisional voting is designed to correct the situation that occurs when election officials do not have perfect knowledge and when they make incorrect determinations about eligibility (the "fail-safe" notion). Denying voters provisional ballots because of on-the-spot determinations directly contradicts this idea. Even before the cited decision, the Florida Secretary of State’s office had determined that any voter who makes the declaration required by federal law is entitled to vote a provisional ballot, even if the voter is in the wrong precinct.

31 Websites in 29 states describe, with varying degrees of specificity, the identification voters may need. In 18 states voters can learn something about the precinct in which they should vote. And in 6 states (California, District of Columbia, Kentucky, Michigan, North Carolina, and South Carolina) they can verify their registration on the website.

32 The Century Foundation, op. cit.
Avoiding error at the polling place will allow more voters to cast a regular ballot and all others who request it to cast a provisional ballot.

1. The layout and staffing of the polling place, particularly the multi-precinct polling place is important. Greeters, maps, and prominently posted voter information about provisional ballots, ID requirements, and related topics can help the potential voters cast their ballot in the right place. States should require poll workers to be familiar with the options and provide the resources needed for them to achieve the knowledge needed to be helpful and effective. Colorado has clear regulations on polling place requirements, including HAVA information and voting demonstration display.\(^{33}\) Many states require training of poll workers. In some states that requirement is recent: after the 2004 election, New Mexico adopted a requirement for poll workers to attend an "election school."\(^{34}\) A state statutory requirement for training could facilitate uniform instruction of poll workers in those states that do not already provide it.

2. The provisional ballot should be of a design or color sufficiently different from a regular ballot to avoid confusion over counting, as occurred in Washington State. The ballot might include a tear-off leaflet with information for voters such as: "Reasons Why Your Provisional Ballot Might Not Be Counted" on one side and "What to Do if My Provisional Ballot Is Not Counted" on the other.

3. Because provisional ballots offer a fail-safe, supplies of the ballots at each polling place should be sufficient for all the potential voters likely to need them. In 2004, some polling places ran out of ballots, with unknown effects on the opportunity to vote. In Middlesex County, New Jersey, for example, on Election Day the Superior Court ordered the county clerk to assure that sufficient provisional ballots were available at several heavily used polling places, and it authorized the clerk "in the event additional provisional ballots are required . . . to photocopy official provisional ballots."\(^{35}\) At least two states, Connecticut and Delaware, provide guidelines to local election officials on how to estimate the demand for provisional ballots. Connecticut sets the number at 1% of the voters in the district, Delaware at 6%.\(^{36}\) States that do not offer a practical method to guide the supply of provisional ballots at polling places should consider doing so. The guideline should take into account both the number of voters in the district and the number of provisional ballots actually cast in recent elections.

4. To achieve the procedural clarity needed to forestall disputes, states should establish a clear chain of custody for the handling of provisional ballots from production through distribution, collection and, finally, evaluation. A number of states have clear procedures for at least parts of this chain of custody. All states should examine their chain-of-custody requirements for clarity. Illinois includes the potentially beneficial requirement that ballots be transported by bi-partisan teams, which offers the potential to avoid some charges of election fraud.

\(^{33}\) 8 Colo. Code Regs. § 1505-1, Rule 7.1.
\(^{34}\) 2005 N.M. Laws 270 page no. 4-5.
\(^{35}\) Voting Order, November 2, 2004, Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Middlesex County.
\(^{36}\) Connecticut: "Equal to or not less than 1% of the number of electors who are eligible to vote in any given district, or such other number as the municipal clerk and the registrars agree is sufficient to protect voting rights. Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 9-232] Delaware: Each County Department of Elections Office is required to provide to each election district a number of provisional ballots equal to 6% of registered voters in that district, with a minimum allocation of 15 ballots. Additional supplies to be delivered when the supply becomes "very low." Del.Code Ann. Tit 15 § 4948(e).
C. Evaluating Voter Eligibility and Counting Provisional Ballots

The clarity of criteria for evaluating voter eligibility is critical to a sound process for deciding which of the cast provisional ballots should be counted. Public recognition of the validity of those criteria is important to establishing the legitimacy of the system as a whole. The experience in 2004 in North Carolina, Washington, and Ohio underlines the importance of clear criteria. As the Century Foundation report put it, “Whatever procedures the states choose [to determine if a provisional ballot should be counted], the paramount consideration—as with all others concerning provisional voting—is that they be clear and thus not susceptible to post-election manipulation and litigation.” Nonetheless, the Panio v. Sutherland decision in New York shows the difficulty of defining the range of administrative errors from which the provisional voters should be held harmless. Even when the standard is “clerical error” judges can differ over what that means exactly. Possibly a state law might be able to clarify a definition by giving examples of clerical errors, but even then the definition is unlikely to be perfect.

1. State statutes or regulations should define a reasonable period for voters who lack the HAVA-specified ID or other information bearing on their eligibility to provide it in order to facilitate the state’s ability to verify that the person casting the provisional ballot is the same one who registered. While there may be a concern to ensure that the individual who returns with the ID may not be the same individual who cast the provisional ballot, the spirit of HAVA demands that the opportunity to prove identity be provided after Election Day. A signature match can go far in establishing that the individual who voted and the individual returning later with identification is, in fact, the same person. Encouraging a voter who lacks ID on Election Day to return later to help the verification process by providing proper identification will strengthen the system and increase public confidence in the electoral process. Our data indicate that some voters would prefer to return with ID rather than to sign an affidavit, perhaps because of uncertainty about the legal process involved in the affidavit. At least 11 states allow voters to provide ID or other information one to 13 days after voting. Of particular interest is Kansas, which allows voters to proffer their ID by electronic means or by mail, as well as in person.

2. More provisional ballots are counted in those states that verify ballots cast outside the correct precinct. While HAVA arguably leaves this decision up to the states, pointing out the effect of the narrower definition on the portion of ballots counted could be useful to the states in deciding this question. States should be aware, however, of the

---

37 The Century Foundation, op. cit.
39 In Kansas, the voter can provide ID to a County Election Officer any time before the County Board of Canvassers meets to count provisional ballots. KS. ST. 25-1122(d). ID can be presented in person, OR via mail or electronic means. ld. The Board must meet either on the Friday or Monday following a Tuesday election. Id. at 25-3104. Deadlines in other states are: Alabama -- 5:00 P.M. on the Monday following the election AL ST § 17-10A-2(c)(1). Florida: until 5:00 P.M. on the third day following the election . Fla. Stat. Ann. § 101.046 (adopted after the 2004 election);Georgia—no later than 2 days after the election. GA ST § 21-2-417; 419. Illinois—2 days to submit additional information 10 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/18A-15(d); Indiana— in 2004 the deadline was the close of the polls IN. ST. § 3-11.7-5-2(a). The time period was extended to 13 days by the adoption of Indiana Code 3-11-8, Section 25, Subsection (l); Maryland—until the meeting of the Election Board; MD ELEC LAW § 11-303. New Jersey—until the close of business on the second day after the election 19:53C-3(i). Nevada—until 5:00 P.M. on the Friday following the election NV ST 293.3085; New Mexico—until 7:00 P.M. on Election Day NM ADC 1.10.22 (B) (H). See Andersen, op. cit, pgs. 23 – 24 for an analysis of the significant effect of counting out-of-precinct ballots. The Election Day Survey found that, “Most notably, jurisdictions that permitted jurisdiction-wide acceptance of provisional ballots reported higher rates of provisional ballots being cast, but also reported a much higher incidence of provisional ballots being counted, than other jurisdictions.”
additional burden placed on the ballot-evaluation process when out-of-precinct ballots are considered. And tradeoffs are involved if out-of-precinct voters are unable to vote for the local offices that might appear on the ballot in their district of residence. One option for states is to involve the voters in the decision by pointing out that voters who cast their provisional ballots in the wrong precinct may not be able to participate in the local election. The voter could then decide to go to the correct precinct or vote provisionally for the higher offices at the top of the ticket only.

3. Alternatively, if a state chooses to require voters to appear at their assigned precinct, where the same polling site serves more than one precinct, a voter's provisional ballot should count so long as the voter cast that ballot at the correct polling site even if at the wrong precinct within that location. Ideally the voter could be directed to the correct machine, but poll worker advice will not always be correct. One way to assess the balance of issues here is to consider that, if a voter in a multi-precinct polling place is sent to the wrong machine, the error is probably the poll worker's, and the voter should not be penalized.

4. Officials should follow a written procedure, and perhaps a checklist, to identify the reason why a provisional ballot is rejected (e.g., check the applicable box “unregistered voter”; “lack of signature match” “wrong precinct,” etc.) Those forms should be disclosed publicly when completed. Colorado’s election rules offer particularly clear guidance to the official evaluating a provisional ballot.

**Colorado Rejection Codes (Any ballot given a rejection code shall not be counted):**

- **RFS** (Rejection federal or state) No federal or state candidates or issues to duplicate.
- **RNS** (Rejection not signed) Provisional Ballot Affidavit not signed.
- **RIN** (Rejection incomplete information provided) Required information is incomplete and the designated election official is unable to confirm voter’s eligibility.
- **RNR** (Rejection not registered) Voter did not register by the voter registration deadline or by emergency registration, Colorado voter registration record was not found, or voter was previously cancelled and has not been reinstated pursuant to 1-2-605(10). C.R.S.
- **REE** (Rejection envelope empty) Provisional ballot envelope is empty.
- **RAB** (Rejection voter voted absentee) Designated election official has confirmed that voter voted an absentee ballot.
- **REV** (Rejection based on ballot cast in early voting) Voter voted early.
- **RIP** (Rejection based on incorrect party) Incorrect Party in Primary Election.
- **RFE** (Rejection felon not eligible to vote) Individual was convicted of a felony and is either serving a sentence of confinement or detention or is on parole.
- **RWC** (Rejection elector not registered in county or State of Colorado) Non-county or non-state resident; therefore voter not eligible to vote in the county where the provisional ballot was voted.
- **RID** (Rejection first time voter has not supplied identification upon registration or thereafter prior to and during time voter voted) First Time Voter who

---

41 Chances are administrative error accounts for the voter being directed to the wrong precinct under these circumstances.
42 8 CCR 1505-1, at 26.5.4, adopted August 4, 2005. See also 1-2-509(3) C.R.S.
registered by mail or through a voter registration drive, is tagged as id deficient, and did not provide id at the time of voting.

**RRD (Rejection registration deficient)** Voter had deficient or incomplete registration and required information was not provided prior to or at the time of filing in the provisional ballot envelope. Voter's eligibility cannot be established.

### D. Verification of Provisional Ballots

1. States that use the information on the provisional ballot to permit voters who have changed their addresses to update their registrations should adopt clear procedures on that process and specify how the new information will be communicated between different Boards of Elections.

2. In verifying provisional ballots, the time by which election officials must make their eligibility determinations is particularly important in presidential elections because of the need to certify electors to the Electoral College. States should consider in particular how to divide the time allowed them by the safe-harbor provisions that apply in presidential elections to the certification to the Electoral College. Some part of this five-week period will be consumed by the eligibility evaluation, but states should take care to provide a sufficient period of time as well for challenges. If a state consumes 21 days following the election in the eligibility evaluations, only two weeks will remain for legal challenges to be concluded. Is that sufficient? Or should the state provide the resources needed to complete the eligibility determinations in 10 days or two weeks, leaving three weeks or more for legal challenges in a close election? Our research did not identify an optimum division of the five weeks available. The prudent course here would be to encourage states to consider the issue and then make a careful decision about how to complete all steps in the evaluation of ballots and challenges to those determinations within the five weeks available.

### E. Post-election Information for Voters

Timely information to voters about the disposition of their provisional ballot will provide helpful feedback and more important enable voters to determine if they are registered for future elections and, if not, what they need to do to become registered.

1. Establish mechanisms to ensure that voters casting provisional ballots are informed whether they are now registered for future elections and, if not, what they need to do to become registered.

### F. State Laws Governing Litigation over Provisional Voting

1. Establish special, streamlined litigation procedures for Election Day complaints that individuals are being denied the right to cast a provisional ballot.

### Broader Considerations

### G. Integrity and the Appearance of Integrity

1. State laws or regulations providing for non-partisan or bi-partisan bodies to make a public determination of the validity of provisional ballots would increase confidence in the system.
2. To improve transparency, state laws or regulations should require the purging process for registration to be public and with an opportunity for voters to correct an erroneous determination that they should be purged.

3. State laws or regulation should require the evaluation process for provisional ballots to be public, while protecting the names of those who voted provisionally.

H. Continuous Assessment of the Provisional Ballot -- Process and Performance

Defining what makes for a successful provisional voting system is difficult. The most successful system is probably not the one with the most provisional votes cast (that could indicate problems with the registration system). Nor is the system with the greatest number counted or with the fewest counted necessarily superior because the evaluation process could be flawed.

Defining quality requires a broad perspective about how well the system works, how open it is to error recognition and correction, and how well provisional voting processes are connected to the registration and voter identification regimes. The EAC should consider engaging one of the national quality organizations or processes, such as Six Sigma\(^{43}\) or the Baldridge Quality process\(^{44}\) to evaluate the provisional ballot process. Pending such a review, the EAC can recommend that states take the following actions.

1. Recognize that the first step to improving quality is to see the provisional voting process as a system and take a systems approach to regular evaluation through standardized metrics with explicit goals for performance.

2. States should begin by collecting data systematically on the provisional voting process so that they can evaluate their voting system and assess changes from one election to the next. The effort should start in the 2006 election, and the data collected should include:
   - Provisional votes cast and counted by jurisdiction, say counties, with details on why the voter had to vote provisionally (lack of ID, not on list, challenged at polling place, issued absentee ballot, etc) and number of ballots actually counted in each category.
   - Reasons why provisional ballots were not counted, using categories such as those that have been adopted by Colorado, described earlier in this report.
   - Measures of variance among jurisdictions.
   - Number of poll workers trained in administration of provisional voting by polling place
   - Number of jurisdictions posting information on provisional voting in the polling place
   - Time required to evaluate ballots by jurisdiction

\(^{43}\) Six Sigma is a measure of quality that strives for near perfection. Six Sigma is a disciplined, data-driven approach and methodology for eliminating defects (driving towards six standard deviations between the mean and the nearest specification limit) in any process -- from manufacturing to transactional and from product to service.

\(^{44}\) The Baldridge Criteria for Performance Excellence provide a systems perspective for understanding performance management. They reflect validated, leading-edge management practices against which an organization can measure itself. With their acceptance nationally and internationally as the model for performance excellence, the Criteria represent a common language for communication among organizations for sharing best practices. The Criteria are also the basis for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award process.
Improving understanding of the provisional voting process through analysis of detailed information will enable state and local election officials to strengthen their systems. By collecting and analyzing this data states can identify which aspects of the registration and electoral system are most important in shunting voters into the provisional ballot process. Responsible officials can then look to their registration system, identification requirements or poll worker training as a way to reduce the need for voters to cast their ballots provisionally.
ATTACHMENT 1 – Data Sources for Classification of the States

Our research on provisional voting divided the various states into several categories to allow an assessment of how different factors may have influenced the process of casting and counting provisional ballots. This analysis was conducted before the release of the Election Day Study, and the categories we used may differ in some respects from its work. The variables used to analyze a state’s use of provisional ballots:

1. New vs. Old (states that used a provisional ballot before the 2004 election)
2. Use of a statewide database of registered voters vs. no use of a statewide database
3. Counting out-of-precinct ballots vs. not counting out-of-precinct ballots
4. Voter identification requirements
5. Method used to verify provisional ballots
6. Levels of provisional ballots cast and counted

We first assigned states within these categories based on classifications done by Electionline.org in its studies. The Electionline data was the only published information available at the time of our research. We reviewed the Electionline data carefully, and, in select cases, updated it with new, detailed information that had become available after its publication. The changes we made are explained below:

--Idaho, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Wisconsin and Wyoming were excluded from our analysis. They have election-day registration systems, and did not need to use HAVA-compliant provisional ballots.

--North Dakota does not register voters, so it also was excluded from HAVA requirements and did not use provisional voting.

--Mississippi has not reported its provisional voting results and could not be included in our analysis, though it was compliant in 2004.

--Pennsylvania did not report its totals for the Election Day Study, but we obtained information on Pennsylvania and included it in our analysis.

**New vs. Old States**

We classified states as “new” or “old” based on the 2001 Electionline study of provisional voting, but condensed its classifications into a single dichotomous variable, new/old with all other cases excluded. The Electionline study divided states into five categories of their use of provisional ballots in the 2000 election:

1. Use of provisional ballots (P)
2. Limited use of provisional ballots (LP)
3. Affidavit ballots (A)
4. No system in place (N)
5. Unnecessary/Not Applicable (U/NA)

We included in the list of “Old States” all states listed as using provisional ballots, limited use of provisional ballots or affidavit ballots. States in all three categories would have been familiar with key aspects of provisional voting. States that had no provisional voting system in place for the 2002 election, and were HAVA compliant in 2004, were listed as “new” states, as 2004 would have been the first year in which they would be offering the option of provisional voting. States that were listed as unnecessary or not applicable were excluded from this study, as they

---

45 This study can be found at: [http://electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Provisional%20Voting.pdf](http://electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Provisional%20Voting.pdf)
were exempt from the HAVA regulations in 2004 because they either allowed same-day registration or did not register voters.

Rhode Island is the only state categorized as an old state by Electionline that we moved into the list of new states. Electionline’s map shows Rhode Island as a state that used provisional voting in 2000, but in the state description, it is listed as having no system in place. We learned from the Rhode Island Board of Elections that the state had previously permitted potential voters to sign an affidavit if they did not appear on a precinct’s list of registered voters, but felt they were registered to vote. Based on the signed affidavit, the election official would then contact a county official to see if the voter was on a more complete registration list. If the voter’s name was on the complete list, that voter was permitted to cast a regular ballot. As this process did not grant the voter a provisional ballot, but served as a different type of administrative failsafe, we concluded that Rhode Island’s first use of provisional voting was in 2004 and, therefore, classified the state as “new” to the system of provisional balloting.

Table 1
CATEGORIZATION OF STATES — Old and New

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old States</th>
<th>New States</th>
<th>HAVA Exempt or NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Statewide List of Registered Voters

The Electionline preview of the 2004 Election was the starting point for compiling a list of states that had a statewide database of registered voters. That study listed 34 States that did not have their statewide database systems complete, and 16 that did, including the District of Columbia. North Dakota does not register voters, so does not need to compile such a database. Electionline’s criterion for concluding that a state had a statewide list was that the state have participation from all jurisdictions in a statewide system. We added Oklahoma to the list of states with statewide databases because we found it had met the Electionline criteria by the 2004 election, albeit too late for inclusion in the Electionline survey.

Out-of-Precinct Ballots

We based our classification of states that allow the counting of ballots cast outside the correct precinct on the data in the 2004 Electionline preview of the 2004 election. States that evaluated ballots cast in a precinct where the voter was not registered were categorized as “out-of-precinct.” States that invalidated such ballots were categorized as “In-precinct only.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Out-of-Precinct</th>
<th>In-Precinct Only</th>
<th>HAVA EXEMPT OR NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 17   | 26   | 7    |


47 In Illinois, it is not clear that all counties followed this procedure. Some counties may not have counted out-of-precinct ballots.
Verification Method

We identified four different ways states assessed provisional ballots to determine if they should be counted: signature match, match voter data, signed affidavits, and bringing back identification later. We gathered information about these verification techniques by checking state websites and consulting journalistic accounts. We consulted state legislation to provide further information where needed.

Table 3
CATEGORIZATION OF STATES -- Ballot Evaluation Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature Match</th>
<th>Data Match</th>
<th>Affidavit</th>
<th>Return with ID</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>N. Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>N. Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Carolina</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 14 14 10 9

* North Carolina lacked clear standards to evaluate provisional ballots and is excluded from this analysis.
Data Collection

To assemble our data for analysis, we began by using the data on provisional votes cast and counted reported by Electionline. To increase the accuracy of this data, we surveyed each state’s election websites for updated data, and for reported numbers on the county level. We then sent emails to 49 (we excluded Alaska, see below) states and the District of Columbia, requesting updated data on the number of provisional votes cast and counted by county. We received information from 25 states by our cut-off date of August 25, 2005.

Table 4
Updated information by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received Updated Data</th>
<th>Did Not Receive Updated Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 States  25 States

48 Alaska was not contacted via email, as the state does not have voting districts comparable to counties in other states and could not be matched with comparable census data.

49 Maryland reported provisional ballots that were counted per county, but not number cast.

50 Nebraska reported an incomplete list of provisional ballots cast and counted by county, but designated counties by number, rather than by name.
The data used in this study differ from the data reported in the Election Day Study for 19 states. The Election Day Study was not completed until well after our statistical analysis of provisional voting was finished. Where there are differences, they are typically very small, usually fewer than 100 votes either cast or counted. Of the 9 states that have differences of more than 100 votes cast or counted, 7 have reported their numbers directly to us and can be considered updated data that EDS had not obtained. For one of those states, New Mexico, EDS had incomplete data, and for another, Pennsylvania, EDS had no data at all. The data that we have collected reflects updated numbers from the states that have changed following recounts and litigation that altered how ballots were evaluated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>EDS Numbers Cast/Counted</th>
<th>Our Numbers Cast/Counted</th>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Updated Info from State?</th>
<th>51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>6,478/1,865</td>
<td>6560/1836</td>
<td>82/29</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>23,285/22,498</td>
<td>23,275/22,498</td>
<td>10/0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>51,529/39,086</td>
<td>51,477/39,163</td>
<td>52/77</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>12,893/4,489</td>
<td>12,893/3,839</td>
<td>0/650</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>346/25</td>
<td>348/25</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>15,406/8,038</td>
<td>15,454/8,048</td>
<td>48/10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>45,535/32,079</td>
<td>45,563/31,805</td>
<td>28/274</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>688/378</td>
<td>653/357</td>
<td>35/21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>17,421/13,788</td>
<td>17,003/13,298</td>
<td>418/490</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>6,153/2,446</td>
<td>6,154/2,447</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>6,410/2,914</td>
<td>15,360/8,767</td>
<td>8,950/5,853</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
<td>77,469/50,370</td>
<td>77,469/42,348</td>
<td>0/8,022</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>157,714/123,902</td>
<td>158,642/123,548</td>
<td>928/354</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>53,698/26,092</td>
<td>53,698/26,092</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>35,282/7,156</td>
<td>36,193/7,770</td>
<td>911/614</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>121/30</td>
<td>101/37</td>
<td>20/7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>4,608/728</td>
<td>4,609/728</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>92,402/73,806</td>
<td>86,239/69,273</td>
<td>6,163/4,533</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>374/119</td>
<td>373/120</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

51 Data not provided by the state itself is taken from Electionline figures.
Subject Re: Voter ID Report and Appendices

Tom-

As was just discussed, the EAC's Commissioners have elected to delay a presentation of Eagleton's report on Voter Identification to the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board, at this time.

The Commissioners will spend time over the next several weeks reviewing and considering this report in great detail and will make a determination, shortly thereafter, regarding how they wish to proceed with the issuance of an EAC report on this study.

Many thanks to you and your staff for the work that has been done. We look forward to next week's presentation of the Eagleton/Moritz study of provisional voting.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Commissioner:

Hope all is going well in your new position— I wanted to get to you the agenda for the Standards Board meetings next week. The Board of Advisors is occurring concurrently, so you can feel free to wander, or to stay at one of the meetings— the same information will be presented in each meeting.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Best regards,
Adam

2006 Standards Board agenda.doc

Adam D. Ambrogi
Special Assistant to Commissioner Ray Martinez III
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3105
Adam,

thanks for sending this; I am going to try to stop by. How are you doing on finding another post? Did you ever talk to Commissioner Walther at the FEC?

Hans

Commissioner:

Hope all is going well in your new position-- I wanted to get to you the agenda for the Standards Board meetings next week. The Board of Advisors is occurring concurrently, so you can feel free to wander, or to stay at one of the meetings-- the same information will be presented in each meeting.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Adam

--------------------------------------
Adam D. Ambrogi
Special Assistant to Commissioner Ray Martinez III
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
Theresa:

Questions/Issues: (Sorry they're a little late)

There have been concerns about both machine failure and pollworker training in the recent primary in Chicago-- what is the EAC doing to focus on these concerns, and how do you believe local election officials are meeting the challenge, and what can ordinary citizens do to assist the process.

What can voters do best to protect their right to vote on election day? What should they bring with them and what information should they know?

(There is, of course the voter identification issues that have been debated on the country with conservatives largely concerned about voting fraud, and liberals largely concerned about voter access. Can you comment on this debate?)

I've heard about a new requirement for provisional voting? What does this mean, and if I'm a voter, and told I can't vote, how do I cast a provisional vote?

You recently authored a New York Times opinion piece (along with Fair Vote President John Anderson) recommending that all high school graduates be registered to vote (to be effective on their 18th birthday). What do you think can be done with that recommendation in the states, and why did you come to that opinion.

You were recently in Ohio to observe the federal primary. Do you see different issues in different states, or are the problems based on the technology used or procedures promulgated?

------------

Adam D. Ambrogi
Special Assistant to Commissioner Ray Martinez III
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3105

"Caldwell, Theresa" <Theresa.Caldwell@mail.house.gov>

---

Hello there! I won't be in the office tomorrow, so I thought I would send you a note just to make sure everything is still all set for Monday's taping of "Perfect Union."
Theresa Caldwell
Deputy Communications Director
Office of Congressman Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.
202-225-0773
I don't know if you had heard about this but in NCSL's annual conference, they're having a piece on Voter ID and fraud issues. I don't know who's on that panel, but I thought I would let you know, since so much of that work is being done through the state legislatures. Hope all is well, and thanks for the updates....

http://www.ncsl.org/annualmeeting/agenda/showmain3.cfm?requesttimeout=90

Tuesday, August 15, 2006
10:15 am - 5:15 pm  Redistricting & Elections Committee

Supremes Rule on Re-Redistricting of Texas
10:15 am - 11:30 am
Three years after the highly publicized redrawing of Texas congressional districts, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in June on whether the Legislature acted unconstitutionally. How will the decision alter the redistricting process? What subtle, but critical, lines were buried in the text of the opinions?

Legislative Competition and the role of Gerrymandering?
11:30 am - 12:45 pm
Are legislative elections really less competitive today than in the past? Is gerrymandering the culprit or one of many reasons. New research helps put the redistricting factor in perspective.

Are Voters Who they Say they Are?
1:00 pm - 2:00 pm
Many states continue to look at the issue of voter ID and struggle with balancing the need for maximum access to the polls with trying to eliminate any possible fraud. How big is this problem and what are states doing about it?

Will Fall Elections Run like Clockwork?
2:00 pm - 3:00 pm
Since the controversial 2000 election debacle, most states have implemented key election reforms to shore up the system and respond to federal legislation. Will this fall's 2006 election go off without a hitch or will new problems emerge in the voting process?

What's Next in Redistricting Technology
3:15 pm - 4:15 pm
Redistricting software vendors will preview and demonstrate what they are planning for 2010. They will be discuss things like the next generation of redistricting technology with support for desktop, Web based and PDA/Cellular applications.

Countdown to Census 2010
4:15 pm - 5:15 pm
Wednesday, August 16, 2006
10:15 am - 11:30 am   Redistricting & Elections Committee

Are 527s Here to Stay?

In many states, the so-called 527 groups are likely to play a major part in this fall’s campaigns. What are they? Should they be regulated? Can they be regulated? What are states doing in this area?

2:45 pm - 4:15 pm   Money and Politics

As ethical scandals over campaign contributions and influence-buying swirl around Washington, D.C., states once again take the lead in finding new solutions to an old problem. This session will highlight states’ innovative ideas for regulating money in politics and the role of lobbyists in fundraising and campaigns.

Friday, August 18, 2006
8:30 am - 10:00 am   General Session and Breakfast

SPEAKERS:

Peter Hart has been one of the country’s leading public opinion analysts for more than 27 years. He conducts all public opinion polling for NBC News and The Wall Street Journal. His focus is public policy, cultural and social issues, and strategic consulting for corporations, including Time Warner, Microsoft, Kodak to name a few.

Frank Luntz is one of the most honored communications professionals in America today. Named one of the four Top Research Minds by Business Week magazine, he pioneered the Instant Response focus group research technique, and won an Emmy Award in 2001 for his 100 Days, 1000 Voices segments on NBC’s primary and election night coverage.

Adam D. Ambrogi
Special Assistant to Commissioner Ray Martinez III
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3105
Thanks Adam. I've been trying to get Tim Storey about this, but with no luck so far. Any news with you? Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: aambrogi@eac.gov [mailto:aambrogi@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 12, 2006 9:06 AM
To: wang@tcf.org
Subject: FYI

I don't know if you had heard about this but in NCSL's annual conference, they're having a piece on Voter ID and fraud issues. I don't know who's on that panel, but I thought I would let you know, since so much of that work is being done through the state legislatures. Hope all is well, and thanks for the updates....

http://www.ncsl.org/annualmeeting/agenda/showmain3.cfm?requesttimeout=90

Tuesday, August 15, 2006
10:15 am - 5:15 pm   Redistricting & Elections Committee

Supremes Rule on Re-Redistricting of Texas
10:15 am - 11:30 am
Three years after the highly publicized redrawing of Texas congressional districts, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in June on whether the Legislature acted unconstitutionally. How will the decision alter the redistricting process? What subtle, but critical, lines were buried in the text of the opinions?

Legislative Competition and the role of Gerrymandering?
11:30 am - 12:45 pm
Are legislative elections really less competitive today than in the past? Is gerrymandering the culprit or one of many reasons. New research helps put the redistricting factor in perspective.

Are Voters Who they Say they Are?
1:00 pm - 2:00 pm
Many states continue to look at the issue of voter ID and struggle with balancing the need for maximum access to the polls with trying to eliminate any possible fraud. How big is this problem and what are states doing about it?

Will Fall Elections Run like Clockwork?
2:00 pm - 3:00 pm
Since the controversial 2000 election debacle, most states have implemented key election
reforms to shore up the system and respond to federal legislation. Will this fall’s 2006 election go off without a hitch or will new problems emerge in the voting process?

*What’s Next in Redistricting Technology*

3:15 pm - 4:15 pm
Redistricting software vendors will preview and demonstrate what they are planning for 2010. They will be discuss things like the next generation of redistricting technology with support for desktop, Web based and PDA/Cellular applications.

*Countdown to Census 2010*

4:15 pm - 5:15 pm
Speakers: Linda Franz, Geographer, U.S. Census Bureau; Washington, D.C.  
Bob LaMacchia, Chief, Geography Division, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, D.C.  
Cathy McCully, Chief, Census Redistricting Data Office, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, D.C.

**Wednesday, August 16, 2006**

10:15 am - 11:30 am  Redistricting & Elections Committee

*Are 527s Here to Stay?*

In many states, the so-called 527 groups are likely to play a major part in this fall's campaigns. What are they? Should they be regulated? Can they be regulated? What are states doing in this area?

2:45 pm - 4:15 pm  Money and Politics

As ethical scandals over campaign contributions and influence-buying swirl around Washington, D.C., states once again take the lead in finding new solutions to an old problem. This session will highlight states' innovative ideas for regulating money in politics and the role of lobbyists in fundraising and campaigns.

**Friday, August 18, 2006**

8:30 am - 10:00 am  General Session and Breakfast

*SPEAKERS:*

Peter Hart has been one of the country's leading public opinion analysts for more than 27 years. He conducts all public opinion polling for NBC News and The Wall Street Journal. His focus is public policy, cultural and social issues, and strategic consulting for corporations, including Time Warner, Microsoft, Kodak to name a few.

Frank Luntz is one of the most honored communications professionals in America today. Named one of the four Top Research Minds by Business Week magazine, he pioneered the Instant Response focus group research technique, and won an Emmy Award in 2001 for his 100 Days, 1000 Voices segments on NBC's primary and election night coverage.
Dear Craig:

Hope is well with you. Hoping that you can help us out with a quick request from a member of congressional committee. They would like to know if there exists a list (compendium or index) of state election laws on crime and fraud specifically. They are trying to get access to such a list as soon as possible, for a Congressional hearing on Thursday. If no list exists to your knowledge, that's great. If it does exists, and we can get access to it, please let me know.

Thanks so much, Craig. I hope all is well.
Best,
Adam

---------------
Adam D. Ambrogi  
Special Assistant to Commissioner Ray Martinez III  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
202-566-3105
I am currently in Europe on official DOJ business. Please call Nancy Simmons, 202-514-1440. We have what you request -- I think, and if we do she can e-mail it to you.

Sent from Dr. D's Fabulous BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: aambrogi@eac.gov <aambrogi@eac.gov>
To: Donsanto, Craig <Craig.Donsanto@crm.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Tue Jun 20 15:01:40 2006
Subject: State election fraud statute collection?

Dear Craig:

Hope is well with you. Hoping that you can help us out with a quick request from a member of congressional committee. They would like to know if there exists a list (compendium or index) of state election laws on crime and fraud specifically. They are trying to get access to such a list as soon as possible, for a Congressional hearing on Thursday. If no list exists to your knowledge, that's great. If it does exists, and we can get access to it, please let me know.

Thanks so much, Craig. I hope all is well.
Best,
Adam

-------------------
Adam D. Ambrogi
Special Assistant to Commissioner Ray Martinez III
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3105
Tom:

Doesn't look like there's a state list of fraud statutes-- there's a federal one.
(See below.)
It's something we have planned to do, but have not completed. What's your timeline and priority? I could pull something together...
AA

-------------
Adam D. Ambrogi
Special Assistant to Commissioner Ray Martinez III
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3105

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Simmons, Nancy" [Nancy.Simmons@usdoj.gov] 
Sent: 06/20/2006 06:52 PM 
To: Adam Ambrogi  
Cc: Margaret Sims; Donsanto, Craig" <Craig.Donsanto@usdoj.gov>  
Subject: list of state election crimes

Adam, Craig thought you were looking for a list of federal statutes, which are discussed in our election fraud manual. We don't have lists of state election crimes. Craig suggests that you contact Peggy Sims at the EAC – she's a wonderful resource, and I'm including her in my reply. Good luck.

Nancy
Thanks! Do you or Joyce have the one from the 24th??
Thanks much,
Adam

Adam D. Ambrogi
Special Assistant to Commissioner Ray Martinez III
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3105

Bryan Whitener/EAC/GOV

Adam Ambrogi/EAC/GOV

To Bryan Whitener/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
bcc
Subject Re: Fw: MAY 23, 2006 Standards Board Meeting

Adam, here's the transcript attached below.

—— Forwarded by Bryan Whitener/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 02:04 PM ——

Joyce Wilson/EAC/GOV

To Bryan Whitener/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Fw: MAY 23, 2006 Standards Board Meeting

Joyce H. Wilson
Staff Assistant
US Election Assistance Commission
202-566-3100 (office)
202-566-3128 (fax)

—— Forwarded by Joyce Wilson/EAC/GOV on 06/26/2006 04:41 PM ——

"Carol J. Thomas Reporting." To jwilson@eac.gov
cc dromig@eac.gov
Subject MAY 23, 2006 Standards Board Meeting

06/28/2006 02:11 PM
06/28/2006 02:04 PM
06/26/2006 04:41 PM
06/26/2006 03:53 PM
Dear Ms. Joyce Wilson,

Attached please note the ASCII file for the Standards Board Meeting taken on Tuesday, May 23, 2006. Your transcript has been shipped to you.

ASCII file name: 052306.txt

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Timothy Brischler, Office Manager, 703.273.9221 052306.TXT
Hey-

Forgot to cc you all on this.

Thanks

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Director, Help America Vote College Program
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Commissioners-

As was discussed during our session on February 17, 2005, please review and provide your approval, disapproval or amendments to the following items by Friday, February 25, 2005:

1. The attached Scope of Work which outlines the tasks related to contract work around projects relating to voluntary guidance on provisional voting and voter identification procedures.

2. The proposal will be advertised beginning February 28, 2005.

3. The deadline for submitting proposals will be March 14, 2005.

4. Proposal review will be completed by EAC staff by March 17, 2005

5. Staff will recommend a contractor to the Commissioners on March 18, 2005.

6. Commissioners will be asked for their decisions no later than Tuesday, March 22, 2005
Thank you for your help and attention to this matter.

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
February 14, 2005

PROVIDING EAC ASSISTANCE IN DEVELOPING VOLUNTARY GUIDANCE ON PROVISIONAL VOTING AND VOTER IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES

0.0 Contract Title: Assistance to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission in the Development of Guidance on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Procedures

1.0 Background: Sec. 302(a) of HAVA requires that all States allow the casting of provisional ballots in instances where a voter declares their eligibility to vote but their name does not appear on the official list of eligible voters, or an election official asserts that a voter is not eligible to vote. This section describes several requirements for implementation of provisional voting, but the States have considerable latitude in specifying how to carry out these requirements. The EAC seeks to examine how provisional voting was implemented in the 2004 general election and to prepare guidance for the States on this topic for the 2006 Federal elections.

HAVA Sec. 303(b) mandates that first time voters who register by mail are required to show proof of identity before being allowed to cast a ballot. The law prescribes certain requirements concerning this section, but also leaves considerable discretion to the States for its implementation. The EAC seeks to examine how these voter identification requirements were implemented in the 2004 general election and to prepare guidance for the States on this topic for the 2006 elections.

One of the remedies for a voter not having an acceptable proof of identity is to allow the voter to cast a provisional ballot, either at the polling place or by mail. This linkage between these two HAVA sections provides a rationale for conducting research on these topics in parallel. However, it is anticipated that two separate guidance documents will result.

2.0 Objective: The objective of this contract is for EAC to obtain assistance with the collection, analysis and interpretation of information regarding HAVA provisional voting and voter identification requirements for the purpose of drafting guidance on these topics for promulgation to the States in time for implementation for the 2006 Federal elections. The anticipated outcome of this activity is the generation of concrete policy recommendations to be issued as voluntary guidance for States.

3.0 Scope: In general the Contractor shall be responsible for all research and analysis activities, including the conduct of public hearings for fact finding and public comment purposes. However, in light of the urgent need to get this work underway, the EAC has scheduled a public hearing on February 23, 2005, on the topic of provisional voting.
An initial framework for provisional voting policy has been set by the court decisions rendered on the election procedures utilized in the 2004 election. The 6th Circuit decision, in particular, has drawn some boundaries which must be given due regard in the course of considering future policy alternatives for provisional voting.

Notice of public meetings and hearings is required to be published in the Federal Register. The Contractor shall be responsible for preparing the notice documents, and the EAC will submit the notices and cover the cost of publication. In addition, draft guidance documents must be published in the Federal Register to obtain public comment prior to their adoption. Again, the Contractor will work with the EAC to prepare the draft documents for publication, which the EAC will submit and cover the cost of publication. Comments received will be provided to the Contractor for analysis and incorporation into the final guidance documents, as appropriate.

4.0 Specific Tasks

For ease of reference, following task 4.3 the remaining tasks are listed separately under the headings of Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Requirements. It is understood that the work on these two topics will be conducted essentially concurrently, with Voter Identification activities starting approximately one month after Provisional Voting.

4.1 Prepare a project work plan. The Contractor shall prepare and deliver a brief Project Plan not later than 10 days after contract award. This plan shall describe how the Contractor will accomplish each of the project tasks, including a timeline indicating major milestones. A single document will be prepared to include both provisional voting and voter identification tasks. The Plan shall be presented at a project kickoff meeting with the EAC Project Manager.

4.2 Submit monthly progress reports. The Contractor shall submit a monthly progress report within 2 weeks of the end of each month. This report shall provide a brief summary of activities performed and indicate progress against the timeline provided in the Project Plan. Any issues that could adversely affect schedule should be identified for resolution. Budget status should also be provided.

4.3 Conduct periodic briefings for the EAC. The Contractor shall periodically meet with the EAC Project Manager and the lead Commissioner for this work to discuss research findings and progress. The Project Plan should make allowance for this activity. The number and frequency of briefings will be determined by the Contractor Project Manager and the EAC Project Manager as the work progresses. The Contractor may also be required to periodically brief the full Commission on their work.

Provisional Voting

4.4 Collect and analyze State legislation, administrative procedures, and court cases. An understanding of the disparities and similarities of how provisional
voting was implemented around the country will provide a baseline for the consideration of future approaches. Seventeen States never had provisional voting before HAVA was enacted, while many other States did. A State-by-State compendium of the legislation, procedures, and litigation reviewed shall be delivered along with the analysis results.

4.5 Recommend alternative approaches for future implementation of provisional voting. The Contractor shall conduct a literature review to identify other research results and data available on this topic. The EAC Election Day Survey, for example, contained several questions on provisional voting. The EAC will make these survey data available to the Contractor. Based on their analysis of available research and the results of Task 4.5, the Contractor shall diagnose the problems and challenges of provisional voting implementation and hypothesize alternative approaches.

The Contractor shall assess the efficacy of these alternatives in relation to the following inter-related policy objectives: (1) enabling the maximum number of eligible voters to cast ballots that will be counted; (2) providing procedural simplicity for voters, poll workers, and election officials; (3) minimizing opportunity for voter fraud; and (4) maintaining a reasonable workload for election officials and poll workers. Additional policy considerations may be identified in the course of this research effort. The Contractor shall document and brief these alternatives to the Commission.

4.6 Prepare preliminary draft guidance document. Based on the feedback received from the Commission, the Contractor shall prepare a draft guidance document for review and comment by the EAC Board of Advisors. EAC will convene a Board of Advisors meeting or teleconference for the discussion of this document. The Contractor shall provide the document in advance and participate in the Board meeting to answer questions and record comments.

4.7 Revise draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register. The Contractor shall revise the guidance document as appropriate to reflect the comments of the EAC and the Board of Advisors and provide the draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register by the EAC.

4.8 Arrange one public hearing for receiving public comment on draft guidance. This hearing should be scheduled 30 days after the initial publication date. The Contractor shall select the location in consultation with the EAC. No speakers will be required. EAC will handle publicity for the meeting.

4.9 Prepare final guidance document for EAC adoption. Review all comments received in response to Federal Register publication and at public hearing and revise guidance document as appropriate. Provide final version to EAC for adoption.
Voter Identification Requirements

4.10 Collect and analyze State legislation, administrative procedures, and court cases. It is assumed that the collection of information for analysis of voter identification requirements will be performed concurrently with the research for Task 4.5. An understanding of the disparities and similarities of how voter identification requirements were implemented around the country will provide a baseline for the consideration of future approaches. A State-by-State compendium of the legislation, procedures, and litigation reviewed shall be delivered along with the analysis results.

4.11 Convene a half day public hearing on the topic of voter identification requirements. The Contractor shall be responsible for all aspects of planning and conducting this hearing in consultation with the EAC. The Contractor shall identify three panels of three to four speakers each. The Contractor shall arrange for speaker attendance to include travel and per diem expenses. The EAC will provide publicity for the hearing. The Contractor shall prepare a document summarizing the proceedings and containing all testimony provided.

4.12 Recommend alternative approaches for future implementation of HAVA voter identification requirements. The Contractor shall conduct a literature review to identify other research results and data available on this topic. Based on their analysis of available research and the results of Task 5.11, the Contractor shall diagnose the problems and challenges of voter identification and hypothesize alternative approaches. The Contractor shall coordinate with the EAC to identify appropriate policy objectives by which to assess these alternatives. The Contractor shall document and brief these alternatives to the Commission.

4.13 Prepare preliminary draft guidance document. Based on the feedback received from the Commission, the Contractor shall prepare a draft guidance document for review and comment by the EAC Board of Advisors. EAC will convene a Board meeting or teleconference for the discussion of this document. The Contractor shall provide the document in advance and participate in the Board meeting to answer questions and record comments.

4.14 Revise draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register. The Contractor shall revise the guidance document as appropriate to reflect the comments of the EAC and the Board of Advisors and provide the draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register by the EAC.

4.15 Arrange one public hearing for receiving public comment on the draft guidance. This hearing should be scheduled 30 days after the initial publication date. The Contractor shall select the location in consultation with the EAC. No speakers will be required. EAC will handle publicity for the hearing.

4.16 Prepare final guidance document for EAC adoption. Review all comments received in response to Federal Register publication and at public hearing and revise guidance document as appropriate. Provide final version to EAC for adoption.
**Contract Type.** The contract type will be Time and Materials with a ceiling of

6.0 **Place of performance.** The principal place of performance will be the Contractor’s place of business. Meetings and occasional work efforts may be performed at the EAC offices.

7.0 **Period of Performance.** The period of performance is from date of award until October 28, 2005.

8.0 **Schedule of Deliverables:**

- Project plan – 10 days after contract award
- Progress reports – monthly
- Briefings – as required
- Analysis report on provisional voting - TBD
- Alternatives report on provisional voting – TBD
- Preliminary draft guidance on provisional voting - TBD
- Draft guidance on provisional voting for publication – 8/2005
- Public hearing on draft guidance – 30 days after publication
- Final guidance on provisional voting for EAC adoption – 9/2005
- Analysis report on voter identification requirements – TBD
- Public hearing on voter identification requirements – TBD
- Summary of voter identification requirements hearing - TBD
- Alternatives report on voter identification requirements - TBD
- Preliminary draft guidance on voter identification requirements - TBD
- Draft guidance on voter identification requirements for publication – 9/2005
- Public hearing on draft guidance – 30 days after publication
- Final guidance on voter identification requirements to EAC for adoption – 10/2005

REMAINING STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS TO BE PROVIDED.
Tom-

Had a very good review and discussion of the PRG at this morning's Commissioner meeting.

Also, the Commissioners have marked their calendars for a conference call with the Eagleton/Moritz team on July 12 at 9:30 AM.

Several concerns were raised about the composition of the PRG and, after some discussion, I indicated that Eagleton will provide the EAC with a revised participant list, and with a more detailed description of the PRG's mission, goals, objectives, workplan and timelines for accomplishing its work.

The Vice Chair is concerned that there is not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG. I would suggest the team do more research to identify well-recognized conservative academics to put on the Group.

Further, the Commissioners recommend a tiered process in which the PRG will prepare a "dispassionate" analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions. This analysis and these conclusions will then be vetted with a defined/select group of local election officials, and then, with a defined/select group of advocacy organizations.

It was also suggested that a final round of focus group meetings be held with a cross-section of these election officials, advocates and academics for an overall interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Hope this helps clarify concerns; I look forward to sharing your revisions to the PRG with them.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
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Deliberative Process Privilege
INTRODUCTION

This report describes our progress from the start of the project on May 26 through June 30, 2005. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks; progress made; challenges encountered or anticipated; milestones reached; and projections for work to be completed in the coming month.

The objective of the contract is to assist the EAC in the collection, analysis and interpretation of information regarding HAVA provisional voting and voter identification requirements on which to base policy recommendations as guidance for the states in the conduct of the 2006 elections. The work has begun well, thanks to the clarity of the EAC’s expectations and the strong collaboration by the scholars and staff at the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, and the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University.

The document report is divided into 4 sections that cover: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, Project Management, and the Financial Report. Each section references the specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract.

Please direct any questions or comments about this report to Tom O’Neill at:
PROVISIONAL VOTING

Tasks 3.4 – 3.9 in our contract relate to provisional voting. Work on the first of these must be complete before proceeding to later tasks. The work plan provides for two months to complete Task 3.4. Work on this task is on schedule.

Task 3.4: Collect and analyze state legislation, administrative procedures, and court cases. Understand the disparities and similarities of how provisional voting was implemented around the country.

LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS, AND LITIGATION

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation. When complete, this information will constitute the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task. It also will provide a base of understanding for the analysis of states’ actual experience with provisional voting in 2004, for which the Eagleton team has lead responsibility.

Description: The Moritz team includes faculty, an executive administrator, a reference librarian, and several research assistants. It began immediately to compile statutes, case law and administrative procedures regarding Provisional Voting. The team has created a 50 state chart to summarize information on provisional voting. Categories for which state statutes and administrative procedures are being reviewed include:

- When did the state create a system compliant with the HAVA provisional ballot requirements?
- Who may be eligible to cast a provisional ballot? and
- What is the process for discovering whether your provisional ballot was counted in the election?

Progress: Initial research for 27 states, including the collection of provisional voting statutes is complete. This phase of the work is on schedule for completion by August 1. By the beginning of the week of July 11, Moritz’s full time research assistant will move from voter identification research to gathering and organizing case law on provisional voting.

Challenges: Identifying the relevant statutes has been challenging; states use different terminology to codify provisional voting issues. Many states have scattered election law provisions throughout their codes. This variation from state to state makes creating a snapshot view across states a challenge. The team is meeting this challenge, and the work is on schedule.
PREPARATION FOR AND EXPERIENCE WITH PROVISIONAL VOTING

The Eagleton team is constructing a narrative description for each state of the 50 states and the District of Columbia. It is also surveying a stratified random sample of county election officials to improve its understanding of actual practice in administering provisional voting.

Description: To construct the narratives, a researcher is examining newspaper accounts, state websites, and reports from third-party organizations to determine what information is publicly available about these issues during the 2004 election. To organize the information derived from this examination, we are creating an information system that will make it possible to catalog the basic information about the states (i.e. whether a state was new to provisional voting, the percentage of provisional votes counted, the method of notifying voters if their vote was counted, etc.) and combine it with Moritz's collection and analysis of statutes, regulations and litigation. The information system will make it possible to provide answers to such topics of particular interest listed in the contract as: How did preparation for provisional voting vary between states that had some form of provisional voting and those that did not?” and “How did litigation affect implementation?”

Progress: The researcher in this area has identified sources of information for every state and the collection process is well underway. Verified database entries for 24 states are complete, as are two state narrative summaries. This phase of the research is on schedule for completion by the end of July.

Challenges: A key challenge is determining just what states actually did in practice to verify and count provisional ballots. A second challenge has been determining the variations in policy within individual states. We are still wrestling with resolving this challenge, but the work is on schedule.

Work Plan: By the end of the July, the compilation of statutes, administrative regulations, and litigation will be complete and ready to be combined with the state-by-state narrative compiled by Eagleton. That will form the basis for the analysis and recommendation of alternative approaches for provisional voting required under Task 3.5.

SURVEY OF COUNTY ELECTION OFFICIALS

This survey will help the research team understand more about such key topics of interest as:

- “How did the experience of provisional voting vary between states that previously had some form of provisional voting and those where provisional voting was new in 2004?”
- “Did state and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots?”
- “Did local officials have a clear understanding of how to implement provisional voting?”

The survey results will supplement the information on these topics from the compilation of statutes, regulations and cases and from the narrative we are constructing for each state.
Description: The Center for Public Interest Polling (CPIP) at Eagleton is conducting a national survey of county election officials to measure several aspects of provisional voting. The survey is designed to determine the following factors related to provisional voting at the county level:

- The content and quality of instructions provided to county officials by the states
- The steps taken by county officials to pass information on to poll workers;
- Differences in experience between states new to provisional voting and those that had some form of provisional ballot before HAVA; and
- Recommendations to improve and/or reduce the need for provisional voting

Progress: The survey instrument is complete. CPIP has compiled a list of election officials at the county level and at the municipal or regional level for states that do not assign the election responsibility to counties. It was forwarded to the call center, Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas Inc., (SRBI) the week of July 5, 2005. A sample will be drawn the week of July 12. Human Subjects Approval from Rutgers University was granted July 12. Pre-notification letters will be sent to election officials around July 12-13, 2005. The EAC has reviewed a draft of this letter, which we have now revised to make clear that the survey will increase our understanding of the provisional voting process, but is not being conducted on behalf of the EAC.

Challenges: We made special efforts to expedite Human Subject Approval to meet the schedule in the work plan. In the absence of an existing, reliable database of local election officials, we had to create one especially for this project. In order to provide a valid comparison between the states new to provisional voting with those that previously had some form of provisional ballot we doubled the sample size from 200 to 400. This increase will require an increase in the budget for the survey from $15,000 to about $24,000. We intend to reallocate costs within the existing budget to make this improvement possible, and will submit a letter describing the reallocation to the EAC in mid-July.

The sample has been, and will continue to represent the biggest challenge in this survey. Compiling the sample required substantial coordination and research to determine the accuracy of the identity and contact information for potential respondents. The difficulty in determining the appropriate contact is attributed to variation in county election officials' titles, jurisdiction types, and state and county election structures across the country. In addition to the potential pitfalls of reaching the appropriate county official, another factor in actually making contact with this special population will be dependent upon the hours that they keep, and may be hindered by the summer season.

Work Plan: This questionnaire will be pre-tested by July 15, and will field July 18 through August 5, 2005. This is somewhat later than projected in the revised work plan, but the information will arrive in time to be considered in drafting the analysis and alternatives document required under Task 3.5.
VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The contract lists 7 tasks (3.10 – 3.16) related to Voter Identification Requirements. During the reporting period, we have made substantial progress in the first two tasks, which constitute the information-gathering phase of the work on Voter ID. The research of Voter ID requirements is proceeding concurrently with our work on the experience of provisional voting.

Task 3.10: Legislation, regulations, and litigation

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation. When complete, this information will constitute the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task.

Description: A team of Election Law@Moritz faculty, executive administrator, a reference librarian, and several research assistants is compiling statutes on Voter Identification, and providing a summarized analysis of this research.

Progress: The Moritz team has created a 50-state chart to record data on voter identification. Categories for which state statutes and administrative regulations are being reviewed include: “Who is required to present ID”, “Types of ID required”, and “Consequences of having no ID”. We have completed the initial research for 45 states and have collected the voter identification statutes for those states. An Election Law@Moritz Fellow is conducting an academic literature review on voter identification. This literature review will help shape the analytical framework that will guide us when the compendium of statutes and administrative regulations is complete.

Challenges: Identifying the relevant statutes has been challenging because of the different terminology used from state to state to codify voter identification issues, and because many states have scattered election law provisions throughout their codes. This variety from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

Projections: At the current rate, a draft of the voter identification chart should be complete on schedule, by the end of July. Work on the literature review will continue into August, but will be available to inform the analysis of alternative approaches for voter identification called for by Task 3.12 of the contract.

SUPPLEMENTS TO LEGAL ANALYSIS

To supplement the legal analysis, the Eagleton team is undertaking two research efforts: First, compiling information on the debate over voter in the states; and second, estimating the effect on turnout of voter ID requirements. Tracking the continuing political debate over voter identification reveals that the relatively narrow HAVA requirements for voter identification have apparently sparked in many states a broader concern with more rigorous identification requirements for all voters. We are following these developments both to
monitor possible secondary effects of HAVA on voter ID, and to provide a rich collection of alternative approaches for consideration.

Individual narratives for the states with significant activity in voter ID will provide a resource for understanding the wide range of experience in the 2004 election. The narratives will include an appraisal of the prevalence and nature of vote fraud, a focus of the concern with increasing the rigor of voter ID requirements. This work is on schedule to be completed by the end of July. The next key milestones will be the completion of the state database and drafting the first narratives.

VOTER ID AND TURNOUT ANALYSIS
The second supplemental analysis will provide objective information on a contentious feature of the debate over voter ID in the states: the effects of more rigorous voter ID regimes on voter turnout and the relationship between the voter ID regime and vote fraud. As part of this effort, Eagleton is undertaking a statistical analysis to gauge the effect of a state's voter ID regime on turnout, especially turnout by minority and elderly voters.

Description: We are creating a database and gathering statistics on the effects of state-level voter identification requirements on voter turnout at the county-level in the 2004 election. Analysis on the county-level will enable us to estimate the influence of ID requirements on various age groups, races, ethnicities and gender groups. We are compiling data from both the 2000 and 2004 Presidential elections to measure the effect that changes in ID requirements may have had on voter turnout through two national election cycles.

Progress: The structure of the database is complete. It contains demographic information from the Census, and turnout data from various sources. The researcher assigned to this task is devising the syntax that will be required to run the statistics when the dataset is complete. The methodology for this part of the study is complete, and the actual data collection will soon be finished.

Projection: We are waiting for the Census Bureau to release the 2004 County Demographic Estimates. We have ordered and await the arrival of 2 datasets that contain voter turnout and voter registration numbers on the county-level for both the 2000 and 2004 elections. Once these two sources of information are received, the researcher will insert this information into the existing database, clean up the dataset, and begin to run the statistics. By that point, the researcher will have separated the states into various ID-requirement groupings that have been determined by the team, which will require coordination with several other parts of the study. This work is on schedule. By the end of July, the researcher should have county-level and state-level statistics on the impact of each ID system upon turnout, analyzed through various demographic features on the county-level.
Task 3.11 Public meeting on Voter Identification Requirements

Description: We are working closely with EAC staff, particularly the General Counsel, to plan a half day public meeting on Voter ID requirements. Presentations at the meeting will form an important part of the information we are compiling about Voter ID requirements and the strengths and shortcomings of a range of alternative approaches.

Progress: We have recommended a focus on the debate over Voter ID now underway in the states. To provide a vivid picture of the debate, we have recommended that one panel include legislators on opposite sides of the issue from two different states. Our research identified Mississippi and Wisconsin as two states to focus on, and we have recommended specific legislators from each. We have discussed with staff adding a researcher to the panel to put the debate in Wisconsin and Mississippi in either a national or historic context. We also recommended two researchers from contrasting points of view, to address the effects of Voter ID provisions under HAVA and broader provisions that are now the subject of national debate. EAC staff recommended a panel of two state election directors to address the interaction of Voter ID with HAVA. We are awaiting a decision on our recommendations from EAC staff. We have no reason not to believe that the work is on schedule to be completed in time to organize a productive meeting on July 28.

Challenges: The date and location of this hearing has been changed twice since the beginning of the project. It was originally scheduled to take place in late June, but was rescheduled for July to allow the June hearing to focus on voting machine technology. The regular meeting was rescheduled for July 26 in Minneapolis, and was recently changed to July 28 in Pasadena. The changes in the scheduling of the July meeting have complicated our choice of panelists. More seriously, the changes mean that information from the hearing will not be available as early in the research process as contemplated in the contract. This timeframe will now require the team to summarize the hearing events at the same time that we are drafting the analysis and alternatives paper in early August.

Additionally, while our contract states that the "Contractor shall be responsible for all aspects of planning and conducting this hearing in consultation with the EAC," we have been asked only to make recommendations of topics and panelists, and the arrangements for the organization of the hearing are in other hands. This lack of clarity has caused some confusion and has delayed invitations to panelists. Thanks to frequent communication with members of the EAC, the process now seems to be working smoothly.

Projection: We believe the work is on schedule for completion in time to recruit the panelists for the July 28 hearing. Preparation of the hearing summary will likely be delayed because of the need to complete the analysis and alternatives paper.
PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Immediately after announcement of the award of the contract, Eagleton and Moritz began supplementing the core group that had prepared to proposal to building a highly qualified team to undertake the work. That team was in place by mid June, just a few weeks after the contract award.

As described in the proposal, the direction of the project is the responsibility of a five-person committee of faculty and staff from Eagleton and Moritz, chaired by Dr. Ruth Mandel, Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics. Project Director Thomas O’Neill, a consultant to Eagleton, reports to this team and provides day-to-day guidance and coordination for the research. A weekly meeting of all the researchers engaged in the project if the primary means of coordinating the work. We have recently added an internal website to facilitate the review and revision of written materials.

Task 3.1 Update the Work Plan

The first task was completed on time with the submission of a detailed work plan and timeline. EAC staff requested that the work plan be supplemented with a Gantt chart created on MS Project, and we submitted that a few days later.

PEER REVIEW GROUP

Description: A feature of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group (PRG). The EAC indicated at our first meeting in May that it would review our recommendations for members of the PRG. Our initial vision of the PRG was a small group of scholars and representatives of advocacy organizations that would comment on the research design, review drafts of our analyses and reports, and, in general, identify areas of the research that should be strengthened and help us improve the breadth, depth and clarity of reports based on that research.

Progress: Upon reflection, the project team agreed that the PRG should not include representatives of advocacy groups. We concluded, as representatives they would feel obligated to act as advocates for positions already taken by their groups. While advocacy organizations should be consulted as stakeholders during the course of our work, they were unlikely to achieve the goals we had in mind for the PRG as a source of advice on research design, methodology, and analysis. We submitted a revised list of potential members, substantially comprised of academics, to EAC for review.

The EAC responded with suggestions concerning both the balance of the PRG’s membership and the creation of additional committees to review our work. We answered with an analysis of the cost and time involved adopting the EAC’s suggestions as well as with suggestions for a balanced selection of academics for the Peer Review Group. We have not received response on this correspondence from the EAC, and the recruitment of the group is on hold.
Challenges: Communications on this issue with the EAC have not been clear or timely. The PRG should be in place now to comment on our research design while there is still time to refine it. While we are confident in the quality of our work, the wisdom and perspective of the outstanding candidates we have proposed for membership would strengthen the analysis and reports of our work.

Projections: We have effectively brought these challenges to the attention of EAC staff and look forward to a resolution speedy enough to allow recruitment of the PRG’s members before the end of the month. If we meet that goal, the work of the PRG will be about 2 weeks behind the milestones indicated in the work plan.

COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Collecting and merging information and data from myriad sources is a demanding requirement of this research. We have developed two principal mechanisms to facilitate the analysis of the material collected or created in the project: an information system and a website for easy access to drafts and reports.

INFORMATION SYSTEM

Description: The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law will be merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which will include a compendium of case law and statutes regarding provisional voting and voter identification.

Progress: The Moritz team has provided Eagleton staff with samples of the work that they are performing. An Eagleton staff member will be reviewing the content and formats of data from all supporting research and (re-)formatting once the work has been completed. The researchers and staff at Eagleton have created a shared folder on the Institute’s server for the safe storage of work and access for those staff members. All of this work is being reviewed by the project team to ensure that a broad survey is being performed.

Challenges: There are no evident challenges to this task at this time.

Projections: By the end of July 2005, much of the above referenced research will have been completed with respective materials and charts near completion. At that time, staff at Eagleton will review, combine and format all documents and materials in preparation for our final reporting to the EAC.

INTRANET

Description: A trial Intranet for the project became available during the week of June 26. The Intranet will facilitate the exchange of information and collaboration among project participants.

Progress: After meetings with staff members of Rutgers University Computer Services (RUCS) and subsequent submission of a proposal by RUCS for technical support and hosting of the Intranet and the evaluation of alternative commercial services, the project team decided at its June 28th meeting to publish the Intranet through www.intranets.com.
one of the leading commercial services. This decision was based on lower costs and earlier publication schedules than offered under the RUCS proposal. The Intranet services were evaluated during a free trial period, which demonstrated the ease of design and navigation of the proposed service.

**Challenges:** There are no immediate challenges to completion of this task by the timeframe specified below.

**Projections:** Design, testing and publication of initial content of the Intranet service is continuing, with all participants expected to be provided access by July 8, 2005.

**FINANCIAL REPORT**

The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. Financial reporting on grant accounts is limited to **actual expenses** that have been incurred during the reporting period. Given that the report reflects the first month of the project, several procedures for payment of subcontractors on the project were initiated. Expenses related to those members of the team are not reflected in this report because they have not yet been incurred.

Our contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, (732) 932-0165, EXT. 2235.

A detail of expenses incurred from project inception through June 30, 2005, is attached.
Job-

I write to see if you might be available to come to Washington on Monday, August 1 to meet with several EAC staff and Commissioners to discuss the voter fraud/voter intimidation project and your possible work as a consultant on the project.

I'd like to schedule this 1-2 hour meeting for sometime between 1 and 3 in the afternoon.

Might you be available to come to Washington for this?

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Tom-

I will be in touch shortly with possible dates in very late August or early September, when EAC staff might be available to meet with Eagleton to discuss the project's research results and next steps.

In the meantime, I thought it was important to follow up on the issues Vice Chair DeGregorio raised while we were in Pasadena.

To be certain that I have the latest information, could you send to me the final list of the Eagleton/Moritz Peer Review Group and the list of organizations that Eagleton will be contacting for input?

Regards-

Karen

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
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INTRODUCTION

This report describes our progress from July 1 through July 31, 2005. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks; progress made; challenges encountered or anticipated; milestones reached; and projections for work to be completed in the coming month.

The effort this month continued to focus on research for the analysis and alternatives paper, including the compilation of Provisional Voting statutes, regulations, and litigation from the 50 states. We also prepared and delivered testimony at the EAC's regular monthly meeting in Pasadena on July 28.

The data collection, analysis, and compilation are all on schedule. Because of delays in agreeing on the composition of the Peer Review Group with EAC, however, the actual completion and submission of the analysis and alternatives paper to the EAC will most likely be delayed about a week beyond the target date in the work plan. We are scheduled to discuss the draft paper and guidance document prior to submission, with the EAC on September 6, and the final draft cannot be completed until several days after that date.

The document report is divided into 4 sections that cover: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, Project Management, and the Financial Report. Each section references the specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract.

Please direct any questions or comments about this report to Tom O'Neill at:
PROVISIONAL VOTING

Tasks 3.4 – 3.9 in our contract relate to provisional voting. Work on the first of these must be complete before proceeding to later tasks. Task 3.4 was completed this month.

Task 3.4: Collect and analyze state legislation, administrative procedures, and court cases. Understand the disparities and similarities of how provisional voting was implemented around the country.

LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS, AND LITIGATION

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation. This information constitutes the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task. It also will provide a base of understanding for the analysis of states’ actual experience with provisional voting in 2004, for which the Eagleton team has lead responsibility.

Description: The Moritz team has created a 50-state chart to summarize information on provisional voting, compiled statutes, case law and administrative procedures regarding Provisional Voting.

Progress: The 50-state (plus District of Columbia) chart created to collect data on provisional voting is complete. We have collected the statutes for all states. State by state summaries of provisional voting have been written for 47 states and D.C. A memorandum summarizing provisional voting litigation is complete. The collection of the documents associated with the litigation is nearing completion.

Challenges: The variety in the form of provisional voting legislation from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

Work Plan: The remaining 3 state summaries of provisional voting will be completed by August 8. Analysis of all the information, data, and survey results concerning provisional voting data will be performed in August.

PREPARATION FOR AND EXPERIENCE WITH PROVISIONAL VOTING

The Eagleton team has researched and compiled a narrative of each state’s experience with provisional voting in 2004. At the end of July the survey of 400 local election officials was nearing its end, and – as of this writing – is now complete with an analysis and report in draft form. We will rely on the survey results to improve our understanding of actual practice in administering provisional voting, including the steps local officials took to prepare for the election.
PROVISIONAL VOTING NARRATIVES

Description: To construct the narratives, a researcher examined newspaper accounts, state websites, and reports from third-party organizations to gather information on the experience with provisional voting in the 2004 election. To organize the information derived from this examination, we created an information system that catalogues information about the states (i.e. whether a state was new to provisional voting, the percentage of provisional votes counted, the method of notifying voters if their vote was counted, etc.) and combined it with Moritz's collection and analysis of statutes, regulations and litigation.

Progress: The state-by-state database is complete, as is a first draft of all state narratives. This work has been shared with the larger team and is being reviewed currently in preparation for constructing analysis and recommendation of alternative approaches for provisional voting required under Task 3.5.

Work Plan: In the next month, revisions of the narratives will be complete. In addition to this research, we will expand upon vote fraud research and examine further the relationship between instances of vote fraud and ensuing election reforms.

SURVEY OF COUNTY ELECTION OFFICIALS

Description: The Center for Public Interest Polling (CPIP) at Eagleton conducted a national survey of county election officials to measure several aspects of provisional voting. The survey was designed to determine the following factors related to provisional voting at the county (or equivalent election jurisdiction) level:

- The content and quality of instructions provided to county officials by the states;
- The steps taken by county officials to pass information on to poll workers;
- Differences in experience between states new to provisional voting and those that had some form of provisional ballot before HAVA; and
- Recommendations to improve and/or reduce the need for provisional voting.

Progress: The fielding and initial analysis of the survey results are complete.

Work Plan: The information derived from the survey will be considered in drafting the analysis and alternatives document required under Task 3.5.
The contract lists 7 tasks (3.10 – 3.16) related to Voter Identification Requirements. During the reporting period, we have completed tasks 3.10 and 3.11. The research on Voter ID requirements is proceeding concurrently with our work on the experience of provisional voting.

**Task 3.10: Legislation, regulations, and litigation**

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation with regard to Voter Identification Requirements. When complete, this information will constitute the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task.

**Description:** The Moritz team has compiled statutes on Voter Identification, and will provide a summarized analysis of this research to the project team for review.

**Progress:** The chart created to collect data on voter identification is complete and is now being reviewed. Voter identification statutes are being collected.

**Challenges:** Identifying the relevant statutes has been challenging because of the different terminology used from state to state to codify voter identification issues, and because many states have scattered election law provisions throughout their codes. This variety from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

**Work Plan:** Review of the voter identification chart, the collection of the voter identification statutes, and the writing of the state by state summaries will be completed by the end of August.

**SUPPLEMENTS TO LEGAL ANALYSIS**

To supplement the legal analysis, the Eagleton team is undertaking two research efforts: First, compiling information on the debate over voter ID in the states; and second, estimating the effect on turnout of voter ID requirements. Tracking the continuing political debate over voter identification reveals that the relatively narrow HAVA requirements for voter identification have apparently sparked in many states a broader concern with more rigorous identification requirements for all voters. We are following these developments both to monitor possible secondary effects of HAVA on voter ID, and to provide a rich collection of alternative approaches for consideration.

Individual narratives for the states with significant activity in voter ID will provide a resource for understanding the wide range of experience in the 2004 election. The narratives will include an appraisal of the prevalence and nature of vote fraud, a focus of the concern
with increasing the rigor of voter ID requirements. The next key milestones will be the completion of the state database and drafting the first narratives.

**Voter ID and Turnout Analysis**

The second supplemental analysis will provide objective information on a contentious feature of the debate over voter ID in the states: the effects of more rigorous voter ID regimes on voter turnout and the relationship between the voter ID regime and vote fraud. As part of this effort, Eagleton is undertaking a statistical analysis to gauge the effect of a state's voter ID regime on turnout, especially turnout by minority and elderly voters.

**Description:** We are creating a database and gathering statistics on the effects of state-level voter identification requirements on voter turnout at the county-level in the 2004 election.

**Progress:** The collection of data for the Voter ID-Turnout analysis is complete. The assembled database contains population demographic data, voter registration data and voter turnout data from all 50 states, 3113 Counties, and the District of Columbia. It also contains exit poll data from the 50 states, providing demographic data of voter turnout. The analysis of that data is well underway.

**Challenges:** The initial methodology that was devised to investigate the questions involved in this part of the study proved insufficient, as the necessary data was unobtainable (the Census Bureau has not yet released their 2004 data). After re-developing an appropriate methodology, the necessary data has been assembled, we have resumed the analysis of this data.

**Projection:** The analysis of the impact that voter identification requirements have upon voter turnout should be completed around mid-August.

---

**Task 3.11 Public meeting on Voter Identification Requirements**

**Description:** In early July, we continued our efforts to identify specific Voter ID topics or issues and panelists who could shed light on them. We recommended a focus on the debate over Voter ID now underway in the states. To provide a vivid picture of the debate, we recommended that one panel include specific legislators on opposite sides of the issue from two different states, Mississippi and Wisconsin. We also discussed adding a researcher to the panel in order to place the debate in a national or historical context. We also recommended a panel of two academic researchers with contrasting points of view, to address the effects of Voter ID provisions under HAVA. In response to our suggestions, EAC staff recommended a panel of two state election directors to address the interaction of Voter ID with HAVA.

By mid-July, the EAC had decided which topics and speakers should be invited, however most of those speakers proved unable to attend.
**Progress:** Tom O'Neill and Dan Tokaji attended the EAC Public Meeting held in Pasadena on July 28. Their presentations at the meeting described the progress of the research and our developing perspective on how to assess the quality of the provisional voting process in the states and identify possible steps for improvement.

**Challenges:** The changes in the scheduling of the July meeting delayed and ultimately made it impossible to assemble a panel, from which we could derive substantive insight into voter identification issues as they are playing out in the states. Additionally, due to the date of the hearing, the information from the hearing was not available as early in the research process as contemplated in the contract.

**Projection:** Preparation of the hearing summary will likely be delayed, due to the team's focus on preparation of the analysis and alternatives paper.

---

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

**PEER REVIEW GROUP**

**Description:** A feature of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group (PRG). The EAC indicated at our first meeting in May that it would review our recommendations for members of the PRG. Our initial vision of the PRG was a small group of scholars and representatives of advocacy organizations that would comment on the research design, review drafts of our analyses and reports, and, in general, identify areas of the research that should be strengthened and help us improve the breadth, depth and clarity of reports based on that research.

**Progress:** Upon reflection, the project team agreed that the PRG should not include representatives of advocacy groups. We concluded that as representatives they would feel obligated to act as advocates for positions already taken by their groups. While advocacy organizations might be consulted as stakeholders during the course of our work, they were unlikely to achieve the goals we had in mind for the PRG as a source of advice on research design, methodology, and analysis. We submitted a revised list of potential members, substantially comprised of academics, to the EAC for review.

The EAC responded with suggestions concerning both the balance of the PRG's membership and the creation of additional committees to review our work. We provided an analysis of the cost and time involved in adopting the EAC's suggestions as well as with suggestions for a balanced selection of academics for the Peer Review Group. In the end, the EAC determined that Eagleton should appoint a balanced Peer Review Group of its own choosing. Initial phone calls were made to all members of that group by the end of July, and written invitations and descriptions of the process have gone to all possible members who had indicated their interest in serving.

**Challenges:** Communications on this issue with the EAC were not clear or timely. The purpose of the PRG is to review our work, and to comment on our research design, which is well underway. We had planned to have the PRG in place early enough in the project to enable them to provide feedback, including the research design. While we are
confident in the quality of our work, the experience and perspective of the Peer Review Group will strengthen our analysis and recommendations as we find a way to receive its critique in the more limited time now available. The delay in creating the Peer Review Group will result in a delay in the completion of the final draft of the analysis and alternatives paper and in the preliminary guidance document.

**Projections:** The work of the PRG will be about 2 weeks behind the milestones indicated in the work plan.

**COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT**

Collecting and merging information and data from myriad sources is a demanding requirement of this research. We have developed two principal mechanisms to facilitate the analysis of the material collected or created in the project: an information system and an internal website for easy access to drafts and reports.

**INFORMATION SYSTEM**

**Description:** The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law will be merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which will include a compendium of case law and statutes regarding provisional voting and voter identification.

**Progress:** The Moritz team has provided Eagleton staff with all completed work. An Eagleton staff member reviews the content and formats of data from all supporting research and will (re-)format once the work has been completed for the compendium and reports submitted to the EAC. The researchers and staff at Eagleton have created a shared folder on the Institute’s server for the safe storage of work and access for those staff members. All of this work is being reviewed by the project team to ensure that a broad survey is being performed.

**Projections:** By the end of July 2005, much of the above referenced research has been completed. The entire project team has begun the process of reviewing all work, and will combine and format all documents and materials in preparation for our final reporting to the EAC.

**INTRANET**

**Description:** All project team members have signed on to the Intranet site. The Intranet facilitates the exchange of information and collaboration among project participants.

**Progress:** Project team members regularly post drafts, completed materials and spreadsheets online for internal review. The intranet has been extremely helpful to team members and serves as an internal website with announcements and important documents readily available to all team members.
The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. Financial reporting on grant accounts is limited to actual expenses that have been incurred during the reporting period. Our contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, (732) 932-0165, EXT. 2235.

A detail of expenses incurred from project inception through June 30, 2005, is attached.
Tom-

Thank you for sharing this list of your Peer Review Group members, to-date. I will share this list with the Commissioners and will be certain to let your know of their feedback, if any.

I will also be back in touch regarding Eagleton’s research around voter fraud and the research project EAC will be undertaking, this fall, around voting fraud and voter intimidation. The EAC is presently in the process of finalizing a work and staff plan for this project and once it is completed, I will be certain to brief you on it.

In the meantime, EAC staff and several of the Commissioners looks forward to meeting with the Eagleton/Moritz team on September 6 at 1:30 PM.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Research Manager  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
tel: 202-566-3123

Karen,  

Attached is a report on the status of recruitment of members of the Peer Review Group. We extended 9 invitations. We have four confirmed members, one reluctant turn-down, one who has yet to respond to an initial inquiry, and are awaiting confirmation from 3 others who initially agreed. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Tom O'Neill

RecruitmentStatus.doc
STATUS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP RECRUITMENT
(As of August 17, 2005)

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.  YES/CONFIRMED
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology

Guy-Uriel Charles  YES
Associate Professor, School of Law
University of Minnesota
612-626-9154

Brad Clark  NO
Professor of Law
George Washington University School of Law

Pamela Susan Karlan  YES
Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law
Stanford Law School
650-725-4851

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.  YES/CONFIRMED
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu

Daniel H. Lowenstein  YES
Professor of Law
UCLA
310-825-4841

John F. Manning  NO RESPONSE
Professor
Harvard Law School

Tim Storey  YES/CONFIRMED
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures

Peter G. Verniero, Esq.  YES/CONFIRMED
Counsel
Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
(Former NJ Attorney General and Supreme Court Justice)
I'm actually out of the office today, so let's talk more when I get back, but in answer to one of your questions -- yes, the CHC has spoken out against ID requirements in the past, especially during the HAVA debate.

Michael Torra
Office of Congressman Charles A. Gonzalez

-----Original Message-----
From: aambrogi@eac.gov <aambrogi@eac.gov>
To: Torra, Michael <Michael.Torra@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Fri Sep 02 15:50:41 2005
Subject: Re: Fw: AZ DOJ response

Thanks-- we had, and it's good coverage. The AP had a piece as well-- this can be seen as a victory. Has the CHC come out officially on these ID issues? It is my opinion that the movements are being made in state legs. that will apply AZ type laws elsewhere. We obviously have good communications with House Admin and Senate Rules, as well as Whip Hoyer's office, but increased communications with Hill member offices would be helpful, if you have any suggestions.

AP Article:

Feds revise stance on Arizona voter ID requirement

Wednesday, August 31, 2005 7:43 PM PDT

PHOENIX (AP) - Arizona voters may be able to obtain at least a provisional ballot at polling places even if they don't show required identification despite the ID requirement in a ballot measure approved by voters last year. Whether that provisional ballot gets counted is another question.

The U.S. Justice Department in January signed off on election-law changes made by Proposition 200 itself. And a top department official in April signaled that the state would not run afoul of federal law if it put into place procedures to implement the ballot measure's voter ID mandate.

However, a different department official on Thursday wrote the state, saying it was "necessary to clarify our earlier interpretation in order to ensure an accurate representation of the Justice Department's views."

Acting Assistant Attorney General Bradley J. Schlozman's letter to a state official said the federal Help America Vote Act of 2002 requires that a person claiming to be an eligible voter and willing to sign a statement to that effect be given at least a provisional ballot.

However, HAVA leaves it up to states to decide whether a person who casts a provisional ballot is actually eligible to vote and therefore whether a provisional ballot should be counted, Schlozman wrote. Therefore, the state is free to
Commissioners-

FYI-

Eagleton's August progress report.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Hi Karen,

Attached is the August progress report in fulfillment of our Contract to Provide Research Assistance to the EAC for the Development of Voluntary Guidance on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Procedures. Please note, as per your instructions earlier this month, that the financial report will be sent via Fedex under separate cover to: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer, EAC. Also attached to the progress report is a finalized list of our Peer Review Group members. If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Tom O'Neill at (908) 794-1030 or.

Have a great day,
Lauren Vincelli

Lauren Vincelli
Business Assistant, Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling
Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University
Carriage House, 185 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
Phone: (732) 932-9384, ext. 237
Fax: (732) 932-1551
Contract to Provide Research Assistance to The EAC
For the Development of Voluntary Guidance on
Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Procedures

MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT
AUGUST 2005

For
UNITED STATES ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100
Washington, DC 20005

September 15, 2005

Prepared by:
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557
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INTRODUCTION

This report describes our progress from August 1 through August 31, 2005. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks; progress made; challenges encountered or anticipated; milestones reached; and projections for work to be completed in the coming month.

Research on Provisional Voting and a draft of reports on the analysis and alternatives were substantially completed in preparation for the September 6 briefing for the EAC. Important reports such as the National Survey of Local Election Officials' Experience with Provisional Voting; Statistical Review Provisional Voting in the 2004 Election; State-by-state Narrative of Developments in Provisional Voting; and the compilation of Provisional Voting statutes, regulations, and litigation from the 50 states, were all completed in August.

We made further progress on recruiting a balanced and authoritative Peer Review Group (which, as this report is written, is receiving all the documents listed above for review). Ingrid Reed of Eagleton will coordinate the work of the Peer Review Group. A list of the members of the Peer Review Group is attached.

This report is divided into 3 sections: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, and Project Management. Each section references specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract. The Financial Report will be sent separately by the Rutgers Division of Grant and Contract Accounting.

Please direct questions or comments about this report to Tom O'Neill at: [Redacted]
Tasks 3.4 – 3.9 in our contract relate to provisional voting. Work on the first of these must be complete before proceeding to later tasks. Task 3.4 was completed in August, and Task 3.5 is well underway.

Task 3.5: Analysis and Alternative Approaches. Assess the potential, problems, and challenges of provisional voting and develop alternative means to achieve the goals of provisional voting.

LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS, AND LITIGATION

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation. This information constitutes the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task. It has provided a base of understanding for the analysis of states’ actual experience with provisional voting in 2004, for which the Eagleton team has lead responsibility.

Description: The Moritz team has created a 50-state chart to summarize information on provisional voting, compiled statutes, case law and administrative procedures regarding Provisional Voting and is near completion with this research.

Progress: We completed the state by state summaries of provisional voting in August. Also complete is a memorandum outlining provisional voting legislative changes since the 2004 election. This material was sent to the EAC as part of the package for briefing on September 6.

Challenges: The variety in the form and frequency of provisional voting legislation from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

Work Plan: The analysis of all the information, data, and survey results concerning provisional voting data will be completed in September, on schedule. The alternatives document should also be complete in September, pending response from the EAC on which direction those alternatives should follow.

PREPARATION FOR AND EXPERIENCE WITH PROVISIONAL VOTING

The Eagleton team has researched and compiled a narrative of each state’s experience with provisional voting in 2004. The report findings from the survey of 400 local election officials is now complete. The survey results improve our understanding of actual practice in administering provisional voting, including the steps local officials took to prepare for the election.
**PROVISIONAL VOTING NARRATIVES**

**Description:** To construct the narratives, a researcher examined newspaper accounts, state websites, and reports from third-party organizations to gather information on the experience with provisional voting in the 2004 election. To organize the information derived from this examination, we created an information system that catalogues information about the states (i.e. whether a state was new to provisional voting, the percentage of provisional votes counted, the method of notifying voters if their vote was counted, etc.) and combined it with Moritz's collection and analysis of statutes, regulations and litigation.

**Progress:** A state-by-state narrative of developments in Provisional Voting is complete and has been distributed to the EAC and the Peer Review Group. This work has been crucial to the process of constructing our draft analysis and recommendation of alternative approaches for provisional voting required under Task 3.5.

**Challenges:** The primary obstacle to constructing the narratives was difficulty in communicating and obtaining necessary information from various state officials. As a result, the narratives underwent multiple revisions in order to incorporate the most up-to-date material available. Had the Election Day Study been available, this task would probably have been simplified considerably.

**Work Plan:** We completed revisions of the narratives.

**SURVEY OF COUNTY ELECTION OFFICIALS**

**Description:** The Center for Public Interest Polling (CPIP) at Eagleton conducted a national survey of county election officials to measure several aspects of provisional voting.

**Progress:** The analysis of the survey results and findings report are complete.

**Work Plan:** We used the information from the survey in drafting the analysis and alternatives document required under Task 3.5.
VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The contract lists 7 tasks (3.10 – 3.16) related to Voter Identification Requirements. The research on Voter ID requirements is proceeding concurrently with our work on the experience of provisional voting, and is becoming the principal focus of our research.

Task 3.10: Legislation, regulations, and litigation

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation with regard to Voter Identification Requirements. This collection of material is nearing completion. It will constitute the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task.

Description: The Moritz team has compiled statutes on Voter Identification, and will provide a summarized analysis of this research to the project team for review.

Progress: We are refining the 50 state (plus District of Columbia) chart of data on voter identification. So far collected are voter identification statutes for 35 states. Summaries of the existing voter identification statutes have been written for forty states.

Challenges: Identifying the relevant statutes has been challenging because of the different terminology used from state to state to codify voter identification issues, and because many states have scattered election law provisions throughout their codes. This variety from state to state makes creating a snapshot view across states a challenge.

Work Plan: The state by state voter identification statute summaries will be completed for the remaining ten states and D.C. and the review of the chart will be completed. Analysis of voter identification data will begin.

SUPPLEMENTS TO LEGAL ANALYSIS

To supplement the legal analysis, the Eagleton team is undertaking two research efforts: First, compiling information on the debate over voter ID in the states; and second, estimating the effect on turnout of different voter ID regimes. Tracking the continuing political debate over voter identification reveals that the relatively narrow HAVA requirements for voter identification have apparently sparked in many states a broader concern, and a sharp political debate over rigorous identification requirements for all voters. The research follows these developments both to monitor possible secondary effects of HAVA on voter ID, and to provide a rich collection of alternative approaches for consideration.

Individual narratives for the states with significant activity in voter ID will provide a resource for understanding the wide range of experience in the 2004 election. The narratives will include an appraisal of the prevalence and nature of vote fraud, a focus of the concern with
increasing the rigor of voter ID requirements. The next key milestones will be the completion of the state database and drafting the first narratives.

**VOTER ID AND TURNOUT ANALYSIS**

The second supplemental analysis will provide objective information on a contentious feature of the debate over voter ID in the states: the effects of more rigorous voter ID regimes on voter turnout and the relationship between the voter ID regime and vote fraud. As part of this effort, Eagleton is undertaking a statistical analysis to gauge the effect of a state’s voter ID regime on turnout, especially turnout by minority and elderly voters.

**Description:** We are creating a database and gathering statistics on the effects of state-level voter identification requirements on voter turnout at the county-level in the 2004 election.

**Progress:** The collection of data for the Voter ID-Turnout analysis is complete. The assembled database contains population demographic data, voter registration data and voter turnout data from all 50 states, 3113 Counties, and the District of Columbia. We have also utilized exit poll data collected on Election Day 2004 as a resource for understanding the demographics of voter turnout. The analysis of that data is underway.

**Challenges:** The main challenges to this task include gathering the complete set of changes to Voter ID laws over the past 5 years, and then incorporating those changes into a sound statistical methodology.

**Projection:** We will continue to work towards resolving the methodology issue, and ultimately produce a final report on this subject. The analysis of the impact that voter identification requirements have upon voter turnout should be completed around mid-September.
PROJECT MANAGEMENT

PEER REVIEW GROUP

Description: A feature of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group (PRG). The Peer Review Group will review our research and methodology and provide valuable feedback and suggestions for the direction of our work.

Progress: The composition of the Peer Review Group has been determined and the membership has been submitted to the EAC. Additionally, as of the date of this report all PRG members have received their first mailing, which included several reports from our research, and a draft of our analysis and alternatives outline for their review.

Challenges: Our timeline for circulating and discussing our research with the PRG has been compromised due to delays in completing the recruitment of members of the group.

Projections: We are in the process of scheduling our first conference call with PRG members for the week of Sept. 19, 2005.

COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Collecting and merging information and data from myriad sources is a demanding requirement of this research. We have developed two principal mechanisms to facilitate the analysis of the material collected or created in the project: an information system and an internal website for easy access to drafts and reports.

INFORMATION SYSTEM

Description: The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law is being merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which will include a compendium of case law and statutes regarding provisional voting and voter identification.

Progress: At this point in the research process, many documents are complete after a lengthy process of circulating drafts among team members. As we near the end of the Provisional Voting research and move into the Voter Identification research, we will re-evaluate the volume of files contained in the Information System and update the system.

Projections: The entire project team continues to review all project drafts, and will staff members combine and format all documents and materials in preparation for our final reporting to the EAC.

INTRANET

Description: All project team members have signed on to the Intranet site. The Intranet facilitates the exchange of information and collaboration among project participants.
**Progress:** Project team members regularly post drafts, completed materials and spreadsheets online for internal review. The intranet has been extremely helpful to team members and serves as an internal website with announcements and important documents readily available to all team members.

**FINANCIAL REPORT**

The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. Financial reporting on grant accounts is limited to actual expenses that have been incurred during the reporting period. Our contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, (732) 932-0165, EXT. 2235.

A detail of expenses incurred from project August 1 - August 31, 2005, will be sent under separate cover to: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer, EAC.
ATTACHMENT:
PEER REVIEW GROUP
FINAL LIST (09/13/05)

R. Michael Alvarez  
Professor of Political Science  
California Institute of Technology  
1200 East California Institute of Technology  
Mail box 228-77  
Pasadena, CA 91125  
rma@hss.caltech.edu  
Tel: (626)395-4422

Daniel H. Lowenstein  
Professor of Law  
School of Law, UCLA  
Box 951476  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1476  
lowenstein@law.ucla.edu  
Tel: (310) 825-4841

Guy-Uriel E. Charles  
Associate Professor  
School of Law, University of Minnesota  
342 Mondale Hall  
229-19th Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
gcharles@umn.edu  
Tel: (612)626-9154

Timothy G. O'Rourke  
Dean, Fulton School of Liberal Arts  
Salisbury University  
1101 Camden Avenue  
Fulton Hall - 225  
Salisbury, MD 21804  
tgorourke@salisbury.edu  
Tel: (410) 543-6000

John C. Harrison  
Massee Professor of Law  
University of Virginia School of Law  
580 Massie Road  
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903-7789  
jfh8m@virginia.edu  
Tel: (434) 924-3093

Bradley A. Smith  
Professor  
Capital Law School  
303 East Broad Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
bsmith@law.capital.edu  
Tel: (614) 236-6500

Pamela Susan Karlan  
Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law  
Stanford Law School  
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Assistant Professor of Political Science  
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Political Science Department  
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Hi Adam,

It was great meeting you at the UDC Law Symposium last week. I wanted to let you know that we are having a meeting about the voter fraud and intimidation meeting at 10 AM on October 28 at the EAC, and it would be great if you and Commissioner Martinez could be there. Let me know, and let's stay in touch. Thanks so much.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Adam,

Just to make sure we're talking about the same thing, I'm actually not going to be at the "kick-off" on the 14th. This is a meeting just about our project on the 28th. The project is already underway and the contracts finalized.

Since the meeting I refer to on the 28th is from 10-12, is there any possibility of the three of us having lunch after that?

Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: aambrogi@eac.gov [mailto:aambrogi@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, October 06, 2005 11:01 AM
To: wang@tcf.org
Subject: Re: October 28 meeting

Tova:

I was about to email you as well. It was certainly good to meet you last week, as I've heard about your work through numerous sources, and am glad we have finally been able to chat. As with many things (we started to discuss), the EAC is doing a lot of these projects for the first time. And unlike a thinktank, or nonprofit, we are constrained in a number of ways, and there are "sensitivities" that exist. Of course, there are benefits to not being a nonprofit, as well.

I'll state that at least myself, but hopefully Cmsr. Martinez will be at the kickoff meeting. You may do this already, but I would attempt to lay out the ideal structure for your involvement in the contract, and perhaps communicate this to Karen and the other contractor immediately before the meeting. That will frame this contract structure (beyond the terms of the agreement) to your liking.

Obviously a suggestion. However, I think that the goal is good, efficient research that is unimpeachable in partisan or methodological grounds—that will then be submitted to the Commission for it approval (and actually getting its approval).

Feel free to call me anytime. If you're in DC before then, and have some time, let's get Cmsr Martinez, you and I together for lunch or coffee.

Best,
Adam

----------------
Adam D. Ambrogi
Hi Adam,

It was great meeting you at the UDC Law Symposium last week. I wanted to let you know that we are having a meeting about the voter fraud and intimidation meeting at 10 AM on October 28 at the EAC, and it would be great if you and Commissioner Martinez could be there. Let me know, and let's stay in touch. Thanks so much.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

--- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 10/17/2005 04:35 PM ---

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
To aimee sherrill
10/18/2005 04:24 PM
cc
Subject Fw: Requested Documents

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

--- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 10/17/2005 04:23 PM ---

"Job Serebrov"<br>
To "Karen Lynn Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
08/19/2005 12:16 PM
cc
Subject Requested Documents

Karen:

Here are the documents that you requested.

Regards,

Job Resume Reg.doc Summary of Election Activities
LEGAL
PRACTICE:

Law clerk to Judge Lavenski R. Smith, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit; 425 West Capitol Ave., Ste. 3110, Metropolitan Bank Bldg., Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Supervisor: Judge Lavenski R. Smith, 501.324.7310
Hours per week: 40+ Dates of employment: August 2004-August 2005

Job duties: Legal research for cases assigned monthly by the judge, drafting of case memorandums and opinions, review of administrative panel and death penalty appeals and attendance at oral argument when required

Private practice of law

Supervisor: Self

Associate attorney, The Nixon Law Firm; 2340 Green Acres Road, Ste. 12, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72703

Supervisor: David Nixon, 479.582.0020
Hours per week: 40+ Dates of employment: December 1998-April 1999

Areas of legal practice:
- Federal and state voting issues and election law
- Federal and state civil and criminal appeals and habeas petitions
- Discovery, trial preparation, trial briefs, trial strategy
- Legislative drafting and review
- Legislative and regulatory advocacy
- Initiatives and referendums
- Administrative law
- Constitutional law
- Legal research and writing
- Election consulting for federal and state candidates
- International development projects
Special Law Clerk, Judge Jay Finch, Nineteenth Judicial Circuit West, Division 3, 203 East Central, Bentonville, AR 72712

Supervisor: Judge Jay Finch, 479.271.1020
Hours per week: varied Dates of employment: December 1998-January 1999

Job duties: research and writing, attendance at hearings, drafting of the opinion

Bar

Admissions:

Federal:
- U.S. Supreme Court
- U.S. Court of Appeals for the following circuits: First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, D.C., and Federal
- U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces
- U.S. Court of Federal Claims
- U.S. Court of International Trade

State:
- Supreme Court of Oklahoma (1991)
- Supreme Court of Nebraska (1992)
- Supreme Court of Arkansas (1994)

Legal

Associations
- Oklahoma Bar Association
- Nebraska Bar Association
- Arkansas Bar Association
- Inter-American Bar Association

Bar

Activities:

Chairman/Founder, Appellate Practice Committee, Arkansas Bar Association, Little Rock, Arkansas, 1993-1996

Member, Drafting Committee, Appeals in Arkansas, Arkansas Bar Association, Little Rock, Arkansas, 1996
Publication:

- "Arkansas Appellate Motion Practice" in Handling Appeals in Arkansas, Arkansas Bar Association, 1996

Legislative Experience:


- Advised on African political and economic affairs
- Served as a liaison for the company in a sugar development/refinery project in the Caprivi region of Namibia and interacted with the Office of the Namibian President and National Assembly
- Retained by the Namibian government and AfricaGlobal to draft a sugar act

Legislative Adviser to the Speaker of the Namibian National Assembly, the Director of the Namibian Election Commission, and the Vice Chancellor of the University of Namibia, January 2000–June 2002

- Reviewed Namibian Election Code and drafted memorandum with recommended improvements
- Drafted national legislation merging the independent agricultural college into the University of Namibia system
- Drafted national legislation guaranteeing voting rights to agricultural workers

Consultant to various members of the Arkansas General Assembly, Little Rock, Arkansas, 1994–1999

- Advised on constitutionality of proposed legislation
- Drafted legislation

Consultant to the Arkansas Court of Appeals Redistricting Commission, Little Rock, Arkansas, 1996–1998

- Drafted five redistricting bills and maps for the constitutionally required redistricting of the Court of Appeals
Member of the Committee on Department of Corrections, Murphy Commission - Restructure of Arkansas Government, Little Rock, Arkansas, 1996-1997

- Reviewed the existing structure of the state Department of Corrections
- Advised on how to streamline the department

ADMINISTRATIVE & QUASI-JUDICIAL EXPERIENCE:

Commissioner, Little Rock Historic District Commission, Little Rock, Arkansas, 2005-2008

- Enforce city regulations regarding alteration to structures in the Little Rock Historic District
- Sit as an administrative tribunal for approval of petitions under the Historic Design Guidelines

Member, Board of Directors of the Arkansas Historic Museum, Little Rock, Arkansas, 2005-2006

- Approve museum operations and budget
- Attend museum functions and fund raisers

Director of International Development, Louisiana State University, 107 Hatcher Hall, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Supervisor: Dr. Stephen Lucas, 225. 578.6801
Hours per week: 40+
Dates of employment: February 2000-August 2003

Job duties:
- Interacted with U.S. and state government agencies, NGOs, foreign governments and universities, and other LSU departments and officials
- Worked with the Louisiana congressional delegation to get a $12.5 million international project funded in fiscal years 2002 and 2003
- Drafted a proposal for the president of the Louisiana Chemical Association and U.S. Senator John Breaux on building a regional system to neutralize transuranic waste from nuclear power plants
- Developed, drafted, wrote grants for, and administered international research, training, education, and consulting projects, especially those dealing with democratization issues
- Drafted and negotiated international contractual agreements for research and faculty and student exchange with universities and research centers
• Hired and supervised staff
• Drafted office budget, project budgets, and strategic plans
• Reorganized and expanded the role of the Office of International Development
• Advised the Office of International Programs and individual units on improving public relations; consulted on PR strategies

Chairman, Committee for the Revision of the Arkansas Constitution, State Political Party of Arkansas, Little Rock, Arkansas, 1995-1996

• Headed committee comprised of state legislators, attorneys, business people, and an appellate judge to review the proposed state Constitution and make recommendations

Member, Washington County Board of Election Commissioners, Fayetteville, Arkansas

No supervisor Dates: 1990-1996

Job duties:
• Enforced election laws within the county
• Drafted administrative regulations for the commission
• Supervised the training of poll workers
• Evaluated various voting systems and purchased an optical scan system to be used countywide
• Prepared and defended annual budgets before the Washington County Quorum Court
• Sat as a member of an administrative tribunal
• Hired and supervised staff

EDUCATION:

• Graduate Certificate, Election Governance, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia (2003)
• Master of Law, University of Arkansas School of Law, 204 Waterman Hall, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701 (1993) Mini Thesis: "Water Rights in Indian Country"
• Juris Doctorate, Washburn University School of Law, 1700 College Ave., Topeka, Kansas 66621 (1984)
• Bachelor of Arts in History, Rutgers University, Administrative Services Bldg., 65 Davidson Road, Bush Campus, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854-8096 (1980)
REFERENCES:

Judge Morris Arnold
U.S. Court of Appeals
for the Eighth Circuit
P.O. Box 2060
Little Rock, AR 72203-2060
501.324.6880

Judge Lavenski Smith
U.S. Court of Appeals
for the Eighth Circuit
425 West Capitol, Ste. 3110
Little Rock, AR 72203
501.324.7310

Brenda Turner
Chief of Staff
Office of the Governor
State Capitol Building, Suite 250
Little Rock, AR 72201
501.682.3608

Judge Herb Ashby
Former judge, Second Appellate District, Division 5
2691 Baywater Place
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
805.493.8205

Judge Jay Finch
Nineteenth Judicial
Circuit West, Division 3
203 East Central
Bentonville, AR 72712
479.271.1020
Aimee-

In case you couldn't open up the document which describes Job's elections background

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

--- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 10/17/2005 04:36 PM ---

Karen:

I enjoyed the discussion too. I really think that this project will be of national importance and can positively affect elections administration while providing an answer to the handling of the vote fraud problem for the future.

On another note, why don't you leave an evening free while I am there for dinner. I am trying to bring my wife along. If you can bring your husband it could make for an interesting evening.

Regards,

Job

Summary of Election Activities of Job Serebrov

Background to Election Problems in Arkansas

Ever since Reconstruction, Arkansas has had a history of election problems. The election fraud that gave rise to the Brooks-Baxter War in Arkansas in the 1870s involved people from both sides of the aisle voting more than once, the dead rising to cast a ballot or two, destroying ballots, creating ballots and making ballot boxes disappear. A strong one-party system
perpetuated this tradition into modern times.

In 1995, I met with Arkansas Supreme Court Justice Tom Glaze to discuss voting issues and my efforts to clean up the electoral process. Although supportive, Justice Glaze encouraged me to proceed with caution. Before being elected to the Supreme Court, Justice Glaze had been employed in the 1960s by Gov. Win Rockefeller to clean up ballot fraud throughout Arkansas. He was nearly disbarred in the process by those involved in ballot fraud in a small, rural county.

Shortly after my discussion with Justice Glaze, I discovered how pervasive the election problems were in the state. For instance, ballot boxes were stuffed or disappeared into the night only to return altered. Contrary to state law, county sheriffs running in contested elections maintained custody of the ballot boxes. In one instance, 20 voted ballot boxes were found in the attic of a sheriff’s deputy after he died.


In my private practice as an attorney, I represented numerous clients in county election contests throughout Arkansas. I also represented clients in matters before the Federal Election Commission. I have never lost an election case. Finally, I was hired as a consultant to a major nonprofit legal organization to review and summarize the 2002 amendments to federal election laws and apply the new law to 10 scenarios.

Member, Washington County Board of Election Commissioners, Fayetteville, Arkansas (1990-1996)

This board consisted of three commissioners; I was the lone Republican. We were charged with supervising the training of poll workers, evaluating voting systems and then purchasing an optical scan system to be used countywide, preparing and justifying our annual budget before the Washington County Quorum Court, hiring and supervising staff and sitting as an administrative tribunal.

When I first came on the board, Washington County was primarily a one-party county and the Democrats were used to running elections according to tradition rather than the law. I had to battle with the two Democrats on the board to enforce election laws within the county. As I started to force the issue in the courts, the Republican Party gained strength. Four years later and after outlasting eight Democrat commissioners, I was able to work with new Democrat commissioners who recognized the need to enforce the law. At this point, the commission requested that I draft administrative regulations for the board. These remain in place today.
Founder, President, General Counsel; Arkansans for Fair Elections (1994-1999)

In 1994, Gov. Mike Huckabee (R), then a candidate for lieutenant governor, asked me to serve as his general counsel for ballot fraud protection. Thinking it best to act independently of any candidate, I formed Arkansans for Fair Elections. I served as the organization’s president and, later, general counsel. This group launched a statewide educational campaign to train poll watchers to recognize irregular or fraudulent electoral procedures; this included the creation of literature and a video. Our extensive public relations campaign brought media attention to the issue. We also organized a statewide team of citizen poll watchers and attorneys to ensure that the election laws were fairly enforced. We were so successful in the lieutenant governor’s race that Arkansans for Fair Elections was asked to continue the effort until 1999 when I moved to Louisiana.

General Counsel – Ballot Fraud Protection Committee, Republican Party of Arkansas (1995-1999)

In late 1995, Asa Hutchinson, chairman of the Republican Party of Arkansas, appointed me as general counsel for the newly formed Ballot Fraud Protection Committee of the state party. I retained this position until 1999. I was responsible for coordinating statewide enforcement efforts and directing a legal team to respond to problematic situations prior to and on election day.

(Through my role with Arkansans for Fair Elections and the Ballot Fraud Protection Committee, I successfully sued or negotiated a settlement in more than two-thirds of the 75 counties in Arkansas over electoral irregularities.)

Legal Consultant to Republican Members of the Arkansas General Assembly (1994-1996)

Republicans in the General Assembly requested that I review and draft suggested changes to Arkansas election law. Based on my personal experience as an election commissioner and as an election attorney, I identified a number of areas of concern and drafted new statutes modeled on the best examples that I could find from other states. My proposal was not passed by the Democrat-controlled General Assembly as a package, however, several of its components were passed into law.

Consultant to the Arkansas Court of Appeals Redistricting Commission (1996-1999)

I drafted five redistricting bills and maps for the
constitutionally required redistricting of the Arkansas Court of Appeals. These bills were based on current U.S. Supreme Court precedent regarding gerrymandering. I had to present each bill and give supporting testimony to the commission.

Director of International Development - Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana (2000-2003)

Part of my duties as director was to develop international cooperative projects. The theme of several of these proposals was democratization. In each case, I required review of the national election code of the country involved.

My activities in Namibia led to a request by the director of the Namibian Election Commission, Joram Rukambe and the Speaker of the Namibian National Assembly, Dr. Mose Tjitendero to review and suggest changes to the Namibian election code. This review took three months and resulted in proposed alterations a number of code sections. These suggestions were considered by the Namibian National Assembly and a number were incorporated into the code revisions. Additionally, I drafted legislation for the Speaker to guarantee voting rights to agricultural workers that were being denied by the owners of the farms. This legislation also was passed into law.

During this time, I was qualified as an election expert and placed on an election consultant list by the United Nations, IFES and the Electoral Institute of Southern Africa.

Related Memberships

- Republican Party of Arkansas (1990-1999)
- Benton County, Arkansas, Republican Committee (1996-1999)
- Washington County, Arkansas, Republican Committee (1990-1996)

(When we moved to Louisiana in 1999, the party was in such turmoil that it was difficult to get involved. This past year, I have been prohibited by the Hatch Act from participating in partisan politics. This prohibition ends August 19 when my judicial clerkship ends.)

Related Education

- Graduate certificate in electoral governance, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia (2003)
FYI-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 11/13/2005 05:32 PM -----

"Tom O'Neill"

To klynndyson@eac.gov

cc tokaji.1@osu.edu, foley.33@osu.edu, lauracw@columbus.rr.com, Vincelli@rutgers.edu, arapp@rci.rutgers.edu, davander@eden.rutgers.edu, dlinky@rci.rutgers.edu, ireed@rutgers.edu, joharris@eden.rutgers.edu, john.weingart@rutgers.edu, rmandel@rci.rutgers.edu, "Johanna Dobrich" <jdobrich@eden.rutgers.edu>

Subject FW: October Progress Report

Tom O'Neill

-----Original Message-----

From: Tom O'Neill [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2005 5:26 PM
To: klynndyson@eac.gov
Cc: Vincelli@rutgers.edu; arapp@rci.rutgers.edu; davander@eden.rutgers.edu; dlinky@rci.rutgers.edu; ireed@rutgers.edu; joharris@eden.rutgers.edu; john.weingart@rutgers.edu; rmandel@rci.rutgers.edu; 'Johanna Dobrich'; tokaji.1@osu.edu; foley.33@osu.edu; lauracw@columbus.rr.com

Subject: October Progress Report

Karen,
Attached is the Progress Report for October. Please note that this report includes an attachment showing how our study classifies each state on key variables, such as counting out-of-precinct ballots, requirements for ballot evaluation, and other variables. It also displays how the data we used differs for some states for the vote counts reported by the Election Day Survey. We believe that our data is more accurate and complete (see for example the data for New Mexico and Pennsylvania).

I look forward to responding to any questions or concerns you or others at the EAC may have.

Tom O'Neill
Contract to Provide Research Assistance to the EAC For the Development of Voluntary Guidance on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Procedures

MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT
October 2005

For
UNITED STATES ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100
Washington, DC 20005

November 15, 2005

Prepared by:
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557
INTRODUCTION

This report describes our progress from October 1 through October 31, 2005. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks; progress made; challenges encountered or anticipated; milestones reached; and projections for work to be completed in the coming month.

In October we focused on finalizing our Provisional Voting analysis paper, including the development of recommendations to the EAC for a draft guidance document and best practices. These policy prescriptions are based on our research and the comments of the Peer Review Group. We completed a careful review of our data to reconcile it with other sources and identify the latest, most reliable information to use in the analysis. (See the attachment to this Progress Report for the details.) The importance of this demanding effort was described in September's Progress Report.

Also in October we revised the schedule for the project in light of the additional time that has been needed for review of earlier drafts by the EAC and the late completion of the Election Day Study. We will seek a meeting with the EAC in the next several weeks to confer about the schedule to complete the project and alternative approaches that could speed the conclusion of our work.

We will submit to the EAC a final draft of our report, a preliminary guidance document, and draft best practices before Thanksgiving. We project that EAC will take 3 to 4 weeks to review and react to that final draft. And we understand that after its review, the EAC will decide if it should move towards issuing a Guidance Document or recommending best practices. If the EAC does decide to issue a Guidance Document on Provisional Voting, the time needed for a review by the advisory boards is likely to delay a public hearing until early February.
This report is divided into 3 sections: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, and Project Management. Each section references specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract. The Financial Report will be sent separately by the Rutgers Division of Grant and Contract Accounting.

Please direct questions or comments about this report to

**PROVISIONAL VOTING**

Tasks 3.4 – 3.9 in our contract relate to Provisional Voting. Work on the first of these must be complete before proceeding to later tasks. Task 3.4 was completed in August, Tasks 3.5 and 3.6 are nearing completion.

**Task 3.5: Analysis and Alternative Approaches.** Assess the potential, problems, and challenges of Provisional Voting and develop alternative means to achieve the goals of Provisional Voting.

**LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS, AND LITIGATION**

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation. This information constitutes the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task. It has provided a base of understanding for the analysis of states' actual experience with Provisional Voting in 2004, for which the Eagleton team has lead responsibility.

**Description:** The Moritz team has created a 50-state chart to summarize information on Provisional Voting, compiled statutes, case law and administrative procedures regarding Provisional Voting and has completed this research.

**Progress:** We have completed the memorandum outlining Provisional Voting legislative changes since the 2004 election and we are continuing to clarify the laws prior to these changes.

**Challenges:** The variety in the form and frequency of Provisional Voting legislation from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

**Work Plan:** The final analysis will be sent to the EAC by Thanksgiving.
PREPARATION FOR AND EXPERIENCE WITH PROVISIONAL VOTING

The Eagleton team has researched and compiled a narrative of each state’s experience with Provisional Voting in 2004. The report findings from the survey of 400 local election officials are now complete. The survey results have proven to be instrumental in shaping our understanding of actual practice in administering Provisional Voting, including the steps local officials took to prepare for the election.

PROVISIONAL VOTING NARRATIVES

Description: To construct the narratives, a researcher examined newspaper accounts, state websites, and reports from third-party organizations to gather information on the experience with Provisional Voting in the 2004 election. To organize the information derived from this examination, we created an information system that catalogues information about the states (i.e. whether a state was new to Provisional Voting, the percentage of provisional votes counted, the method of notifying voters if their vote was counted, etc.) and combined it with Moritz’s collection and analysis of statutes, regulations and litigation.

Progress: We completed a state-by-state narrative of developments in Provisional Voting and distributed it to the EAC and the PRG. This work has been helpful in understanding the context of the data collected on provisional voting from the states.

Challenges: The primary obstacle to constructing the narratives was difficulty in communicating and obtaining necessary information from various state officials. As a result, the narratives underwent several revisions to incorporate up-to-date and reliable information. Now that so many other analyses, including the Election Day Survey, have been released, we were challenged by different interpretations of the same basic facts. But the reconciliation of interpretation and data collection has been invaluable in establishing rigor in our report.

Work Plan: We completed revisions of the narratives incorporating comments from the PRG and addressing any discrepancies between our findings and other interpretations of similar information included in other studies.

PROVISIONAL VOTING STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Description: During October the Eagleton research team continued to check its statistical analysis, and worked to reconcile the classifications of this analysis (such as states counting only those provisional ballots cast within the proper precinct versus states that counted ballots cast within the proper county) with the classification made in other parts of this study or in other studies (such as the Election Day Study or Electionline reports).

Progress: The effort to double check all of the classifications used in the study is complete. The results of this effort are displayed in the attachment to this progress report, “Characteristics of the Provisional Voting Process -- Classification of the States,”
beginning on page 9. Only Delaware and Arkansas remain unclear in regard to one of the measures, and both states have been contacted to receive clarification in this area.

**Challenges:** The difficulties encountered have been a result of communication delays and time constraints. Some states have been more responsive to our inquiries about their practices than others. Overall, this is not an irresolvable problem but it does slow the process of completion down.

**Work Plan:** By early-November the final revision of the statistical analysis, which includes full reconciliation of all data within the study, will be complete. The reconciliation of data is displayed in the attachment to this progress report.

**Survey of County Election Officials**

**Description:** The Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (CPIP) conducted a national survey of county election officials to measure several aspects of Provisional Voting.

**Progress:** The analysis of the survey results and findings report is complete. As a result of the critique by the PRG, the research team is revising and clarifying the descriptions of the survey design and sample selection process to make the research methods more transparent.

**Work Plan:** We used the information from the survey in drafting the analysis and alternatives document required under Task 3.5. We will include necessary clarifications regarding survey design and sample selection in the final analysis and alternatives document.

**Task 3.6: Prepare preliminary draft guidance document.**

The report and recommendations now nearing completion constitutes the draft preliminary guidance document. Based on our conversation with the EAC, the draft gives the EAC the option of proceeding with a guidance document or issuing recommendations to the state for best practices, recommendations that would not constitute voluntary guidance. Before proceeding to Task 3.7 (revise the guidance document for publication) or 3.8 (arrange a public hearing on the draft guidance), we will await the EAC’s decision on how to proceed.
VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The contract lists 7 tasks (3.10 – 3.16) related to Voter Identification Requirements. The research on Voter ID requirements is proceeding concurrently with our work on the experience of Provisional Voting, and is becoming the principal focus of our research.

Task 3.10: Legislation, regulations, and litigation

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation with regard to Voter Identification Requirements. This collection of material is nearing completion. It will constitute the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task.

Description: The Moritz team has compiled statutes on Voter Identification, and will provide a summarized analysis of this research to the project team for review.

Progress: The 50 State (plus the District of Columbia) chart has been completed, the voter identification statutes have been collected for all states and D.C., and summaries of the existing voter identification statutes have been written for all states and D.C.

Challenges: Identifying the relevant statutes has been challenging because of the different terminology used from state to state to codify voter identification issues, and because many states have scattered election law provisions throughout their codes. This variety from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

Work Plan: Analysis of voter identification data has begun and will increasingly become the central focus of our work.

SUPPLEMENTS TO LEGAL ANALYSIS

To supplement the legal analysis, the Eagleton team is undertaking two research efforts: First, compiling information on the debate over voter ID in the states; and second, estimating the effect on turnout of different voter ID regimes. Tracking the continuing political debate over voter identification reveals that the relatively narrow HAVA requirements for voter identification have apparently sparked in many states a broader concern and a sharp political debate over rigorous identification requirements for all voters. The research follows these developments both to monitor possible secondary effects of HAVA on voter ID, and to provide a rich collection of alternative approaches for consideration.
VOTER ID AND TURNOUT ANALYSIS

The second supplemental analysis will provide objective information on a contentious feature of the debate over voter ID in the states: the effects of more rigorous voter ID regimes on voter turnout and the relationship between the voter ID regime and vote fraud. As part of this effort, Eagleton is undertaking a statistical analysis to gauge the effect of a state’s voter ID regime on turnout, especially turnout by minority and elderly voters.

Description: We have created a database and gathered statistics on the effects of state-level voter identification requirements on voter turnout at the county-level in the 2004 election.

Progress: The collection of data for the Voter ID-Turnout analysis is complete. The assembled database contains population demographic data, voter registration data and voter turnout data from all 50 states, 3113 Counties, and the District of Columbia. We have also used exit poll data collected on Election Day 2004 as a resource for understanding the demographics of voter turnout.

Challenges: The analysis of these data had been postponed until the data reconciliation of Provisional Voting is complete. As a result of the extensive revision and data reconciliation efforts aimed at the Provisional Voting section of our work VID had been temporarily placed on hold. We are now beginning data analysis on the impact of voter identification requirements on voter turnout.

Work Plan: The analysis of the impact that voter identification requirements have upon voter turnout should be completed by early December. Early January is our target to deliver the draft report and outline of alternative policies to the Peer Review Group. In mid January, the EAC would receive a draft report and recommendations that take into account the comments of the PRG.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

PEER REVIEW GROUP

Description: A feature of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group (PRG). It reviews our research and methodology and provides valuable feedback and suggestions for the direction of our work.

Progress: Eagleton has stayed in touch with members of the Peer Review Group since the September 21st conference call, and has solicited their final comments on the Provisional Voting research. During October, we telephoned two members who did not participate in the conference call to confirm their commitment to serving as members of the Peer Review Group. Profess Guy Charles affirmed his interest. Professor Pamela Karlan did not return the call. The revisions in the schedule for the project have now made it possible to begin the process of scheduling a meeting of the PRG to consider our draft report and recommendations on Voter Identification Issues. We anticipate that meeting will take place the second week of January.
Challenges: No new challenges were encountered during October.

COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Collecting and merging information and data from myriad sources is a demanding requirement of this research. We have developed two principal mechanisms to facilitate the analysis of the material collected or created in the project: an information system and an internal website for easy access to drafts and reports.

INFORMATION SYSTEM

Description: The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law is being merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which will include a compendium of case law and statutes regarding Provisional Voting and voter identification.

Progress: At this point in the research process, many documents are complete after a lengthy process of circulating drafts among team members. We have reorganized our system by separating final drafts from earlier versions of documents, discarding dated files contained in the Information System, and updating the system as a whole. Upon their completion, new documents continue to be added.

Projections: The entire project team continues to use the Information System which contains the above referenced research, in working toward the preparation for our final reports to the EAC.

INTRANET

Description: All project team members have signed on to the Intranet site, and regularly post drafts, completed materials and spreadsheets online for internal review. The Intranet facilitates the exchange of information and collaboration among project participants.

FINANCIAL REPORT

The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. Financial reporting on grant accounts is limited to actual expenses that have been incurred during the reporting period. Our contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, (732) 932-0165, EXT. 2235.

A detail of expenses incurred from project October 1- October 31, 2005, will be sent under separate cover to: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer at the EAC.
Characteristics of the Provisional Voting Process

Classification of the States

Our research on provisional voting divided the various states into several categories to allow an assessment of how different factors may have influenced the process of casting and counting provisional ballots. This analysis was conducted before the release of the Election Day Study, and the categories we used may differ in some respects from its work. The categories analyzed here are:

1. New vs. Old (states that used a provisional ballot before the 2004 election)
2. Use of a statewide database of registered voters vs. no use of a statewide database
3. Counting out-of-precinct ballots vs. not counting out-of-precinct ballots
4. Voter identification requirements
5. Method used to verify provisional ballots
6. Levels of provisional ballots cast and counted

We first assigned states within these categories based on classifications done by Electionline.org in its studies. The Electionline data was the only published information available at the time of our research. We reviewed the Electionline data carefully, and, in select cases, updated it with new, detailed information that had become available after its publication. The changes we made are explained below.

Please note that:

--Idaho, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Wisconsin and Wyoming were excluded from our analysis. They have election-day registration systems, and did not need to use HAVA-compliant provisional ballots.

--North Dakota does not register voters, so it also was excluded from HAVA requirements and did not use provisional voting.

--Mississippi has not reported its provisional voting results and could not be included in our analysis, though it was compliant in 2004.

--Pennsylvania did not report its totals for the Election Day Study, but we obtained information on Pennsylvania and did include it in our analysis.
New vs. Old States

We classified states as “new” or “old” based on the 2001 Electionline study of provisional voting\(^1\) and condensing its classifications into a single dichotomous variable, new/old with all other cases excluded. The Electionline study divided states into five categories of their use of provisional ballots in the 2000 election:

1. Use of provisional ballots (P)
2. Limited use of provisional ballots (LP)
3. Affidavit ballots (A)
4. No system in place (N)
5. Unnecessary/Not Applicable (U/NA)

We collapsed all of the states listed as using provisional ballots, limited use of provisional ballots or affidavit ballots as “old” states, because the states in all three categories would have been familiar with key aspects of provisional voting. States that had no provisional voting system in place for the 2002 election, and were HAVA compliant in 2004, were listed as “new” states, as 2004 would have been the first year in which they would be offering the option of provisional voting. States that were listed as unnecessary or not applicable were excluded from this study, as they were exempt from the HAVA regulations in 2004 because they either allowed same-day registration or did not register voters.

Rhode Island is the only state categorized as an old state by Electionline that we moved into the list of new states. Electionline’s map shows Rhode Island as a state that used provisional voting in 2000, but in the state description, it is listed as having no system in place. We learned from the Rhode Island Board of Elections that the state had previously permitted potential voters to sign an affidavit if they did not appear on a precinct’s list of registered voters, but felt they were registered to vote. Based on the signed affidavit, the election official would then contact a county official to see if the voter was on a more complete registration list. If the voter’s name was on the complete list, that voter was permitted to cast a regular ballot. As this process did not grant the voter a provisional ballot, but served as a different type of administrative failsafe, we concluded that Rhode Island’s first use of provisional voting was in 2004 and, therefore, classified the state as “new” to the system of provisional balloting.

\(^{1}\) This study can be found at: http://electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Provisional%20Voting.pdf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old States</th>
<th>New States</th>
<th>HAVA Exempt or NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|              | 26 | 18 | 7 |

Statewide List of Registered Voters

The Electionline preview of the 2004 Election\(^2\) was the starting point for compiling a list of states that had a statewide database of registered voters. That study listed 34 States that did not have their statewide database systems complete, and 16 that did, including the District of Columbia. North Dakota does not register voters, so does not need to compile such a database. Electionline’s criterion for concluding that a state had a statewide list was that the state have participation from all jurisdictions in a statewide system. We added Oklahoma to the list of states with statewide databases.

---

\(^2\) "Election Preview 2004: What’s changed, What Hasn’t and Why". This study can be found at: http://electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Election.preview.2004.report.final.update.pdf
because we found they had met the Electionline criteria by the 2004 election, albeit too late for inclusion in the Electionline survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>CATEGORIZATION OF STATES -- Statewide Registration Database</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had Database 2004</td>
<td>No Database A-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 16 | 27 | 8 |

Minnesota has a statewide database but was excluded from the analysis because it did not offer provisional ballots and was exempt from the HAVA requirements.

**Out-of-Precinct Ballots**

We based our classification of states that allow the counting of ballots cast outside the correct precinct on the data in the 2004 Electionline preview of the 2004 election. States that evaluated ballots cast in a precinct where the voter was not registered were categorized as "out-of-precinct." States that invalidated such ballots were categorized as "In-precinct only."
### Table 3
**CATEGORIZATION OF STATES — Counting Out-Of-Precinct Ballots**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out-of-Precinct</th>
<th>In-Precinct Only</th>
<th>HAVA EXEMPT OR NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvannia</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Nebrska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Voter Identification**

We relied on Electionline studies, including the Voter Identification study[^3] and the 2004 Election Preview, to classify the states on their requirements for voter identification. Each state's categorization is taken directly from the Electionline studies except Hawaii.[^4] The five different, and increasingly rigorous, categories are: Give Name (8 states), Sign Name (14 states), Match Signature (8 states), Provide ID (15 states), and Photo ID (5 states).

[^3]: This study can be found at: [http://electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Voter%20Identification.pdf](http://electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Voter%20Identification.pdf)

[^4]: In 2004, ElectionLine listed Hawaii as requiring identification. Our review of statutes revealed that Hawaii could require photo ID. Since that is the most rigorous form of identification that may be required of voters, we classified Hawaii under this category.
**Table 4**

**CATEGORIZATION OF STATES -- Forms of Identification Required**

*States in italics are exempt from HAVA or did not report Provisional Ballot data and are not included in the analysis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Give Name</th>
<th>Sign Name</th>
<th>Match Signature</th>
<th>Provide ID</th>
<th>Photo ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 14 8 15 5

South Dakota complicates the effort to assign each state to a category. It permits voters to sign an affidavit that would allow them to vote without presenting photo ID. While Hawaii did not normally require photo ID, its statutes gave challenged voters the opportunity to respond by producing a photo ID.

**Verification Method**

We identified four different ways states assessed provisional ballots to determine if they should be counted: signature match, match voter data, signed affidavits, and bringing back identification later. We gathered information about these verification techniques by checking state websites and consulting journalistic accounts. We consulted state legislation to provide further information where needed.
Table 5
CATEGORIZATION OF STATES — Ballot Evaluation Methods
States in italics are exempt from HAVA or did not report Provisional Ballot data and are not included in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature Match</th>
<th>Data Match</th>
<th>Affidavit</th>
<th>Return with ID</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>N. Dakota</td>
<td>New Mexico, Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>N. Dakota</td>
<td>New Mexico, Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Carolina</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection
To assemble our data for analysis, we began by using the data on provisional votes cast and counted reported by Electionline. To increase the accuracy of this data, we surveyed each state’s election websites for updated data, and for reported numbers on the county level. We then sent emails to 49 (we excluded Alaska, see below) states and the District of Columbia, requesting updated data on the number of provisional votes cast and counted by county. We received information from 25 states by our cut-off date of August 25, 2005.

* North Carolina lacked clear standards to evaluate provisional ballots and is excluded from this analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received Updated Data</th>
<th>Did Not Receive Updated Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Alaska&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 States 25 States

<sup>5</sup> Alaska was not contacted via email, as the state does not have voting districts comparable to counties in other states and could not be matched with comparable census data.

<sup>6</sup> Maryland reported provisional ballots that were counted per county, but not number cast.

<sup>7</sup> Nebraska reported an incomplete list of provisional ballots cast and counted by county, but designated counties by number, rather than by name.
Data Differences with Election Day Study

The data used in this study differs from the data reported in the Election Day Study for 19 states. The Election Day Study was not completed until well after our statistical analysis of provisional voting was finished, on the schedule laid out in our work plan. Where there are differences, they are typically very small, usually fewer than 100 votes either cast or counted. Of the 9 states that have differences of more than 100 votes cast or counted, 7 have reported their numbers directly to us and can be considered updated data that EDS had not obtained. For one of those states, New Mexico, EDS had incomplete data, and for another, Pennsylvania, EDS had no data at all. The data that we have collected reflects updated numbers from the states that have changed following recounts and litigation that altered how ballots were evaluated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>EDS Numbers Cast/Counted</th>
<th>Our Numbers Cast/Counted</th>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Updated Info from State?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>6,478/1,865</td>
<td>6560/1836</td>
<td>82/29</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>23,285/22,498</td>
<td>23,275/22,498</td>
<td>10/0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>51,529/39,086</td>
<td>51,477/39,163</td>
<td>52/77</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>12,893/4,489</td>
<td>12,893/3,839</td>
<td>0/650</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>346/25</td>
<td>348/25</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>15,406/8,038</td>
<td>15,454/8,048</td>
<td>48/10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>45,535/32,079</td>
<td>45,563/31,805</td>
<td>28/274</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>688/378</td>
<td>653/357</td>
<td>35/21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>17,421/13,788</td>
<td>17,003/13,298</td>
<td>418/490</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>6,153/2,446</td>
<td>6,154/2,447</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>6,410/2,914</td>
<td>15,360/8,767</td>
<td>8,950/5,853</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
<td>77,469/50,370</td>
<td>77,469/42,348</td>
<td>0/8,022</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>157,714/123,902</td>
<td>158,642/123,548</td>
<td>928/354</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>53,698/26,092</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>35,282/7,156</td>
<td>36,193/7,770</td>
<td>911/614</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>121/30</td>
<td>101/37</td>
<td>20/7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>4,608/728</td>
<td>4,609/728</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>92,402/73,806</td>
<td>86,239/69,273</td>
<td>6,163/4,533</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>374/119</td>
<td>373/120</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eagleton's latest monthly report for your Commissioner's review.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
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Subject November's Progress Report

Dear Ms. Karen Lynn-Dyson:

Attached please find the Eagleton/Moritz Progress Report for the month of November.

Please direct any questions about this report to Tom O'Neill.

Sincerely,

Johanna Dobrich

Johanna Dobrich
jdobrich@eden.rutgers.edu
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INTRODUCTION

This report describes our progress from November 1 through November 30, 2005. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks; progress made; challenges encountered or anticipated; milestones reached; and projections for work to be completed in the coming month.

In November we completed and submitted our Provisional Voting analysis paper, including recommendations to the EAC for best practices. These policy prescriptions are based on our research and the comments of the Peer Review Group on that research. We completed a careful review of our data to reconcile it with other sources and identify the latest, most reliable information to use in the analysis. The importance of this demanding effort was described in October’s Progress Report. We continue to await the EAC’s comments on that final draft.

Also in November we revised the schedule for the project in light of the additional time that has been needed for review of earlier drafts by the EAC and the late completion of the Election Day Study. We made a written request to the EAC for a no-cost extension of the contract through the end of February which we understand is likely to be approved before Christmas.

Since the submission of our Provisional Voting report to the EAC on November 28, 2005, our efforts have been entirely aimed at the completion of the voter identification research. We have been advised that EAC will take several weeks to review and react to our final draft on provisional voting. As we await a January meeting on that topic, we are moving ahead
quickly on the statistical analysis of voter identification data and summarizing the legal research that was completed earlier.

This Monthly Progress Report is divided into 3 sections: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, and Project Management. Each section references specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract. The Financial Report will be sent separately by the Rutgers Division of Grant and Contract Accounting.

Please direct questions or comments about this report to [redacted] or by telephone at [redacted].

PROVISIONAL VOTING

Tasks 3.4 – 3.9 in our contract relate to Provisional Voting. Task 3.4 was completed in August, and Tasks 3.5 and 3.6 were completed in November.

Task 3.6: Prepare preliminary draft guidance document.

The report and recommendations which were sent to the EAC on November 28, 2005 recommends against the adoption of a guidance document per se and advises that the EAC adopt its recommendations as best practices. That recommendation followed agreement by the EAC with that course of action. The submission of that report and recommendations, however, constitutes the document required under this task. Before proceeding to Task 3.7 (revise the guidance document for publication) or 3.8 (arrange a public hearing on the draft guidance), we await the EAC’s decision on how to proceed.
VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The contract lists 7 tasks (3.10 – 3.16) related to Voter Identification Requirements. The research on Voter ID requirements is proceeding concurrently with our work on the experience of Provisional Voting, and is the principal focus of our research at this time.

Task 3.10: Legislation, regulations, and litigation

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation with regard to Voter Identification Requirements. This collection of material is nearing completion. It will constitute the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task.

Description: The Moritz team has compiled statutes on Voter Identification, and will provide a summarized analysis of this research to the project team for review.

Progress: The 50 state (plus District of Columbia) chart has been completed, the voter identification statutes have been collected for all states and D.C., and summaries of the existing voter identification statutes have been written for all states and D.C. Moritz has completed its review of voter identification litigation. Moritz and Eagleton have worked together to review the research, clarify the categorization of that research on our charts, and reconcile the data developed in our two different research techniques categorizations.

Challenges: The biggest challenge facing the reconciliation process of research findings, descriptions and categorizations is that it is being done by two different teams (Moritz and Eagleton) who rely on different primary source materials. Despite the necessity this has created to reconcile conflicting data from time to time, the collaboration has also been very beneficial because it has made our research efforts more rigorous.

Work Plan: During December we will conclude our reconciliation and continue analysis of voter identification research, including an analysis of the most important issues and trends in voter identification litigation.

SUPPLEMENTS TO LEGAL ANALYSIS

To supplement the legal analysis, the Eagleton team is undertaking two research efforts: First, compiling information on the debate over voter ID in the states; and second, estimating the effect on turnout of different voter ID regimes. Tracking the continuing political debate over voter identification reveals that the relatively narrow HAVA requirements for voter identification have apparently sparked in many states a broader concern and a sharp political debate over rigorous identification requirements for all voters. The research follows these developments both to monitor possible secondary effects of HAVA on voter ID, and to provide a rich collection of alternative approaches for consideration.
During the month of November, we developed narratives to establish how laws were passed, looking at when they were proposed and when they were eventually enacted. In the upcoming month, Eagleton will examine voter registration forms across the states to see what forms of identification are requested from mail-in registrants. The difficulty will be determining the 2004 status of the states.

**VOTER ID AND TURNOUT ANALYSIS**

Now under way is a statistical analysis to gauge the effect of a state’s voter ID regime on turnout, especially turnout by minority and elderly voters.

**Description:** We have created a database and gathered statistics on the effects of state-level voter identification requirements on voter turnout at the county-level in the 2004 election. In November, we have analyzed both aggregate- and individual-level data to determine whether there is any relationship between voter turnout and the various forms of voter identification states require.

**Progress:** Analysis is under way for two data sets: County-level data that includes registration and turnout rates for 2000 and 2004, as well as Census measures and indicators of the type of voter identification requirements that were in existence at the time of the 2004 presidential election. The second data set consists of the voter supplement to the November 2004 Current Population Survey. This data set allows for testing of the same hypotheses at the individual level. Preliminary findings from the aggregate data set suggest that voter ID requirements have their greatest effect at the registration stage, as opposed to the turnout stage. This is a first cut at the data, however, and we will be adding a number of control variables to the analysis to see if the relationship holds.

**Challenges:** These analyses use hierarchical linear modeling. Because voter identification requirements vary by state, one must pay special attention to other, unseen state-level influences on the data. The models are difficult to run and interpret, so the analyses are time-consuming.

**Work Plan:** The statistical analyses will continue during the month of December, and a draft of the findings is anticipated by the end of the month.

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

**PEER REVIEW GROUP**

**Description:** A feature of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group (PRG). It reviews our research and methodology and provides valuable feedback and suggestions for the direction of our work.
Progress: During the month of November, Eagleton contacted the PRG Members on two occasions. First, all members received the final draft provisional voting report that was submitted to the EAC. Further comments are welcome but not expected from the PRG. Second, we have asked PRG members to reserve two dates in mid-January for potential conference call sessions to review the voter identification report.

Challenges: No new challenges were encountered during November.

COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Collecting and merging information and data from myriad sources is a demanding requirement of this research. We have developed two principal mechanisms to facilitate the analysis of the material collected or created in the project: an information system and an internal website for easy access to drafts and reports.

INFORMATION SYSTEM

Description: The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law is being merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which will include a compendium of case law and statutes regarding Provisional Voting and voter identification.

Progress: At this point in the research process, many documents are complete after a lengthy process of circulating drafts among team members. We have reorganized our system by separating final drafts from earlier versions of documents, discarding dated files contained in the Information System, and updating the system as a whole. Upon their completion, new documents continue to be added.

Projections: The entire project team continues to use the Information System which contains the above referenced research, in working toward the preparation for our final reports to the EAC.

INTRANET

Description: All project team members have signed on to the Intranet site, and regularly post drafts, completed materials and spreadsheets online for internal review. The Intranet facilitates the exchange of information and collaboration among project participants.

FINANCIAL REPORT

The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. Financial reporting on grant accounts is limited to actual expenses that have been incurred during the reporting period. Our contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, (732) 932-0165, EXT. 2235.
A detail of expenses incurred from project November 1- November 30, 2005, will be sent under separate cover to: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer at the EAC.
U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Status Report on the
Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Research Project

May 17, 2006
INTRODUCTION

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the tasks listed in the statute is the development of:

- nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office [section 241(b)(6)]; and

- ways of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)].

EAC's Board of Advisors recommended that the agency make research on these matters a high priority.

FOCUS OF CURRENT RESEARCH

In September 2005, the Commission hired two consultants with expertise in this subject matter, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, to:

- develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;

- perform background research (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;

- establish a project working group, in consultation with EAC, composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation;

- provide the description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation and the results of the preliminary research to the working group, and convene the working group to discuss potential avenues for future EAC research on this topic; and

- produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future research, if any;

As of the date of this report, the consultants have drafted a definition of election fraud, reviewed relevant literature and reports, interviewed persons from government and private sectors with subject matter expertise, analyzed news reports of alleged election fraud, reviewed case law, and established a project working group.
DEFINITION OF ELECTION FRAUD

The consultants drafted a definition of election fraud that includes numerous aspects of voting fraud (including voter intimidation, which is considered a subset of voting fraud) and voter registration fraud, but excludes campaign finance violations and election administration mistakes. This draft will be discussed and probably refined by the project working group, which is scheduled to convene on May 18, 2006.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The consultants found many reports and books that describe anecdotes and draw broad conclusions from a large array of incidents. They found little research that is truly systematic or scientific. The most systematic look at fraud appears to be the report written by Lori Minnite, entitled “Securing the Vote: An Analysis of Election Fraud”. The most systematic look at voter intimidation appears to be the report by Laughlin McDonald, entitled “The New Poll Tax”. The consultants found that books written about this subject all seem to have a political bias and a pre-existing agenda that makes them somewhat less valuable.

Moreover, the consultants found that reports and books make allegations but, perhaps by their nature, have little follow up. As a result, it is difficult to know when something has remained in the stage of an allegation and gone no further, or progressed to the point of being investigated or prosecuted or in any other way proven to be valid by an independent, neutral entity. This is true, for example, with respect to allegations of voter intimidation by civil rights organizations, and, with respect to fraud, John Fund’s frequently cited book, “Stealing Elections”.

Consultants found that researchers agree that measuring something like the incidence of fraud and intimidation in a scientifically legitimate way is extremely difficult from a methodological perspective and would require resources beyond the means of most social and political scientists. As a result, there is much more written on this topic by advocacy groups than social scientists.

Other items of note:

- There is as much evidence, and as much concern, about structural forms of disenfranchisement as about intentional abuse of the system. These include felon disenfranchisement, poor maintenance of databases and identification requirements.

- There is tremendous disagreement about the extent to which polling place fraud, e.g. double voting, intentional felon voting, noncitizen voting, is a serious problem. On balance, more researchers find it to be less of a problem than is commonly described in the political debate; but some reports say it is a major problem, albeit hard to identify.
• There is substantial concern across the board about absentee balloting and the opportunity it presents for fraud.

• Federal law governing election fraud and intimidation is varied and complex and yet may nonetheless be insufficient or subject to too many limitations to be as effective as it might be.

• Deceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004.

• Voter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities, although the American Center for Voting Rights uniquely alleges it is focused on Republicans.

Recommendations

The consultants recommend that subsequent EAC research include a follow up study of allegations made in reports, books and newspaper articles. They also suggest that the research should focus on filling the gap between the lack of reports based on methodical studies by social or political scientists and the numerous, but less scientific, reports published by advocacy groups.

INTERVIEWS

The consultants jointly selected experts from the public and private sector for interviews. The consultants’ analysis of their discussions with these members of the legal, election official, advocacy, and academic communities follows.

Common Themes

• There is virtually universal agreement that absentee ballot fraud is the biggest problem, with vote buying and registration fraud coming in after that. The vote buying often comes in the form of payment for absentee ballots, although not always. Some absentee ballot fraud is part of an organized effort; some is by individuals, who sometimes are not even aware that what they are doing is illegal. Voter registration fraud seems to take the form of people signing up with false names. Registration fraud seems to be most common where people doing the registration were paid by the signature.

• There is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud, or at least much less than is claimed, including voter impersonation, “dead” voters, noncitizen voting and felon voters. Those few who believe it occurs often enough to be a concern say that it is impossible to show the extent to which it happens, but do point to instances in the press of such incidents. Most people believe that false registration forms have not resulted in polling place fraud,
although it may create the perception that vote fraud is possible. Those who believe there is more polling place fraud than reported/investigated/prosecuted believe that registration fraud does lead to fraudulent votes. Jason Torchinsky from the American Center for Voting Rights is the only interviewee who believes that polling place fraud is widespread and among the most significant problems in the system.

- Abuse of challenger laws and abusive challengers seem to be the biggest intimidation/suppression concerns, and many of those interviewed assert that the new identification requirements are the modern version of voter intimidation and suppression. However there is evidence of some continued outright intimidation and suppression, especially in some Native American communities. A number of people also raise the problem of poll workers engaging in harassment of minority voters. Other activities commonly raised were the issue of polling places being moved at the last moment, unequal distribution of voting machines, videotaping of voters at the polls, and targeted misinformation campaigns.

- Several people – including representatives from the Department of Justice (DOJ) - indicate that, for various reasons, DOJ is bringing fewer voter intimidation and suppression cases now, and has increased its focus on matters such as noncitizen voting, double voting, and felon voting. While DOJ’s Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, focuses on systemic patterns of malfeasance, the Election Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, has increased prosecutions of individual instances of felon, alien, and double voting at the same time as it maintains an aggressive pursuit of systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process.

- The problem of badly kept voter registration lists, with both ineligible voters remaining on the rolls and eligible voters being taken off, remains a common concern. A few people are also troubled by voters being on registration lists in two states. They said that there was no evidence that this had led to double voting, but it opens the door to the possibility. There is great hope that full implementation of the new requirements of HAVA – done well, a major caveat – will reduce this problem dramatically.

Common Recommendations:

- Many of those interviewed recommend better poll worker training as the best way to improve the process; a few also recommended longer voting times or voting on days other than election day (such as weekends) but fewer polling places so only the best poll workers would be employed.

- Many interviewed support stronger criminal laws and increased enforcement of existing laws with respect to both fraud and intimidation. Advocates from across the spectrum expressed frustration with the failure of the Department of Justice to pursue complaints.
With respect to DOJ’s Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, John Tanner indicated that fewer cases are being brought because fewer are warranted — it has become increasingly difficult to know when allegations of intimidation and suppression are credible since it depends on one’s definition of intimidation, and because both parties are doing it. Moreover prior enforcement of the laws has now changed the entire landscape — race based problems are rare now. Although challenges based on race and unequal implementation of identification rules would be actionable, Mr. Tanner was unaware of such situations actually occurring and his office has not pursued any such cases.

Craig Donsanto of DOJ’s Election Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, says that while the number of election fraud related complaints have not gone up since 2002, nor has the proportion of legitimate to illegitimate claims of fraud, the number of cases DOJ is investigating and the number of indictments his office is pursuing are both up dramatically. Since 2002, DOJ has brought more cases against alien voters, felon voters and double voters than ever before. Mr. Donsanto would like more resources so that his agency can do more and would like to have laws that make it easier for the federal government to assume jurisdiction over voter fraud cases.

- A couple of interviewees recommend a new law that would make it easier to criminally prosecute people for intimidation even when there is not racial animus.
- Several advocate expanded monitoring of the polls, including some associated with the Department of Justice.
- Almost everyone hopes that administrators will maximize the potential of statewide voter registration databases to prevent fraud.
- Challenge laws, both with respect to pre-election day challenges and challengers at the polls, need to be revised by all states to ensure they are not used for purposes of wrongful disenfranchisement and harassment.
- Several people advocate passage of Senator Barak Obama’s “deceptive practices” bill.
- There is a split on whether it would be helpful to have nonpartisan election officials — some indicated they thought even if elections officials are elected as non partisan officials, they will carry out their duties in biased ways nonetheless. However, most agree that elections officials pursuing partisan agendas are a problem that must be addressed in some fashion. Suggestions included moving election responsibilities out of the secretary of states’ office; increasing transparency in the process; and enacting conflict of interest rules.
- A few recommend returning to allowing use of absentee ballots “for cause” only if it were politically feasible.
• A few recommend enacting a national identification card, including Pat Rogers, an attorney in New Mexico, and Jason Torchinsky from ACVR, who advocates the proposal in the Carter-Baker Commission Report.

• A couple of interviewees indicated the need for clear standards for the distribution of voting machines

NEWS ARTICLES

Consultants conducted a Nexis search of related news articles published between January 1, 2001 and January 1, 2006. A systematic, numerical analysis of the data collected during this review is currently being prepared. What follows is an overview of these articles provided by the consultants.

Absentee Ballots

According to press reports, absentee ballots are abused in a variety of ways:

• Campaign workers, candidates and others coerce the voting choices of vulnerable populations, usually elderly voters.

• Workers for groups and individuals have attempted to vote absentee in the names of the deceased.

• Workers for groups, campaign workers and individuals have attempted to forge the names of other voters on absentee ballot requests and absentee ballots and thus vote multiple times.

It is unclear how often actual convictions result from these activities (a handful of articles indicate convictions and guilty pleas), but this is an area in which there have been a substantial number of official investigations and actual charges filed, according to news reports where such information is available. A few of the allegations became part of civil court proceedings contesting the outcome of the election.

While absentee fraud allegations turn up throughout the country, a few states have had several such cases. Especially of note are Indiana, New Jersey, South Dakota, and most particularly, Texas. Interestingly, there were no articles regarding Oregon, where the entire system is vote by mail.
Voter Registration Fraud

According to press reports, the following types of allegations of voter registration fraud are most common:

- Registering in the name of dead people;
- Fake names and other information on voter registration forms;
- Illegitimate addresses used on voter registration forms;
- Voters being tricked into registering for a particular party under false pretenses; and
- Destruction of voter registration forms depending on the party the voter registered with.

There was only one self-evident instance of a noncitizen registering to vote. Many of the instances reported included official investigations and charges filed, but few actual convictions, at least from the news reporting. There have been multiple reports of registration fraud in California, Colorado, Florida, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Voter Intimidation and Suppression

This is the area which had the most articles, in part because there were so many allegations of intimidation and suppression during the 2004 election. Most of these remained allegations and no criminal investigation or prosecution ensued. Some of the cases did end up in civil litigation.

This is not to say that these alleged activities were confined to 2004—there were several allegations made during every year studied. Most notable were the high number of allegations of voter intimidation and harassment reported during the 2003 Philadelphia mayoral race.

A very high number of the articles were about the issue of challenges to voters’ registration status and challengers at the polling places. There were many allegations that planned challenge activities were targeted at minority communities. Some of the challenges were concentrated in immigrant communities.

However, the tactics alleged varied greatly. The types of activities discussed also include the following:

- Photographing or videotaping voters coming out of polling places;
- Improper demands for identification;
• Poll watchers harassing voters;

• Poll workers being hostile to or aggressively challenging voters;

• Disproportionate police presence;

• Poll watchers wearing clothes with messages that seemed intended to intimidate; and

• Insufficient voting machines and unmanageably long lines.

Although the incidents reported on occurred everywhere, not surprisingly, many came from "battleground" states. There were several such reports out of Florida, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

"Dead Voters and Multiple Voting"

There were a high number of articles about people voting in the names of the dead and voting more than once. Many of these articles were marked by allegations of big numbers of people committing these frauds, and relatively few of these allegations turning out to be accurate according to investigations by the newspapers themselves, elections officials, and criminal investigators. Often the problem turned out to be a result of administrative error, poll workers mis-marking voter lists, a flawed registration list and/or errors made in the attempt to match names of voters on the list with the names of the people who voted. In a good number of cases, there were allegations that charges of double voting by political leaders were an effort to scare people away from the voting process.

Nonetheless there were a few cases of people actually being charged and/or convicted for these kinds of activities. Most of the cases involved a person voting both by absentee ballot and in person. A few instances involved people voting both during early voting and on Election Day, which calls into question the proper marking and maintenance of the voting lists. In many instances, the person charged claimed not to have voted twice on purpose. A very small handful of cases involved a voter voting in more than one county and there was one substantiated case involving a person voting in more than one state. Other instances in which such efforts were alleged were disproved by officials.

In the case of voting in the name of a dead person, the problem lay in the voter registration list not being properly maintained, i.e. the person was still on the registration list as eligible to vote, and a person took criminal advantage of that. In total, the San Francisco Chronicle found five such cases in March 2004; the AP cited a newspaper analysis of five such persons in an Indiana primary in May 2004; and a senate committee found two people to have voted in the names of the dead in 2005.
As usual, there were a disproportionate number of such articles coming out of Florida. Notably, there were three articles out of Oregon, which has one hundred percent vote-by-mail.

**Vote Buying**

There were a surprising number of articles about vote buying cases. A few of these instances involved long-time investigations concentrated in three states (Illinois, Kentucky, and West Virginia). There were more official investigations, indictments and convictions/pleas in this area.

**Deceptive Practices**

In 2004 there were numerous reports of intentional disinformation about voting eligibility and the voting process meant to confuse voters about their rights and when and where to vote. Misinformation came in the form of flyers, phone calls, letters, and even people going door to door. Many of the efforts were reportedly targeted at minority communities. A disproportionate number of them came from key battleground states, particularly Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. From the news reports found, only one of these instances was officially investigated, the case in Oregon involving the destruction of completed voter registration applications. There were no reports of prosecutions or any other legal proceeding.

**Non-citizen Voting**

There were surprisingly few articles regarding noncitizen registration and voting – just seven all together, in seven different states across the country. They were also evenly split between allegations of noncitizens registering and noncitizens voting. In one case, charges were filed against ten individuals. In another case, a judge in a civil suit found there was illegal noncitizen voting. Three instances prompted official investigations. Two cases, from this Nexis search, remained just allegations of noncitizen voting.

**Felon Voting**

Although there were only thirteen cases of felon voting, some of them involved large numbers of voters. Most notably, of course, are the cases that came to light in the Washington gubernatorial election contest (see Washington summary) and in Wisconsin (see Wisconsin summary). In several states, the main problem was the large number of ineligible felons that remained on the voting list.

**Election Official Fraud**

In most of the cases in which fraud by elections officials is suspected or alleged, it is difficult to determine whether it is incompetence or a crime. There are several cases of ballots gone missing, ballots unaccounted for and ballots ending up in a worker’s possession. In two cases workers were said to have changed peoples’ votes. The one
instance in which widespread ballot box stuffing by elections workers was alleged was in Washington State. The judge in the civil trial of that election contest did not find that elections workers had committed fraud. Four of the cases are from Texas.

Recommendation

The consultants recommend that subsequent EAC research should include a Nexis search that specifically attempts to follow up on the cases for which no resolution is evident from this particular initial search.

CASE LAW RESEARCH

After reviewing over 40,000 cases from 2000 to the present, the majority of which came from appeals courts, the consultants found comparatively few applicable to this study. Of those that were applicable, the consultants found that no apparent thematic pattern emerges. However, it appears to them that the greatest areas of fraud and intimidation have shifted from past patterns of stealing votes to present problems with voter registration, voter identification, the proper delivery and counting of absentee and overseas ballots, provisional voting, vote buying, and challenges to felon eligibility.

Recommendation

Because so few cases provided a picture of these current problems, consultants suggest that subsequent EAC research include a review of state trial-level decisions.

PROJECT WORKING GROUP

Consultants and EAC worked together to select members for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group that included election officials and representatives of advocacy groups and the legal community who have an interest and expertise in the subject matter. (See Attachment A for a list of members.) The working group is scheduled to convene at EAC offices on May 18, 2006 to consider the results of the preliminary research and to offer ideas for future EAC activities concerning this subject.

FINAL REPORT

After convening the project working group, the consultants will draft a final report summarizing the results of their research and the working group deliberations. This report will include recommendations for future EAC research related to this subject matter. The draft report will be reviewed by EAC and, after obtaining any clarifications or corrections deemed necessary, will be made available to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors for review and comment. Following this, a final report will be prepared.
Attachment A

**Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project Working Group**

**The Honorable Todd Rokita**  
Indiana Secretary of State  
Member, EAC Standards Board and the Executive Board of the Standards Board

**Kathy Rogers**  
Georgia Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State  
Member, EAC Standards Board

**J.R. Perez**  
Guadalupe County Elections Administrator, TX

**Barbara Arnwine**  
Executive Director, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law  
Leader of Election Protection Coalition  
*(To be represented at May 18, 2006 meeting by Jon M. Greenbaum, Director of the Voting Rights Project for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law)*

**Robert Bauer**  
Chair of the Political Law Practice at the law firm of Perkins Coie, DC  
National Counsel for Voter Protection, Democratic National Committee

**Benjamin L. Ginsberg**  
Partner, Patton Boggs LLP  
Counsel to national Republican campaign committees and Republican candidates

**Mark (Thor) Hearne II**  
Partner-Member, Lathrop & Gage, St Louis, MO  
National Counsel to the American Center for Voting Rights

**Barry Weinberg**  
Former Deputy Chief and Acting Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

*EAC Invited Technical Advisor:*

**Craig Donsanto**  
Director, Election Crimes Branch, U.S. Department of Justice
Tom-

Had a very good review and discussion of the PRG at this morning's Commissioner meeting.

Also, the Commissioners have marked their calendars for a conference call with the Eagleton/Moritz team on July 12 at 9:30 AM.

Several concerns were raised about the composition of the PRG and, after some discussion, I indicated that Eagleton will provide the EAC with a revised participant list, and with a more detailed description of the PRG's mission, goals, objectives, workplan and timelines for accomplishing its work.

The Vice Chair is concerned that there is not sufficient conservative representation on the PRG. I would suggest the team do more research to identify well-recognized conservative academics to put on the Group.

Further, the Commissioners recommend a tiered process in which the PRG will prepare a "dispassionate" analysis of the issues and draw some tentative conclusions. This analysis and these conclusions will then be vetted with a defined/select group of local election officials, and then, with a defined/select group of advocacy organizations.

It was also suggested that a final round of focus group meetings be held with a cross-section of these election officials, advocates and academics for an overall interactive reaction to the analysis and recommendations.

Hope this helps clarify concerns; I look forward to sharing your revisions to the PRG with them.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Thanks, Karen.

Tom

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2005 2:24 PM
To: 
Subject: Re: Peer Review Group

Tom-

I will be back to you early next week with EAC's feedback on this.

Our initial reaction is that the group needs to include some local and/or state-level election officials, who have first-hand experience with these issues.

We will get you additional names and reactions by mid-week next week.

Thanks
K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen, 

As you probably recall, one of the features of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group to look over our findings, conclusions and draft reports before we prepare final drafts for the EAC's review. The EAC asked that before recruiting members of the PRG we submit names for EAC's review. The aim, course, is to assemble a panel that is experienced, informed, and
balanced.

Attached is a list of potential PRG members drawn from academia, the law, and non-profit organizations with interests in this area. Please look it over.

We may conclude that the PRG should also include two or three former government officials now in academia or related fields. We have a conference call with our partners at Moritz planned for tomorrow or Friday to decide a) if former officials should be included in the PRG and b) if so, who they should be. I'll keep you informed of our thinking as it develops.

Tom
Should any of you all need or want a sense of what Eagleton has done on provisional voting and voter identification in preparation for the Cal Tech meeting, attached is their June monthly report.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

--- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 07/15/2005 03:57 PM -----

"Lauren Vincelli*
<vincelli@rutgers.edu>

To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc "Tom O’neill"
  john.weingart@rutgers.edu
Subject Eagleton Institute June 2005 Progress Report

Ms. Dyson,

Attached please find the June 2005 Progress Report for the project entitled, "Contract to Provide Research Assistance to the EAC for the Development of Voluntary Guidance on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Procedures." If you have any questions regarding any part of this document please direct them to Tom O’Neill at...

The financial reporting for this project is performed by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting at Rutgers University. A copy of this report was not made available to us in an electronic format. Hard copies of the Progress Report and Financial Report have been Fedex’ed to you this afternoon and should arrive to your attention tomorrow morning. Please let me know if you do not receive this package by tomorrow afternoon.

Thank you for your time, have a great evening.

Best,
Lauren Vincelli

Lauren Vincelli
Business Assistant, Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling
Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University
Carriage House, 185 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
Phone: (732) 932-9384, ext. 237
Contract to Provide Research Assistance to The EAC
For the Development of Voluntary Guidance on
Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Procedures

MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT
JUNE 2005

For
UNITED STATES ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100
Washington, DC 20005

July 14, 2005

Prepared by:
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557
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INTRODUCTION

This report describes our progress from the start of the project on May 26 through June 30, 2005. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks; progress made; challenges encountered or anticipated; milestones reached; and projections for work to be completed in the coming month.

The objective of the contract is to assist the EAC in the collection, analysis and interpretation of information regarding HAVA provisional voting and voter identification requirements on which to base policy recommendations as guidance for the states in the conduct of the 2006 elections. The work has begun well, thanks to the clarity of the EAC’s expectations and the strong collaboration by the scholars and staff at the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, and the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University.

The document report is divided into 4 sections that cover: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, Project Management, and the Financial Report. Each section references the specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract.

Please direct any questions or comments about this report to Tom O’Neill at:
Tasks 3.4 – 3.9 in our contract relate to provisional voting. Work on the first of these must be complete before proceeding to later tasks. The work plan provides for two months to complete Task 3.4. Work on this task is on schedule.

Task 3.4: Collect and analyze state legislation, administrative procedures, and court cases. Understand the disparities and similarities of how provisional voting was implemented around the country.

LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS, AND LITIGATION

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation. When complete, this information will constitute the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task. It also will provide a base of understanding for the analysis of states’ actual experience with provisional voting in 2004, for which the Eagleton team has lead responsibility.

Description: The Moritz team includes faculty, an executive administrator, a reference librarian, and several research assistants. It began immediately to compile statutes, case law and administrative procedures regarding Provisional Voting. The team has created a 50 state chart to summarize information on provisional voting. Categories for which state statutes and administrative procedures are being reviewed include:

- When did the state create a system compliant with the HAVA provisional ballot requirements?
- Who may be eligible to cast a provisional ballot? and
- What is the process for discovering whether your provisional ballot was counted in the election?

Progress: Initial research for 27 states, including the collection of provisional voting statutes is complete. This phase of the work is on schedule for completion by August 1. By the beginning of the week of July 11, Moritz’s full time research assistant will move from voter identification research to gathering and organizing case law on provisional voting.

Challenges: Identifying the relevant statutes has been challenging; states use different terminology to codify provisional voting issues. Many states have scattered election law provisions throughout their codes. This variation from state to state makes creating a snapshot view across states a challenge. The team is meeting this challenge, and the work is on schedule.
PREPARATION FOR AND EXPERIENCE WITH PROVISIONAL VOTING

The Eagleton team is constructing a narrative description for each state of the 50 states and the District of Columbia. It is also surveying a stratified random sample of county election officials to improve its understanding of actual practice in administering provisional voting.

Description: To construct the narratives, a researcher is examining newspaper accounts, state websites, and reports from third-party organizations to determine what information is publicly available about these issues during the 2004 election. To organize the information derived from this examination, we are creating an information system that will make it possible to catalog the basic information about the states (i.e. whether a state was new to provisional voting, the percentage of provisional votes counted, the method of notifying voters if their vote was counted, etc.) and combine it with Moritz’s collection and analysis of statutes, regulations and litigation. The information system will make it possible to provide answers to such topics of particular interest listed in the contract as: How did preparation for provisional voting vary between states that had some form of provisional voting and those that did not?” and “How did litigation affect implementation?”

Progress: The researcher in this area has identified sources of information for every state and the collection process is well underway. Verified database entries for 24 states are complete, as are two state narrative summaries. This phase of the research is on schedule for completion by the end of July.

Challenges: A key challenge is determining just what states actually did in practice to verify and count provisional ballots. A second challenge has been determining the variations in policy within individual states. We are still wrestling with resolving this challenge, but the work is on schedule.

Work Plan: By the end of July, the compilation of statutes, administrative regulations, and litigation will be complete and ready to be combined with the state-by-state narrative compiled by Eagleton. That will form the basis for the analysis and recommendation of alternative approaches for provisional voting required under Task 3.5.

SURVEY OF COUNTY ELECTION OFFICIALS

This survey will help the research team understand more about such key topics of interest as:

- “How did the experience of provisional voting vary between states that previously had some form of provisional voting and those where provisional voting was new in 2004?”

- “Did state and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots?”

- “Did local officials have a clear understanding of how to implement provisional voting?”

The survey results will supplement the information on these topics from the compilation of statutes, regulations and cases and from the narrative we are constructing for each state.
**Description:** The Center for Public Interest Polling (CPIP) at Eagleton is conducting a national survey of county election officials to measure several aspects of provisional voting. The survey is designed to determine the following factors related to provisional voting at the county level:

- The content and quality of instructions provided to county officials by the states
- The steps taken by county officials to pass information on to poll workers;
- Differences in experience between states new to provisional voting and those that had some form of provisional ballot before HAVA; and
- Recommendations to improve and/or reduce the need for provisional voting

**Progress:** The survey instrument is complete. CPIP has compiled a list of election officials at the county level and at the municipal or regional level for states that do not assign the election responsibility to counties. It was forwarded to the call center, Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas Inc., (SRBI) the week of July 5, 2005. A sample will be drawn the week of July 12. Human Subjects Approval from Rutgers University was granted July 12. Pre-notification letters will be sent to election officials around July 12-13, 2005. The EAC has reviewed a draft of this letter, which we have now revised to make clear that the survey will increase our understanding of the provisional voting process, but is not being conducted on behalf of the EAC.

**Challenges:** We made special efforts to expedite Human Subject Approval to meet the schedule in the work plan. In the absence of an existing, reliable database of local election officials, we had to create one especially for this project. In order to provide a valid comparison between the states new to provisional voting with those that previously had some form of provisional ballot we doubled the sample size from 200 to 400. This increase will require an increase in the budget for the survey from $15,000 to about $24,000. We intend to reallocate costs within the existing budget to make this improvement possible, and will submit a letter describing the reallocation to the EAC in mid-July.

The sample has been, and will continue to represent the biggest challenge in this survey. Compiling the sample required substantial coordination and research to determine the accuracy of the identity and contact information for potential respondents. The difficulty in determining the appropriate contact is attributed to variation in county election officials’ titles, jurisdiction types, and state and county election structures across the country. In addition to the potential pitfalls of reaching the appropriate county official, another factor in actually making contact with this special population will be dependent upon the hours that they keep, and may be hindered by the summer season.

**Work Plan:** This questionnaire will be pre-tested by July 15, and will field July 18 through August 5, 2005. This is somewhat later than projected in the revised work plan, but the information will arrive in time to be considered in drafting the analysis and alternatives document required under Task 3.5.
The contract lists 7 tasks (3.10 – 3.16) related to Voter Identification Requirements. During the reporting period, we have made substantial progress in the first two tasks, which constitute the information-gathering phase of the work on Voter ID. The research of Voter ID requirements is proceeding concurrently with our work on the experience of provisional voting.

**Task 3.10: Legislation, regulations, and litigation**

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation. When complete, this information will constitute the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task.

**Description:** A team of Election Law@Moritz faculty, executive administrator, a reference librarian, and several research assistants is compiling statutes on Voter Identification, and providing a summarized analysis of this research.

**Progress:** The Moritz team has created a 50-state chart to record data on voter identification. Categories for which state statutes and administrative regulations are being reviewed include: “Who is required to present ID”, “Types of ID required”, and “Consequences of having no ID”. We have completed the initial research for 45 states and have collected the voter identification statutes for those states. An Election Law@Moritz Fellow is conducting an academic literature review on voter identification. This literature review will help shape the analytical framework that will guide us when the compendium of statutes and administrative regulations is complete.

**Challenges:** Identifying the relevant statutes has been challenging because of the different terminology used from state to state to codify voter identification issues, and because many states have scattered election law provisions throughout their codes. This variety from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

**Projections:** At the current rate, a draft of the voter identification chart should be complete on schedule, by the end of July. Work on the literature review will continue into August, but will be available to inform the analysis of alternative approaches for voter identification called for by Task 3.12 of the contract.

**Supplements to Legal Analysis**

To supplement the legal analysis, the Eagleton team is undertaking two research efforts: First, compiling information on the debate over voter in the states; and second, estimating the effect on turnout of voter id requirements. Tracking the continuing political debate over voter identification reveals that the relatively narrow HAVA requirements for voter identification have apparently sparked in many states a broader concern with more rigorous identification requirements for all voters. We are following these developments both to
monitor possible secondary effects of HAVA on voter ID, and to provide a rich collection of alternative approaches for consideration.

Individual narratives for the states with significant activity in voter ID will provide a resource for understanding the wide range of experience in the 2004 election. The narratives will include an appraisal of the prevalence and nature of vote fraud, a focus of the concern with increasing the rigor of voter ID requirements. This work is on schedule to be completed by the end of July. The next key milestones will be the completion of the state database and drafting the first narratives.

**Voter ID and Turnout Analysis**

The second supplemental analysis will provide objective information on a contentious feature of the debate over voter ID in the states: the effects of more rigorous voter ID regimes on voter turnout and the relationship between the voter ID regime and vote fraud. As part of this effort, Eagleton is undertaking a statistical analysis to gauge the effect of a state’s voter ID regime on turnout, especially turnout by minority and elderly voters.

**Description:** We are creating a database and gathering statistics on the effects of state-level voter identification requirements on voter turnout at the county-level in the 2004 election. Analysis on the county-level will enable us to estimate the influence of ID requirements on various age groups, races, ethnicities and gender groups. We are compiling data from both the 2000 and 2004 Presidential elections to measure the effect that changes in ID requirements may have had on voter turnout through two national election cycles.

**Progress:** The structure of the database is complete. It contains demographic information from the Census, and turnout data from various sources. The researcher assigned to this task is devising the syntax that will be required to run the statistics when the dataset is complete. The methodology for this part of the study is complete, and the actual data collection will soon be finished.

**Projection:** We are waiting for the Census Bureau to release the 2004 County Demographic Estimates. We have ordered and await the arrival of 2 datasets that contain voter turnout and voter registration numbers on the county-level for both the 2000 and 2004 elections. Once these two sources of information are received, the researcher will insert this information into the existing database, clean up the dataset, and begin to run the statistics. By that point, the researcher will have separated the states into various ID-requirement groupings that have been determined by the team, which will require coordination with several other parts of the study. This work is on schedule. By the end of July, the researcher should have county-level and state-level statistics on the impact of each ID system upon turnout, analyzed through various demographic features on the county-level.
Task 3.11 Public meeting on Voter Identification Requirements

**Description:** We are working closely with EAC staff, particularly the General Counsel, to plan a half day public meeting on Voter ID requirements. Presentations at the meeting will form an important part of the information we are compiling about Voter ID requirements and the strengths and shortcomings of a range of alternative approaches.

**Progress:** We have recommended a focus on the debate over Voter ID now underway in the states. To provide a vivid picture of the debate, we have recommended that one panel include legislators on opposite sides of the issue from two different states. Our research identified Mississippi and Wisconsin as two states to focus on, and we have recommended specific legislators from each. We have discussed with staff adding a researcher to the panel to put the debate in Wisconsin and Mississippi in either a national or historic context. We also recommended two researchers from contrasting points of view, to address the effects of Voter ID provisions under HAVA and broader provisions that are now the subject of national debate. EAC staff recommended a panel of two state election directors to address the interaction of Voter ID with HAVA. We are awaiting a decision on our recommendations from EAC staff. We have no reason not to believe that the work is on schedule to be completed in time to organize a productive meeting on July 28.

**Challenges:** The date and location of this hearing has been changed twice since the beginning of the project. It was originally scheduled to take place in late June, but was rescheduled for July to allow the June hearing to focus on voting machine technology. The regular meeting was rescheduled for July 26 in Minneapolis, and was recently changed to July 28 in Pasadena. The changes in the scheduling of the July meeting have complicated our choice of panelists. More seriously, the changes mean that information from the hearing will not be available as early in the research process as contemplated in the contract. This timeframe will now require the team to summarize the hearing events at the same time that we are drafting the analysis and alternatives paper in early August.

Additionally, while our contract states that the “Contractor shall be responsible for all aspects of planning and conducting this hearing in consultation with the EAC,” we have been asked only to make recommendations of topics and panelists, and the arrangements for the organization of the hearing are in other hands. This lack of clarity has caused some confusion and has delayed invitations to panelists. Thanks to frequent communication with members of the EAC, the process now seems to be working smoothly.

**Projection:** We believe the work is on schedule for completion in time to recruit the panelists for the July 28 hearing. Preparation of the hearing summary will likely be delayed because of the need to complete the analysis and alternatives paper.
Immediately after announcement of the award of the contract, Eagleton and Moritz began supplementing the core group that had prepared to proposal to building a highly qualified team to undertake the work. That team was in place by mid June, just a few weeks after the contract award.

As described in the proposal, the direction of the project is the responsibility of a five-person committee of faculty and staff from Eagleton and Moritz, chaired by Dr. Ruth Mandel, Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics. Project Director Thomas O’Neill, a consultant to Eagleton, reports to this team and provides day-to-day guidance and coordination for the research. A weekly meeting of all the researchers engaged in the project if the primary means of coordinating the work. We have recently added an internal website to facilitate the review and revision of written materials.

**Task 3.1 Update the Work Plan**

The first task was completed on time with the submission of a detailed work plan and timeline. EAC staff requested that the work plan be supplemented with a Gantt chart created on MS Project, and we submitted that a few days later.

**Peer Review Group**

Description: A feature of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group (PRG). The EAC indicated at our first meeting in May that it would review our recommendations for members of the PRG. Our initial vision of the PRG was a small group of scholars and representatives of advocacy organizations that would comment on the research design, review drafts of our analyses and reports, and, in general, identify areas of the research that should be strengthened and help us improve the breadth, depth and clarity of reports based on that research.

Progress: Upon reflection, the project team agreed that the PRG should not include representatives of advocacy groups. We concluded, as representatives they would feel obligated to act as advocates for positions already taken by their groups. While advocacy organizations should be consulted as stakeholders during the course of our work, they were unlikely to achieve the goals we had in mind for the PRG as a source of advice on research design, methodology, and analysis. We submitted a revised list of potential members, substantially comprised of academics, to EAC for review.

The EAC responded with suggestions concerning both the balance of the PRG’s membership and the creation of additional committees to review our work. We answered with an analysis of the cost and time involved adopting the EAC’s suggestions as well as with suggestions for a balanced selection of academics for the Peer Review Group. We have not received response on this correspondence from the EAC, and the recruitment of the group is on hold.
Challenges: Communications on this issue with the EAC have not been clear or timely. The PRG should be in place now to comment on our research design while there is still time to refine it. While we are confident in the quality of our work, the wisdom and perspective of the outstanding candidates we have proposed for membership would strengthen the analysis and reports of our work.

Projections: We have effectively brought these challenges to the attention of EAC staff and look forward to a resolution speedy enough to allow recruitment of the PRG’s members before the end of the month. If we meet that goal, the work of the PRG will be about 2 weeks behind the milestones indicated in the work plan.

COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Collecting and merging information and data from myriad sources is a demanding requirement of this research. We have developed two principal mechanisms to facilitate the analysis of the material collected or created in the project: an information system and a website for easy access to drafts and reports.

INFORMATION SYSTEM

Description: The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law will be merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which will include a compendium of case law and statutes regarding provisional voting and voter identification.

Progress: The Moritz team has provided Eagleton staff with samples of the work that they are performing. An Eagleton staff member will be reviewing the content and formats of data from all supporting research and (re-)formatting once the work has been completed. The researchers and staff at Eagleton have created a shared folder on the Institute’s server for the safe storage of work and access for those staff members. All of this work is being reviewed by the project team to ensure that a broad survey is being performed.

Challenges: There are no evident challenges to this task at this time.

Projections: By the end of July 2005, much of the above referenced research will have been completed with respective materials and charts near completion. At that time, staff at Eagleton will review, combine and format all documents and materials in preparation for our final reporting to the EAC.

INTRANET

Description: A trial Intranet for the project became available during the week of June 26. The Intranet will facilitate the exchange of information and collaboration among project participants.

Progress: After meetings with staff members of Rutgers University Computer Services (RUCS) and subsequent submission of a proposal by RUCS for technical support and hosting of the Intranet and the evaluation of alternative commercial services, the project team decided at its June 26th meeting to publish the Intranet through www.intranets.com.
one of the leading commercial services. This decision was based on lower costs and earlier
publication schedules than offered under the RUCS proposal. The Intranet services were
evaluated during a free trial period, which demonstrated the ease of design and navigation of
the proposed service.

**Challenges:** There are no immediate challenges to completion of this task by the
timeframe specified below.

**Projections:** Design, testing and publication of initial content of the Intranet service
is continuing, with all participants expected to be provided access by July 8, 2005.

---

**FINANCIAL REPORT**

The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant
and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. Financial reporting on grant accounts is
limited to *actual expenses* that have been incurred during the reporting period. Given that
the report reflects the first month of the project, several procedures for payment of
subcontractors on the project were initiated. Expenses related to those members of the team
are not reflected in this report because they have not yet been incurred.

Our contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, (732) 932-0165, EXT. 2235.

A detail of expenses incurred from project inception through June 30, 2005, is attached.
Ms. Dyson,

Attached please find the July 2005 Progress Report for the project entitled, “Contract to Provide Research Assistance to the EAC for the Development of Voluntary Guidance on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Procedures.” If you have any questions regarding any part of this document please contact Tom O’Neill at:

The financial reporting for this project is performed by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting at Rutgers University. A copy of this report was not made available to us in an electronic format. Hard copies of the Progress Report and Financial Report have been Fedex’ed to you this afternoon and should arrive to your attention tomorrow morning. Please let me know if you do not receive this package by tomorrow afternoon.

Thank you for your time, have a great evening.

Best,
Lauren Vincelli
Contract to Provide Research Assistance to The EAC
For the Development of Voluntary Guidance on
Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Procedures

MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT
JULY 2005

For
UNITED STATES ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100
Washington, DC 20005

August 15, 2005

Prepared by:
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557
This report describes our progress from July 1 through July 31, 2005. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks; progress made; challenges encountered or anticipated; milestones reached; and projections for work to be completed in the coming month.

The effort this month continued to focus on research for the analysis and alternatives paper, including the compilation of Provisional Voting statutes, regulations, and litigation from the 50 states. We also prepared and delivered testimony at the EAC's regular monthly meeting in Pasadena on July 28.

The data collection, analysis, and compilation are all on schedule. Because of delays in agreeing on the composition of the Peer Review Group with EAC, however, the actual completion and submission of the analysis and alternatives paper to the EAC will most likely be delayed about a week beyond the target date in the work plan. We are scheduled to discuss the draft paper and guidance document prior to submission, with the EAC on September 6, and the final draft cannot be completed until several days after that date.

The document report is divided into 4 sections that cover: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, Project Management, and the Financial Report. Each section references the specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract.

Please direct any questions or comments about this report to Tom O'Neill at:
Tasks 3.4 – 3.9 in our contract relate to provisional voting. Work on the first of these must be complete before proceeding to later tasks. Task 3.4 was completed this month.

**Task 3.4: Collect and analyze state legislation, administrative procedures, and court cases. Understand the disparities and similarities of how provisional voting was implemented around the country.**

**LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS, AND LITIGATION**

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation. This information constitutes the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task. It also will provide a base of understanding for the analysis of states' actual experience with provisional voting in 2004, for which the Eagleton team has lead responsibility.

**Description:** The Moritz team has created a 50-state chart to summarize information on provisional voting, compiled statutes, case law and administrative procedures regarding Provisional Voting.

**Progress:** The 50-state (plus District of Columbia) chart created to collect data on provisional voting is complete. We have collected the statutes for all states. State by state summaries of provisional voting have been written for 47 states and D.C. A memorandum summarizing provisional voting litigation is complete. The collection of the documents associated with the litigation is nearing completion.

**Challenges:** The variety in the form of provisional voting legislation from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

**Work Plan:** The remaining 3 state summaries of provisional voting will be completed by August 8. Analysis of all the information, data, and survey results concerning provisional voting data will be performed in August.

**PREPARATION FOR AND EXPERIENCE WITH PROVISIONAL VOTING**

The Eagleton team has researched and compiled a narrative of each state’s experience with provisional voting in 2004. At the end of July the survey of 400 local election officials was nearing its end, and – as of this writing – is now complete with an analysis and report in draft form. We will rely on the survey results to improve our understanding of actual practice in administering provisional voting, including the steps local officials took to prepare for the election.
PROVISIONAL VOTING NARRATIVES

Description: To construct the narratives, a researcher examined newspaper accounts, state websites, and reports from third-party organizations to gather information on the experience with provisional voting in the 2004 election. To organize the information derived from this examination, we created an information system that catalogues information about the states (i.e. whether a state was new to provisional voting, the percentage of provisional votes counted, the method of notifying voters if their vote was counted, etc.) and combined it with Moritz’s collection and analysis of statutes, regulations and litigation.

Progress: The state-by-state database is complete, as is a first draft of all state narratives. This work has been shared with the larger team and is being reviewed currently in preparation for constructing analysis and recommendation of alternative approaches for provisional voting required under Task 3.5.

Work Plan: In the next month, revisions of the narratives will be complete. In addition to this research, we will expand upon vote fraud research and examine further the relationship between instances of vote fraud and ensuing election reforms.

SURVEY OF COUNTY ELECTION OFFICIALS

Description: The Center for Public Interest Polling (CPIP) at Eagleton conducted a national survey of county election officials to measure several aspects of provisional voting. The survey was designed to determine the following factors related to provisional voting at the county (or equivalent election jurisdiction) level:

- The content and quality of instructions provided to county officials by the states;
- The steps taken by county officials to pass information on to poll workers;
- Differences in experience between states new to provisional voting and those that had some form of provisional ballot before HAVA; and
- Recommendations to improve and/or reduce the need for provisional voting.

Progress: The fielding and initial analysis of the survey results are complete.

Work Plan: The information derived from the survey will be considered in drafting the analysis and alternatives document required under Task 3.5.
The contract lists 7 tasks (3.10 – 3.16) related to Voter Identification Requirements. During the reporting period, we have completed tasks 3.10 and 3.11. The research on Voter ID requirements is proceeding concurrently with our work on the experience of provisional voting.

**Task 3.10: Legislation, regulations, and litigation**

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation with regard to Voter Identification Requirements. When complete, this information will constitute the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task.

**Description:** The Moritz team has compiled statutes on Voter Identification, and will provide a summarized analysis of this research to the project team for review.

**Progress:** The chart created to collect data on voter identification is complete and is now being reviewed. Voter identification statutes are being collected.

**Challenges:** Identifying the relevant statutes has been challenging because of the different terminology used from state to state to codify voter identification issues, and because many states have scattered election law provisions throughout their codes. This variety from state to state makes creating a snapshot view across states a challenge.

**Work Plan:** Review of the voter identification chart, the collection of the voter identification statutes, and the writing of the state by state summaries will be completed by the end of August.

**SUPPLEMENTS TO LEGAL ANALYSIS**

To supplement the legal analysis, the Eagleton team is undertaking two research efforts: First, compiling information on the debate over voter ID in the states; and second, estimating the effect on turnout of voter ID requirements. Tracking the continuing political debate over voter identification reveals that the relatively narrow HAVA requirements for voter identification have apparently sparked in many states a broader concern with more rigorous identification requirements for all voters. We are following these developments both to monitor possible secondary effects of HAVA on voter ID, and to provide a rich collection of alternative approaches for consideration.

Individual narratives for the states with significant activity in voter ID will provide a resource for understanding the wide range of experience in the 2004 election. The narratives will include an appraisal of the prevalence and nature of vote fraud, a focus of the concern
with increasing the rigor of voter ID requirements. The next key milestones will be the completion of the state database and drafting the first narratives.

VOTER ID AND TURNOUT ANALYSIS

The second supplemental analysis will provide objective information on a contentious feature of the debate over voter ID in the states: the effects of more rigorous voter ID regimes on voter turnout and the relationship between the voter ID regime and vote fraud. As part of this effort, Eagleton is undertaking a statistical analysis to gauge the effect of a state’s voter ID regime on turnout, especially turnout by minority and elderly voters.

**Description:** We are creating a database and gathering statistics on the effects of state-level voter identification requirements on voter turnout at the county-level in the 2004 election.

**Progress:** The collection of data for the Voter ID-Turnout analysis is complete. The assembled database contains population demographic data, voter registration data and voter turnout data from all 50 states, 3113 Counties, and the District of Columbia. It also contains exit poll data from the 50 states, providing demographic data of voter turnout. The analysis of that data is well underway.

**Challenges:** The initial methodology that was devised to investigate the questions involved in this part of the study proved insufficient, as the necessary data was unobtainable (the Census Bureau has not yet released their 2004 data). After re-developing an appropriate methodology, the necessary data has been assembled, we have resumed the analysis of this data.

**Projection:** The analysis of the impact that voter identification requirements have upon voter turnout should be completed around mid-August.

---

**Task 3.11 Public meeting on Voter Identification Requirements**

**Description:** In early July, we continued our efforts to identify specific Voter ID topics or issues and panelists who could shed light on them. We recommended a focus on the debate over Voter ID now underway in the states. To provide a vivid picture of the debate, we recommended that one panel include specific legislators on opposite sides of the issue from two different states, Mississippi and Wisconsin. We also discussed adding a researcher to the panel in order to place the debate in a national or historical context. We also recommended a panel of two academic researchers with contrasting points of view, to address the effects of Voter ID provisions under HAVA. In response to our suggestions, EAC staff recommended a panel of two state election directors to address the interaction of Voter ID with HAVA.

By mid-July, the EAC had decided which topics and speakers should be invited, however most of those speakers proved unable to attend.
**Progress:** Tom O’Neill and Dan Tokaji attended the EAC Public Meeting held in Pasadena on July 28. Their presentations at the meeting described the progress of the research and our developing perspective on how to assess the quality of the provisional voting process in the states and identify possible steps for improvement.

**Challenges:** The changes in the scheduling of the July meeting delayed and ultimately made it impossible to assemble a panel, from which we could derive substantive insight into voter identification issues as they are playing out in the states. Additionally, due to the date of the hearing, the information from the hearing was not available as early in the research process as contemplated in the contract.

**Projection:** Preparation of the hearing summary will likely be delayed, due to the team’s focus on preparation of the analysis and alternatives paper.

---

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT

PEER REVIEW GROUP**

**Description:** A feature of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group (PRG). The EAC indicated at our first meeting in May that it would review our recommendations for members of the PRG. Our initial vision of the PRG was a small group of scholars and representatives of advocacy organizations that would comment on the research design, review drafts of our analyses and reports, and, in general, identify areas of the research that should be strengthened and help us improve the breadth, depth and clarity of reports based on that research.

**Progress:** Upon reflection, the project team agreed that the PRG should not include representatives of advocacy groups. We concluded that as representatives they would feel obligated to act as advocates for positions already taken by their groups. While advocacy organizations might be consulted as stakeholders during the course of our work, they were unlikely to achieve the goals we had in mind for the PRG as a source of advice on research design, methodology, and analysis. We submitted a revised list of potential members, substantially comprised of academics, to the EAC for review.

The EAC responded with suggestions concerning both the balance of the PRG’s membership and the creation of additional committees to review our work. We provided an analysis of the cost and time involved in adopting the EAC’s suggestions as well as with suggestions for a balanced selection of academics for the Peer Review Group. In the end, the EAC determined that Eagleton should appoint a balanced Peer Review Group of its own choosing. Initial phone calls were made to all members of that group by the end of July, and written invitations and descriptions of the process have gone to all possible members who had indicated their interest in serving.

**Challenges:** Communications on this issue with the EAC were not clear or timely. The purpose of the PRG is to review our work, and to comment on our research design, which is well underway. We had planned to have the PRG in place early enough in the project to enable them to provide feedback, including the research design. While we are...
confident in the quality of our work, the experience and perspective of the Peer Review Group will strengthen our analysis and recommendations as we find a way to receive its critique in the more limited time now available. The delay in creating the Peer Review Group will result in a delay in the completion of the final draft of the analysis and alternatives paper and in the preliminary guidance document.

**Projections:** The work of the PRG will be about 2 weeks behind the milestones indicated in the work plan.

**COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT**

Collecting and merging information and data from myriad sources is a demanding requirement of this research. We have developed two principal mechanisms to facilitate the analysis of the material collected or created in the project: an information system and an internal website for easy access to drafts and reports.

**INFORMATION SYSTEM**

**Description:** The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law will be merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which will include a compendium of case law and statutes regarding provisional voting and voter identification.

**Progress:** The Moritz team has provided Eagleton staff with all completed work. An Eagleton staff member reviews the content and formats of data from all supporting research and will (re-)format once the work has been completed for the compendium and reports submitted to the EAC. The researchers and staff at Eagleton have created a shared folder on the Institute’s server for the safe storage of work and access for those staff members. All of this work is being reviewed by the project team to ensure that a broad survey is being performed.

**Projections:** By the end of July 2005, much of the above referenced research has been completed. The entire project team has begun the process of reviewing all work, and will combine and format all documents and materials in preparation for our final reporting to the EAC.

**INTRANET**

**Description:** All project team members have signed on to the Intranet site. The Intranet facilitates the exchange of information and collaboration among project participants.

**Progress:** Project team members regularly post drafts, completed materials and spreadsheets online for internal review. The intranet has been extremely helpful to team members and serves as an internal website with announcements and important documents readily available to all team members.
FINANCIAL REPORT

The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. Financial reporting on grant accounts is limited to actual expenses that have been incurred during the reporting period. Our contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, (732) 932-0165, EXT. 2235.

A detail of expenses incurred from project inception through June 30, 2005, is attached.
Tom -

Thank you for sharing this list of your Peer Review Group members, to-date. I will share this list with the Commissioners and will be certain to let your know of their feedback, if any.

I will also be back in touch regarding Eagleton's research around voter fraud and the research project EAC will be undertaking this fall, around voting fraud and voter intimidation. The EAC is presently in the process of finalizing a work and staff plan for this project and once it is completed, I will be certain to brief you on it.

In the meantime, EAC staff and several of the Commissioners looks forward to meeting with the Eagleton/Moritz team on September 6 at 1:30 PM.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen,

Attached is a report on the status of recruitment of members of the Peer Review Group. We extended 9 invitations. We have four confirmed members, one reluctant turn-down, one who has yet to respond to an initial inquiry, and are awaiting confirmation from 3 others who initially agreed. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Tom O'Neill

RecruitmentStatus.doc
STATUS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP RECRUITMENT
(As of August 17, 2005)

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D. YES/CONFIRMED
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology

Guy-Uriel Charles YES
Associate Professor, School of Law
University of Minnesota
612-626-9154

Brad Clark NO
Professor of Law
George Washington University School of Law

Pamela Susan Karlan YES
Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law
Stanford Law School
650-725-4851

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D. YES/CONFIRMED
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu

Daniel H. Lowenstein YES
Professor of Law
UCLA
310-825-4841

John F. Manning NO RESPONSE
Professor
Harvard Law School

Tim Storey YES/CONFIRMED
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures

Peter G. Verniero, Esq. YES/CONFIRMED
Counsel
Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
(Former NJ Attorney General and Supreme Court Justice)
Karen Lynn-Dyson / EAC / GOV

09/19/2005 01:05 PM


cc  Sheila A. Banks / EAC / GOV, Arnie J. Martinez / EAC / GOV

bcc

Subject  Fw: August Progress Report - Eagleton Institute of Politics

Commissioners-

FYI-

Eagleton’s August progress report.

Karen Lynn-Dyson

Research Manager

U.S. Election Assistance Commission

1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20005

tel: 202-566-3123

--- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson / EAC / GOV on 09/18/2005 01:02 PM ---

Lauren Vincelli

Business Assistant, Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling

Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University

Carriage House, 185 Ryders Lane

New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Phone: (732) 932-9384, ext. 237

Fax: (732) 932-1551

Hi Karen,

Attached is the August progress report in fulfillment of our Contract to Provide Research Assistance to the EAC for the Development of Voluntary Guidance on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Procedures. Please note, as per your instructions earlier this month, that the financial report will be sent via Fedex under separate cover to: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer, EAC. Also attached to the progress report is a finalized list of our Peer Review Group members. If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Tom O’Neill.

Have a great day,

Lauren Vincelli
Contract to Provide Research Assistance to The EAC
For the Development of Voluntary Guidance on
Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Procedures

MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT
AUGUST 2005

For
UNITED STATES ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100
Washington, DC 20005

September 15, 2005

Prepared by:
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557
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INTRODUCTION

This report describes our progress from August 1 through August 31, 2005. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks; progress made; challenges encountered or anticipated; milestones reached; and projections for work to be completed in the coming month.

Research on Provisional Voting and a draft of reports on the analysis and alternatives were substantially completed in preparation for the September 6 briefing for the EAC. Important reports such as the National Survey of Local Election Officials’ Experience with Provisional Voting; Statistical Review Provisional Voting in the 2004 Election; State-by-state Narrative of Developments in Provisional Voting; and the compilation of Provisional Voting statutes, regulations, and litigation from the 50 states, were all completed in August.

We made further progress on recruiting a balanced and authoritative Peer Review Group (which, as this report is written, is receiving all the documents listed above for review). Ingrid Reed of Eagleton will coordinate the work of the Peer Review Group. A list of the members of the Peer Review Group is attached.

This report is divided into 3 sections: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, and Project Management. Each section references specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract. The Financial Report will be sent separately by the Rutgers Division of Grant and Contract Accounting.

Please direct questions or comments about this report to Tom O'Neill at:
PROVISIONAL VOTING

Tasks 3.4 – 3.9 in our contract relate to provisional voting. Work on the first of these must be complete before proceeding to later tasks. Task 3.4 was completed in August, and Task 3.5 is well underway.

Task 3.5: Analysis and Alternative Approaches. Assess the potential, problems, and challenges of provisional voting and develop alternative means to achieve the goals of provisional voting.

LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS, AND LITIGATION

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation. This information constitutes the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task. It has provided a base of understanding for the analysis of states' actual experience with provisional voting in 2004, for which the Eagleton team has lead responsibility.

Description: The Moritz team has created a 50-state chart to summarize information on provisional voting, compiled statutes, case law and administrative procedures regarding Provisional Voting and is near completion with this research.

Progress: We completed the state by state summaries of provisional voting in August. Also complete is a memorandum outlining provisional voting legislative changes since the 2004 election. This material was sent to the EAC as part of the package for briefing on September 6.

Challenges: The variety in the form and frequency of provisional voting legislation from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

Work Plan: The analysis of all the information, data, and survey results concerning provisional voting data will be completed in September, on schedule. The alternatives document should also be complete in September, pending response from the EAC on which direction those alternatives should follow.

PREPARATION FOR AND EXPERIENCE WITH PROVISIONAL VOTING

The Eagleton team has researched and compiled a narrative of each state's experience with provisional voting in 2004. The report findings from the survey of 400 local election officials is now complete. The survey results improve our understanding of actual practice in administering provisional voting, including the steps local officials took to prepare for the election.
**PROVISIONAL VOTING NARRATIVES**

**Description:** To construct the narratives, a researcher examined newspaper accounts, state websites, and reports from third-party organizations to gather information on the experience with provisional voting in the 2004 election. To organize the information derived from this examination, we created an information system that catalogues information about the states (i.e. whether a state was new to provisional voting, the percentage of provisional votes counted, the method of notifying voters if their vote was counted, etc.) and combined it with Moritz's collection and analysis of statutes, regulations and litigation.

**Progress:** A state-by-state narrative of developments in Provisional Voting is complete and has been distributed to the EAC and the Peer Review Group. This work has been crucial to the process of constructing our draft analysis and recommendation of alternative approaches for provisional voting required under Task 3.5.

**Challenges:** The primary obstacle to constructing the narratives was difficulty in communicating and obtaining necessary information from various state officials. As a result, the narratives underwent multiple revisions in order to incorporate the most up-to-date material available. Had the Election Day Study been available, this task would probably have been simplified considerably.

**Work Plan:** We completed revisions of the narratives.

**SURVEY OF COUNTY ELECTION OFFICIALS**

**Description:** The Center for Public Interest Polling (CPIP) at Eagleton conducted a national survey of county election officials to measure several aspects of provisional voting.

**Progress:** The analysis of the survey results and findings report are complete.

**Work Plan:** We used the information from the survey in drafting the analysis and alternatives document required under Task 3.5.
The contract lists 7 tasks (3.10 – 3.16) related to Voter Identification Requirements. The research on Voter ID requirements is proceeding concurrently with our work on the experience of provisional voting, and is becoming the principal focus of our research.

**Task 3.10: Legislation, regulations, and litigation**

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation with regard to Voter Identification Requirements. This collection of material is nearing completion. It will constitute the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task.

**Description:** The Moritz team has compiled statutes on Voter Identification, and will provide a summarized analysis of this research to the project team for review.

**Progress:** We are refining the 50 state (plus District of Columbia) chart of data on voter identification. So far collected are voter identification statutes for 35 states. Summaries of the existing voter identification statutes have been written for forty states.

**Challenges:** Identifying the relevant statutes has been challenging because of the different terminology used from state to state to codify voter identification issues, and because many states have scattered election law provisions throughout their codes. This variety from state to state makes creating a snapshot view across states a challenge.

**Work Plan:** The state by state voter identification statute summaries will be completed for the remaining ten states and D.C. and the review of the chart will be completed. Analysis of voter identification data will begin.

**SUPPLEMENTS TO LEGAL ANALYSIS**

To supplement the legal analysis, the Eagleton team is undertaking two research efforts: First, compiling information on the debate over voter ID in the states; and second, estimating the effect on turnout of different voter ID regimes. Tracking the continuing political debate over voter identification reveals that the relatively narrow HAVA requirements for voter identification have apparently sparked in many states a broader concern, and a sharp political debate over rigorous identification requirements for all voters. The research follows these developments both to monitor possible secondary effects of HAVA on voter ID, and to provide a rich collection of alternative approaches for consideration.

Individual narratives for the states with significant activity in voter ID will provide a resource for understanding the wide range of experience in the 2004 election. The narratives will include an appraisal of the prevalence and nature of vote fraud, a focus of the concern with
increasing the rigor of voter ID requirements. The next key milestones will be the completion of the state database and drafting the first narratives.

**VOTER ID AND TURNOUT ANALYSIS**

The second supplemental analysis will provide objective information on a contentious feature of the debate over voter ID in the states: the effects of more rigorous voter ID regimes on voter turnout and the relationship between the voter ID regime and vote fraud. As part of this effort, Eagleton is undertaking a statistical analysis to gauge the effect of a state’s voter ID regime on turnout, especially turnout by minority and elderly voters.

**Description:** We are creating a database and gathering statistics on the effects of state-level voter identification requirements on voter turnout at the county-level in the 2004 election.

**Progress:** The collection of data for the Voter ID-Turnout analysis is complete. The assembled database contains population demographic data, voter registration data and voter turnout data from all 50 states, 3113 Counties, and the District of Columbia. We have also utilized exit poll data collected on Election Day 2004 as a resource for understanding the demographics of voter turnout. The analysis of that data is underway.

**Challenges:** The main challenges to this task include gathering the complete set of changes to Voter ID laws over the past 5 years, and then incorporating those changes into a sound statistical methodology.

**Projection:** We will continue to work towards resolving the methodology issue, and ultimately produce a final report on this subject. The analysis of the impact that voter identification requirements have upon voter turnout should be completed around mid-September.
PROJECT MANAGEMENT

PEER REVIEW GROUP

Description: A feature of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group (PRG). The Peer Review Group will review our research and methodology and provide valuable feedback and suggestions for the direction of our work.

Progress: The composition of the Peer Review Group has been determined and the membership has been submitted to the EAC. Additionally, as of the date of this report all PRG members have received their first mailing, which included several reports from our research, and a draft of our analysis and alternatives outline for their review.

Challenges: Our timeline for circulating and discussing our research with the PRG has been compromised due to delays in completing the recruitment of members of the group.

Projections: We are in the process of scheduling our first conference call with PRG members for the week of Sept. 19, 2005.

COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Collecting and merging information and data from myriad sources is a demanding requirement of this research. We have developed two principal mechanisms to facilitate the analysis of the material collected or created in the project: an information system and an internal website for easy access to drafts and reports.

INFORMATION SYSTEM

Description: The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law is being merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which will include a compendium of case law and statutes regarding provisional voting and voter identification.

Progress: At this point in the research process, many documents are complete after a lengthy process of circulating drafts among team members. As we near the end of the Provisional Voting research and move into the Voter Identification research, we will re-evaluate the volume of files contained in the Information System and update the system.

Projections: The entire project team continues to review all project drafts, and will staff members combine and format all documents and materials in preparation for our final reporting to the EAC.

INTRANET

Description: All project team members have signed on to the Intranet site. The Intranet facilitates the exchange of information and collaboration among project participants.
Progress: Project team members regularly post drafts, completed materials and spreadsheets online for internal review. The intranet has been extremely helpful to team members and serves as an internal website with announcements and important documents readily available to all team members.

FINANCIAL REPORT

The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. Financial reporting on grant accounts is limited to actual expenses that have been incurred during the reporting period. Our contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, (732) 932-0165, EXT. 2235.

A detail of expenses incurred from project August 1 - August 31, 2005, will be sent under separate cover to: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer, EAC.
ATTACHMENT:
PEER REVIEW GROUP
FINAL LIST (09/13/05)

R. Michael Alvarez
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology
1200 East California Institute of Technology
Mail box 228-77
Pasadena, CA 91125
rmal@hss.caltech.edu
Tel: (626)395-4422

Guy-Uriel E. Charles
Associate Professor
School of Law, University of Minnesota
342 Mondale Hall
229-19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
gcharles@umn.edu
Tel: (612)626-9154

John C. Harrison
Massee Professor of Law
University of Virginia School of Law
580 Massie Road
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903-7789
jh8m@virginia.edu
Tel: (434) 924-3093

Pamela Susan Karlan
Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law
Stanford Law School
559 Nathan Abbott Way
Stanford, CA 94305-8610
karlan@stanford.edu
Tel: (650) 725-4851

Martha E. Kropf
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
Political Science Department
5120 Rock Hill Road, 213 Haag Hall
Kansas City, Missouri 64110-2499
KropfM@umkc.edu
Tel: (816) 235-5948

Daniel H. Lowenstein
Professor of Law
School of Law, UCLA
Box 951476
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1476
lowenstein@law.ucla.edu
Tel: (310) 825-4841

Timothy G. O'Rourke
Dean, Fulton School of Liberal Arts
Salisbury University
1101 Camden Avenue
Fulton Hall - 225
Salisbury, MD 21804
gorourke@salisbury.edu
Tel: (410) 543-6000

Bradley A. Smith
Professor
Capital Law School
303 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215
bsmith@law.capital.edu
Tel: (614) 236-6500

Tim Storey
Program Principal
National Conference on State Legislatures
7700 East 1st Place
Denver, CO 80230
Tel: (303) 364-7700 or
Tel: (202) 624-5400

Peter G. Verniero
Counsel
Sills, Cummins, Epstein and Gross, PC
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, NJ 07102
pverniere@sillscummins.com
Tel: (973) 643-7000
FYI-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

--- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 11/13/2005 05:32 PM ---

"Tom O'neill"

To: klynndyson@eac.gov
cc: tokaji.1@osu.edu, foley.33@osu.edu, lauracw@columbus.rr.com, Vincelli@rutgers.edu, arapp@rci.rutgers.edu, davander@eden.rutgers.edu, dlinky@rci.rutgers.edu, ireed@rutgers.edu, joharris@eden.rutgers.edu, john.weingart@rutgers.edu, rmandel@rci.rutgers.edu, "Johanna Dobrich"<jdobrich@eden.rutgers.edu>

Subject: FW: October Progress Report

Tom O'neill

-----Original Message-----
From: Tom O'neill [mailto:tomoneill@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2005 5:26 PM
To: klynndyson@eac.gov
Cc: Vincelli@rutgers.edu; arapp@rci.rutgers.edu; davander@eden.rutgers.edu; dlinky@rci.rutgers.edu; ireed@rutgers.edu; joharris@eden.rutgers.edu; john.weingart@rutgers.edu; rmandel@rci.rutgers.edu; 'Johanna Dobrich'; tokaji.1@osu.edu; foley.33@osu.edu; lauracw@columbus.rr.com
Subject: October Progress Report

Karen,
Attached is the Progress Report for October. Please note that this report includes an attachment showing how our study classifies each state on key variables, such as counting out-of-precinct ballots, requirements for ballot evaluation, and other variables. It also displays how the data we used differs for some states for the vote counts reported by the Election Day Survey. We believe that our data is more accurate and complete (see for example the data for New Mexico and Pennsylvania).

I look forward to responding to any questions or concerns you or others at the EAC may have.

Tom O'Neill
INTRODUCTION

This report describes our progress from October 1 through October 31, 2005. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks; progress made; challenges encountered or anticipated; milestones reached; and projections for work to be completed in the coming month.

In October we focused on finalizing our Provisional Voting analysis paper, including the development of recommendations to the EAC for a draft guidance document and best practices. These policy prescriptions are based on our research and the comments of the Peer Review Group. We completed a careful review of our data to reconcile it with other sources and identify the latest, most reliable information to use in the analysis. (See the attachment to this Progress Report for the details.) The importance of this demanding effort was described in September's Progress Report.

Also in October we revised the schedule for the project in light of the additional time that has been needed for review of earlier drafts by the EAC and the late completion of the Election Day Study. We will seek a meeting with the EAC in the next several weeks to confer about the schedule to complete the project and alternative approaches that could speed the conclusion of our work.

We will submit to the EAC a final draft of our report, a preliminary guidance document, and draft best practices before Thanksgiving. We project that EAC will take 3 to 4 weeks to review and react to that final draft. And we understand that after its review, the EAC will decide if it should move towards issuing a Guidance Document or recommending best practices. If the EAC does decide to issue a Guidance Document on Provisional Voting, the time needed for a review by the advisory boards is likely to delay a public hearing until early February.
This report is divided into 3 sections: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, and Project Management. Each section references specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract. The Financial Report will be sent separately by the Rutgers Division of Grant and Contract Accounting.

Please direct questions or comments about this report to [redacted] or by [redacted].

**PROVISIONAL VOTING**

Tasks 3.4 – 3.9 in our contract relate to Provisional Voting. Work on the first of these must be complete before proceeding to later tasks. Task 3.4 was completed in August, Tasks 3.5 and 3.6 are nearing completion.

**Task 3.5: Analysis and Alternative Approaches.** Assess the potential, problems, and challenges of Provisional Voting and develop alternative means to achieve the goals of Provisional Voting.

**LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS, AND LITIGATION**

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation. This information constitutes the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task. It has provided a base of understanding for the analysis of states’ actual experience with Provisional Voting in 2004, for which the Eagleton team has lead responsibility.

**Description:** The Moritz team has created a 50-state chart to summarize information on Provisional Voting, compiled statutes, case law and administrative procedures regarding Provisional Voting and has completed this research.

**Progress:** We have completed the memorandum outlining Provisional Voting legislative changes since the 2004 election and we are continuing to clarify the laws prior to these changes.

**Challenges:** The variety in the form and frequency of Provisional Voting legislation from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

**Work Plan:** The final analysis will be sent to the EAC by Thanksgiving.
PREPARATION FOR AND EXPERIENCE WITH PROVISIONAL VOTING

The Eagleton team has researched and compiled a narrative of each state’s experience with Provisional Voting in 2004. The report findings from the survey of 400 local election officials are now complete. The survey results have proven to be instrumental in shaping our understanding of actual practice in administering Provisional Voting, including the steps local officials took to prepare for the election.

PROVISIONAL VOTING NARRATIVES

Description: To construct the narratives, a researcher examined newspaper accounts, state websites, and reports from third-party organizations to gather information on the experience with Provisional Voting in the 2004 election. To organize the information derived from this examination, we created an information system that catalogues information about the states (i.e. whether a state was new to Provisional Voting, the percentage of provisional votes counted, the method of notifying voters if their vote was counted, etc.) and combined it with Moritz’s collection and analysis of statutes, regulations and litigation.

Progress: We completed a state-by-state narrative of developments in Provisional Voting and distributed it to the EAC and the PRG. This work has been helpful in understanding the context of the data collected on provisional voting from the states.

Challenges: The primary obstacle to constructing the narratives was difficulty in communicating and obtaining necessary information from various state officials. As a result, the narratives underwent several revisions to incorporate up-to-date and reliable information. Now that so many other analyses, including the Election Day Survey, have been released, we were challenged by different interpretations of the same basic facts. But the reconciliation of interpretation and data collection has been invaluable in establishing rigor in our report.

Work Plan: We completed revisions of the narratives incorporating comments from the PRG and addressing any discrepancies between our findings and other interpretations of similar information included in other studies.

PROVISIONAL VOTING STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Description: During October the Eagleton research team continued to check its statistical analysis, and worked to reconcile the classifications of this analysis (such as states counting only those provisional ballots cast within the proper precinct versus states that counted ballots cast within the proper county) with the classification made in other parts of this study or in other studies (such as the Election Day Study or Electionline reports).

Progress: The effort to double check all of the classifications used in the study is complete. The results of this effort are displayed in the attachment to this progress report, “Characteristics of the Provisional Voting Process -- Classification of the States,”
beginning on page 9. Only Delaware and Arkansas remain unclear in regard to one of the measures, and both states have been contacted to receive clarification in this area.

Challenges: The difficulties encountered have been a result of communication delays and time constraints. Some states have been more responsive to our inquiries about their practices than others. Overall, this is not an irresolvable problem but it does slow the process of completion down.

Work Plan: By early-November the final revision of the statistical analysis, which includes full reconciliation of all data within the study, will be complete. The reconciliation of data is displayed in the attachment to this progress report.

SURVEY OF COUNTY ELECTION OFFICIALS

Description: The Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (CPIP) conducted a national survey of county election officials to measure several aspects of Provisional Voting.

Progress: The analysis of the survey results and findings report is complete. As a result of the critique by the PRG, the research team is revising and clarifying the descriptions of the survey design and sample selection process to make the research methods more transparent.

Work Plan: We used the information from the survey in drafting the analysis and alternatives document required under Task 3.5. We will include necessary clarifications regarding survey design and sample selection in the final analysis and alternatives document.

Task 3.6: Prepare preliminary draft guidance document.

The report and recommendations now nearing completion constitutes the draft preliminary guidance document. Based on our conversation with the EAC, the draft gives the EAC the option of proceeding with a guidance document or issuing recommendations to the state for best practices, recommendations that would not constitute voluntary guidance. Before proceeding to Task 3.7 (revise the guidance document for publication) or 3.8 (arrange a public hearing on the draft guidance), we will await the EAC’s decision on how to proceed.
VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The contract lists 7 tasks (3.10 – 3.16) related to Voter Identification Requirements. The research on Voter ID requirements is proceeding concurrently with our work on the experience of Provisional Voting, and is becoming the principal focus of our research.

Task 3.10: Legislation, regulations, and litigation

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation with regard to Voter Identification Requirements. This collection of material is nearing completion. It will constitute the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task.

Description: The Moritz team has compiled statutes on Voter Identification, and will provide a summarized analysis of this research to the project team for review.

Progress: The 50 State (plus the District of Columbia) chart has been completed, the voter identification statutes have been collected for all states and D.C., and summaries of the existing voter identification statutes have been written for all states and D.C.

Challenges: Identifying the relevant statutes has been challenging because of the different terminology used from state to state to codify voter identification issues, and because many states have scattered election law provisions throughout their codes. This variety from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

Work Plan: Analysis of voter identification data has begun and will increasingly become the central focus of our work.

SUPPLEMENTS TO LEGAL ANALYSIS

To supplement the legal analysis, the Eagleton team is undertaking two research efforts: First, compiling information on the debate over voter ID in the states; and second, estimating the effect on turnout of different voter ID regimes. Tracking the continuing political debate over voter identification reveals that the relatively narrow HAVA requirements for voter identification have apparently sparked in many states a broader concern and a sharp political debate over rigorous identification requirements for all voters. The research follows these developments both to monitor possible secondary effects of HAVA on voter ID, and to provide a rich collection of alternative approaches for consideration.
VOTER ID AND TURNOUT ANALYSIS

The second supplemental analysis will provide objective information on a contentious feature of the debate over voter ID in the states: the effects of more rigorous voter ID regimes on voter turnout and the relationship between the voter ID regime and vote fraud. As part of this effort, Eagleton is undertaking a statistical analysis to gauge the effect of a state's voter ID regime on turnout, especially turnout by minority and elderly voters.

Description: We have created a database and gathered statistics on the effects of state-level voter identification requirements on voter turnout at the county-level in the 2004 election.

Progress: The collection of data for the Voter ID-Turnout analysis is complete. The assembled database contains population demographic data, voter registration data and voter turnout data from all 50 states, 3113 Counties, and the District of Columbia. We have also used exit poll data collected on Election Day 2004 as a resource for understanding the demographics of voter turnout.

Challenges: The analysis of these data had been postponed until the data reconciliation of Provisional Voting is complete. As a result of the extensive revision and data reconciliation efforts aimed at the Provisional Voting section of our work VID had been temporarily placed on hold. We are now beginning data analysis on the impact of voter identification requirements on voter turnout.

Work Plan: The analysis of the impact that voter identification requirements have upon voter turnout should be completed by early December. Early January is our target to deliver the draft report and outline of alternative policies to the Peer Review Group. In mid January, the EAC would receive a draft report and recommendations that take into account the comments of the PRG.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

PEER REVIEW GROUP

Description: A feature of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group (PRG). It reviews our research and methodology and provides valuable feedback and suggestions for the direction of our work.

Progress: Eagleton has stayed in touch with members of the Peer Review Group since the September 21st conference call, and has solicited their final comments on the Provisional Voting research. During October, we telephoned two members who did not participate in the conference call to confirm their commitment to serving as members of the Peer Review Group. Profess Guy Charles affirmed his interest. Professor Pamela Karlan did not return the call. The revisions in the schedule for the project have now made it possible to begin the process of scheduling a meeting of the PRG to consider our draft report and recommendations on Voter Identification Issues. We anticipate that meeting will take place the second week of January.
Challenges: No new challenges were encountered during October.

COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Collecting and merging information and data from myriad sources is a demanding requirement of this research. We have developed two principal mechanisms to facilitate the analysis of the material collected or created in the project: an information system and an internal website for easy access to drafts and reports.

INFORMATION SYSTEM

Description: The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law is being merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which will include a compendium of case law and statutes regarding Provisional Voting and voter identification.

Progress: At this point in the research process, many documents are complete after a lengthy process of circulating drafts among team members. We have reorganized our system by separating final drafts from earlier versions of documents, discarding dated files contained in the Information System, and updating the system as a whole. Upon their completion, new documents continue to be added.

Projections: The entire project team continues to use the Information System which contains the above referenced research, in working toward the preparation for our final reports to the EAC.

INTRANET

Description: All project team members have signed on to the Intranet site, and regularly post drafts, completed materials and spreadsheets online for internal review. The Intranet facilitates the exchange of information and collaboration among project participants.

FINANCIAL REPORT

The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. Financial reporting on grant accounts is limited to actual expenses that have been incurred during the reporting period. Our contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, (732) 932-0165, EXT. 2235.

A detail of expenses incurred from project October 1- October 31, 2005, will be sent under separate cover to: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer at the EAC.
ATTACHMENT TO OCTOBER PROGRESS REPORT
Characteristics of the Provisional Voting Process
Classification of the States

Our research on provisional voting divided the various states into several categories to allow an assessment of how different factors may have influenced the process of casting and counting provisional ballots. This analysis was conducted before the release of the Election Day Study, and the categories we used may differ in some respects from its work. The categories analyzed here are:

1. New vs. Old (states that used a provisional ballot before the 2004 election)
2. Use of a statewide database of registered voters vs. no use of a statewide database
3. Counting out-of-precinct ballots vs. not counting out-of-precinct ballots
4. Voter identification requirements
5. Method used to verify provisional ballots
6. Levels of provisional ballots cast and counted

We first assigned states within these categories based on classifications done by Electionline.org in its studies. The Electionline data was the only published information available at the time of our research. We reviewed the Electionline data carefully, and, in select cases, updated it with new, detailed information that had become available after its publication. The changes we made are explained below.

Please note that:
--Idaho, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Wisconsin and Wyoming were excluded from our analysis. They have election-day registration systems, and did not need to use HAVA-compliant provisional ballots.

--North Dakota does not register voters, so it also was excluded from HAVA requirements and did not use provisional voting.

--Mississippi has not reported its provisional voting results and could not be included in our analysis, though it was compliant in 2004.

--Pennsylvania did not report its totals for the Election Day Study, but we obtained information on Pennsylvania and did include it in our analysis.
New vs. Old States

We classified states as “new” or “old” based on the 2001 Electionline study of provisional voting\(^1\) and condensing its classifications into a single dichotomous variable, new/old with all other cases excluded. The Electionline study divided states into five categories of their use of provisional ballots in the 2000 election:

1. Use of provisional ballots (P)
2. Limited use of provisional ballots (LP)
3. Affidavit ballots (A)
4. No system in place (N)
5. Unnecessary/Not Applicable (U/NA)

We collapsed all of the states listed as using provisional ballots, limited use of provisional ballots or affidavit ballots as “old” states, because the states in all three categories would have been familiar with key aspects of provisional voting. States that had no provisional voting system in place for the 2002 election, and were HAVA compliant in 2004, were listed as “new” states, as 2004 would have been the first year in which they would be offering the option of provisional voting. States that were listed as unnecessary or not applicable were excluded from this study, as they were exempt from the HAVA regulations in 2004 because they either allowed same-day registration or did not register voters.

Rhode Island is the only state categorized as an old state by Electionline that we moved into the list of new states. Electionline’s map shows Rhode Island as a state that used provisional voting in 2000, but in the state description, it is listed as having no system in place. We learned from the Rhode Island Board of Elections that the state had previously permitted potential voters to sign an affidavit if they did not appear on a precinct’s list of registered voters, but felt they were registered to vote. Based on the signed affidavit, the election official would then contact a county official to see if the voter was on a more complete registration list. If the voter’s name was on the complete list, that voter was permitted to cast a regular ballot. As this process did not grant the voter a provisional ballot, but served as a different type of administrative failsafe, we concluded that Rhode Island’s first use of provisional voting was in 2004 and, therefore, classified the state as “new” to the system of provisional balloting.

---

\(^1\) This study can be found at: [http://electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Provisional%20Voting.pdf](http://electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Provisional%20Voting.pdf).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old States</th>
<th>New States</th>
<th>HAVA Exempt or NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 26 | 18 | 7 |

Statewide List of Registered Voters

The Electionline preview of the 2004 Election\(^2\) was the starting point for compiling a list of states that had a statewide database of registered voters. That study listed 34 States that did not have their statewide database systems complete, and 16 that did, including the District of Columbia. North Dakota does not register voters, so does not need to compile such a database. Electionline’s criterion for concluding that a state had a statewide list was that the state have participation from all jurisdictions in a statewide system. We added Oklahoma to the list of states with statewide databases.

because we found they had met the Electionline criteria by the 2004 election, albeit too late for inclusion in the Electionline survey.

Table 2
CATEGORIZATION OF STATES — Statewide Registration Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Had Database 2004</th>
<th>No Database A-N</th>
<th>No Database N-W</th>
<th>HAVA Exempt or NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minnesota has a statewide database but was excluded from the analysis because it did not offer provisional ballots and was exempt from the HAVA requirements.

Out-of-Precinct Ballots

We based our classification of states that allow the counting of ballots cast outside the correct precinct on the data in the 2004 Electionline preview of the 2004 election\(^2\). States that evaluated ballots cast in a precinct where the voter was not registered were categorized as “out-of-precinct.” States that invalidated such ballots were categorized as “In-precinct only.”
### Table 3
CATEGORIZATION OF STATES -- Counting Out-Of-Precinct Ballots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out-of-Precinct</th>
<th>In-Precinct Only</th>
<th>HAVA EXEMPT OR NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 17              | 26               | 7                 |

**Voter Identification**

We relied on Electionline studies, including the Voter Identification study[^3] and the 2004 Election Preview, to classify the states on their requirements for voter identification. Each state's categorization is taken directly from the Electionline studies except Hawaii[^4]. The five different, and increasingly rigorous, categories are: Give Name (8 states), Sign Name (14 states), Match Signature (8 states), Provide ID (15 states), and Photo ID (5 states).

[^3]: This study can be found at: [http://electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Voter%20Identification.pdf](http://electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Voter%20Identification.pdf)

[^4]: In 2004, ElectionLine listed Hawaii as requiring identification. Our review of statutes revealed that Hawaii could require photo ID. Since that is the most rigorous form of identification that may be required of voters, we classified Hawaii under this category.
Table 4
CATEGORIZATION OF STATES -- Forms of Identification Required
States in italics are exempt from HAVA or did not report Provisional Ballot data and are not included in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Give Name</th>
<th>Sign Name</th>
<th>Match Signature</th>
<th>Provide ID</th>
<th>Photo ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

South Dakota complicates the effort to assign each state to a category. It permits voters to sign an affidavit that would allow them to vote without presenting photo ID. While Hawaii did not normally require photo ID, its statutes gave challenged voters the opportunity to respond by producing a photo ID.

Verification Method

We identified four different ways states assessed provisional ballots to determine if they should be counted: signature match, match voter data, signed affidavits, and bringing back identification later. We gathered information about these verification techniques by checking state websites and consulting journalistic accounts. We consulted state legislation to provide further information where needed.
Table 5
CATEGORIZATION OF STATES — Ballot Evaluation Methods
States in italics are exempt from HAVA or did not report Provisional Ballot data and are not included in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature Match</th>
<th>Data Match</th>
<th>Affidavit</th>
<th>Return with ID</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>N. Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Carolina</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4  14  14  10  9

Data Collection
To assemble our data for analysis, we began by using the data on provisional votes cast and counted reported by Electionline. To increase the accuracy of this data, we surveyed each state’s election websites for updated data, and for reported numbers on the county level. We then sent emails to 49 (we excluded Alaska, see below) states and the District of Columbia, requesting updated data on the number of provisional votes cast and counted by county. We received information from 25 states by our cut-off date of August 25, 2005.

* North Carolina lacked clear standards to evaluate provisional ballots and is excluded from this analysis.
### Table 6

**Updated information by State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received Updated Data</th>
<th>Did Not Receive Updated Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Alaska&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 States 25 States

<sup>5</sup> Alaska was not contacted via email, as the state does not have voting districts comparable to counties in other states and could not be matched with comparable census data.

<sup>6</sup> Maryland reported provisional ballots that were counted per county, but not number cast.

<sup>7</sup> Nebraska reported an incomplete list of provisional ballots cast and counted by county, but designated counties by number, rather than by name.
Data Differences with Election Day Study

The data used in this study differs from the data reported in the Election Day Study for 19 states. The Election Day Study was not completed until well after our statistical analysis of provisional voting was finished, on the schedule laid out in our work plan. Where there are differences, they are typically very small, usually fewer than 100 votes either cast or counted. Of the 9 states that have differences of more than 100 votes cast or counted, 7 have reported their numbers directly to us and can be considered updated data that EDS had not obtained. For one of those states, New Mexico, EDS had incomplete data, and for another, Pennsylvania, EDS had no data at all. The data that we have collected reflects updated numbers from the states that have changed following recounts and litigation that altered how ballots were evaluated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>EDS Numbers Cast/Counted</th>
<th>Our Numbers Cast/Counted</th>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Updated Info from State?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>6,478/1,865</td>
<td>6560/1836</td>
<td>82/29</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>23,285/22,498</td>
<td>23,275/22,498</td>
<td>10/0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>51,529/39,086</td>
<td>51,477/39,163</td>
<td>52/77</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>12,893/4,489</td>
<td>12,893/3,839</td>
<td>0/650</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>346/25</td>
<td>348/25</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>15,406/8,038</td>
<td>15,454/8,048</td>
<td>48/10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>45,535/32,079</td>
<td>45,563/31,805</td>
<td>28/274</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>688/378</td>
<td>653/357</td>
<td>35/21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>17,421/13,788</td>
<td>17,003/13,298</td>
<td>418/490</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>6,153/2,446</td>
<td>6,154/2,447</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>6,410/2,914</td>
<td>15,360/8,767</td>
<td>8,950/5,853</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
<td>77,469/50,370</td>
<td>77,469/42,348</td>
<td>0/8,022</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>157,714/123,902</td>
<td>158,642/123,548</td>
<td>928/354</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>53,698/26,092</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>35,282/7,156</td>
<td>36,193/7,770</td>
<td>911/614</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>121/30</td>
<td>101/37</td>
<td>20/7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>4,608/728</td>
<td>4,609/728</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>92,402/73,806</td>
<td>86,239/69,273</td>
<td>6,163/4,533</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>374/119</td>
<td>373/120</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Commissioners:

The consultants' contracts for EAC's voting fraud and voter intimidation project require Tova Wang and Job Serebrov to work in consultation with EAC staff and the Commissioners "to identify a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation". The contracts do not specify the number of working group members but, as EAC has to pay for the group's travel and we want the size of the group to be manageable, I recommend that we limit the number to 6 or 8. Please let me know if you think that this limit is too conservative.

Attached for your review and comment are two lists of potential working group members for this project. One list was submitted by Job, the other by Tova. Tova and Job have provided brief summaries of each candidate's relevant experience and have placed asterisks next to the names of the individuals whom they particularly recommend. I can provide more extensive biographies of these individuals, if you need them. If EAC agrees that the recommended working group members are acceptable, an equal number may be selected from each list in order to maintain a balanced perspective.

Absent from the attached lists is the name of a representative from the U.S. Department of Justice's Election Crimes Branch. At this time, I am working through the DOJ bureaucracy to determine to what degree Craig Donsanto will be permitted to participate. If he cannot be named as a working group member, we may still be able to use him as a resource.

Please provide your feedback to me no later than Monday, November 28. I am available to meet with you if you would like to discuss this matter further.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist

Possible Working Group Members - Serebrov.doc  Possible Working Group Members - Wang.doc
Possible Working Group Members - Serebroy

I recommend the first four with an *

*Mark (Thor) Hearne II- Counsel to Republican National Committee; National Counsel to American Center for Voting Rights; National election counsel to Bush-Cheney, '04; Testified before U.S. House Administration Committee hearings into conduct of Ohio presidential election; Academic Advisor to Commission on Federal Election Reform (Baker-Carter Commission).

*Todd Rokita- Secretary of State, Indiana; Secretary Rokita strives to reform Indiana’s election practices to ensure Indiana’s elections are as fair, accurate and accessible as possible; Secretary Rokita serves on the nine-member Executive Board of the Election Assistance Commission Standards Board, charged by federal law to address election reform issues.

*Patrick J. Rogers- Partner/Shareholder, Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris and Sisk, P.A., Albuquerque, New Mexico; 1991-2003 General Counsel to the New Mexico Republican Party; Election cases: The Coalition to Expose Ballot Deception, et al v. Judy N. Chavez, et al; Second Judicial District Court of Bernalillo County, New Mexico (2005); represented plaintiffs challenging petition procedures; Miguel Gomez v. Ken Sanchez and Judy Chaves; Second Judicial District Court of Bernalillo County, New Mexico (2005); residency challenge; Moises Griego, et al v. Rebecca Vigil-Giron v. Ralph Nader and Peter Miguel Camejo, Supreme Court for the State of New Mexico (2004); represented Ralph Nader and Peter Camejo, ballot access issues; Larry Larrañaga, et al v. Mary E. Herrera and Rebecca Vigil-Giron, Supreme Court of New Mexico (2004); voter identification and fraudulent registration issues; Decker, et al v. Kunko, et al; District Court of Chaves County, New Mexico (2004); voter identification and fraudulent registration issues; Kunko, et al v. Decker, et al; Supreme Court of New Mexico (2004); voter identification and fraudulent registration issues; In the Matter of the Security of Ballots Cast in Bernalillo County in the 2000 General Election; Second Judicial District Court of Bernalillo County, New Mexico (2000); voting and counting irregularities and fraud.

*David A. Norcross- Partner, Blank Rome LLP, Trenton NJ, Washington D.C; Chairman, New Jersey Republican State Committee, 1977 – 1981; General Counsel, Republican National Committee, 1993 – 1997; General Counsel, International Republican Institute; Counsel, The Center for Democracy; Vice Chairman, Commission on Presidential Debates; Executive Director, New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission

Benjamin L. Ginsberg-Served as national counsel to the Bush-Cheney presidential campaign; He played a central role in the 2000 Florida recount; He also represents the campaigns and leadership PACs of numerous members of the Senate and House, as well as the Republican National Committee, National Republican Senatorial Committee and
National Republican Congressional Committee; His expertise is more in campaign finance.

**Cleta Mitchell** Partner in the Washington, D.C. office of Foley & Lardner LLP; She advises corporations, nonprofit organizations, candidates, campaigns, and individuals on state and federal election and campaign finance law, and compliance issues related to lobbying, ethics and financial disclosure; Ms. Mitchell practices before the Federal Election Commission and similar federal and state enforcement agencies; Her expertise is more in campaign finance law.

**Mark Braden** Of counsel at Baker & Hostetler; He concentrates his work principally on election law and governmental affairs, including work with Congress, the Federal Election Commission, state campaign finance agencies, public integrity issues, political broadcast regulation, contests, recounts, the Voting Rights Act, initiatives, referendums and redistricting; His expertise is mainly outside of the voter fraud area.
To: Peggy Sims  
From: Tova Wang  
Re: Working Group Recommendations  
Date: November 12, 2005

*Wendy R. Weiser, Associate Counsel in the Democracy Program at the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law and an expert in federal and constitutional law, has done a great deal of research, writing, speaking, and litigating on voting rights and election law issues. As part of the Brennan Center’s wide ranging activities in the area of democracy, Ms. Weiser is currently overseeing an analysis and investigation of recent allegations of voter fraud throughout the country.

*Barbara Arnwine is Executive Director of the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, an organization that for four decades has been at the forefront of the legal struggle to secure racial justice and equal access to the electoral process for all voters. Notably, Ms. Arnwine and the organization have led the Election Protection program for the last several years, a nationwide grassroots education and legal effort deploying thousands of volunteers and using a nationally recognized voter hotline to protect voters’ rights on election day.

*Daniel Tokaji, professor and associate director of the Election Law Center at the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University, is one of the nation’s foremost experts in election law and reform and ensuring equality in the voting system. Professor Tokaji frequently writes and speaks on democracy related issues at academic and practitioner conferences, on such issues as voting technology, fraud, registration, and identification requirements, as well as the interplay between the election administration practices and voting rights laws.

Donna Brazile is Chair of the Democratic National Committee’s Voting Rights Institute, the Democratic Party’s major initiative to promote and protect the right to vote created in response to the irregularities of the 2000 election, and former Campaign Manager for Gore-Lieberman 2000 (the first African American to lead a major presidential campaign.) Brazile is a weekly contributor and political commentator on CNN’s Inside Politics and American Morning, a columnist for Roll Call Newspaper and a contributing writer for Ms. Magazine.

Wade Henderson is the Executive Director of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (LCCR) and Counsel to the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund (LCRCREF), an organization at the forefront of defending voting rights for the last fifty years. Prior to his role with the Leadership Conference, Mr. Henderson was the Washington Bureau Director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)

Robert Bauer is the Chair of the Political Law Practice at the law firm of Perkins Coie, National Counsel for Voter Protection, Democratic National Committee, Counsel to the Democratic Senatorial and Congressional Campaign Committees and Co-Author, Report Deliberative Process Privilege
of Counsel to the Senate Rules and Administration Committee in the Matter of the United States Senate Seat from Louisiana in the 105th Congress of the United States, (March 27, 1997). He is the author of *United States Federal Election Law*, and one of the foremost attorneys in the country in the area of federal/state campaign finance and election laws.

Laughlin McDonald has been the executive director of the Southern Regional Office of the ACLU since 1972 and as the Director of the ACLU Voting Rights Project, McDonald has played a leading role eradicating discriminatory election practices and protecting the gains in political participation won by racial minorities since passage of the 1965 federal Voting Rights Act. During the past two decades, McDonald has broken new ground by expanding ACLU voting rights cases to include representation of Native Americans in various western states, and written innumerable publications on voting rights issues.

Joseph E. Sandler is a member of the firm of Sandler, Reiff & Young, P.C., in Washington, D.C., concentrating in campaign finance and election law matters, and general counsel to the Democratic National Committee. As an attorney he has handled campaign finance and election law matters for Democratic national and state party organizations, Members of Congress, candidates and campaigns. He served as general co-counsel of the Association of State Democratic Chairs, as general counsel for the Democratic Governors' Association and as counsel to several state Democratic parties.

Cathy Cox is serving her second term as Georgia's Secretary of State, having first been elected in 1998. In 2002 she earned re-election with over 61 percent of the vote, winning 146 out of 159 counties. Because of Secretary Cox’s efforts Georgia has become a national leader in election reform. Her initiative made Georgia the first state in America to deploy a modern, uniform electronic voting system in every county.
Dear Ms. Karen Lynn-Dyson:

Attached please find the Eagleton/Moritz Progress Report for the month of November.

Please direct any questions about this report to Tom O'Neill

Sincerely,

Johanna Dobrich

--

Johanna Dobrich
jdoebich@eden.rutgers.edu
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INTRODUCTION

This report describes our progress from November 1 through November 30, 2005. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks; progress made; challenges encountered or anticipated; milestones reached; and projections for work to be completed in the coming month.

In November we completed and submitted our Provisional Voting analysis paper, including recommendations to the EAC for best practices. These policy prescriptions are based on our research and the comments of the Peer Review Group on that research. We completed a careful review of our data to reconcile it with other sources and identify the latest, most reliable information to use in the analysis. The importance of this demanding effort was described in October's Progress Report. We continue to await the EAC's comments on that final draft.

Also in November we revised the schedule for the project in light of the additional time that has been needed for review of earlier drafts by the EAC and the late completion of the Election Day Study. We made a written request to the EAC for a no-cost extension of the contract through the end of February which we understand is likely to be approved before Christmas.

Since the submission of our Provisional Voting report to the EAC on November 28, 2005, our efforts have been entirely aimed at the completion of the voter identification research. We have been advised that EAC will take several weeks to review and react to our final draft on provisional voting. As we await a January meeting on that topic, we are moving ahead...
quickly on the statistical analysis of voter identification data and summarizing the legal research that was completed earlier.

This Monthly Progress Report is divided into 3 sections: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, and Project Management. Each section references specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract. The Financial Report will be sent separately by the Rutgers Division of Grant and Contract Accounting.

Please direct questions or comments about this report to by

**PROVISIONAL VOTING**

Tasks 3.4 – 3.9 in our contract relate to Provisional Voting. Task 3.4 was completed in August, and Tasks 3.5 and 3.6 were completed in November.

**Task 3.6: Prepare preliminary draft guidance document.**

The report and recommendations which were sent to the EAC on November 28, 2005 recommends against the adoption of a guidance document per se and advises that the EAC adopt its recommendations as best practices. That recommendation followed agreement by the EAC with that course of action. The submission of that report and recommendations, however, constitutes the document required under this task. Before proceeding to Task 3.7 (revise the guidance document for publication) or 3.8 (arrange a public hearing on the draft guidance), we await the EAC's decision on how to proceed.
VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The contract lists 7 tasks (3.10 – 3.16) related to Voter Identification Requirements. The research on Voter ID requirements is proceeding concurrently with our work on the experience of Provisional Voting, and is the principal focus of our research at this time.

Task 3.10: Legislation, regulations, and litigation

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation with regard to Voter Identification Requirements. This collection of material is nearing completion. It will constitute the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task.

Description: The Moritz team has compiled statutes on Voter Identification, and will provide a summarized analysis of this research to the project team for review.

Progress: The 50 state (plus District of Columbia) chart has been completed, the voter identification statutes have been collected for all states and D.C., and summaries of the existing voter identification statutes have been written for all states and D.C. Moritz has completed its review of voter identification litigation. Moritz and Eagleton have worked together to review the research, clarify the categorization of that research on our charts, and reconcile the data developed in our two different research techniques categorizations.

Challenges: The biggest challenge facing the reconciliation process of research findings, descriptions and categorizations is that it is being done by two different teams (Moritz and Eagleton) who rely on different primary source materials. Despite the necessity this has created to reconcile conflicting data from time to time, the collaboration has also been very beneficial because it has made our research efforts more rigorous.

Work Plan: During December we will conclude our reconciliation and continue analysis of voter identification research, including an analysis of the most important issues and trends in voter identification litigation.

SUPPLEMENTS TO LEGAL ANALYSIS

To supplement the legal analysis, the Eagleton team is undertaking two research efforts: First, compiling information on the debate over voter ID in the states; and second, estimating the effect on turnout of different voter ID regimes. Tracking the continuing political debate over voter identification reveals that the relatively narrow HAVA requirements for voter identification have apparently sparked in many states a broader concern and a sharp political debate over rigorous identification requirements for all voters. The research follows these developments both to monitor possible secondary effects of HAVA on voter ID, and to provide a rich collection of alternative approaches for consideration.
During the month of November, we developed narratives to establish how laws were passed, looking at when they were proposed and when they were eventually enacted. In the upcoming month, Eagleton will examine voter registration forms across the states to see what forms of identification are requested from mail-in registrants. The difficulty will be determining the 2004 status of the states.

**VOTER ID AND TURNOUT ANALYSIS**

Now under way is a statistical analysis to gauge the effect of a state’s voter ID regime on turnout, especially turnout by minority and elderly voters.

**Description:** We have created a database and gathered statistics on the effects of state-level voter identification requirements on voter turnout at the county-level in the 2004 election. In November, we have analyzed both aggregate- and individual-level data to determine whether there is any relationship between voter turnout and the various forms of voter identification states require.

**Progress:** Analysis is under way for two data sets: County-level data that includes registration and turnout rates for 2000 and 2004, as well as Census measures and indicators of the type of voter identification requirements that were in existence at the time of the 2004 presidential election. The second data set consists of the voter supplement to the November 2004 Current Population Survey. This data set allows for testing of the same hypotheses at the individual level. Preliminary findings from the aggregate data set suggest that voter ID requirements have their greatest effect at the registration stage, as opposed to the turnout stage. This is a first cut at the data, however, and we will be adding a number of control variables to the analysis to see if the relationship holds.

**Challenges:** These analyses use hierarchical linear modeling. Because voter identification requirements vary by state, one must pay special attention to other, unseen state-level influences on the data. The models are difficult to run and interpret, so the analyses are time-consuming.

**Work Plan:** The statistical analyses will continue during the month of December, and a draft of the findings is anticipated by the end of the month.

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

**PEER REVIEW GROUP**

**Description:** A feature of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group (PRG). It reviews our research and methodology and provides valuable feedback and suggestions for the direction of our work.
Progress: During the month of November, Eagleton contacted the PRG Members on two occasions. First, all members received the final draft provisional voting report that was submitted to the EAC. Further comments are welcome but not expected from the PRG. Second, we have asked PRG members to reserve two dates in mid-January for potential conference call sessions to review the voter identification report.

Challenges: No new challenges were encountered during November.

COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Collecting and merging information and data from myriad sources is a demanding requirement of this research. We have developed two principal mechanisms to facilitate the analysis of the material collected or created in the project: an information system and an internal website for easy access to drafts and reports.

INFORMATION SYSTEM

Description: The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law is being merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which will include a compendium of case law and statutes regarding Provisional Voting and voter identification.

Progress: At this point in the research process, many documents are complete after a lengthy process of circulating drafts among team members. We have reorganized our system by separating final drafts from earlier versions of documents, discarding dated files contained in the Information System, and updating the system as a whole. Upon their completion, new documents continue to be added.

Projections: The entire project team continues to use the Information System which contains the above referenced research, in working toward the preparation for our final reports to the EAC.

INTRANET

Description: All project team members have signed on to the Intranet site, and regularly post drafts, completed materials and spreadsheets online for internal review. The Intranet facilitates the exchange of information and collaboration among project participants.

FINANCIAL REPORT

The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. Financial reporting on grant accounts is limited to actual expenses that have been incurred during the reporting period. Our contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, (732) 932-0165, EXT. 2235.
A detail of expenses incurred from project November 1- November 30, 2005, will be sent under separate cover to: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer at the EAC.
Commissioners' Staff Briefing: Thursday, 8-24-06
9:30 AM - 11:30 AM EST, Small Conference Room

- Commissioners DeGregorio, Davidson and Hillman will participate.

1. CA Appeal (EC/MS)
2. Vendor Responses (BH)
3. Indirect Cost Response Policy (MS)
4. Eagleton Update (KLD)
5. Gov Works Update (KLD)
6. Addition to NAS Contract (TW/KLD)
7. September Public Mtg Draft Agenda (TW)
8. Private Briefing (Tom/Gavin)

Materials to be distributed by COB 8-02-06
Materials to be distributed by COB 8-22-06
Materials to be distributed by COB 8-22-06
Materials to be distributed by COB 8-22-04
No materials
No materials
Draft Agenda attached
No materials

Bert A. Benavides
Special Assistant to the Executive Director
U. S. Elections Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.3114 direct line
202.566.3128 fax
bbenavides@eac.gov
Will do. I didn’t have time to review the final version before it went to you guys, but will do so. The last one I read was an improvement over prior drafts.

Daniel P. Tokaji  
Assistant Professor of Law  
The Ohio State University  
Moritz College of Law  
614.292.6566  
http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/blogs/tokaji/

Dan:

Also, I know we talked about this before, but I just received a draft of the Eagleton ID Provision piece. If you have comments or follow-up, pls let me know...

Thanks.  
Adam

______________________________
Adam D. Ambrogi  
Special Assistant to Commissioner Ray Martinez III  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
202-566-3105
Adam: Just read this and think it's perfect. Thanks to both you and the Commissioner! Dan

Daniel P. Tokaji  
Assistant Professor of Law  
The Ohio State University  
Moritz College of Law  
614.292.6566  
http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/blogs/tokaji/

From: aambrogi@eac.gov  
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 6:43 PM  
To: tokaji.l@osu.edu; lowenstein@law.ucla.edu; mathews@law.ucla.edu; Rick.Hasen@lls.edu  
Cc: rmartinez@eac.gov  
Subject: Martinez ELJ Submission

Profs. Hasen, Lowenstein, and Tokaji:

Attached please find the submission of the Martinez Submission to the Election Law Journal's Mortiz Edition.

We apologize for turning in this paper late; we have unfortunately been occupied with a series of fast-moving election administration events (largely beyond our control). That said, we believe this to be a strong, well researched piece that makes an important statement, and are proud to submit it for consideration.

We are, of course, open to any edits that you may have to this papers, and as to structure, or footnoting improvements. I will provide your staff with any items that you may need to keep "on file" that are not readily available in the public for the cited material. I have taken the opportunity to do a generic law review style format, but you can obviously alter that as per ELJ's specifications. I have limited the "short cite" format-- because the piece isn't terribly long, but I have attempted to follow the Bluebook as much as possible.

Again, I know that Commissioner Martinez truly appreciates the opportunity to write for the ELJ, and the encouragement that you all have provided him to get this piece done. We welcome your comments, and will be happy to work with you on further improving this piece.

Very truly yours,
Adam Ambrogi
INTRODUCTION

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the tasks listed in the statute is the development of:

- nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office [section 241(b)(6)]; and

- ways of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)].

EAC’s Board of Advisors recommended that the agency make research on these matters a high priority.

FOCUS OF CURRENT RESEARCH

In September 2005, the Commission hired two consultants with expertise in this subject matter, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, to:

- develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;

- perform background research (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;

- establish a project working group, in consultation with EAC, composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation;

- provide the description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation and the results of the preliminary research to the working group, and convene the working group to discuss potential avenues for future EAC research on this topic; and

- produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future research, if any;

As of the date of this report, the consultants have drafted a definition of election fraud, reviewed relevant literature and reports, interviewed persons from government and private sectors with subject matter expertise, analyzed news reports of alleged election fraud, reviewed case law, and established a project working group.
DEFINITION OF ELECTION FRAUD

The consultants drafted a definition of election fraud that includes numerous aspects of voting fraud (including voter intimidation, which is considered a subset of voting fraud) and voter registration fraud, but excludes campaign finance violations and election administration mistakes. This draft will be discussed and probably refined by the project working group, which is scheduled to convene on May 18, 2006.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The consultants found many reports and books that describe anecdotes and draw broad conclusions from a large array of incidents. They found little research that is truly systematic or scientific. The most systematic look at fraud appears to be the report written by Lori Minnite, entitled “Securing the Vote: An Analysis of Election Fraud”. The most systematic look at voter intimidation appears to be the report by Laughlin McDonald, entitled “The New Poll Tax”. The consultants found that books written about this subject all seem to have a political bias and a pre-existing agenda that makes them somewhat less valuable.

Moreover, the consultants found that reports and books make allegations but, perhaps by their nature, have little follow up. As a result, it is difficult to know when something has remained in the stage of being an allegation and gone no further, or progressed to the point of being investigated or prosecuted or in any other way proven to be valid by an independent, neutral entity. This is true, for example, with respect to allegations of voter intimidation by civil rights organizations, and, with respect to fraud, John Fund’s frequently cited book, “Stealing Elections”.

Consultants found that researchers agree that measuring something like the incidence of fraud and intimidation in a scientifically legitimate way is extremely difficult from a methodological perspective and would require resources beyond the means of most social and political scientists. As a result, there is much more written on this topic by advocacy groups than social scientists.

Other items of note:

- There is as much evidence, and as much concern, about structural forms of disenfranchisement as about intentional abuse of the system. These include felon disenfranchisement, poor maintenance of databases and identification requirements.

- There is tremendous disagreement about the extent to which polling place fraud, e.g. double voting, intentional felon voting, noncitizen voting, is a serious problem. On balance, more researchers find it to be less of a problem than is commonly described in the political debate; but some reports say it is a major problem, albeit hard to identify.
There is substantial concern across the board about absentee balloting and the opportunity it presents for fraud.

Federal law governing election fraud and intimidation is varied and complex and yet may nonetheless be insufficient or subject to too many limitations to be as effective as it might be.

Deceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004.

Voter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities, although the American Center for Voting Rights uniquely alleges it is focused on Republicans.

**Recommendations**

The consultants recommend that subsequent EAC research include a follow up study of allegations made in reports, books and newspaper articles. They also suggest that the research should focus on filling the gap between the lack of reports based on methodical studies by social or political scientists and the numerous, but less scientific, reports published by advocacy groups.

**INTERVIEWS**

The consultants jointly selected experts from the public and private sector for interviews. The consultants' analysis of their discussions with these members of the legal, election official, advocacy, and academic communities follows.

**Common Themes**

- There is virtually universal agreement that absentee ballot fraud is the biggest problem, with vote buying and registration fraud coming in after that. The vote buying often comes in the form of payment for absentee ballots, although not always. Some absentee ballot fraud is part of an organized effort; some is by individuals, who sometimes are not even aware that what they are doing is illegal. Voter registration fraud seems to take the form of people signing up with false names. Registration fraud seems to be most common where people doing the registration were paid by the signature.

- There is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud, or at least much less than is claimed, including voter impersonation, "dead" voters, noncitizen voting and felon voters. Those few who believe it occurs often enough to be a concern say that it is impossible to show the extent to which it happens, but do point to instances in the press of such incidents. Most people believe that false registration forms have not resulted in polling place fraud,
although it may create the perception that vote fraud is possible. Those who believe there is more polling place fraud than reported/investigated/prosecuted believe that registration fraud does lead to fraudulent votes. Jason Torchinsky from the American Center for Voting Rights is the only interviewee who believes that polling place fraud is widespread and among the most significant problems in the system.

- Abuse of challenger laws and abusive challengers seem to be the biggest intimidation/suppression concerns, and many of those interviewed assert that the new identification requirements are the modern version of voter intimidation and suppression. However there is evidence of some continued outright intimidation and suppression, especially in some Native American communities. A number of people also raise the problem of poll workers engaging in harassment of minority voters. Other activities commonly raised were the issue of polling places being moved at the last moment, unequal distribution of voting machines, videotaping of voters at the polls, and targeted misinformation campaigns.

- Several people indicate that, for various reasons, DOJ is bringing fewer voter intimidation and suppression cases now, and has increased its focus on matters such as noncitizen voting, double voting, and felon voting. Interviews with DOJ personnel indicate that the Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, focuses on systemic patterns of malfeasance in this area. While the Election Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, continues to maintain an aggressive pursuit of systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process (including voter suppression), it also has increased prosecutions of individual instances of felon, alien, and double voting.

- The problem of badly kept voter registration lists, with both ineligible voters remaining on the rolls and eligible voters being taken off, remains a common concern. A few people are also troubled by voters being on registration lists in two states. They said that there was no evidence that this had led to double voting, but it opens the door to the possibility. There is great hope that full implementation of the new requirements of HAVA – done well, a major caveat – will reduce this problem dramatically.

**Common Recommendations:**

- Many of those interviewed recommend better poll worker training as the best way to improve the process; a few also recommended longer voting times or voting on days other than election day (such as weekends) but fewer polling places so only the best poll workers would be employed.

- Many interviewed support stronger criminal laws and increased enforcement of existing laws with respect to both fraud and intimidation. Advocates from across the spectrum expressed frustration with the failure of the Department of Justice to pursue complaints.
With respect to DOJ’s Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, John Tanner indicated that fewer cases are being brought because fewer are warranted – it has become increasingly difficult to know when allegations of intimidation and suppression are credible since it depends on one’s definition of intimidation, and because both parties are doing it. Moreover prior enforcement of the laws has now changed the entire landscape – race based problems are rare now. Although challenges based on race and unequal implementation of identification rules would be actionable, Mr. Tanner was unaware of such situations actually occurring and his office has not pursued any such cases.

Craig Donsanto of DOJ’s Election Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, says that while the number of election fraud related complaints have not gone up since 2002, nor has the proportion of legitimate to illegitimate claims of fraud, the number of cases DOJ is investigating and the number of indictments his office is pursuing are both up dramatically. Since 2002, in addition to pursuing systematic election corruption schemes, DOJ has brought more cases against alien voters, felon voters and double voters than ever before. Mr. Donsanto would like more resources so that his agency can do more and would like to have laws that make it easier for the federal government to assume jurisdiction over voter fraud cases.

- A couple of interviewees recommend a new law that would make it easier to criminally prosecute people for intimidation even when there is not racial animus.
- Several advocate expanded monitoring of the polls, including some associated with the Department of Justice.
- Almost everyone hopes that administrators will maximize the potential of statewide voter registration databases to prevent fraud.
- Challenge laws, both with respect to pre-election day challenges and challengers at the polls, need to be revised by all states to ensure they are not used for purposes of wrongful disenfranchisement and harassment.
- Several people advocate passage of Senator Barak Obama’s “deceptive practices” bill.
- There is a split on whether it would be helpful to have nonpartisan election officials – some indicated they thought even if elections officials are elected as non partisan officials, they will carry out their duties in biased ways nonetheless. However, most agree that elections officials pursuing partisan agendas are a problem that must be addressed in some fashion. Suggestions included moving election responsibilities out of the secretary of states’ office; increasing transparency in the process; and enacting conflict of interest rules.
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- A few recommend returning to allowing use of absentee ballots “for cause” only if it were politically feasible.

- A few recommend enacting a national identification card, including Pat Rogers, an attorney in New Mexico, and Jason Torchinsky from ACVR, who advocates the proposal in the Carter-Baker Commission Report.

- A couple of interviewees indicated the need for clear standards for the distribution of voting machines

NEWS ARTICLES

Consultants conducted a Nexis search of related news articles published between January 1, 2001 and January 1, 2006. A systematic, numerical analysis of the data collected during this review is currently being prepared. What follows is an overview of these articles provided by the consultants.

Absentee Ballots

According to press reports, absentee ballots are abused in a variety of ways:

- Campaign workers, candidates and others coerce the voting choices of vulnerable populations, usually elderly voters.

- Workers for groups and individuals have attempted to vote absentee in the names of the deceased.

- Workers for groups, campaign workers and individuals have attempted to forge the names of other voters on absentee ballot requests and absentee ballots and thus vote multiple times.

It is unclear how often actual convictions result from these activities (a handful of articles indicate convictions and guilty pleas), but this is an area in which there have been a substantial number of official investigations and actual charges filed, according to news reports where such information is available. A few of the allegations became part of civil court proceedings contesting the outcome of the election.

While absentee fraud allegations turn up throughout the country, a few states have had several such cases. Especially of note are Indiana, New Jersey, South Dakota, and most particularly, Texas. Interestingly, there were no articles regarding Oregon, where the entire system is vote by mail.
Voter Registration Fraud

According to press reports, the following types of allegations of voter registration fraud are most common:

- Registering in the name of dead people;
- Fake names and other information on voter registration forms;
- Illegitimate addresses used on voter registration forms;
- Voters being tricked into registering for a particular party under false pretenses; and
- Destruction of voter registration forms depending on the party the voter registered with.

There was only one self evident instance of a noncitizen registering to vote. Many of the instances reported included official investigations and charges filed, but few actual convictions, at least from the news reporting. There have been multiple reports of registration fraud in California, Colorado, Florida, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Voter Intimidation and Suppression

This is the area which had the most articles, in part because there were so many allegations of intimidation and suppression during the 2004 election. Most of these remained allegations and no criminal investigation or prosecution ensued. Some of the cases did end up in civil litigation.

This is not to say that these alleged activities were confined to 2004 – there were several allegations made during every year studied. Most notable were the high number of allegations of voter intimidation and harassment reported during the 2003 Philadelphia mayoral race.

A very high number of the articles were about the issue of challenges to voters’ registration status and challengers at the polling places. There were many allegations that planned challenge activities were targeted at minority communities. Some of the challenges were concentrated in immigrant communities.

However, the tactics alleged varied greatly. The types of activities discussed also include the following:

- Photographing or videotaping voters coming out of polling places;
- Improper demands for identification;
• Poll watchers harassing voters;
• Poll workers being hostile to or aggressively challenging voters;
• Disproportionate police presence;
• Poll watchers wearing clothes with messages that seemed intended to intimidate; and
• Insufficient voting machines and unmanageably long lines.

Although the incidents reported on occurred everywhere, not surprisingly, many came from “battleground” states. There were several such reports out of Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

“Dead Voters and Multiple Voting”

There were a high number of articles about people voting in the names of the dead and voting more than once. Many of these articles were marked by allegations of big numbers of people committing these frauds, and relatively few of these allegations turning out to be accurate according to investigations by the newspapers themselves, elections officials, and criminal investigators. Often the problem turned out to be a result of administrative error, poll workers mis-marking voter lists, a flawed registration list and/or errors made in the attempt to match names of voters on the list with the names of the people who voted. In a good number of cases, there were allegations that charges of double voting by political leaders were an effort to scare people away from the voting process.

Nonetheless there were a few cases of people actually being charged and/or convicted for these kinds of activities. Most of the cases involved a person voting both by absentee ballot and in person. A few instances involved people voting both during early voting and on Election Day, which calls into question the proper marking and maintenance of the voting lists. In many instances, the person charged claimed not to have voted twice on purpose. A very small handful of cases involved a voter voting in more than one county and there was one substantiated case involving a person voting in more than one state. Other instances in which such efforts were alleged were disproved by officials.

In the case of voting in the name of a dead person, the problem lay in the voter registration list not being properly maintained, i.e. the person was still on the registration list as eligible to vote, and a person took criminal advantage of that. In total, the San Francisco Chronicle found five such cases in March 2004; the AP cited a newspaper analysis of five such persons in an Indiana primary in May 2004; and a senate committee found two people to have voted in the names of the dead in 2005.
As usual, there were a disproportionate number of such articles coming out of Florida. Notably, there were three articles out of Oregon, which has one hundred percent vote-by-mail.

Vote Buying

There were a surprising number of articles about vote buying cases. A few of these instances involved long-time investigations concentrated in three states (Illinois, Kentucky, and West Virginia). There were more official investigations, indictments and convictions/pleas in this area.

Deceptive Practices

In 2004 there were numerous reports of intentional disinformation about voting eligibility and the voting process meant to confuse voters about their rights and when and where to vote. Misinformation came in the form of flyers, phone calls, letters, and even people going door to door. Many of the efforts were reportedly targeted at minority communities. A disproportionate number of them came from key battleground states, particularly Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. From the news reports found, only one of these instances was officially investigated, the case in Oregon involving the destruction of completed voter registration applications. There were no reports of prosecutions or any other legal proceeding.

Non-citizen Voting

There were surprisingly few articles regarding noncitizen registration and voting – just seven all together, in seven different states across the country. They were also evenly split between allegations of noncitizens registering and noncitizens voting. In one case, charges were filed against ten individuals. In another case, a judge in a civil suit found there was illegal noncitizen voting. Three instances prompted official investigations. Two cases, from this Nexis search, remained just allegations of noncitizen voting.

Felon Voting

Although there were only thirteen cases of felon voting, some of them involved large numbers of voters. Most notably, of course, are the cases that came to light in the Washington gubernatorial election contest (see Washington summary) and in Wisconsin (see Wisconsin summary). In several states, the main problem was the large number of ineligible felons that remained on the voting list.

Election Official Fraud

In most of the cases in which fraud by elections officials is suspected or alleged, it is difficult to determine whether it is incompetence or a crime. There are several cases of ballots gone missing, ballots unaccounted for and ballots ending up in a worker's possession. In two cases workers were said to have changed peoples' votes. The one
instance in which widespread ballot box stuffing by elections workers was alleged was in Washington State. The judge in the civil trial of that election contest did not find that elections workers had committed fraud. Four of the cases are from Texas.

**Recommendation**

The consultants recommend that subsequent EAC research should include a Nexis search that specifically attempts to follow up on the cases for which no resolution is evident from this particular initial search.

**CASE LAW RESEARCH**

After reviewing over 40,000 cases from 2000 to the present, the majority of which came from appeals courts, the consultants found comparatively few applicable to this study. Of those that were applicable, the consultants found that no apparent thematic pattern emerges. However, it appears to them that the greatest areas of fraud and intimidation have shifted from past patterns of stealing votes to present problems with voter registration, voter identification, the proper delivery and counting of absentee and overseas ballots, provisional voting, vote buying, and challenges to felon eligibility.

**Recommendation**

Because so few cases provided a picture of these current problems, consultants suggest that subsequent EAC research include a review of state trial-level decisions.

**PROJECT WORKING GROUP**

Consultants and EAC worked together to select members for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group that included election officials and representatives of advocacy groups and the legal community who have an interest and expertise in the subject matter. (See Attachment A for a list of members.) The working group is scheduled to convene at EAC offices on May 18, 2006 to consider the results of the preliminary research and to offer ideas for future EAC activities concerning this subject.

**FINAL REPORT**

After convening the project working group, the consultants will draft a final report summarizing the results of their research and the working group deliberations. This report will include recommendations for future EAC research related to this subject matter. The draft report will be reviewed by EAC and, after obtaining any clarifications or corrections deemed necessary, will be made available to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors for review and comment. Following this, a final report will be prepared.
Attachment A

**Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project Working Group**

**The Honorable Todd Rokita**
Indiana Secretary of State  
Member, EAC Standards Board and the Executive Board of the Standards Board

**Kathy Rogers**
Georgia Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State  
Member, EAC Standards Board

**J.R. Perez**
Guadalupe County Elections Administrator, TX

**Barbara Arnwine**
Executive Director, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law  
Leader of Election Protection Coalition  
*(To be represented at May 18, 2006 meeting by Jon M. Greenbaum, Director of the Voting Rights Project for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law)*

**Robert Bauer**
Chair of the Political Law Practice at the law firm of Perkins Coie, DC  
National Counsel for Voter Protection, Democratic National Committee

**Benjamin L. Ginsberg**
Partner, Patton Boggs LLP  
Counsel to national Republican campaign committees and Republican candidates

**Mark (Thor) Hearne II**
Partner-Member, Lathrop & Gage, St Louis, MO  
National Counsel to the American Center for Voting Rights

**Barry Weinberg**
Former Deputy Chief and Acting Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

**EAC Invited Technical Advisor:**

**Craig Donsanto**
Director, Election Crimes Branch, U.S. Department of Justice
U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
STANDARDS BOARD MEETING

Taken at the Hamilton Crown Plaza Hotel
1001 14th Street, Northwest
Washington, D.C.

Taken on the date of:
Tuesday, May 23, 2006

Start time: 10:00 o'clock, a.m.

AGENDA:

1 Brief Welcoming Remarks    
   Commissioner Ray Martinez

2 EAC Staff Presentations:

3 Legal on-line Information

4 Clearinghouse     
   Julie Hodgkins

5 Design for Democracy      
   Karen Lynn-Dyson
MR. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, everybody.

Please continue with your lunch. We are going to get started with the program. And what I am going to do for a quick two or three minutes is just to lay the groundwork if you will and try to let you all know what we are going to attempt to accomplish over the next couple of days. And give you an idea as to what issues we hope to put in front of you et. Cetera.

Again I am Ray Martinez. I am a Commissioner with the U.S. Elections Assistance Commission. I do want you to recognize my esteemed colleague the former Secretary of State of the great State of Colorado and now Commissioner with EAC, Betty Davidson. Madame
Commissioner if you will stand up (Applause).

What we hope to accomplish—well, we are here to discuss and get advice, the EAC, to get advice from our Statutory Advisory Boards. We have two main Statutory Advisory Boards created by (inaudible) which is our government statute. One is the Board of Advisors which is meeting up on the second floor and is conducting concurrent meetings doing and hearing exactly the same issues that you all will be hearing about as well.

We have a presenter upstairs and as soon as they are done we switch places and we will run concurrent agenda with the Board of Advisors up stairs.

And of course our second important Advisory Board committee is this great body right here and that is the 110 Member Standards Board.

What we have done in preparing your agenda for this particular meeting is different from what we did in Denver last September. In Denver last September we had a very important issue that we had to put before our two Statutory Advisory Boards and the Board of Advisors met separately for that meeting in a different location.

What we did is focus on the voluntary voting system guidelines back in Denver back in September of last year. We broke up into break out sessions on the various aspects of the BBSG, security,
accessibility human factors et cetera. We had a very productive meeting about the voluntary voting system guidelines.

For this particular meeting what you have is an agenda full of Commissions and working EAC research projects. Just about our full research agenda will be presented to you throughout the next two days. And the reason for us to do that is because the EAC--a very important function of the EAC in addition to working as your full partner in implementing the various requirements in HAVA will also be a national clearing house for best practices on election administration. And to be able to fully play and fulfill that role as an agency it is incumbent upon us to commission objective and professional and sound research so we can fully inform our partners in the election community and in the advocacy community, all our stakeholders as to what we find our best practices in election administration.

So you will hear a series of presentations that begin almost immediately as soon as I get off the podium here. They will start to tell you here are the things that we are working. And the goal that we want to try to accomplish in the next day and a half is to get your candid advice of what we are working on.
strongly encourage as much feedback, whether they are positive or challenging. We want to get a sense of direction on the projects we are going to be presenting to you over the next day and a half. So we want to encourage your candid interaction as you hear these presentations and we need to get fully informed as to the direction that we are headed.

So the goal of this meeting is to give you a full briefing of all of our research projects we are working on. If you look at the agenda you will see at the end of the next day and a half, meaning tomorrow afternoon, you will have a two block. And that block can be extended even further if necessary for a plenary session time where you will be able to talk among yourselves as members of the Standards Board and to discuss what you heard from the EAC and if necessary if it is so desired pass resolutions and speak formally as a Standards Board, as an Advisory Board as to your collective opinion about the work that we are doing here.

We truly value the feedback we get from all of you. We don't just meet in a vacuum. I see so many
faces out in this room that we at the EAC call on just about every day for advice and for input.

So it is a very unique situation for us to have so many of you that we call upon almost daily to have you all collectively in the same room and to be able to draw from your vast experience and expertise for the next day and a half. We feel very fortunate to have you here. We are very thankful that you have traveled a great distance for many of you to spend the next day and a half with us. Thank you in advance.

So with that let me say I do need to announce anybody that needs to have an interpreter or signage can come and sit in the front row or we will make better accommodations for you to have a better view of the interpreter. This meeting is open to the public as have all of our Standards Board meetings have been. So there is a section in the back where non Standards Board Members are present. However Q and A and actual interaction is limited to the Standards Board members who are present. The members of the public who are here may observe but they may not ask questions or engage in any of the discussions or
presentations. It is strictly for the members of the Standards Board.

After we do some quick presentations here for the remainder of our lunch hour this meeting will be turned over to the members of your executive board, meaning your acting chair, Peggy Nighswonger and her colleagues on the Executive Board, will then come up to the head table and begin to work you through the agenda and solicit your feedback.

So with that I will go ahead and ask our first presenter, our current General Counsel, Julie Thompson Hodgkins to come up and give us a brief presentation on our Legal Resources web page. After that we will have three more presentations. And then we will take a break and go into your first Plenary Session. Julie, if you will come up, please.

MS. THOMPSON-HODGKINS: Thank you Mr. Martinez and welcome everyone to Washington D.C. I am so pleased to be the first presenter. To be able to talk about, well, what is a small project for EAC, but one that I hope will bring a lot of value to the election.

Just to briefly give you a little insight
into this project I remember the days back when I was a State Election Administrator being general counsel for the Department of Elections in Louisiana thinking it really would be nice to have one source to be able to go to take a look at all of the laws, all of the regulations, all of the cases country wide that dealt with elections.

I remember those days when you got frantic calls from the Legislature wanting to know how another state dealt with provisional voting or casting ballots or absentee voting or what have you and wishing I had a resource.

Actually at the Denver meeting I took a little poll of a few of you asking what you would think about EAC putting together this kind of resource. And it got some support. I brought it to the Commissioners and said, you know, hey what do you think about this? And they thought it was a good idea to.

So what we are doing is putting together a website to provide access for all of you, all the members of the public, to legal materials related to elections. It will provide you with up to date information, current statues, current cases, and in a format that is user friendly.

We decided to start this project with a
rather simple focus and that is State and Federal elections. Anything from State Constitutions, Federal Constitutions, Federal law, such as Help America Vote Act, and NVRA, The Voting Rights Act. Certainly the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped, ADA and the rehab act. Anything that we could think of either in the Federal or State arena in terms of Legislation that would impact the elections process.

We are also going to have State Statutes, Constitutions, Administrative Rules and Regs. They will be categorized by state and by topical area. So if you're interested in knowing how California deals with provisional voting you can go to California and take a look at Provisional Voting Statutes or cases. The same thing with voting equipment and various other categories.

However if you are looking for a broader search you will also be able to key in the terms that you're interested in finding and take a look across all of the States to see a sort of panorama of how that particular topic is dealt with.

As far as the cases are concerned we asked our contractor to summarize the cases for you at the beginning so that you didn't have to read the whole
case in order to determine whether or not it was
something that really applied to your particular
situation. You will also have a link to the full text
of that decision. We started with a narrow focus and
that is State and Federal elections particularly Help
America Vote Act and the NVRA, and those issues which
would be the most important to you guys as you are
implementing HAVA.

As far as the time line is concerned on this
project our contractor is just about finished
identifying all of the resources that we need to be
contained in the data base. They are in the process of
summarizing those cases. And we will be populating that
data base.

I am thrilled actually today to be able to
give you a little bit of a preview of the data base. I
hope you guys can see this. The text is a little small.

But these are some screen shots that we have. And this
a look into the actual key word search where you would
be able to enter in for instance: "Cast Ballot". And
pull up cases, statutes, regulations that deal with how
various different states are casting ballots. You can
also of course, as I told you before, search by
category or by state. So there will be a browsing
function there that you can go to those into a drop
down menu and choose from various different sources.

And this is sort of an example of what the results page would look like. The information that you will be needing.

We are very excited about this. I hope that you guys share the excitement and hope this will be a great resource for you. This is another little screen shot here of browsing a particular record for a single state.

If you have any questions, comments anything that I can answer right now I would be happy to take questions.

MS. LYNN BAILEY: (Georgia) when do you anticipate that project will be available for the public.

MS. THOMPSON-HODGKINS: I believe the tract that the contractor is on right now we should have this up by mid July. They are well into identifying all of the resources. There are quite a number of cases that they have summarized. But we try to ask them to do that on a priority bases, the newest cases first so that we can get that information out to you in that time frame.

BRAD CLARK: (California) Will this be available to a regular EAC website? Will there be a be
a link to that legal resources.

MS. THOMPSON-HODGKINS: That is correct. There will be a link to Legal Resources Clearing House or Legal resources. You will be able to just go get that right off the EAC page.

The court Reporter has asked me to tell those who are speaking to identify yourselves so we will know who is speaking. Thank you so much for this opportunity to come and talk to you about this. I will be around for the next day and a half. So if any other questions come up with regard to Legal Resource Clearing House or in regard to anything else please do not hesitate to come and find me.

MR. MARTINEZ: I think Julie actually makes a good point at the end. And that is our staff will be around for the next couple of days. The presentations that you're hearing today at lunch are going to be kind of rushed because we are trying to get you as much information as we can. And we are starting with this lunch hour. But after the lunch hour the presentations that you will have will be issue specific. You will not not have four in a one hour block of time. There will be a time when you will get a ten or fifteen minute presentation with about thirty to forty minutes to ask questions on a particular issue.
So these are the ones we thought we could do rather quickly. But still even so we encourage you to ask to ask questions even if it means we need to readjust our agenda this afternoon.

Okay. Our next presenter-- I am going to ask Karen Lynn-Dyson who is our research manager. Karen manages all of our research agenda. And Karen, why don't you come on up to the microphone if you don't mind. And Karen will introduce our next presenter who will give a very quick, brief, presentation. This project is on the work that we are doing to redesign or to offer more user friendly designs for various products that our presenter will explain to you. Karen come on up.

MS. KAREN LYNN-DYSON: I just want to reiterate what Commission Martinez said in terms of my availability to everyone here over the next couple of days. Am the individual responsible for oversight for all of the agencies research works and projects. I look forward very much to hearing from you all, your concerns, you issues, things you would like to see us addressing or addressing in more detail.

We have with us today Rick Grafe who is the CEO of the American Institute of Graphic Art. This
project which the Elections Assistance Commission is contracted for is one that Commissioner Martinez indicated where we are trying to provide to you all a series of best practices on ballot design and on signage. And with these best practices and these exhibits, if you will, of possibilities for approaches to ballot design and polling place signage we will take into consideration literacy, readability, usability alternate languages, braille, audio accessibility and ADA compliance.

The American Institute of Graphic Art is the professional association of design. It has some 17,000 designers working in a variety of communication media. And they through their Design for Democracy which is their non profit affiliate can assist you all, government agencies, in finding national or local professional designers and researchers who can help you on a for hire basis to implement some of these designs.

So with that very brief introduction I am going to Mr. Grafe Korfe go ahead and describe to you all the work they have been doing for the EAC on this contract.

DESIGN FOR DEMOCRACY

MR. RICK KORFE:
All right. Thank you Karen. Again I am Rick Grafe sic. I want to thank you, Karen and also Commissioner Martinez. And I think some of the comments that he made are so very critical to what we want to share with you. That is he talked about the importance of best practices; he talked about the importance of research; and he talked about how critical input is. And I think all of those are reflected in what we are trying to share with you today.

This is going to be very brief. And one of the reasons it is going to be brief is that this isn't really about you listening to me it is really about our me listening to you.

Our project is effective design in election administration (sic) and as Karen pointed out Sign for Democracy is an initiative for AIGA which has been around since 1999.

It eventually focused on clear communication and more thoughtful experiences in public sphere so we can trust in government and increase citizen participation.

The specific project we are working on is aimed at building expertise, or building from our expertise, experience and new research to create models.
for optical scan electronic ballots and also for polling place signage.

Now the exhibits we actually created are under Tab five in your binders. And I mention that because I am going to do something that is a little unusual in talking about design. And that is I am not going to show you the designs because what we really want to do is gain your input. And there is an opportunity for you to look at the work under tab five and get a sense of it. And also in a room right across the hall we have two staff people, user specialists and researchers who are there to gain your input on various of the exhibits that are over there.

So during the next day, well actually two days, we will have the room, again, right across the hall. There is Elizabeth Hare, our Project Director and Mary Kwan who is our experienced strategist and usability specialist strategist. And they both will be over there looking for your input on some the exhibits. The exhibits are things like this. And while they are all drafts the intention is to get your reaction so we can refine them.

I want to mention now a couple of things quickly about designers and try to disavow you of
1 certain preconceptions about about design. What we are 2 talking about here is not people in flip flops and long 3 pony tails who are trying to design this stuff. And we 4 are not talking about arrogant artists wearing all 5 black. What we are talking about are professionals who 6 can take an experience and define and break it down 7 into the small pieces that make an experience, like the 8 voting experience, like the election experience and 9 break it up into segments. And research how people 10 react to information and then craft a solution.

So what we are really talking about is a 11 process, a designing process, a way of thinking about a 12 problem and the election process itself.

We broke it down into identification, 13 orientation, instruction, action, is the voting part, 14 completion. And what you do is you look at the election 15 process and say what are all the pieces and how do 16 people relate to that.

And out of that what we are going to do is we 17 are going to propose to you guidelines that respect a 18 number of issues, that respects a number of issues. It 19 respects HAVA compliance; it will respect need to adapt
materials for local applications; it will always to
seek to find clarity and simplicity in what we are
doing. And it will also reflect the need to respond to
the technical requirements of voting equipment.
So right now our approach, and what happened
to our project, right now our approach will deal with
guidelines on the content, on what information is
really needed by people at various stages.
You will deal with the voting system
implication of course responding to the technical
issues. It will deal with layout systems, the way
people work through information. We know patterns that
are most effective. And we will share those with you as
well as issues of layout that reflect the needs of
different technical systems. And also principles of
design so that materials being adapted for the local
level there are certain principles that you will know
to follow.
What you see here are twelve stages in the
design process. And I need to mention this again to
point out that when you are dealing with a designer you
shouldn't just expect them to design a ballot.
You should deal with designers who are actually asking you more about the process of design. And the issues that are highlighted, five and six, gather information and develop prototype ideas is a stage that we are at. With that, that is an important stage.

We need to understand how people need, use information. What information is needed and then you develop prototypes which are like the draft examples you will see across the hall and then you gain greater information.

This is one case were when we talk about testing we are not testing to figure out how well we have done. We are testing to inform what we do. So the idea here is that we have materials for you to react to and it is your reaction that is as critical as it is to what we bring to the project.

I know that for many dealing with this issue isn't traumatic but it is a tough one because ballots have been developed over the years and they have accommodated a huge amount of information, a huge amount of requirements that are very local. And most people in this room, and most people in most of the
elections systems, feel very strongly, they feel the
issues we are confronting are unique. And they are
concerned that all of the challenges they have already
faced be accommodated in the outcome.

Let me assure you that that is exactly why we
want to hear from you. Understanding what you bring
about, what is important, is actually critical for us
to be able to adapt to something that you can use
effectively at the local level.

One of the advantages of the work we have
done. One of the advantages of the work that we have
done our election design project team has already
worked with election officials in Cook County, Illinois
and the state of Oregon. And so in terms of the
testing process we have actually have not only the
kinds of test that we do in order to perform research,
to understand how people can best understand the issues
and answer the ballot. But also we have had field
testing and post election use. And we bring to the
project here not only that experience but also certain
things that are true of virtually any information
design issue.

And our objective here is useful usable
design. And our core team and what we bring to it,
among other things, in addition to that experience, we
bring what we know from other research in terms of how people use information. And we know that there are certain principles that we will share with you that regardless of how your design evolves that you need to keep in mind and that is the design is not because it makes things look pretty but because it makes things useful. It makes things usable. They are effective. They are clear, they are simple.

These are things like using clear capital letters; not center lining type; keep the number of type variations down; understand information hierarchy; and using graphics to help illustrate points. We will share those things. And that's where we start.

Then we have our own panel of experts and project advisors that advise us and become part of that process of testing. Are we making the right conclusion when we are coming us with certain solutions?

And the next critical aspect is all of you.

That's why we will be here for two days because we need to hear from you the issues that are most important to you and make sure we can accommodate them.

And then of course there are the voters as well. We look to them and their response in two ways. One is through putting together some test situations
with prototypical or typical voters in advance and also
the outcomes of actual use.

The concept we are taking here is we want to
create a design that is simple enough to address
exceptional means. And by dealing with the needs at the
extremes, the exceptional needs, and making something
simple and clear for them we believe we will meet
everyone's requirements.

So in this next round of testing that we do
we are going to include people from 18 to 21 years of
age, 65 to 80 and address the kind of issues that Karen
pointed are the object of the issues and that is
dealing with literacy issues, readability, usability,
alternate languages, braille and audio accessibility
and ADA compliance. And then in addition we will try to
see what the requirements are for localization, for low

experience levels and also for cultural obstacles.

Ultimately again the outcome will be models that are
other compliant, capable for local variability, easy to
implement and sensitive to technical requirements.

The next stage will be some tests that we
will do in the field, task based usability testing. We
plane to do it on the east coast, midwest and west
coast. And certainly if any of you want to be involved
in this be sure to let Elizabeth or Mary know because
we have not selected sights yet. And the testing will be putting together, presumably, test labs and bring in volunteers to actually use the information.

I mention we will be in the room across the hall in the McPhearson Square Room, oh, I guess tomorrow is in the Board Room, it is not across the hall. So in the McPhearson Square Room, all day today until 6 o'clock. And tomorrow it will be in the Board Room which is also on this level Board Room one I believe from 10 a.m., to 6 p.m. And you can also respond and even if it is not responding to what you see sharing with us your concerns.

Now what is this? We also want to get your feed back on line. But this is one of those slides from hell. You know you try to come up with a simple solution, especially for designers who talk about simplicity. You try to come up with a simple solution and you get a URL that no one can remember. So we will skip that. We are looking for a survey monkey to do another job.

Next, you can use this link on the Home page of Design for Democracy.org/participate URL there is a link of that on line survey which is going to be available through the end of the month for any of your concerns.
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comments on any materials in Tab 5. And again: Design
for Democracy.org/participate. And that will be up for
ten more days, until the end of the month to gather
your comments.

There are the names of Mary and Elizabeth who
we be here the next two says seeking your input. And we
certainly welcome it in any way or form you choose to
get it to us. But it is critical for us to hear from
all of you on this in order to accommodate your needs.

Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any questions on this

particular presentation? Okay. Great thank you.

It occurs to me as I was listening to that
presentation that perhaps this room could have been
designed a little better for our meeting. Howard is
that you behind the pillar? I think so. So our
apologies for columns that are blocking the view, not
that you want to see us up here anyway. But hopefully
you can hear us back there, Howard.

What we want to do next, the final
presentation both of this presentations on Public
Access Portals and Spanish and Asian Language Working
Groups that we have assembled will be presented by
Edgardo Cortes who is one of our research specialists
at the EAC. He will talk to you very quickly about
these issues and give you a chance to ask questions.

I also want to say about the previous presentation we reached our to Design for Democracy and to pull together best practices on ballot design and polling place signage et cetera. Based upon the input and urging from many of you out there we actually got a lot of feedback from, in particular, our Board of Advisors, upstairs, that this was a useful project for us to do with a lot of positive feedback from election officials who had worked with Design for Democracy. And we felt they were an important group to bring in. Have them do some templates and some best practice documents that we could put out for your consumption to see if you want to follow up with any of their work. And that is why you heard that presentation.

Okay. The following two presentations very quickly, Edgardo Cortes with the EAC staff:

PUBLIC ACCESS PORTALS & SPANISH & ASIAN LANGUAGE WORKING GROUPS.

MR. CORTES:

Thank you Mr. Vice Chairman. Give me just a
minute to set this up.

Good afternoon, everyone, my name is Edgardo Cortes. I have been with EAC since late July of last year. Prior to that I used to run a National Voter Registration campaign that was funded by the government of Puerto Rico as well as did some political consulting work for a couple of campaigns around the country. Probably working with Peggy Sims dealing with all the requirement payments issues, the HAVA funding questions that come in, the College Board Approval Programs, any NVRA issues that come up and so anything I am Peggy's backup for that. So a lot of stuff you send in to us she and I work on getting your responses to.

First thing I am going to talk about is the Public Access Portal Project that we have been working on since last fall. We awarded a contract to Publius.org to conduct a study which will examine and create a best practices document about Public Access Portals. Publius is a non partisan, non profit 501c3 based out of Detroit Michigan. They have been in existence for about ten years now. And actually got their start setting up an information web site like this for the state of Michigan.
The methods up here is essentially from the research that is ongoing, it is kind of a color coded map as to what sorts of web sites by available by state. You can see some of them have state wide sites available. Some just have independent jurisdictions, half sites. Some are county based. And you can also see there are quite a few states that don't have anything set up so far. So those are kind of-- in terms of the research that is a visual representation of what they have looked at so far.

They have from September through December what they did was they went out and started doing an initial search of what web sites were out there and who is running them. And to this point they have identified and reviewed approximately 425 state, county and local web sites that provide information to voters. Of those 425 what they did was, starting in January, they started a more comprehensive look at a much smaller section of those, approximately fifty. What they have done is they are going in an ah, number one, going through the process of looking up information on the site, capturing what information is provided, how it is being provided all those sorts of things.
And then they have also conducted about 100 interviews so far, finance reviews with the administrator that run these sites, with the IG folks. And what they have done in terms of those 50 sites they really went out and got a variety of state, county and local web sites to look at. They focused on urban and rural web sites, you know various that were urban and rural. They looked at as much geographic diversity as possible so that the Best Practices Document that comes out in the end will address some of the regional differences that might exist in terms of how information is presented. And will look at the differences throughout the states.

A couple facts about the web site. The actual first source of these informational web sites actually date back to around 1996, when the Internet, the use was not very wide spread yet. And so they really advanced a lot between then and now.

In terms of their initial research one of the things that they have found to be the most popular function-- when we went into this we really thought that the big questions were people wanting the check their registrations status, their voter registration
status. And to know where their polling place was located.

That was one of the reasons we received this project, the kind of internal, initial research that we did to prepare to let this out a contractor indicated that those were the two big questions.

What we actually found is that aside from those, those are very important actually, but one of the things that draws people most to these sites are the sites that have candidate information and sample ballot information on the sites. Which is something they are taking a look at in terms of what ways that can be readily presented to folks. And what they found is that sites that have the usage increases dramatically once that information goes up closer to election time. Once those sites put that information up the usage goes up.

Another interesting thing that we were able to take a look at this year, and it is going into the final report actually, is Louisiana set up a web site to provide voter information to displaced voters. Folks that were displaced after Hurricane Katrina. And they
set up this web site so that those folks, prior to the special election in New Orleans, would be able to, from anywhere in the country, go in and access not only the information of, you know, the dates and everything, but were able to get information on the absentee ballot process, were able to download applications for absentee ballots and really provided a lot of information and was kept up to date. So Publius was actually able to, because of the timing of our project was actually able to look at from beginning to end this process and has spoken with folks in Louisiana about it. And that is one of the things we will be dealing with in the final report which we might be able to use in the future for other studies as well.

One of the things that may or may not surprise you is that number one there is a lot of interest at all levels for providing these sites. It is has really been an issue of resources up until now as to whether or not jurisdictions provide these sites and how advanced they are.

One of the things through the phone calls and interviews that they have done with existing sites is a
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lot of the smaller jurisdictions and the counties have been kind of stalling further development of these sites because there is a lot of concern out there about how the switch to a statewide voter registration list is going to impact states providing this information whether or not it is going to be done at a state level. And kind of remove the need for them to have it at the local level. So that is one of the concerns that has come up during the research as well.

One thing that shouldn't surprise anybody is there is no one promotion strategy for these sites that works. Every location that has them is different as to how they get the word out about them and how they draw people to those sites.

In terms of timing, just go give everybody an idea, they have been doing this research for a while now. They are hoping to-- we are hoping to have the draft document ready by mid to late summer. So July or August we are hoping to have a draft document available which we will-- I will work with the Commissioner to make sure that we are able to distribute that to both the Standards Board and the Board of Advisors for people to be able to look at it, give their feedback before it goes into the final version which we hope if
we can get the draft in mid summer and we are hoping that sometime in the early fall we will be able to have a final document out there.

In terms of the time line we realize it is an election year. We realize this information is going out in the fall. One of the things that we realized early on was that even last fall it was to the point where it was pretty much too late for states and jurisdictions to implement the suggestions that were going to come out of this in time to impact this year's elections. So what we are really hoping to get out of this document is that it will be available toward the end of this cycle so that once we get into next year and people start looking toward the '08 Presidential elections. And we have gotten past the HAVA deadlines and everybody's attention starts to shift this information will be out there so that states, and counties and local jurisdictions can take the information in here and be able to implement these sites with enough time to make them functional and work out all the bugs and everything before we move into the election year. So that's what we are looking at in terms of timelines for this project.

I will take questions about both of these after I finish the second topic.
SPANISH AND ASIAN LANGUAGES WORKING GROUPS.

Many of you know there have been a lot demographic changes in the country and a lot of-- particularly in the past decade there is a lot of jurisdictions that have sizeable populations that fall under Section 203 of Voting Rights Act, or who will soon be, and a lot of jurisdictions. And lot of jurisdictions that didn't before now have to provide information in alternative languages.

We have seen it and we realize the issues that come up in terms of jurisdictions that have never dealt with alternative languages or to some of the issues that come up and how can they implement this properly.

Prior to my getting here the work had already started on these projects. It was decided by the Commission that we should-- really what we should do is to bring together some working groups that consist of election administrators, advocacy organizations, different people that deal with the issues that come up and deal with them first hand and let us know what sort of research we can conduct that will help you in that
process.

HAVA Section 241, which is the section that talks about the studies of election administrations one of the things that it charges the EAC to do is conduct research on making information most convenient, accessible and easy to use for voters including voters with limited proficiency in the English language. So that is actually in HAVA. And one of our mandates is to go out there and find information to make it easier to provide or to administer elections using alternative languages.

The way we started out was last August we had the first meeting of the Spanish language working group. We had that at the EAC offices. And the reason we chose to deal with the Spanish language first is

number one it is largest alternative language that folks are dealing with. Most of the--- the majority of jurisdictions out there that deal with alternative languages have been dealing with Spanish. And that really has been because of the growing population size it has been an issue that a lot of knew jurisdictions have had to deal with. So we wanted to bring that group together and see what sort of things we could do. That was in early August.

The next group we decided to bring together
was a group to discuss access to different Asian languages. Under Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act there are actually five Asian languages, Asian and Pacific Islander languages that are covered and that certain jurisdictions have to provide information in those languages. That is Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese and Tadowlin (sic). So that working group we actually had at the end of April, so just about a month ago we brought that group together.

We are looking toward the future, hopefully sometime next year to be able to bring together a working group dealing with native American languages.

And that one is going to be really interesting because with a lot of languages we are talking about languages that have no written form, they are all spoken languages. And so that presents a whole additional set of issues when you're talking about administering elections and providing information in an alternative language that you can't write.

So basically what all three of these groups are meant to do is provide the EAC with, or help us in accessing what sort of language specific projects we can conduct as an agency.

Some of the things that have already come up
and that we are actually are working towards is number one creating translation dictionaries of election terminology to have a document that would provide a whole list of election terms and provide a translation from English to whatever the alternative language is. The first one we are working on is actually English to Spanish. And so we are also looking towards doing the five Asian languages.

And one of the biggest complaints we have gotten in terms of, and I am sure you have all heard, in terms of trying to provide this information is that the translation services that are out there aren't always the best. And when election information gets translated a lot of time it is a literal translation and the meaning is really lost when you translate it to the other language.

So we are hoping by providing this tool for election administrators it can help you all meet the needs of the communities that you are serving, and the electorate that you serve.

The other project that we actually are working and we hope to have ready by mid summer is providing a translation of the National Voter Registration form. We have the Spanish language version, the updated one already up on our website.
Both the English and the Spanish were recently updated. But the form hasn't been translated into the five Asian languages since the FEC first created the initial voter registration form. So it has been quite a while. And we are hoping to get that done fairly quickly so that those jurisdiction can have voter registration forms available in those languages later this year.

And then finally we are-- one of the roles of these groups is to provide us not only with the feedback but to help us prioritize. I mean there is all these questions all the time for different research projects that you all think would be useful. And by bringing these groups together we are hoping to establish some sort of priority for what we can do short term to get some immediate assistance out there and then look at what we can do long term in terms of these issues.

So that is pretty much what the language groups are doing. So I can take some questions.

MR. MARTINEZ: We can move very quickly for some questions or comments from anybody out there? Any questions or comments about Public Access Portals or the working groups we have assembled, Secretary Kidmeyer.
SECRETARY KIDMEYER: A question in regards to dialects how do you handle dialects even though it is the same language?

MR. CORTES: That is actually one of the things we spent a lot of time on actually during both working groups. The Spanish language translations are the first ones we are working on so I can tell you a little bit about how we are going to handle that.

One of the suggestions we had was to bring together a group of language experts, academics to review the work we are doing in terms of translation. But the other thing that we are doing is we are going to look at what the regional differences are and provide alternative terms to reference the same thing.

For instance the word ballot is translated into Spanish is different if you go to Florida if you go to New York, if you go to California. They all use different terms for that. In the instances were we can provide some sort of standard translation term that everybody understands or alternatively for those were that doesn't exist to provide, you know, multiples translations so that depending on where you're at you can look and see what sort of populations you are coming from.

A lot has to do with country of origin. So
providing that information you will be able to go to the list and say well my jurisdiction has a very large Puerto Rican population this is probably the translation form I should use.

MR. MARTINEZ: Other questions please? Yes, John.

JOHN LINDBACK: It is a really basic question. I don't understand the difference between a Public Access Portal and conventional website. Because we have had a ton of information out there on a conventional website. When you talk Public Access Portals what do you mean exactly?

MR. CORTES: It is essentially a voter information website. And what they are looking at is a website were you can go in and get information as far as registration status. It is a polling state locations, candidate information, all those very specific election information.

We do realize that most states do have basic sites, whether it is the Chief Election Officer or the local jurisdictions that have polling place hours and those things. We are really looking at sites that open further and are more interactive in terms of the information that people can pull from them.
MR. MARTINEZ: And some states, I think, have more experience in putting forth what is regarded as Public Access Portals. I am looking at Sarah Ball Johnson who is right next to you because I think Kentucky is one of the states that has been something like this for a while. She is whispering to you right now.

I broke my own rule. When you raise your hand to speak if you can introduce yourself, state your name for the court reporter. And I apologize, Secretary Mary Kiffmeyer and John Lindback from Oregon. Mary Kiffmeyer from Minnesota.

Any other questions or comments on anything that was presented, please.

Okay. Edgardo, thank you very much. I appreciate your work.

Again as a quick background what we are presenting to you over the next day and a half, and what we just started with the first four presentations are research projects that are grounded in some place in our government statute, within HAVA.

We are either wearing a hat of producing a
national clearing house of best practices; or we are wearing a hat of having to produce voluntary guidance to help clarify title free requirements. So there are different hats that the EAC will wear statutorily that when we wear the hat we want to wear it in the manner that is consistent with the advice that we get from our statutory boards, and that is you. Again what we do proactively is to try to reach out to all of you, as many as we can individually, throughout the course of our fiscal year, asking you to participate in working groups, many of you have done so, seeking your advice through our fiscal year. We have a chance to get you all in one room once or twice a year to put it all in front of you and solicit your candid feedback. So again I encourage your questions. And it doesn't have to happen in this hour. We can continue this conversation throughout the duration of the next day and a half I am going to turn the mic over, after the break, to your Executive Board and they will commence the official gavel of your Standards Board Meeting. So thank you very much for being here once.
Thank you for what I know will be a productive day and a half. The four Commissioners will be in and out because we have the Board of Advisors going on simultaneously two floors above you we will be alternating in and out. But all four Commissioners will be around for the next couple of days. We look forward, I certainly look forward to engaging in conversation both with the body collectively and all of you individually.

So with that Madam Chair, I have 1:25 if you want to allow for a ten break we can just go five minutes off your schedule. I have 1:25 if we can reassemble at 1:35. Thank you very much.

(Recess from 1:25 to 1:45 P.M.)

MS. NIGHTSWONGER: Okay. Commission Martinez has already welcomes you and I would also like to welcome you to our meeting here of the National Standards Board. And I am only here because Mike left us. He had the nerve to go out on us. And you all probably got that email about him getting a new fantastic job. So he kind of left me hanging out here. So all of you are going to have to be very patient with me today and tomorrow and please don't throw tomatoes.
at me from the crowd. I will try to get someone up here in a few minutes to help keep me in line.

Before we begin to day I guess I should call this meeting to order first of all. I don't have a gavel. I don't know if Adam took it or what happened. I would like to just talk about a couple of ground rules that I'd like to put in place here and that is for our Court Reporter here is going to be taking the minutes, the official minutes of this meeting so we really do need to speak in a microphone when we go to the floor. And we are going to have some roving mics so that you don't always have to get out of your seat. So if you will raise your hand I will call on you and the people carrying the mic will get a microphone to you. And I would like you to address the group with your name and where you are from please. And then you can give your question or whatever. So if you can just try to do that. That way we will know who is talking and what they are saying and we can hear very well.

The first thing we need to do is call the role. So I would like to have Bill Campbell if you would go ahead and do that. If you would respond when he call your name so we can make sure we have a quorum at this meeting.
MR. CAMPBELL: I will read the state name and then the members.

Alabama, Nancy Worley.
MS. WORLEY: Here.


Alaska, Whitney Brewster.
MS. BREWSTER: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Shelly Crowden?
MS. CROWDEN: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: American Samoa? Soliai T. Fuimaono?
MR. FUIMAONO: Here.


MR. TYNE: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mitch Etter?
MR. ETTER: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Arkansas, Charlie Daniels? (No response).

MR. CAMPBELL: Mary Lou Slinkard?
MS SLINKARD: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: California, Brad Clark?
MR. CLARK: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Coney McCormack? (no response).

MR. CAMPBELL: Colorado, Gigi Dennis (no response).
MR. CAMPBELL: Russ Ragsdale? (No response).


Sandra Hutton? (No response).

Delaware, Frank Calio? (no response).

Howard Sholl?

MR. SHOLL: Present.

MR. CAMPBELL: District of Columbia, Alice Miller?

MS. MILLER: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Jonda McFarlane? (no response)

Florida; Dawn Kimmel Roberts?

MS. ROBERTS: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Bill Cowles?

MR. COWLES: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Georgia, Kathy Rogers (No

response) Lynn Bailey?

MS. BAILEY: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Guam, Gerald Taitano?

MR. TAITANO: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Hawaii, Scott Nago?

MR. NAGO: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Glenn Takahashi?

MR. TAKAHASKI: Here.
Illinois, Daniel W, White?
MR. WHITE: Here.
MR. CAMPBELL: Richard Cowen? (No response)
Indiana, Todd Rolita?
MR. ROKITA: Here.
MR. CAMPBELL: The Honorable Shannon Weisheit?
MS SHANNON WEISHEIT: Here.
Kansas Ron Thornburgh? (No response).
Donald Merriman? (no response).

Kentucky. Sarah Ball Johnson?
MS. JOHNSON: Here.
MR. CAMPBELL: Don Blevins?
MR. BLEVINS: Here.
Louie Bernard?
MR. BERNARD: Here.
MR. CAMPBELL: Maine, Julie Flynn?
MS. FLYNN: Here.
MR. CAMPBELL: Clairma Matherne?
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12  MS. MATHERNE: Here.
13  MR. CAMPBELL: Maryland, Linda H. Lamone? (No response).
14  Kim A. Atkins? (No response).
16  MR. CAMPBELL: I am here.
17  Michigan, Thomas Luitje?
18  MR. LUITJE: Here.
19  MR. CAMPBELL: Tony Bartholomew?
20  MR. BARTHOLOMEW: Here.
21  
22  
23  MR. CAMPBELL: Minnesota, Mary Kiffmeyer?
24  MS. KIFFMEYER: Present.
25  MR. CAMPBELL: Sharon Anderson?
26  MS. ANDERSON: Here.
28  Missouri, Leslye Winslow?
29  MS. WINSLOW: Here.
30  MR. CAMPBELL: Richard T. Struckhoff?
31  MR. STRUCKHOFF: Here.
32  MR. CAMPBELL: Montana, Elaine Gravely? (No response) Vickie Zeier?
33  MS. ZEIER: Here.
Nevada, Dean Heller? (No response).
Harvard L. Lomax?
MR. LOMAX: Here.
MR. CAMPBELL: New Hampshire, Anthony Stevens?
MR. STEVENS: Here.
MR. CAMPBELL: Carol Johnson?
MS. JOHNSON: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: New Jersey, Maria Delcoch?
MS. DELCOCH: Here.
MR. CAMPBELL: Joanne Ambruster?
MS. AMBRUSTER: Here.
MR. CAMPBELL: New Mexico, Rebecca Vigil-Geron?
MS. VIGIL-GERON: Here.
MR. CAMPBELL: David Kunko? (no response)
New York, John Haggerty?
MR. HAGGERTY: Here.
MR. CAMPBELL: Edward Szczesniak?
MR. SZCZESNIAK: Here.
MR. CAMPBELL: North Carolina, Johnnie McLean?
MS. MCLEAN: Here.
MR. CAMPBELL: Kathie Cooper? (No response)
17 North Dakota, James Silrum?
18         MR. SILRUM: Here.
19         MR. CAMPBELL: Michael M. Montplairer?
20         MR. MONTPLAISER: Here.
21         MR. CAMPBELL: Ohio, J. Kenneth Blackwell?
22 (no response).

197 North Dakota, James Silrum?
20         MR. SILRUM: Here.
21         MR. CAMPBELL: Michael M. Montplairer?
22         MR. MONTPLAISER: Here.
23         MR. CAMPBELL: Ohio, J. Kenneth Blackwell?
24 (no response).

Steve Harsman?
2         MR. HARSMAN: Here.
3         MR. CAMPBELL: Oklahoma, Clint Parr? (No response).
4         MR. CAMPBELL: Oklahoma, Clint Parr? (No response).
5         Oregon, Jack Lindback?
6         MR. LINDBACK: Here.
7         MR. CAMPBELL: John Kauffman?
8         MR. KAUFFMAN: Here.
9         MR. CAMPBELL: Pennsylvania, Pedro Cortes?
10 (No response) Regis Young?
11         MR. YOUNG: Present.
13         Juan M. Toledo-Diaz?
14         MR. TOLEDO-DIAZ: Here.
15         MR. CAMPBELL: Rhode Island, Jan Ruggerio?
16 (no response).
17 (no response).
18         Marian Clarke? (no response).
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South Carolina, Marci Andino? (No response)

Marilyn Bowers?

MS. BOWERS: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: South Dakota, Kea Warne.

MS. WARNE: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Sue Roust?

MS. ROUST: Here.


Texas, Trey Trainor?

MR. TRAINER: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Dana DeBeauvoir?

MS. DeBEAUVOIR: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Utah, Michael Cragun?

MR. CRAGUN: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Robert Pero?

MR. PERO: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Vermont, Deborah Markowitz?

MS. MARKOWITZ: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Arnette Cappy? (No response).

MR. CAMPBELL: Virginia, Jean Jansen?

MS. JANSEN: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Allan Harrison, Jr.?

MR. ALLAN HARRISON, JR.: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Virgin Islands, Corinna
Halyyard Plaskett?

MS. PLASKETT: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Natalie Thomas?

MS. THOMAS: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Washington, Paul Miller?

MR. MILLER: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Bob Terwilliger?

MR. TERWILLIGER: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: West Virginia, Benjamin Beakes? (No response).

Gary Williams? (No response).

Wisconsin, Kevin Kennedy?

MR. KENNEDY: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Sandra L. Wesolowski?

MS. WESOLOWSKI: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Wyoming, Peggy Nightswonger?

MS. NIGHTSWONGER: Present.

MR. CAMPBELL: Julie Freese?

MS. FRESE: Here

MS. NIGHTSWONGER I believe we need 56 members for a quorum, so we will figure this out.

MR. CAMPBELL: Is there anyone that did not
respond to the roll call?

MS. NIGHTSWONGER: Okay. We have a sufficient number of members to conduct business. We will move ahead.

Before we get started here with some other things on the agenda I would like to introduce the Executive Board if I could. Probably most of you know who they are but I'd like them to stand so you can make sure you know what their face looks like in case you want to bombard them with a problem or an issue that you're having.

Actually is the room okay? I want to ask that. Is anyone too hot or too cold or do we care that they are uncomfortable?

So if I could just have you stand when I call your name. First of all Indiana Secretary of State Todd Rokita. And Vermont's Secretary of State Deborah Markowitz. Oregon Director of Elections John Lindback. Kentucky Executive Director Sarah Ball Johnson. City Clerk of Woburn, Massachusetts Bill Campbell who is up here with me. And Clark County Registrar of Voters, Harvard Lomax. And last but not least, even though he
came last Natchitoches Clerk of the Court, Louie
Bernard. And Louie do you want to come up. You have
something to say. I am almost afraid to call him to the
table. So that's your Executive Board. And I really
appreciate all of them and the help they haven given
me. Now you know what they look like in case you have
forgotten since Denver.

MR. BERNARD: I was asked to be the chaperon
for the Executive Board when we were first elected. I
was not here last night. I have nothing to do with last
night. I don't know what they did and I don't want to
know what they did.

It is very good to see all of you. I couldn't
come in until this morning. Beverly Kauffman and I flew
up together from Houston. We just happened to meet up,
it is good to be here and see all these familiar faces
again.

As most of you know Ray Martinez has
announced that he will be leaving the EAC in June. I am
personally very pleased about that because anyone who
has worked with Ray, you know how pushy he can be
(laughter). For almost two years we all have had the
honor and privilege to work with this tireless and
selfless man. And we all better people for and a better
EAC for him having come our way.

I don't know about you, I sense in this
country a partisanship that almost strangles everything
we try to do. Our Commissioner since the day I came in
here at the meeting in Houston. I've always been amazed
how they seem to get along and work together with one
another. I have no doubt that behind closed doors when
we go home they may holler and scream but there is an
outward appearance that lets try to respect each other
and accomplish accomplish something for the entire
group. And I think that is a good thing to do.

Ray Martinez has been at the heart of all
that is positive, that has happened with EAC in this
relatively short period of time.

He is one of the four, what I call one of the
four T-Rex's at the EAC but the endearing quality
about Ray is that he doesn't know he is one of those.
He is a man of great humility. He is a man of great
sincerity and he is someone more than anything else
respects someone's point of view.

Where I come from the nicest thing that can
be said about a man is that he is truly a gentleman.
And I think without question, despite if you agree with everything that Ray has said or done, that Ray Martinez is truly a gentleman.

Ray, the Executive Board and the Standards Board would like to wish the very best in all that comes down your way in the future we want to give to you our heartfelt appreciation for all you have done for us.

I think it would be a shame for anybody to be a part of any organization and leave without being able to say they made a difference. I don't think Ray Martinez has anything to worry about when it comes to having made a difference at the EAC.

So I will close it by allowing Peggy to present this plaque. And Ray I just want to tell you that on behalf of all of us it is not an original blessing but it is something that I feel is very appropriate as you leave, the old Irish blessing, we would all say to you:

"May the Road rise to meet you.

May the wind be always at your back.
May the sun shine warm upon your face.
May the rain fall softly upon your fields.
And until we all meet again may the Lord.
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Hold you in the palm of His hand."

Ray, would you come forward you. (Applause).

Presented to Ray Martinez III for selfless
and exemplary service to the Elections Assistance
Standards Board, our heartfelt thanks for going the
extra mile for America's voters this 23rd day of May
2006, by a very appreciative Executive Board.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you very much. I am
going to get out of your way quickly. I can not thank
you, Louie, for the wonderful words and my thanks to
all of the members of the Executive Board. I have had
the distinct privilege of working very closely now for
the past year that I feel like I am a close friend with
each and every one of them for a very long time now. I
am so appreciative.

And you know I am still the Commissioner for
at least a few more weeks and I am going to savor every

moment of it because has been truly for me the most
fulfilling professional experience in my life.

In my household growing up in south Texas
public service meant something. And I am proud to say
to my family and all my friends that I have tried to
fulfill that. So I thank you very much. It is with
genuine sincerity it has been a privilege for me, a
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real privilege and honor, to work with all of you. So
thank you very much now get to work.

(Appplause).

MS. NIGHSWONGER: Thank you Commissioner.
The first order of business is we need to
appoint a Parliamentarian. And Julie has been so kind
to do that for us in the past. She too has left us. I
don't know what is going on here. Everyone is leaving
us.

So I would like to open this up. I am sure
many of you are Parliamentarians and would love the
opportunity to sit up here beside me and keep me in
line. So is there anyone who would like to do that
today? Don't be shy. We know who you are. Some on.

MR. BERNARD: I think they are being shy.
I know there is someone out there who can do
it. You don't want me.

MS. NIGHSWONGER: Anybody? I really do need
help, honest. Secretary Kiffmeyer, oops she is still
deciding here. Thank you so much for volunteering, if
you will come up and take the seat on my left. Are you
right handed.

MS. KIFFMEYER: Either hand will do.
MS. NIGHSWONGER: Thank you so much.

The next thing on our agenda here, and I think all of you got an agenda I hope. They were in your books. If you need an agenda please raise your hand we can get you one for today's meeting. As we look down over the agenda we are going to do a little bit of Board business here. And then following that we will move into some presentations from the EAC.

If we can move ahead with the agenda the chair will entertain a motion to adopt the agenda if we could first.

MS. BARTHOLOMEW: I so move.

MS. NIGHSWONGER: All in favor?

(Aye).

MS. NIGHSWONGER: Opposed? I hear no opposed, Okay. The Aye's have it and we have an agenda.

As for the minutes in your book, behind Tab 4 I believe it is we have a synthesis of the Denver meeting. I don't know about you but I probably would like to look over those a little bit. And I was wondering if we can postpone talking about the minutes until tomorrow sometime. That would give you tonight to look over the minutes of the synthesis of what was done in the Denver meeting.
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a lot for you to read after just picking up your books.
So we will postpone that on the agenda until tomorrow
that would work better.

Okay. You all have your books. And I think
the books are pretty self explanatory. Everything is
tabbed and put together very nicely. So we will be
working from the agenda. As you notice all of the
presenters have information in our books. And you will
find them behind the tabs as indicated in your book.

Right now we do have some discussion about

our bylaws when we were in Denver last year as many of
you probably remember. And we actually adopted our
bylaws when we were in Denver. But I am going to ask
Kevin Kennedy if he would come up. Kevin worked on the
original bylaws committee, or whatever that committee
was called, when we were trying to establish bylaws.
And I would like him to give us a brief presentation on
sort of what is going on and the history.

I know many of you are new to our Board
because someone has left and you have been appointed
to this position and you may not even know some of the
things that have gone on in the past. So Kevin if you
would just give us a brief presentation about that I
would appreciate it.
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. First I would like to welcome Peggy to this new position. And challenge her during the course of this meeting to pronounce the name of the New Mexico Secretary of State and the Travis County clerk (laughter).

MS. NIGHSWONGER: I have been working at it.

MR. KENNEDY: The minutes-- I'm sorry. The bylaws are set up behind Tab 2. And as Peggy said were adopted at the last meeting. The minutes provide a very good summary of the fact that we had three motions to change those bylaws. All three of those bylaws failed. So what you see in front of you are the bylaws. I would like to draw your attention to a few sections of that so that your familiar with it because as a new organization. I think this tells you how we are going to operate. It is a point of reference. One of the motions that failed dealt with Section 23 on authority, page one on how to treat non-partisan members of the Commission of the Standards Board.

I'd also want to make sure you are familiar with the Procedures of Nominating of new members of the Board, members of the Executive Board that are set out on page 2 of the materials under Section 4. Section C of the bylaws themselves, the
Chair, on page 3 certain duties of a client, we have two standing committees according to the bylaws. One is a nominating committee. So there will be some action on that towards the end of the year. And our President will appoint a Chair for that committee and the Board will find members.

The same is true of the bylaws committee. A Chair will be appointed in the interim. And committee members will volunteer for that. That is in Section 4F, on page 3.

The final thing we had some questions that failed at the last meeting dealing on how we establish quorum. And whether or not we use proxy votes. And if you look at Section 5-- I'm sorry, Section 6 on page 8 it describes the voting procedures.

Section 7 proposes how we handle the actual bylaws for the committee. And with Section 7 I will point out the committee wants us to is establish and be charged with developing a forum. My experience of working with this group in the last year in putting a these bylaws together is that there is no shortness of ideas on how to come up with rules and regulations. One of the proposals is there will be a sample form so that we can have a very orderly process in doing this.
I think it is very important for all of the members to take the time to review the materials that are on pages one through ten before the next meeting, if you have ideas on changes to the bylaws. In terms of that my guess is that the Bylaws Committee will have a form in place.

And what I would like to do for my final comment before is there any questions is to point out these initial set of bylaws would not have happened if it were not for Joanne Armbruster, Bill Campbell, Tonni Bartholomew, Howard Sholl all made dedicated attempts to review these bylaws, make suggestions and edit the initial document that was put together by Julie Horowits (sic) so with that unless there are any questions that is my summary.

MS. NIGHSWONGER: I think I might before take questions from the floor. I think a little apology to the Executive Board I believe we asked for people who had an interest in working on the bylaws committee to indicate that somehow while we were at the Denver meeting. And we never really formally asked for that. So I would just indicate that right now that if you want to look at our bylaws and propose any changes we do need a committee to work on that. So I would really like you to let me know if you have any interest in
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doing that because I think it is our job to appoint a
Bylaws Committee. Seven members?

   MR. KENNEDY: Seven members.
   
   MS. NIGHSWONGER:
So if you have an interest on working on bylaws I
would really challenge you to let me know that. You can
email me. My email address is in the book. And I would
be happy to hear you about that. Any questions for
Kevin?

   MS. Nighswonger: One thing that I failed to
mention. It was just a little housekeeping thing. In
the book where the members are listed. Behind Tab 3. I
want you all to really take a good look at that list
and also the bios for all of the members of the
Standards Board because I think there are some people
who think that maybe they were left out, or maybe their
bio isn't correct, or it is an old one. Anyway please
look at that while you're here at this meeting and make
sure that everything on your information is correct.
Read your bio. And if there are any changes to anything
on that page or in that section I would suggest you get
hold of Adam. You can email Adam at the EAC and he will
get those changes made before we send out anymore mailings or meet again. So it you will take a look at that that will be great.

Okay. I think I would like to call Commissioner Martinez to the front again. He is going to review and present the Standards Board charter. And we can talk about that little bit.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you, Madam Chair.

One person, and actually I believe you have heard his name over and over again, but needs to be properly introduced is Adam Ambrosi(sic) who is my special assistant and who had helped to pull together all of the logistics and all of the preparations for this meeting. He has done a terrific job. He did it in Denver. Adam is your point of contact for anything that you need. He will be floating around here for the next couple of days and will be available to help in any way. So that is who Adam Ambrosi is.

The Charter that we took up, the Federal Advisory Act, governs advisory committees to Federal agencies. It requires that we adopt a charter in the next couple of days.
MS. NIGHSWONGER: If you don't have a copy of
the charter it is outside on the table.

MR. MARTINEZ: Adam can you get a stack of
copies and make them available.

MS. NIGHSWONGER: Maybe we can them pass out.

MR. MARTINEZ: Right.

MS. NIGHSWONGER: I am sorry. I meant to do
that.

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes I should have done that.

But we have them up front and Adam will get a stack and
walk down the center isle here and pass them out.

The Charter, Madam Chair, is required under
the Federal Advisory Committee Act and it essentially,
I have a copy of one in front of me this is the Charter
that governed the authority of this Advisory Committee
for the past two years. And it simply has to be
readopted. It is required to be readopted. And we
readopt it every two years. And you have reached the
two year mark.

Essentially the Charter reiterates it just
takes the authority and responsibilities that come
straight out of our governing statute which is the Help
American Vote Act puts it into a Charter type of format and says, here are your responsibilities, here is how we are going to carry out those responsibilities. It is a pretty straightforward document. And we will ask that you all will allow for the Charter to be adopted once again.

And, Madam Chair, of course, if there is any questions or if there is a desire to wait until your plenary session tomorrow in case anybody has any questions or concerns obviously I don't think that is a problem from our perspective. It is just before you leave here at the close of business tomorrow we obviously need to readopt your Charter. As it is now about to expire. Thank you. Back to you Madam Chair.

MS. NIGHSWONGER: Thank you, Commissioner. I need a motion.

MS. VIGIL-GORON: Rebecca Vigil-Gorom from the State of New Mexico. I make a motion for adoption if there is no objection from the other members.

MR. KENNEDY; I will second that motion. I am Kevin Kennedy.

MS. NIGHSWONGER: All in favor?

(Ayes from the audience).

MS. NIGHSWONGER: Opposed? Motion carries.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you very much.
MS. NIGHSWONGER: I'm sorry. I am out of order. We did not have discussion. Too late the motion carried.

Would like to introduce my secretary, Joe Meyer. I am so nervous about this you all conduct theses meetings a lot on a local level. This is not like we do in Wyoming. We take a sot gun and when someone is out of order we just shoot it. (laughter) I guess that would go over big here.

Okay. Next item on our agenda is the election of our Executive Board vacancy. With Mike leaving that left a vacancy on the Standards Board and on the Executive Board. Now when we went to figure out how to figure out how to fill this vacancy nothing was very clear about that in our Bylaws. So there is something for you to do.

So what the Board talked about-- many of you, or all of you, should have received emails from Adam with the names of the people who are interested in filling that vacancy. What the Executive Board talked and decided to do because we didn't have a nominating committee either, which is something that we need to appoint and get a nominating committee before our next meeting. We decided to go ahead and throw that out for
people to put their names in for that position. We did
have four people that showed interest for that
position. And I believe Adam set their bios out, that
are over there on the table. That is another thing that
is on the table. So if you don't have them with you
maybe raise your hand and we can get you a copy of that
also.

What we decided to do is take these names-- I
would like the four people who did submit their names
and their bio to give us a two or three minute
introduction to themselves so that we will know their
face and know who they really are. And I am going to
give them that opportunity. And then we would like to
pass out a paper ballot. And we are going to let all
the voting members vote for one person that he would
like to fill this vacancy on the Executive Board. And
we have a very responsible Counting Board that is going
to handle those ballots for us. Did everyone get a copy
of the bios?

MR. CAMPBELL: Can I say something?

MS. NIGHSWONGER: Yes, Bill, you can say
anything that you want.

MR. CAMPBELL: The bylaws do provide a method
by which a method is filled. And that is the Executive
Board Interim appointment. But we, as an Executive
Board, have discussed this. We took the message and hold closely the message that we received when we were first appointed or elected as an Executive Board and that is we never want the full Board to feel that we are trying to usurp any authority. And although you have delegated it to us we decided the best practice although it was only a four or five month period was actually wait to hold the position vacant and have the full election take place today.

So the by laws do have a provision that it didn't have to have sufficient information to allow us to set up that election today. We have a Nominating Committee and deadlines to next February. So I hope you understand how we got here and how we tried to limit the selection process without limiting the selection process and that the Bylaws Committee will know that one of their first tasks is to try to work out how this interim election will be can be made.

MS. NIGHSWONGER: Secretary Markowitz?
MS. MARKOWITZ: I am sorry for not thinking about this morning at our Executive Board meeting preparing for this today. But under Roberts Rules in order to have a paper ballot for elections we need to have a vote to do so. So I will actually so move.
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MS. NIGHSWONGER: It is in the regular bylaws already.

MS. MARKOWITZ: Oh, good so it's in the regular bylaw. But thank you. Anyone else on our board want to make any comments about how we came to this process?

Okay. If not I'd like to introduce the four people. And if you would just step to the microphone. First I am going to call Carol Johnson who is the Deputy City Clerk from Manchester, New Hampshire. Anything you want to say, you can tell us about yourself.

MS. JOHNSON: Good afternoon, my name is Carol Johnson. I am from Manchester, New Hampshire and I am the local election official. I have been in this municipal business for 29 years, hopefully I don't look it. So I have been around for a while. I am a certified municipal clerk. I have been involved in the City Clerk's Office since 1988. It was not my first introduction to elections but that is where I started helping run them for the city.

I guess somebody said to me very nicely in the hallway a little while ago that with every great act there are some unattended consequences which is why I responded to the email.
My bio is not contained in the book which is why I am mentioning that although I have been around for a couple of years. I am a certified municipal clerk. I have worked as the mediator, if you will, with the state and a lot of local election officials in the process of delving out the processes that Howard has brought us.

And the reason for responding to all of that was I think local election officials are the ones that frequently advise State because we are in the nitty gritty and we are in with the details of it. And we frequently work with other municipal and local election officials and help get through the process in a positive manner which is not always easy talk but usually we can get there.

The Standards Board is very much that. It is in an advisory capacity but the devil is in the detail. And I think this is the Board that needs to focus on those details for the EAC. So with that I will part company because we have a lot on our agenda today.

Thank you.

MS. NIGHSWONGER: Thank you, Carol. Okay, Sandi Wasolowski. I hope I said that correctly Sandi is the Franklin City Clerk. She is from Franklin,
MS. WASOLOWSKI: Thank you. I am Sandi Wasolowski. You pronounced it pretty close.

I am the Director of Clerk Services, City Clerk for the city of Franklin, Wisconsin. As a local election official I represent 1850 local election officials in the state of Wisconsin. I have been involved in the administration of election since 1976. So for some 30 years that has been my desire my strong field.

I have been on the Standards Board since its inception. I briefly was the State of Wisconsin elections director and HAVA coordinator. I was-- I returned to the city of Franklin after a new months of doing that for the state. The weather in Washington has taken my throat and voice.

You can see on the bio that I have been involved with the state of Wisconsin HAVA State Plan Committee. I was a former member of the SVRS, the State Regulation Administration Steering Committee. I was-- I am still on the Standards Board for the state of Wisconsin. I am a member of the International Institute of Municipal Clerks. I am also a member of the Wisconsin Municipal Clerks Association. I am the past president of the Metro Milwaukee Municipal Clerks.
I would be honored to fill the unexpired term of Mike. And I will be brief and that is it.

MS. NIGHSWONGER: Thank you. You all have weird names, Ed Szczesniak, they are worse than my name Ed is from New York. He is Onondaga County Commissioner of Elections for Syracuse.

MR. SZCZESNIAK: Thank you. Good afternoon. The reason I responded positively I was selected and I was honored by back in 2003, January, to be selected to be as a local official on this Standards Board.

What I have attempted to do over the years is attend every meeting and be as active as I can in this particular group. I think it is a meaningful role for a very meaningful organization, the Election Assistance Commission in terms of the revolutionary impact it is having on elections administrations across this country.

Being from New York as you see I feel a little overwhelmed by three women and myself on this floor of candidates here. But what I want to say is rather than read through all my notes I have been involved in all levels from the local town level as a
candidate, as a party official right through county
level, state level and national level in terms of

involvement in the party as well with elections.

I think I have a fair understanding what it looks like at the County level. And I happen to be from New York State. But we have had the distinction of being the only state that has had DOG lawsuit against it to enforce HAVA. And I won't take responsibility for the lawsuit. But I know the difficulty that you all are going through in terms of trying to make this work. And the time lines that Congress has set for us to try to make this work.

I think that participating in things like the Standards Board goes a long way toward making sure everyone understands how things are happening at the local level to make this thing happen. I think our mission, if there is one, is to have a can do attitude to make this system work whether it is through Best Practices or whatever. We can share that knowledge and do it right at the county level as well as the state level and of course it all becomes the Federal level.

So with that I would honored if you would consider me to be the replacement for the unexpired term. Thank you very much.
MS. NIGHSWONGER: There are other people trying to get rid of me, too. Last but not least, Tonni Bartholomew, is the City Clerk of Troy, Michigan.

MS. BARTHOLOMEW: Thank you very much for letting me have this opportunity to speak to you. I too am very interested in this Directors position on the Executive Board. I am a local clerk for a Municipality of about 90,000 people. I do everything from recruit people to code the devices. I have been involved at various levels in the State. I do instructions for the MNL as well as the Michigan Tactical Association and I have been involved on various advisory boards for the state of Michigan. I am currently Voter File Advisory Board. I was on the JEC for the State Devices for the State of Michigan.

If you talk to people from Michigan they will say I am a very detailed person. I am all about all about code standards and laws and if it says do it they we do it. I think I can lend that kind of expertise from my experience which I am much older than I look, I have been involved with elections since 1986,'87. And
I would really like the opportunity to serve you and serve the people of the United States.

MS. NIGHSWONGER: Thank you, Tonni. How many of us can say we are older than we look?

Okay. If there is no objections we will proceed with the lucky new candidate to join us on this Executive Board. Oh yes, did we get the ballots past out? Would you pass the ballots out please and while you are doing that I want to remind you to vote for one, please do not over vote or under vote, vote for one. And if you can you can fold your ballot in half once. I am going to have Sarah and John collect the ballots. Sarah I am going to ask you to take this side of the room, on my right. John if you will collect the ballots on the left side of the room please. Todd would you like to get the map? So if you will mark your ballot and fold it in half they will pick up your ballot. And then we will have a group of people who will be counting the votes and we will announce to you on one of our breaks who the lucky person is.

Oh, yes, is there anyone in the room that did not respond to the first roll call? That is one thing I
I want to ask you. Julie as been running around trying to track down her luggage. That is always a hard thing.

Sara John and Todd are going to be picking up the ballots and I would like to remind you that voting members only will be marking the ballots. Polls are officially closed.

Again I would like to remind you before we close this session of our meeting I would just like to remind you if you are interested in serving on a nominating committee before the next meeting we will have to utilize a nominating committee in order to get-- Phil I believe there are two more positions on our Board that will be vacant by people-- Oh, three? One State and two local. If you're interested in serving on a nominating committee I would appreciate getting information about that so we can do this process appropriately at our next meeting.

Thank you so much. And we will move on into the next portion of our meetings. If I can get Commissioner Martinez' attention. He is in the hallway there. We will move on to our next report on Getting a report on Provisional Voting. So will the panel who going to be talking on Provisional Voting if you can.
come on up here we will give you our seats.

MR. MARTINEZ: We will move into our next presentation. We are, by my watch, about 11 minutes off schedule right now. So we will make up the time during break, or at some point we will figure out how to do that. I know some of you had plans after the meeting is over to get out of the hotel and so forth. So we will try to honor our agenda as closely as possible.

Out next pane will give us an important presentation on Provisional Voting. The Help America Vote Act requires as all of you know that the EAC at a minimum consider the development of voluntary guidance on any of the Title 3 requirements the Title 3 requirements of course for those of us with voting systems that require section 301, State Wide Voter Registration Voter Data Basis and Voter ID for certain voters that are in Section 303 and Section 302 which is Provisional Voting and Poling Place Signage. So in looking at that mandate that the EAC developed Voluntary Guidance on Provisional Voting, we felt we needed to commission some sound research and analysis on the issue of provisional voting.

We turned for that task to the Eagleton--

Tom, forgive me is it Eagleton Institute, yes, I almost
lost it there, at Rutgers University. And in turn
Eagleton Institute also brought in Moritz School of Law
at the Ohio State University and thus we have Professor
Edward Foley.

Tom O'Neil is the Project Manager, the lead
consultant, if you will, to the EAC for the study that
has been conducted on provisional voting. They will
give you the details. We have been working with Tom now
for perhaps the last eight or ten months perhaps longer
than that. Lots of discussions about the issue. Tom
will present, as well as professor Ed Foley who is the
director of Election Law at Moritz program, an expert,
well known national expert on election law issues
covering the whole gamut of election law from
redistricting to election administration.

We are very pleased to have their
participation in this project. And particularly please
to have them here today to present the draft product of

what they have been working on and to answer your
questions. What we have asked our presenters to do is
give you an audio visual presentation that will be
short and to the point we hope. After which our counsel
Julie Thompson-Hodgkins is here. She is listed as the
resource person and she will lead the discussion upon.
the end of the presentation. And we hope that you will be-- that you will not be shy in asking questions and give us your opinions and advice on the work product you are about to hear about.

With that, Tom, I will give you the podium.

DISCUSSION: DRAFT REPORT ON PROVISIONAL VOTING

Presenters: Thomas O'Neill, Provisional Voting/ Voter Identification
Tim Vercellotti, Eagleton Institute.
Edward Foley, Election Law @ Moritz School of Law.

MR. O'NEIL: Thank you Commissioner Martinez, I am happy to be here. We regard the presentation we are making at this meeting as phase of our research. We are going to be presenting our final draft, report and recommendations. And we hope that it will elicit from you comments and questions that will become part and parcel of our research efforts to understand the dynamics of provisional voting in 2004 and going forward. And we hope that the states have much to learn from one another in the provisional voting process and that we can do something to act as a catalyst in that mutual learning exercise that all of you are engaged in here as members of this Board.
As Commissioner Martinez said we are looking at provisional voting. We have been working on this project just shy of a year. And today you're to see the sum of what we have concluded and our recommendations to the EAC. In term what we are recommending to the EAC is that they make recommendations for Best Practices to States and localities to improve the functioning of the provisional voting system.

Commissioner Martinez described the parties that are doing this, the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers State University in New Jersey, the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University which is well known for the website it maintains on election law all around the county.

Ed Foley and I are happy to be up here on the podium but we represent a larger group. This is the project management team. The principal investigators Dr. Ruth Mandel, the Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics. With us here today, from the Project Management Team, are Ingrid Reed, Ansa Cadgie from the Moritz College of Law and one of our lead researchers Tim Bersollti, Assistant Director from the Center of Public Interest Polling that undertook the survey of
local election officials on which some of our findings are based.

We proceeded by looking at six questions that the EAC raised with us. And those questions are displayed on this slide they are basic, they are important and some of them I have to tell you are very hard indeed to answer.

How do states prepare for HAVA's Provisional Voting Requirements? How did preparation and performance vary between states that previously had some form of provisional ballot and those that did not?

We will be coming back to that issue several times via this report. And so we have developed a short hand for it. We call them Old states and New States. And I hope you will bear with me. If you come from one of those Old States we don't mean it personally.

How did litigation effect the implementation of provisional Voting? How effective was provisional voting in enfranchising qualified? Did state and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots? Did local election officials have a clear understanding on how to implement provisional voting?

To answer those questions we undertook several steps. Our aim being throughout this to provide
the EAC with a strategy to engage the states in a continuing effort to strengthen the provisional voting process and increase the consistency, this is important, increase the consistency by which provisional voting was administered. Particularly consistency within the State as opposed to consistency on the States.

We surveyed 400 local election officials. We reviewed the EAC election day survey. We analyzed the states experience with provisional voting mostly on a statistical basis. We collected the provisional voting statutes and regulations for each State in the country. And in fact part of our deliverables to the EAC was a continuum of those statutes and regulations. And they will all be on one CD rom for easy access. And we analyzed the litigation that took place concerning provisional voting issues in 2004.

Summary of findings, again looking at this consistency issue which is so important. There was considerable variation among the States. HAVA allows the States considerable latitude in how to implement provisional voting including deciding who beyond the required categories of voters should receive provisional ballots. And how to determine which
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provisional ballots should be counted. We had just shy
of two million ballots cast in 2004 and 63 percent of
them were counted.

Now the variation of among the States is
enormous. The percentage of provisional ballot in the
total vote varied by a factor of a thousand. From as

high as seven percent in Alaska to Vermont's six one
thousands of one percent. Now that's like the lobster
production between Maine and Utah. You don't find that
large a difference among States on measures like this.
So there is an enormous variation.

And the portion of the provisional ballots
counted varied significantly from 96 percent in Alaska
to 6 percent in Delaware. We don't need to tell you is
that the percentage of total votes cast rises in terms
of provisional votes being a greater that becomes more
and more significant in closer elections. If the
election margin of victory is two percent but seven
percent in provisional ballots that is a very
different scenario than if one percent was of ballots
are provisional but the victory was ten percent.

There are some sources of the variation among
the States. Number one that jumped out at us was
experience. The share of provisional ballots in the
total vote was six times greater in states that had
20 used provisional ballots before than in States where
21 the provisional ballot was new before.
22 MR. VERCHELLOTTI: It is good to be an old
23
24 MR. O'NEILL: In the 25 states, 25 States
25 that had experience with provisional balloting 18 were
26 new.
27 Administrative arrangements. Simple
28 administrative differences also I think go a long way
29 in explaining the variation in the use of provisional
30 ballots.
31 The time to evaluate ballots. How much time
32 after the election do you give officials to determine
33 whether a provisional ballot should be counted? States
34 that provided less than a week, counted a little bit
35 more of a third of the provisional ballots counted.
36 States that permitted more than two weeks counted 61
37 percent. That time factor is important.
38 And voter registration data basis. States
39 with voter registration data basis, and there were only
40 a few of them in 2004, counted an average of only 20'
41 percent of the provisional ballots cast. States without
42 those data basis counted twice that number.
43 MR. FOLEY: If I can just underscore these two
44
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22 points that you're going to hear throughout this presentation the importance of both of them. In other words the time to evaluate the ballots increasing the accuracy is a very important finding. And it leads to an issue on how to trade off the value of accuracy verses speed or completeness of finality of the election. And we will be talking ore about that.

Likewise another theme that will run throughout this presentation is the important relationship between the provisional voting system as one component of an overall election system with the registration data basis. Those two subsystems if you will are very much integrated as you know.

And they will be increasingly integrated under HAVA and under centralized voter data basis.

MR. O'NEILL: Now turning from looking at variation across States to variation within States.

We gathered county election-- provisional ballot data for 20 States. Had we been able to get data from all of the States at a county level the ranges and variation I am reporting to you might be wider than what we found. So bear that in mind. The rate of counting provisional ballots within the same State
varied by as much as 90 to 100 percent among counties in the State. The resources available to administer provisional voting varied significantly within the same State.

The election day study found that staffing problems appeared to be particularly acute in jurisdictions in the lower income and education category. Small rural jurisdictions, large poor urban jurisdictions have higher rates of inadequate training for poll workers. The jurisdictions in poorer areas reported more inactive voter registrations and more provisional ballots cast. Richer areas had more poll workers per polling place and reported lower rates of staffing problems per precinct.

There are other effects that go beyond what is going on at the State other than scio-economic. Some reports from the states suggest possible sources of lack of consistency. You know Iowa cast some provisional not signed in the assigned precincts. Even thought the States policy was to count only those ballots cast in the correct precinct. So you could see how that would enlarge the variation among counties in
the percentage of provisional votes that were cast.

Similar kinds of free lancing were going on in Washington state.

MR. FOLEY: Another theme that we found. There is a difference between the rules on the books and the rules as they were enforced in practice. And that obviously is of concern potentially in respect to litigation when we get to that point.

MR. O'NEILL: Turning to from this sort of summary in terms of what the variation was all about to some of the details of the answers we developed in each of the questions that were put to us by the EAC.

First how did States prepare for the provisional voting requirement? Most election officials we talked to in our survey received provisional voting instructions from State government. But the type and amount of that instructions varied very widely across the States. Almost all of them provided training or written instruction to precinct public poll workers. Only in about one in ten made available to poll workers the voter registration data base. Equally rare was training or written procedures...
for poll workers to understand how provisional ballots would be evaluated.

Second question, how did preparation and performance vary between States, the old States and the new States? The local election officials in the old States felt more confident about exercising their responsibilities for provisional voting. As we earlier 18 States were new to provisional voting, 25 others had experience.

The New State officials I thought they did not receive enough information more frequently and felt and felt more funding was necessary to educate voters about, their rights to cast a provisional ballot.

Ballot.

Local Officials in the old states counted more ballots, were better prepared to direct voters to their correct precincts with maps and other types of information. And regarded provisional voting as easy to implement.

Officials from new states were more likely to believe that voters needed more information where to vote and to feel that provisional voting created unnecessary problems. There was much less if a response than from officials in the old states.
Mr. Foley: One could abstract from that provisional voting is a dynamic process. It is not static, it's not that HAVA created provisional voting and now we have it and we are done. There is a learning curve here. It is not an all or nothing situation. There are shades of gray involved. Sometimes it is sold as a safety mechanism, or fail safe. But the ability for it to perform as a fail safe is dependant on various factors. It's not automatic.

Mr. O'Neill: Question three: How did litigation effect the implementation of provisional voting?

Litigation before the election clarified voters rights. To sue in federal Court to remedy violations of HAVA; to receive provisional ballots even though they wouldn't be counted; have the voters be directed to the right precinct. And most of the litigations occurred too late to influence how states implemented provisional voting in the year 2004. Even with that finding I think it is a fair assessment to say that pre election litigation was more successful in changing the dynamic of at least the rules. And to clarify what the rules were going into election day. And therefore could be perceived as having some utility in the process. Post election litigation only invited
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6 more complexity, more problems, more uncertainty and
7 usually unsuccessful from the litigants perspective and
8 obviously for complicated from the administrative
9 perspective as well.

10 How effective was provisional voting in
11 enfranchising qualified voters?
12 And I suggested at the outset some of these
13 questions were very hard to answer. And this was among
14 the hardest. To know the answer to how effective was
15 provisional voting in providing that fail safe that Ed
16 just mentioned and you show up and your not on the
17 registration rolls how effective is getting that
18 provisional to you? Ideally to know that we have to
19 know the decisions that were made in 200,000 precincts
20 around the country. And we would have to know the
21 criteria that the evaluators of provisional ballot used
22 when the process came to them to decide which ones

1 counted and which ones didn't. And there is a
2 considerable element of individual eccentricity in
3 making these decisions. It is hard to predict and
4 therefore we had to look for a more abstract way to
5 have some kind of number to attach effectiveness. If
6 that batter hits the ball one third of the time as it
7 comes across the plate it is .333. So we are aiming for
something not quite as precise as Ted Williams 405 but
something that would at least put us in the order of
magnitude.

We know that 1.2 million voters, or about
one percent of the turnout, got to vote by provisional
ballot who otherwise would have been turned away. But
what is the denominator of that? What do you divide
into? Well in 2000 the CalTech MIT voting technology
estimated that two and a half million to four million
votes were lost in the 2000 Presidential election
because of registration mix ups or confusion at the
polling place.

Now registration mix up and confusion at the
polling place are pretty good description of what is
going to put someone in the line for provisional ballot

instead of to get on the regular machine. So 1.2
million voters casting a provisional ballot and maybe
two and a half to three million figure in the number of
them who were there but didn't get one, we figure that
provisional balloting might just have been 50 percent
effective in 2004. It's an approximation but it
indicates something I think we all will agree about
which is there is room for improvement.

Indeed legislative activity in the states
following the 2004 election leads us to believe that
the states themselves recognized that they were not satisfied with the effectiveness of their provisional voting systems and made efforts to improve that through legislation.

Question five: Did state and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots?

Again this is a topic of considerable interest. As we have already talked about there was little consistency among states and within states. That the use of provisional ballots was not distributed evenly across the country. In fact six states accounted for two thirds of all the provisional ballots cast. The share of provisional ballots in the total vote was six times greater in experiences states than in new states. The more rigorous the state's voter ID requirements the smaller percentage of provisional ballots that were counted. And new states with registration data bases counted 20 percent of the ballots past. Those without data bases counted more than double that rate, 44 percent.

MR. FOLEY: And I can add to that. The most common reason why a provisional ballot was not counted in most states it was reported that the provisional
voter was not a registered voter. That was the reason given. What is poorly understood unfortunately at this point is what underlies the reason why that voter was not registered according to the system, yet that voter attested that to believing he or she was registered by HAVA. And what our research has shown, as Tom just suggested, is that there is a considerable variation both among states and within states as the method for checking whether nor note the provisional voter is registered.

The methods and the processes that the system uses to try to verify whether this ballot should count varied considerably. And there is very little rule guidance as to what that methodology should be. So an important part of our presentation today is the need to better understand that and to develop more guidelines. The theme here is there is just a lot of difference just about the mechanics on how to go about determining whether this voter is even an eligible.

MR. O'NEILL: Continuing on with the consistency question.

States that allowed out of precinct ballots counted 65 percent of the provisional ballots cast.

States that recognized only ballots cast in the proper
precinct counted 42 percent. In old states the
difference was greater than that 52 percent were
counted in states requiring new district ballots and 70
percent were counted in those allowing other precinct
ballots.

This aspect of the consistency issue takes us
back to the time question. Fourteen states permitted

less than a week to evaluate provisional ballots, they
counted 35 percent of the ballots. Fifteen states
between one and two weeks, they counted 47 percent of
the ballot. And 14 states that permitted more than two
weeks they counted 61 percent of the ballots. Just the
administrative handling of the ballots makes a
difference in the performance of the state.

Conclusions with this? The states have
latitude on how they meet under the HAVA requirements.
A considerable degree of variation among the states are
to be expected. And here is the interesting observation
about that. If the variation among the states reflects
differences in their political cultures it is likely to
persist. If it reflects a learning curve for the new
states figuring out how to do this provisional ballot
thing then consistency among the states is likely to be
achieved much more quickly than if some states have a
fundamental philosophic objection to the concept of the provisional ballot.

Questions six: Did local election officials have a clear understanding on how to implement provisional voting?

What we did was ask the local officials themselves to characterize understanding. From a sample of about 400 of them around the country eight out of ten reported receiving instructions from state government; four out of ten, only four out of ten I should say, felt poll workers needed more training to understand their responsibilities.

Moving back now from asking the local officials themselves for some kind of objective evaluation on how the process was managed. The lack of consistency among and within states indicates the differences in how our election officials understand their responsibilities and managed the 2004 election.

In thinking through this body of information we have to recognize the existence of inconsistency of understanding between the states and within the states. Particularly of concern are the inconsistencies within a state. And that we need to forge away to approach this as a learning experience, a way to understand and explain the rules by which each state governs
And we will phrase this as a set of questions. Does the provisional ballot system distribute, collect, record and tally provisional ballots with sufficient accuracy as to be seen as procedurally legitimate by both supporters and opponents of the winning candidate. That is the acid test here.

Second: Does the provisional balloting system place administrative demands on local jurisdictions that are realistically related to the staff and other resources available to fulfill those demand?

Third: Is the variation within state great enough to cause concern that the system might not be administered uniformly from county to county.

MR. FOLEY: I just want to act on Tom's point about the acid test of legitimacy. The reason why clarity is so important to that is again because the provisional votes matter as you know when there is a close race and when there is a dispute about what to do with these ballots. Should they be verified or not? And if the rules for that process are unclear and disputable that casts everything in doubt. It casts the
process in doubt; it casts the results of the election in doubt. So clarity is the first and most important value for bringing legitimacy to the process. Because it will be a process that unfolds after election day in the heat of the moment. And to avoid litigation, and particularly destabilizing litigation, clarity has to be the first priority.

MR. O'NEILL: In looking for clarity a place the states often turn to is the history of litigation. Litigation coming out of the 2004 election clarified the right of voters to receive provisional ballots even though the election officials were certain they would not be counted. And lawsuits prompted election officials to take better care in instructing precinct officials on how to notify voters about the needs and go to the correct precinct in order to cast a countable ballot. Those are the issues of clarity like we have just been discussing.

We recommending to the EAC that it recommend as Best Practices to states the promulgation of clear standards for evaluating provisions ballots. And provide training for the officials who will apply those
ballots. We believe they should provide materials to local jurisdictions. To train polling workers on such procedures as how to locate polling places for potential voters who show up at the wrong place. And to think that the only permissible requirement to obtain a provisional ballot is an affirmation by that voter standing in front of a local election official that that voter is registered in the jurisdiction and eligible to vote in an election for federal office. And poll workers need the training to understand their duty to give those voters a provisional ballot.

MR. FOLEY: And on that point, on the voters affirmation, it's their sincere belief that they think that they are registered. The polling place is not the time or place to verify eligibility in determining whether the voter is correct or not.

And in that sense as a working rule, as a practical matter given long lines in a high turn out election, you know if a voter asks for provisional ballot they really ought to get one. Then you can figure out what to do with it later the one question that can be asked is: Do you really think you are
registered? If they think they are registered they should get that provisional ballot. It should not be a complicated process to administer provisional voting at the precinct.

There maybe complexities that are unavoidable after election day. And again it might be best to minimize those complexities as we get into. But it is very, very important to stream line the process at the polling place itself. And so it should be virtually automatic that if a voter says: I think I am entitled to vote; that they get the provisional ballot.

MR. O'NEILL: We believe the general way the states can most effectively pursue improvements in the provisional voting process is to take a quality improvement approach.

Defining quality begins in asking how well the system works now. But figuring it out to how open it is to error, recognition and correction. And by asking how well our provisional voting process is connected to the other parts of the machine that they need to be well characterized to the registration and voter identification names. So to do all that requires a systematic quality improvement program that starts by
collecting data that is not now generally available. The data collected should insure a list of the specific reasons why provisional ballots were not counted; measures of variance among jurisdictions, counties or even precincts; a hard look at the time actually required to evaluate the ballots by jurisdiction and then comparing that to what the statute or regulation allows in that state. If it is simply unrealistic what kind of changes are needed? And an accurate and timely report on provisional votes cast and counted by jurisdiction down to the precinct level so you can spot anomalies and take a look at where more poll worker training may necessary to get them up to the standard you would like the entire state operate at.

MR. FOLEY: Just to give an example of this. Most of you know about Washington State's experience with its gubernatorial election in 2004. That illustrated several things about this process. One of which was this issue is the provisional voter registered? And in some localities the answer came back yes, and this was not true by the way of only Washington State, this occurred in other states in lower profile races. So the answer comes down back "no,
we have looked at our data base, our files and we don't have this voter as a registered voter." Then the question arises well they are not in the system but did you go back to the original voter registration card and see for whatever reason that card for a new registrant was not entered in the system in the run up to this particular election? Sure enough it turned out there were a substantial number of voters in Washington state, and elsewhere, that had submitted timely registration forms; that had submitted timely registration forms; had submitted procedurally proper registration forms and they should have been in the system but were not through no fault of their own. That's the very thing that a provisional voting fail safe is supposed to protect against. But it couldn't protect against it if the only checking mechanism is to go back to the data base as opposed to going back to the original voter registration card. The reason why the poll book, the precinct official has, didn't the registered voter is because they weren't in the system to begin with. So there was a match between what the poll book said and what the system said but the misstep was getting that card entered in the system in the first place given the high volume of new registrations filed at the deadline.
The courts ordered those forms to be entered into the system and ordered those provisional ballots to count several weeks after the election had already be certified.

So here is an example of where the methodology used and the process used determined what does it mean to be a registered voter really matters which is why there has to specific standards on that.

And that gets into the finality point, or the timing point that we have already talked about. If it takes, five, six, eight weeks to add those hundreds of voters to the certified total you run up against serious deadlines. You have past certification deadlines. In some cases you have past inauguration deadline. You have past the Federal so called safe harbor deadline for Presidential races.

So there was an ability to increase accuracy that had outcome determinative effects in terms of who was the winner of the governor's race in Washington. That final certification occurred two days before New Year's Eve. So again accuracy verses timing is a these that needs to be evaluated as you specify what are best practices for implementing the evaluation process.

MR. O'NEILL: The heart of this quality
approach for improving the provisional voting process is to access each stage of the provisional voting process. Before the election the better the voters understand their rights and obligations the easier the system will be to manage and the more legitimate the appearance of the process.

At the polling place? Avoiding error at the polling place will allow more voters to cast a regular ballot and all others who requested cast a provisional ballot. In the evaluation process the clarity of the criteria for evaluating voter eligibility is critical to a sound process for deciding which of the cast provisional ballots should be counted.

And post election we believe the best practice is for states to consider how to complete, as Ed was just saying, all the steps in the evaluation of ballots and challenges to that determinations within the five weeks available in Presidential elections it is important top provide timely information to voters about the disposition of their provisional ballot. For instance having cast a provisional ballot this time are they now registered for future elections. They should know that. If not what do they need to do to be covered?

As I said at the opening we look at this
briefing as an opportunity to continue our research by hearing from you. The detailed examination of each stage in the provisional voting process we hope can lay the foundation that each state needs to improve its system.

Efforts to improve provisional voting may be most effective as a part of a broader effort to strengthen voting systems. Collecting and analyzing data about those systems will enable states to identify which aspects of the registration and electoral process are most important into the provisions voting process. Responsible officials can then look to their registration system, their identification requirements, poll worker training, as ways to reduce the need for voters to cast their ballot provisionally and evaluate them consistently. Thank you and we are looking forward to our discussion.

MR. FOLEY: Likewise. Thank you.

And just one more general remark to share with you before turning it over for questions and so forth. If 2004 was a learning experience in terms of the provisional voting process. And we saw stresses imposed on that system and we were asking could the provisional voting process handle the stresses of a
close election and the demands put on it. I think right now, two years later in 2006 we are in an interesting situation because there has been reaction to 2004, as Tomb said. There has been new legislation. Some of that new legislation has alleviated some of the stresses that were imposed onto the provisional voting system, having increased its ability to be the fail safe that HAVA and Congress spoke of. But some of the legislation and some of the developments candidly put more stresses on the provisional voting system. It is possible that as we go forward in elections this Fall and in the future we will see higher rates of provisional ballots past, not lower rates more demands in terms of how to evaluate them. Some of this again is maybe good and important for understandable reasons, but as the data bases get rolled out and as there are complexities in terms of rolling out the data bases that may cause more questions to be asked about the eligibility of a registered voter. And that may cause that voter to cast a provisional ballot whereas in the past the question would not have been raised and would have cast a regular ballot.

Likewise in the states without the voter ID requirements those new requirements may raise questions.
about eligibility causing more votes to be cast as provisional votes in stead of regular votes.

So that has created a rather interesting phenomenon and that HAVA said from a voting rights perspective, if you will, said we saw the situation in which a voter went to vote, turned up at the voting place on election day believing that they were entitled and then finding that they were purged, sometimes erroneously purged, and they were turned away. So what provisional voting was designed to do is to make sure no one was ever turned away like that. They could at least cast a provisional ballot and then we could ask questions.

Some of the new legislation and some of the new demands being put on the system have instead of saying this is really for the voter. They are saying this a reason to check eligible voters and therefore instead of using a provisional ballot to give the voter an opportunity so that they are not cast away we are going to use this provisional ballot so that the voter doesn't case a regular ballot. We are going to put them in the question mark category rather than the yes category which is different than putting them in the question mark category rather than the no category. But
as that happens more questions marks get raised so more stress gets put on the system. Thank you.

MS. HODGKINS: Thank you Mr. O'Neill and Professor Foley. Members of the Standards Board we have about 35 minutes until the end of this session for your discussion, comments. I know many of you have questions about perhaps the methodology, their conclusions maybe experiences you would like to share. I am going to be here to make sure this is an orderly process. And as you had in your previous session there are several hand held mics that are around the room. If you will indicate to me that you're interested in making a statement will recognize you and then we bring a mic to you and let you speak. Please do remember to identify yourself before you start speaking Mr. Szczesniak?

MR. SZCZESNIAK: Yes. I guess through from the presentation I got the sense that many states as part of your survey have coworkers make the determination as to whether or not the provisional ballot was a good deal or not; is that correct, or was I misunderstanding something.

MR. O'NEILL: We did not mean to imply that.

MR. SZCZESNIAK: That's good because it didn't make any sense to me.
MR. FOLEY: It is after determination. And

sometimes it's two after the facts that the process
gets wrapped up. Sometimes it is two weeks. So there is
considerable variation on how long the boards take to
process the provisionals.

MR. O'NEILL: Another comment is many people
that do put that out are the old states. But it is
truly a fail safe provision and we focus that in the
training of the inspectors, poll workers so they
understand that nobody leaves the polling place
without having had the opportunity to vote either on
the machine, by court order or by provisional ballot.

MR. SZCZESNIAK: But many people cast a
ballot thinking they are registered voters and they
aren't. There is a requirement that we do not put in
our poll box any inactive voters whether active or not.
Many people who show up at the right place but they
just can't. We give them the affidavit and we check
them out and give them a chance.

Some reason they are not counted is that
people have moved within out jurisdiction. They are in
the right church and the wrong pew. They are still
eligible to vote but now with the new requirement and
because of federal lawsuits says right church wrong pew
that's okay. But if they are in the wrong church they
just can't be counted. So we tell them to go to the
right polling place if they want to get counted.

MS. HODGKINS: Mr. Kennedy?

MR. KENNEDY: Kevin Kennedy from Wisconsin. I
have a question about the methodology in the sense that
you have 43 states that do not include the six states
with election day registration?

MR. O'NEILL: That is correct, yes.

MS. HODGKINS: Yes, ma'am behind Al.

MS. ROUST: Sue Roust from South Dakota. On
page eight of your handout at the top that says: "EAC
should recommend to the states that they" and one of
the bullet points is: "Make clear the only permissible
requirement to obtain a provisional ballot is an
affirmation that the voter is registered in the
jurisdiction and eligible to vote in a federal
election."

Are you saying that you feel that the EAC
should recommend that on that question of do you have
to be at the right precinct or you just have to be
eligible to be registered anywhere in the jurisdiction. Are you saying that the EAC should come down on the side that if you go to the wrong precinct that your registered somewhere in that jurisdiction that you should be allowed to vote or that your provisional ballot should count?

MR. FOLEY: Well first of all it is our understanding in examining the case law that has developed on this that HAVA itself does not require the states to adopt the so called wrong precinct you count the ballot rule.

So it couldn't be mandated as a matter of what HAVA requires. In terms of-- if EAC considers itself in a position to provide best practice type recommendations that aren't necessarily HAVA requirements then it could be considered whether or not as a policy matter is there something advisable. And actually in reference to the New York litigation it seemed that a middle step position is that if a state is going to allow for multiple precincts to exist within the same location and the voter shows up at the correct location but ends up in the wrong line at that
location could that be considered attributable to administrative error as opposed to voter error? That was the holding of the New York case. So that the voter should get the benefit of the doubt if they go to the right place even if they ended up in the wrong line. And we thought as a policy matter that was appropriate to recommend as best practices. Beyond that probably it makes sense to say that as a matter of Federalism in federal law it's really up to the state whether to go beyond that.

MS. HODGKINS: Mr. Clark.

MR. CLARK: Bradley Clark from California.

I was just curious. How you on methodology how you selected your 400 jurisdictions to survey?

MR. O'NEILL: It was a stratified random sample we looked for size, a mix of size, a mix of urban and suburban and then selected randomly from within that. We have our poll director here if you would like more details.

MS. HODGKINS: Mr. Sholl.

MR. SHOLL: Howard Sholl from Delaware. I have a few comments.

First of all in your analysis you seemed to
forget there are different types of provisional ballots. By that I mean in Delaware we had 300 and some odd provisional ballots that were cast between 400,000 people and you were saying we were doing a very good job. Well, actually if you would count our fail safe if someone changes an address instead of sending them to a different a different polling or giving them a provisional ballot we made every effort to qualify them and let them vote normal. So instead of having 6 percent rate that we counted you count the 6 or 7 thousand change of addresses that we did at the polling place we ended up counting 95 percent of our so called provisional ballots.

So there is a difference of what a state calls a provisional ballot. You will find that it varies across the country and that could effect your analysis to some degree.

Second of all. You are very correct information needs to be distributed to the election officials and their friends. It also needs to go to the media who consistently misrepresented what provisional voting was. The media in the Philadelphia market said you can vote anywhere you want to. Well that wrong in Pennsylvania, that was wrong in Delaware and I don't
know about New Jersey. But people picked up information
from elsewhere in the country and misrepresented it to
their populations. So the media needs a heck of a lot
of education about what provisional voting is so they
don't misrepresent it to the voter, because we can't
counter what the media blitz misrepresents.

MR. FOLEY: Well that underscores what we
were saying were A this is a dynamic evolving process
and not static. We couldn't agree more with that point.
Secondly we agreed very much as Tom said that there
were challenges, methodological challenges in terms of
finding the right data, evaluating the right data, and
one theme in our recommendation, and you know-- besides
we are a snapshot or synopsis of the larger report. But
one theme is that a very helpful role that the EAC can
play is that of data collection, data consistency in
terms of terminology or data classification of data. So
we hope that through this cycle of empirical studies is

just the first in a series of cycles of empirical
studies that increase knowledge and increase
understanding of the mechanics of the process.

MR. O'NEILL: Can I respond also.

MS. HODGKINS: Sure.

MR. O'NEILL: Mr. Sholl you said that there
are different kinds of provisional ballots in Delaware.
Is there more than one category of provisional ballot that you report? Or are there some sorts of things that provisional ballots aren't really provisional ballots as we have been referring to? When you talk about qualifying voters for instance to make sure that they can vote a regular ballot?

MR. SHOLL: Howard Sholl from Delaware.

No, we call a provisional ballot exactly what it is: it is a provisional ballot. It's the last chance to vote. So that's what we report, we don't report fail safe, what we call fail safe voting call. We update your address at the polling place, we verify the registration and we let them vote it. That's not in our lingo a provisional ballot. But it is in the lingo of other states what a provisional ballot is.

So when you're looking at Delaware versus Ohio versus California you're looking at apples and oranges.

MR. O'NEILL: Thank you.

MR. HODGKINS: The lady in the back and then we will come over here for Mr. Lomax.

MS. ANDERSON: Sharon Anderson from Minnesota.

My question is about limiting the study to 43 states that do not now have election day registration,
and I guess North Dakota doesn't have registration at. I am curious about studying those EDR states in the future. And the reason that I ask that is I have spent my entire 27 years in the county office is riveted with election day registration. And certainly on election day in those EDR states is moving that whole decision making process to election day. And one of the slides that you were showing is training between the poll workers makes a big difference, I can assure you that makes a huge difference when you are an EDR state. So my question is based in the thought that perhaps perhaps things to be learned from EDR states that could improve the provisional ballot process.

MS. HODGKINS: Mr. Lomax?

MR. LOMAX: Harvey Lomax, Clark county, Nevada.

I guess your sources of variation you listed is the experience of the state and how long a time the state has given to resolve the provisional ballot. Yet I would suggest kind of piggy backing on what Howard said that the laws of the state-- if you take the laws of California and Nevada and look it the laws of who past the provisional ballot. They drive (sic) more the number of provisional ballots cast, how long it takes to resolve those issues and how many are going to be
excepted. And most of that has to do with how people changes in address and if you allow changes in address up to the last minute.

In Nevada for instance no changes in address are allowed. So all we are dealing with are they registered or are they not registered. That's pretty much it. So it doesn't take us as long. And you're going to have a much higher rejection rate.

Just on the side a different issue. I can also speak loud and clear not all voters who show up and attest that they are registered voters even begin to qualify. In Nevada a high tourism state down there in Las Vegas in the 2004 elections we had people from all over the country insisting they had a right to vote in Nevada. And we let them vote provisionally and we didn't count them.

MR. FOLEY: And we are by no means suggesting that provisional votes should be counted if in fact the provisional voter was not properly registered voter. And in fact one of the problems that occurred in the state of Washington was the erroneous inclusion of provisional voters, of some provisional ballots in the final certified total that should not have been included. They were included prior to the evaluation
process. So there are two possible errors. There is the exclusion of one that should have been validated. And the other kind of error is the inclusion of those that should not have been validated. In a well designed system we try to minimize both types of error.

MR. O'NEILL: Let me supplement that a little bit.

I think what is driving our recommendation is anybody that comes in and affirms that he or she is registered and eligible to get a provisional ballot is driven by the pressures on the poll workers on election day. And we gladly not see those poll workers time taken up by sort of a quasi traditional process in deciding whether any particular voter really deserves a provisional ballot. Everybody should get it and sort out later when you have a matter of weeks rather than matter of hours. That is the burden of our argument.

MS. HODGKINS: The gentleman in the blue shirt?

MR. TERWILLIGER: Bob Terwilliger from the state of Washington.

I hear categorizations of states by the way the they verify (inaudible) the ballot. You talk about a voters affidavit and current ID as if they exclusive. In the state of Washington we actually use three.
determine whether or not they get a mechanical ballot. The only thing we don't have is to return with your ID. If we have an affidavit on the envelope we check the signature. We also verify that he or she is an actual registered voter which to is three of the four that you list there.

MR. O'NEILL: We will clarify that.

MR. MILLER: Paul Miller also from the state of Washington.

And I was interested in your comments about going back and checking against the actual original registration card for a couple of reasons.

One the practical administration implications of that. And two because you cited Washington state specifically in regards to that. And I think that there may be possibly some misunderstanding as to what came out of the 2004 gubernatorial election in that regards.

First of all as a practical matter what I understand you to say is we ought to be going back and checking all of our voter registration cards to make sure we didn't inadvertently miss one or more. Obviously in King County where they have 1.2 million registered voters, as an administrative matter that is an impossibility.
Two, what I am understanding you to refer to actually is a little more complex; but, raises some additional questions I think you might want to investigate in your survey which is what can be remedied in voters registration when either the provisional affidavit is incomplete or when the original voter registration form is incomplete. If the person, for example, didn't sign the voter registration form they can't be made inactive registered voter. Can that be remedied with a provisional ballot and a signature verification if the address was an invalid address and couldn't be precincted can we give them a provisional ballot? Those are some of the kinds of issues that did come out and we were forced, in Washington, to clarify those kinds of questions.

MR. FOLEY: Those are really important questions. And absolutely that's where clarify is the primary value. It's much more important to have an answer to that question ahead of time that it matters what the answer is. So if the issue is a missing address we should ahead of time what the consequences of that missing address is. It either counts or it won't count. But at least you know the rule ahead of time So I absolutely agree with that.

MR. O'NEILL: And I believe the court case
you are referring to is the Judge ordered King County
to seek signatures for provisional when they hadn't
signed the provisional ballot. That's my understanding
of the decision in that case. My guess is that was the
court case you were referring to.

MR. FOLEY: Well there were multiple cases as
you know. And one piece of good news on this I do
think the HAVA requirement of statewide centralized
voter registration data bases will help because I think
a well designed data base will always archive any
retained historical records with respect to registered
voter. In the event of a purge or in the event of some
action on that registered voter you can go back and
archive the history. And that will minimize to a
considerable degree issues about the validity of the
status should they arise in the context of a
provisional ballot.

But there is still a question of the point of
intake question. In other words until you get that
registrant within the system, in the centralized data
base there is a gap and we have seen it. It is not just
in Washington. There are gaps in terms of forms
delivered to DMV that are not transferred timely to the
Board of Elections, who bears the burden of that risk?
Of course there is a different burden of risk if the
form is delivered to one of the third party groups. And
they make a mistake. I am not saying that all risks
should be borne by the state. Some risk should be borne
by the voters. Some risks maybe should be borne by the
system. But the most important issue is to clarify
ahead of time is who bears the risk of a missed form,
and under what circumstances?

MS. HODGKINS: The gentleman in the back and
then we will go to Mr. McCormack.
REGIS YOUNG: Regis Young from Pennsylvania.
You made several points about educating the
polls workers throughout your presentation. But nowhere
did you mention educating the news media. I am
following up on what Howard mentioned before especially
in Pennsylvania in 2004 the news media kind of took
over our election by advertising and saying it doesn't
matter if you're registered or not just go vote. It
doesn't matter where you live just go vote to your
nearest polling place. And I was wondering did you
gather any statistics on your survey in Pennsylvania? We had a low percentage of counting the provisional ballots because of that. It was too late for us to get to the the news media to change.

I think it should be noted that on the national level the news media should be trained right down to the local newspapers.

MR. O'NEILL: They usually resist training.
MS. HODGKINS: Okay. Mr. Lindback and then
Secretary Markowitz.

MR. LINDBACK: John Lindback, I am Director of Elections in Oregon.

You know we are one of those odd ball states where we do things very differently and it effects your study I am sure. One of those states that make you rip your hair out.

One of the things we found with implementation of state wide voter registration program is in a primary election last week is it appears that the number of provisional ballots went dramatically down because of our statewide voter registration system. It sort of strikes me that your research team
lists us as a moving target in regards to the dynamics of elections changing in this country. And I sympathize with. And I am wondering if you could go back for a second to your slide on your quality improvement program because I have a question about that.

MR. O'NEILL: Tell me when.

MR. LINDBACK: That one. As election officials we get told we ought to do a lot of things. And in fact I have gotten kind of used to it. Ever since 2000 we have to do this and we have to do that we have to do a lot of things that are very good ideas. Rarely do we get a suggestion are we told how to do it. And a cost effective in a efficient way. And I am looking specifically for example at time required to evaluate ballots by jurisdiction.

When we get into that level of detain and data collection I need to hire a full time person to collect that data at election time. I don't have the budget to do that or the resources to do it and that kind of thing.

I think we are appreciated as election officials when folks from the academic world do studies and make recommendations. We don't only need recommendations on what we ought to do as to how we ought to do it and how we can do it in a cost effective
and efficient way. I think if you folks would look at
that specifically with request to these four
suggestions because to me they look expensive and
overwhelming is some respects when we are trying to
collect the data.

MR. FOLEY: I hope we were sensitive to that.
we tried to be, maybe not sufficiently, but we wrestled
with the notion of trying get specific. And there are
downsides to getting too specific on some of these
issues, particularly as to what date should this be
done by. It also relates to a larger theme which I
theme which I as an academic.

I think requires a dialogue between people
who are implementing election law in practice as
administrators and then people who are studying it. And
a real genuine back and forth ongoing dynamic dialogue
because what would it take to build an optimal
provisional voting system is not an easy task just in
terms of identifying the values. And there are trade
off values, there is a trade off between accuracy and
finality not to mention not to mention budgets and
expenses. And I think it is unfair to election
officials that the media in particular and public
rhetoric demands more than is achievable. It is sort of
an expectation that the system is going to be perfect
that provisional voting is going to be that automatic
fail safe.

I think one of the education functions that
hopefully the EAC can play given its public profile is
that there needs to be more sophisticated
understanding that a well designed system can't promise
too much. And it can work without the-- cars, you know
well designed cars sometimes break down but we don't
think the car was poorly designed because you have to
take it to the shop every few years. And it may be that
a well designed election system, you know, is still
well designed it still functions appropriately given
the budget and so forth even though it has glitches
here and there.

I don't think the public is not quite at that
point in the conversation, and hopefully our process

and the EAC can help with that understanding.

MR. O'NEILL: We agree with the thrust of
your comments I believe somewhere in here we have a
bullet point that calls for an assessment of cost
effectiveness of the kinds of regulations you set up to
improve and evaluate provisional ballots.

You will find also here a specific reference
to the check list that has been using, Colorado to
9 record the reasons provisional ballots were not
10 excepted with a simple three letter code and will allow
11 you to go back at the end of the election and process
12 and evaluate why persons are getting into the
13 provisional ballot line and why they are failing to
14 have their ballots evaluated and counted. It will give
15 you a check on the functioning of many parts of the
16 system.
17 And many of these pieces of information are
18 collected for other purposes. You know how many
19 provisional ballots are cast. You know how many are
20 counted. But they are not necessarily compiled in a way
21 that allows you to analyze the data at leisure once
22 the election is over. So in general what we are calling

23 for is using the data for two purposes; to call the
24 election and after it is all over to analyze why the
25 system worked the way it did in that particular
26 election. Your right it is a moving target and each
27 year will be a little different.
28 MS. HODGKINS; Secretary Markowitz? And Adam
29 if you wouldn't mind the gentleman on the front row
30 will be next and secretary Ruggiero will have the last
31 word.
32 MS. MARKOWITZ: Secretary of State, Deborah
Markowitz from Vermont.

I like to go back to the comments from Delaware. As you continue to study this issue you look at what the goal of provisional balloting is and then evaluate how it is working state by state. Vermont is your lowest participant in provisional voting and that's because our-- we actually do something better than that like Delaware where we have affidavit voting. So somebody comes in-- and we have a terrible problem with motor voter, and I don't know about the rest of the other states, but routinely there are thousands of people who never make it on the voter rolls because those registration forms aren't filled out correctly and don't get to us or don't get to the right place and really, in most cases, through no fault of the voter. So for many years and we are called an old state with provisional balloting and we have resolved by allowing somebody to swear or affirm that they were registered and we simply add them to the check list on election day and allow them to vote.

In Vermont provisional voting is reflected in two things: One was town clerks or election officials who misunderstood provisional voting and used it instead of the activating list and we should have a lower number than that. Or there were people from
Connecticut who come to Vermont and think they have a right to vote in any polling place because they are Americans. So we should say that we have something better that allows them to have an actual ballot.

MR. FOLEY: Oh, absolutely. Like Tom said and I will definitely repeat. A large number of provisional ballots cast in a jurisdiction is by no means necessarily a good thing. And a large number of provisional ballots counted is not necessarily a good thing because maybe those folks should have gotten an actual ballot in the first place, if it was determined that they were registered voters why weren't they voting a regular ballot.

Now, again, a fire extinguisher is good. It is good to have safety measures. It is good to have fire extinguisher if there is a fire that you have to put out. It would be nice to avoid the first in the first place. And some of the academic research that we drew upon was efforts to have improvements in registration systems that would avoid the need for provisional voting and put less stress on the on provisional voting precisely because provisional voting is after election day when the litigants want to gain the system. In other words in a post election
environment there is inevitably going to be extra stress if the election is close. So it would be much, much better if you could reduce the number of provisional ballots cast and have those be actual ballots if that is a feasible thing. So that's why we talk about the relationship between the provisional voting system as a subsystem, with the data bases another subsystem. It is an important component and it is provided by HAVA and it is good to have fire extinguishes. But one needs and overall assessment of the totality of the states election system really to be able to evaluate its component that is provisional voting.

MR. BLEVINS: Don Blevins, Lexington, Kentucky. I have got a couple of things. Number one you say that everybody should get a provisional ballot. And the application, if we decide to put it in place, is not a good thing. We only allow a provisional ballot for federal elections only. And given that there is no such thing really as a federal election. There is an election day in America where we elect officers of a all levels of government including six cities where half a dozen people get together and decide they want to have a little city. So for those of us who administer elections on the local level we have
to absorb the entire scheme of officers and issues that
are on the ballot. So in our state the way we put it in
place in a perfect situation we would never count a
provisional ballot. We have it orchestrated so that

that truly is a last resort. On the other hand we want
the voters to be able to vote in all election issues
and races that they are eligible to vote in. And when
they choose the provisional ballot route they have
opted out of that. So that is not necessarily the best
route to go.

We have a statewide data base. We have had it
for a long time. We have a leg up on the states that
don't have that. And we have a telecommunications
system that allows us check the registration. The size
of the population of the state plays a roll we have
four million people, two million registered voters.
They top that in Los Angeles county in California. So I
can tell you from my administration we would have to
look at this in a different context by virtue of sheer
volume.

The second thing I want to point out to you
is that I think the biggest over simplification that
was in HAVA was this idea that we are not training poll
workers well enough. Or we are not training the public
well enough. I don't think the federal government has
got enough money to train the electorate out there on

how to do this voting. So the burden of the election on
the county. When people talk about.

Educating poll workers I hear what I think
must be a two, three or four day training session. And
you're lucky if you get them in for 30, 40 minutes.
They have the attention span of a kindergartner. So
this is over glorified and under appreciated that these
poll workers are volunteers and get paid poorly. And
until there is some heat built up on the state to put
up more money poll workers were are we going to get
that?

Another thing that HAVA wants is we are
supposed to teach them a sensitivity about disabled. We
are supposed to teach them about provisional ballots.
we have to teach them about state law and all this. You
know, I don't know about anybody else but we get a them
for two hours we have performed a miracle. So this idea
of training being the answer to everything I think you
are going to find between academics and practice there
is a big over simplification difference.

MR. FOLEY: I think we are very much in the
arena because it is because of that complexity and
difficulty that out point about the practical rule of thumb is to give them a provisional ballot. And I stress that is when the poll workers are in a position to say I am in a position were I can not give this voter standing in front of me, or a would be voter, a regular ballot. Something has caused me to make the determination that they can't vote a regular ballot. They are not on my list; they don't have the right ID whatever. If at that point the voter says I don't want to go home empty handed I would like to vote a provisional ballot because I believe I am eligible it is at that point that our recommendation is don't take time to worry about that. You have too much on your mind poll worker. At that point you know you're not going to let them in the regular booth or regular ballot give them a provisional ballot. So it is not giving them a provisional ballot instead of letting them vote regularly. That is not an issue.

MR. O'NEILL: I did not follow one part of your comment, maybe you can straighten it out for me. You said you don't like the issue of the provisional ballot in Kentucky. And if you do the person who get it
doesn't get to vote in a local election. That's the part I didn't understand.

MR. BLEVINS: We chose to make the provisional ballot only for federal elections. We went with HAVA in that regard that it only applied to federal elections.

MR. O'NEILL: I understand. Thank you.

MR. BLEVINS: And we did that for several reasons that may not make a lot sense here. Voter fraud, and vote ban and those sort of things.

MR. O'NEILL: You're talking to someone from New Jersey.

MS. HODGKINS: Thank you Mr. Blevins.

Secretary Rokita.

MR. ROKITA: I have a couple comments and a couple of questions if you can bear with me.

First of all for the record I also agree that there is much more relationship between this subject and ERA than to your research currently. And I would suggest doing a little more research in that regard. For example when EAC requires that full service agencies to continue to accept voter registrations it's
a great thing. But you're also at the same time right
after the election and if you would the election coming
up after registering it might be driving more people to
the polling place like NVRA requires only to have them
cast a provisional ballot because the registrant won't
let us pass. So issues like that I think might be
right for some of your discussions.

What data point did you specifically come up
to conclude that if someone is in the right polling
site, all be it not the right precinct, that their
ballot should count?

MR. FOLEY: It was a core decision, correct.

MR. ROKITA: I understand. Just for example a
photo ID, I will use that as an example, are you saying
that there is a coral effect between the time allowed
to count a provisional ballot and the rate-- are you
saying there is a causal effect and the rate of
counting that provisional ballot and voter ID are you
saying it causal?

MR. FOLEY: No. We found correlation if you
will, I don't have the time but I could go into this
more. But I don't think we are making a finding on

causation.
MR. ROKITA: Well, if it is not causal I
guess my point would be, so you can respond, what value
is it to be in this report?

MR. O'NEILL: The existence of the correlation
between having less time to evaluate ballots and with
fewer ballots being excepted it is an indication to us
that something is going on. We don't know exactly
whether it is causative or merely highly correlated.
But whatever it is it makes it worth while looking at
the time period allowed to evaluate ballots and try to
figure out if it is causing it. And you can do that
for instance by finding out are there a bunch of
ballots that you never got to at the end of the
process, the process was only three days long. It is
worthy of further investigation.

My own suspicion is that the arrow of
causality does flow that way but it is only a
suspicion.

MR. FOLEY: And there would be reasons to
look at the timing issue even if that data didn't
exist. I mean it maybe anecdotal but I mean I keep

referring to Washington but half of the Washington
governor's race the process for evaluating the ballots
shut down on the same date in 2004 as a matter of state
law that the federal Supreme Court in Bush vs. Gore
shut down the counting process in 2000, the current
governor would be a different incumbent. So the fact
that the process took longer than the five weeks
that federal law allows for Presidential elections
shows that timing can be outcome determinative.

And I simply wanted to share that knowledge
with all of you as you determine for your own races
what is the appropriate time table to utilize before
bringing the process to conclusion.

MR. O'NEILL: And my recommendation for the
EAC is that they be very careful with this research
were things are not causal or currently suspicions that
we say that.

I think at the outset with some of these
subjects, and I am usually the first on up to bat, but
some of the other subjects that we are going to deal
with maybe the same way, maybe not. But these issue
these themes are not conducive to very easy data
gathering. I must have said that ten times here. And
maybe it has to stop right there or slow down right
there. Maybe there is value in just saying that, rather
than try to fit a square peg in a round hole where
these potential conclusions or these correlations that
you're saying could be taken by the public as
conclusion or causality when there really is none.

MS. HODGKINS: Thank you. Mr. Martinez, we do apologize for running this session over time but--

MR. MARTINEZ: That was great. We were looking for the kind of discussion we had today. It's very valuable to us. We are on the record and we can come back and really consider the comments. We really do appreciate them all and are looking for this kind of discussion.

I am speaking for myself and not the EAC in saying this. I think there is strong sentiment at the EAC, at least from my perspective, to evaluate in very sound and deliberative manner, Mr. Secretary, the kinds of reports of reports that were presented to you. Keep in mind these reports are from our consultants to the EAC and we are sharing them with you. These were not EAC reports that we have adopted and are presenting to you for final analysis.

There is a complete difference in those areas and that's why we took these extremely important steps to show you what the consultants have brought to us and sharing it with you at this stage in the development so we can then honor that importance to deliberate and contemplate very thoroughly before we embrace whether it is voluntary guidance or best practices. So we are...
very much in that period. I encourage it for the rest
of the discussions we are going to discuss.

All right. We are going to take a quick
break our next topic will be Research on Poll Worker
Recruitment.

Madam Chair, it is 4:20 and I am calling for
a 15 minutes break or so. Reassemble in 15 minutes,
please.

(Recess taken at 4:20 p.m., and reconvened at
4:40).

MR. MARTINEZ: We are starting again. We have
one more session left. I know it has been a long
afternoon full of a lot of information. We have one

session left for today and tomorrow we will hit you
again with a long session.

What we are going to do today is give you a
presentation regarding another one of our contracted
research projects and that is pertaining to poll worker
recruitment, training and retention for poll workers
who are generally used at the polls but targeted
specifically as well to college poll workers, to the
population of college poll workers.

We have a couple of consultants that we have
hired that have done some tremendous work and want to
share the results of that work. What I am going to do is ask Karen Lynn Dyson who we all heard before. She is our project research manager at the EAC and has been with us for quite some time now to stand up and give us a quick introduction of our project consultants and anything else she might want to say.

However I forgot I am supposed to recognize your chair, Peggy Nighswonger who wants to give you a quick piece of information, Madam Chair.

MS. NIGHSWONGER: Okay. I am just going to tell you that 66 ballots were counted successfully. So please welcome Tonni as our new Executive Director. We are leaving right after this session.

MR. MARTINEZ: Congratulations. Karen Lynn-Dyson will make the introductions and we will get to the last presentation of the afternoon.

MS. LYNN-DYSON: Commissioner Martinez just mentioned that I have been with the EAC for some time and I could swear either he said or Chairman Boyer said I have been here for years. He said a lifetime.

I am pleased to introduce two of our contractors Abby Horn who is to my immediate right. And Abbey is the Assistant Director for the Center for Election Integrity at Cleveland State University.
leads the Center as Acting Assistant Director and she came to the Center as a democracy for the United States for International Development and did a lot of work all over the world, primarily in Central America related to democracy and citizenship.

The Center for Election Integrity at Cleveland State University is a partnership of the Cleveland Marshall College of Law and the Massey, Goodman, Levine College of Urban Affairs. She draws upon the long-standing expertise from those colleges in electoral and regulatory law, public education and civic education. The Center for Election Integrity provides research, training, consultation to assist Ohio in becoming a national leader in transparent, legal, efficient and accurate elections. It is three organizations dedicated to three interconnected missions: To assist Ohio in becoming the national leader in elections; to help assure the citizens trust that their elections are fair, lawful and accurate and to undertake scholarly studies and offer recommendations on election administration and legal reform at the state, local and international level.

Again Abby is overseeing the Cleveland State's efforts related to college poll worker.
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recruitment and training and retention.

Jennifer Collins-Foley to Abby's right is an attorney who has provided democracy development around the world since 1989 working with election administrators, civic organizations and political parties in the former Soviet Union, Central Asia and the Middle East.

Jennifer has served in the Elections Administration Community since 1996, spending seven years as Assistant Registrar of Voters of LA County. She now serves as an Election Administration Consultant. And has worked in recent years with us and on this project with IFES. And IFES for those of you who don't know was established in 1987 as a non governmental, non partisan, non profit organization. IFES has provided assistance to current elections, the rule of law, civil society and good government in more than a hundred countries including the US. IFES is headquartered in Washington with offices in nearly 30 countries and it specializes in technical assessments, poll worker training programs, technical observations, election commission management reviews and election equipment and commodities procurement systems.

IFES is the contractor for the Elections
Assistance Commission is doing work on the general poll worker recruitment and training and retention project. So with that I am going to turn it over to Jennifer who is going to make her presentation that will last for about 15 minutes. And then Abby will go for about 15 minutes. And then I will open it up for questions. Thank you.

RESEARCH ON POLL WORKER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION (INCLUDING COLLEGE POLL WORKERS)

Presenters: Jennifer Collins-Foley, IFES.

Abby Horn, Cleveland State University
Karen Lynn-Dyson, EAC.

MS. COLLINS-FOLEY: First off I want to say it is an honor it is to work on this project because I am a self proclaimed poll geek. And to be part of a team that gets to look at these issues for 15 months and actually get paid for it. And talk to hundreds of election places across the country it's really neat. And I have been having a lot of fun with it.

Went over a little bit of where the project came from, of course it stems from a Help America Vote Act that is such an important program and is the heart
We were awarded this project in September 2005 and it goes until the end of this year 2006, a fifteen month applied research project. We are working under IFES, International Foundation Election Systems, and it has been terrific working with them. It is a fantastic international program offering technical systems to jurisdictions in the US, and visa versa offering models from the US to international partners.

I am President of an organization called the Poll Worker Institute which is a relatively new non profit focusing on poll worker issues in the US, and we have a Board that is quite active. Conny McCormack is on the Board; Beverly Kauffman from Harris County Texas and Lynn Shadman from Washington D.C. And we are also very fortunate to have the League of Women Voters working on this project as well. I don't have to introduce the League I guess.

What we have been working on these past 13 months is we have been partners with Cleveland State University to compile 50 state laws as they apply to poll workers to compile field tested practices in poll
worker recruiting, training and retention. We pulled
together a working group to give us guidance over the
course of this program.

We conducted some focus groups with the
League of Women Voters project earlier this year. We
are developing a how to practical guide book which we
will talk about in a few minutes. And I hope you have
the job table of contents that was supposed to have
been distributed to you earlier today. We will be
conducting some pilot projects to test the guidebook.

I won't go too much into the compilation of
state laws because Abby is going to talks about that
more in a bit.

The three things we found really impacted the
ability to have innovative poll worker programs were
age requirement, obviously if you want to bring high
school or college students in that can sometimes can be
an impediment. Residency requirement become an issue if
the poll worker can only serve in that precinct. They
can start more innovative programs like corporate or
college. And being required to be nominated by your
political party can also achieve programs that are a
little more out of the box.

We were very fortunate to partner with the National Association of Counties. They were going to do an intensive survey of counties on poll worker practices. So we worked with them to have their survey be as helpful to us as it could be in terms of collecting practices. We also went to some fabulous programs or collection of practices that had been put together by NEMS, by NASED, by IACREAT, the Election Center and the EAC. So we began pulling together practices that we thought were bordering on successful. Some of them were not so successful, bordering on best practices but certainly in the successful realm. Early on we started pulling together our guidebook and then of course together with NECO Survey we were thrilled that we got three hundred responses out of three thousand counties.

Before I was in this project I used to think a ten percent response rate that is terrible. But that is really good when you are doing research. And our research people was thrilled with that. And of course it has given us fabulous stuff to work from. So we are
I am going to be putting out some results soon. And it is going to be great on who is doing what kinds of practices; who doing what kind recruiting. We also pulled together a great working group to guide us through the projects. I should have mentioned earlier IFES and the poll workers we pulled together were a terrific group for consultants to work on this project. All retired or current election officials who really had some field tested practices to share.

And on our working group we had State Election Directors, two local election directors from large and small jurisdictions from large and small jurisdictions, Academic advisor a research advisor, an adult learning advisor and a training expert form the private sector. So we really were able to pull together some good folks to help us look at whether these programs we were compiling really are successful. We also were fortunate to have advocates from the multi lingual and voters with Disabilities community. We have tried to call in as many (inaudible) as we can in addition to the NECO survey we are really trying to find out what is going on out there and pulling in some practices, and our working group pulling some information from them. We also pulled
together a round table with volunteers. Not all of us consider poll workers volunteers, in some places they do.

They gave us some pretty good thoughts on when you are working with volunteers apparently there is a growing trend in what we call episodic volunteers which means you get all your volunteering done in one big chunk. So really you would think that poll workers would follow that trend.

All you need to do is ask. And they said if you don't mind us telling you, your election officials don't ask the right questions if you're really going coworkers as volunteers. Uncle Sam needs you they tell us is a bomb. They advised us to think more about your community needs you on election day to serve in this place and this is what you are going to be doing. They said the more specific the request the better. So you're going to hear feedback from people who, like the Points of Light Foundation, people who are really in the field of volunteerism.

We talked to and interviewed training experts. A lot of you know Ray Hawkins and Robert Lovejoy (sic) absolute opinion leaders in the field. They gave us some terrific feedback. We had voters with Disability round table talk about some practices
on recruiting poll workers with disabilities. And also some pieces that are going to go in our guidebook that are really good for sensitivity training. Getting your poll workers to go out there and, you know, really make polls set up the best way to accommodate these folks.

The League of Women Voters in an amazing two or three month period did 19 focus groups in 17 jurisdictions. Obviously they were trying to compile strategies and also to underscore some potential put falls. They came back with some shocking survey analysis which is that election officials do work on shoe string budgets. I was amazed to know that. They also said that election officials had limited staff, and also that the election environment system historically had little need for change. Those of you or started transitioning from punch card voting back in the 60's will welcome the change. I am not supposed to side with the focus group results.

Now some current reasons for change include a course of Help America Vote Act, bringing in new technology that will have big impacts on poll workers. The increase of public scrutiny of election administrators obviously we all under the microscope now. And that means our poll workers are under the
microscope. Razor thin margins of electoral victories in recent elections. Obviously the candidates know who their voters are, and if they lose it must be our fault, or the poll workers fault. And finally the anticipated demographic changes that have served as agents for change. And this is everything from increasing needs to have more bilingual poll workers that kind of thing. So lots of change going on there.

The most common recruiting practices include word of mouth, personal networks, referrals, more people are paying more money. Lead poll workers in some places are selecting their own team. And some other very common recruiting practices, flyers, posters, adds. Check boxes on voter registration forms. This is traditionally you put something out there as an election official and the voter, the potential poll worker contacts you.

Some of the more innovative recruiting methods are where you find the partner and the partner gets you your poll workers and gets you-- instead of one poll worker they get you multiple poll workers. These programs include what we call county poll worker programs, also called governmental private sector, also called corporate poll worker programs, high school college student programs, civic organization programs
and bilingual poll worker programs.

One thing that came out of the focus groups is that it is generally more difficult to recruit poll workers from lower income areas and very wealthy areas. And for those of you who have read or will read our guidebook you will see that the chapter that says: "Tips for Recruiting Poll Workers in Low Income Areas" is blank. And that's because we actually haven't found very many good tips. We have spoken to literally dozens of election officials in low income areas, that have to recruit for low income areas including me in Los Angeles, and we are drawing a blank. There really are not too many successful tips. We are getting there. We are talking to churches. If anybody has any ideas I am listening so please do let me know. Another thing that the focus group found is it is especially difficult to get technological savvy poll workers in economically disadvantaged areas.

When we put this in our guidebook we are going to say: "Well, you have two choices you can kill yourself trying to find tech savvy people in those precincts or you shut them down". So our guidebook we are really trying to be very practical.

Strategies that met with mixed results
included recruiting a partnership of political parties.

Obviously there are practices out there of how many have this in their state law that you have to work with political parties. And the reality is that election officials have told us that this is mostly a bomb. Very few election officials have said: "Oh this is a fabulous recruiting technique." Most people have said this is the biggest pain in the neck ever. The people we get we can't place them, they are dead by the time-- I mean no disrespect. I mean very mixed results on this particular type of recruiting. Offering split shifts is another thing we found. First thing a voter on the street, a potential poll worker will say: "Well if I was offered split shifts I would be glad to do it." Then they find out that you-- that they have to find their partner because Hello we are not going to find their partner for them on the split shift and they quit. Or they say: "Do I have to share my stipend? There is no way I am doing that." So you know the perception is okay if we just this practice everything will be great. The reality is a little different. And our guidebook goes into some of these nuances.

And one things that has become a kind of undertone of our whole project is that there is, you know, strategies that give you the balmies (sic). Like
you know we always talk laughingly about the breathing test. If they are breathing we will hire them. And those strategies really go by the wayside in the time when we are using new technologies and we are under the microscope and there are all these tight elections. We really need to be working on strategies that provide the best poll poll workers not just enough poll workers.

Some successful messages that the League came back with from their focus groups are based on the person you ask you need to ask is it a family; is it a neighbor is it somebody calling person to person asking some kind of connection. The more specific you can be the better. And stress the benefit to the community.

Key findings on poll worker training. We found that in the focus groups and also in the NECO (sic) Survey and also in talking to literally hundreds of election workers across the country there is a trend from moving away from talking head training more to hands on roll playing, setting up a full poll worker station, a full mock polling place and the training and allowing as much hands on as possible. And one interesting thing that we found in both the survey and the focus groups is that paying poll workers to attend
training dramatically increases the people who turn out
for your training programs.

I am going to read this because I think it is
important: "The most important theme is--" You're
supposed to read from your power point." That is one

of the things that we learned when we were just
developing our conflict chapter in the manual. You're
not supposed to read from your manual but it is a good
quote you are allowed to. "The most important thing to
arise from the discussions of all the state holders is
there is no magic bullet. There is not a one size fits
all solutions for every jurisdiction or for reaching
out to every population. Election officials must
experiment to find the right balance for their
jurisdictions needs." I am sure that does not surprise
any of you. We all know everybody has had different
site jurisdictions, different demographics, different
support from your bosses, different size staffs. And so
because this is a kind of a theme of our project.

Our guidebook has become what we call a
recipe book. Let me share with you this is what I call
my Betty Crocker Cookbook. And in our guidebook we
actually do have practices that are the very basic,
boiling an egg. And you know the hamburger version of
recipe books. And in our guidebook we have some very
basic practices such as word of mouth, or putting up a
poster at the polling place. And this is the diet cookbook it's an Oprah cookbook. This is an analogy
for the smaller jurisdictions that needed a different
kind of recipe because they are trying to stretch their
calories further sort of speak. Then you have the
connoisseurs cookbook. So there are pieces of the
guidebook that are a little bit more for a jurisdiction
that is really trying to be cutting edge and wants to
do all sorts of fancy new things, new ways of
recruiting, new ways of training, fancy power points.
All of, you know, more hands on training. They have
more money to pay for more in-depth training for some
of their poll workers, some of their trouble shooters
type of thing. And then we also have-- I have my
little New York cookbook. This is to show that we were
really ambitious in trying to get models from as many
jurisdictions of different sizes and different
resources as possible around the country. I promise you
this is the end of my little cookbook schmeel.
So if you look at our table of contents you
will see that we hope to have covered the whole realm
of practices that are out there. We have called our,
book successful practices. We didn't say they were best
practices and what we tried to do as we talked to practitioners across the country, as we were gathering their thoughts on their programs and their practices and their tools we asked them Okay that's great but is this sustainable? Is this something you can keep doing for years to come? Or is this a one time things where you had a bunch of money and you have a fabulous employee who can champion it? Is it measurable? Is it something you can say okay this actually did have an impact of getting better poll workers or having people retain the training pieces better. And we also asked them is it replicable? Is it something that could only happen in your county? Or is it something that really can be shared with other counties, and they won't have to reinvent the wheel? Then what we did is when we found out, we got the responses, their nuance responses about their practices, and so in our book we also talk-- for each practice we have, we discuss the benefits of the practice, the pitfalls and challenges because we don't want other people to reinvent the wheel. Some tips for in making it happen in your jurisdiction. And we are also providing a methodology
of whether it can work long term for you.

That's what the guidebook is. What the guidebook is not is it is not magic bullet. Obviously you're not going to read this guidebook and say: "okay, if I do all this good stuff I am going to have no problems getting fabulous poll workers. We are going to do the training and be brilliant on election day. What we hope is that you will pick and choose and really come out with some good stuff to chew on.

It is not a poll worker management program. We really had to step back from doing some of the management pieces because that's going to be in the EAC Management Guidelines for one thing. It wasn't part of our contract. Although we did cheat a little bit, we couldn't help ourselves we put in a chapter on Poll trouble shooters because although we are not technically poll workers we all know that they can be a fantastic saving grace on election day.

What we really hope is that this is not a static document. We are really hoping that all of you will think about ways that once this guidebook hits the streets, maybe at the end of this year, early next
1 year, that it will be, you know, disseminated as much as possible. Think about maybe having it discussed at lunches and conferences, on IACREAT conferences. Think about maybe at your state associations summer meetings. We are hoping that some of our workers can be on a speaker circuit to get out there and introduce them to folks that can't come to meetings like this. And if you can think about that we would ask you to do that in your feedback form.

We also have not yet, if any of you got the electronic copy of this, we haven't yet put in some of the models we have gotten because people are still getting us electronic models. We really would like to have as many models as possible. So if you can send us things electronically we really appreciate it. We haven't it in the book yet because then if becomes difficult to share it. And it would have blown out your systems, you know, if we sent it to you that way. But we are looking for more models. And we are going to be testing-- I am going to wrap this up because Karen just stood up. That is my sign to wrap this up.

We are going to be testing this guidebook in three pilot jurisdictions this summer. We are going to
be going to be going to Hamilton County, Ohio, to Santa Fe New Mexico and to Milwaukee, Wisconsin. So we will be seeing if this guidebook really works. As as we go through changing or updating the guidebook to fit the realities of the jurisdictions that we are working with we definitely will be very happy to have more ideas more models from you all. So please look at that feedback form and provide us with, you know, some good stuff to put in here.

MS. HORN: I am Abergail Horn with the Center for Election Integrity from Cleveland State University. Thank you very much for having me today. It has been a real pleasure working with the EAC and an honor getting to speak to you all of you today.

I came to this not as a poll worker junkie or geek, I believe Jennifer said. But I have to admit that since working on this since October I guess I have to describe myself as a poll worker geek as well. But it is a proud term and we had a lot of fun with it.

Again, the Center for Election Integrity pulls expertise from the law school as well as the Urban Affairs College that has a focus on public administration so we really have a nice (inaudible) going. College students are in the learning mold. They
are tech savvy. They tend to be young and more energetic. They are generally physically fit and can set up heavy equipment, carry things around. They tend to have more flexible schedules and this is my favorite, but no proven over time, but this is a hypothesis that if you hook them now you have them for the future. Not necessarily as a poll worker. But if you get them engaged now in a real way within the democratic process, within the electoral process they will see the value of it and they will become physically engaged individuals throughout their lifetime. So that is part of it and that's why I became part of the program. But it is not a panacea, it is not a solution for every jurisdiction for the entire nations shortage of poll workers. There are a bunch of hurdles and I am going to go into them in more detail both legal hurdles as well as structural and circumstantial.

The three main ones are students are often not registered to vote in the same state or in the county or sometimes were necessary in the precinct where they are living and where the college is. And that can be a problem. They generally do not want to work, nor do they want to commit to work for more than one election. " I know what my schedule is this
semester and I am not signing up for anything that says I have to work more than this one". And indeed although they are flexible classes and assignments can get in the way and they can get in the way at the last minute about working on a full day schedule. That is why we put an emphasis in our guidebook in trying to get a university wide policy of excused absences for anyone who is going to be working as a poll worker. And that is something to work on as they get going.

Our project is set up in the same way that Jennifer's is in terms of having a project working group and having focus groups. We have a seven person team; three elections officials, three professors and indeed college students who are all providing us really wonderful feedback on the work as we move along.

We set out to collect what began from initial work to be best practices but we quickly included that to become effective strategies. We were really lucky. We had a wonderful pool of things to start looking at which was in 2004 the EAC provided grants to 15 different colleges and non profits to run college poll worker programs. So we looked at those really carefully, talked to most of them and got a really good sense of what worked for them and what didn't. We went
on and looked at lots of different surveys and other materials. In fact Jennifer was a wonderful resource for us and fed us whenever she heard about college poll worker programs in different shapes and forms. And we have been following up in collecting lots of different examples. And please if you have any send them my way. My email will be at the end of this presentation. You may have it in your packet already, I'm not sure it already.

But, surprisingly, there are very few structured programs. And a lot of people look to colleges and Universities in getting students to be poll workers but they don't have ongoing relationship with a particular college or university with a structured program in place. Not a lot of overtime programs. And that's what we really focused on in our guidebook which is to develop a long term relationship between the election jurisdiction and the college or university.

We had four things for the focus groups and most of them we did. One with students who had worked as poll workers and one who did not. Overall their findings reiterated what we had already found through our research so that was great. We mainly talked to the students about incentives for being a poll worker and
hurdles. And we pulled that all together.

The next part of the project was pulling together the state statutes requirements. We looked at the statutory law in all 50 states territories etcetera related case law, anything pertaining to college poll workers popped us as well as where applicable in some states that we had to also look at the administrative code and the state constitution and of course at times they were in conflict with each other. But that is just to be expected.

We then really-- it took a long time to confirm all the data that we had. And send out to all of the states their particular information trying to get confirmation. We're just about there. And if you happen to notice any errors in there let us know. We are in an ongoing cleaning up process of the data.

And then there is always this issue of the fact that sometimes practice at the local level is not quite equal with what the policies say. And that is true in many, many cases. And sometimes, quite frankly, that is a good thing because the policies were pretty new and if practiced exactly as they are written often times it would be really hard to get college students to work. And I will go into those later.
The state statues. We collected all the
information and several more but I thought these were
the more interesting ones so I stuck them up there.
Each state, we have a three or four page information
sheet and that all will be available on the EAC website
when this project is all done. You can click on the
page and see various requirements for poll workers. We
have synthesized that into a chart that is in our
guidebook, and I believe you have a copy of the
guidebook.

This leads me to the actual guidebook which
some of you may have. I have a few color versions with
me so if you're really excited about college poll
workers and want to see the color version let me know
and I will give you one of those.

One issue that we struggled with in writing
is that we are writing for two different audiences. And
I would love feedback from any of you on that in that
we are writing for both elections officials who want to
figure out to develop a program with college students.
As well as for college and university representatives
who want to get their students more integrated. So
they are really two very different audiences. And at
times that can be challenging.

We have three different sort of call out
boxes that you will notice in the handbook. We suggest handing these out prior to election day. And to consider using the students they make really great temporary election workers as things get hectic.

A how-to box for example we have one on how to develop a course reading, a big emphasis in the book is incorporating poll work into a class curriculum either has a service learning assignment or as extra credit. Or developing a whole course around the idea of citizenship. We have suggested reading that you might use to build a course around.

Ignore at your own risk for example one of the color boxes is designing equipment materials for college students be careful not to inadvertently insult your older veteran poll workers. You don't want to say we really need young smart people.

And there is a table of contents for the guidebook is a campus champion that is something we have put emphasis on. You really need to find somebody at the college or university who is going to be that champion a person who is really going to get out there put the word out and make it happen. At the same point you also need to have a strong liaison with the Election office.
Now I want to talk about retention and sustainability in college poll worker programs. We see that we are not able to retain these students. At most you're going to get a student for four years. And most likely you're not going to get the same student for their four years of college. But the emphasis is really on having sustainable programs. What you want to know is that you have this ongoing relationship that you work on and instruct with the local college or university. So that you can count on having 200 students every year. They may be different faces and have to go through the training and so on. But you know that you have those bodies and that your partner at the college is going to come through for you. And indeed they are going to be quality poll workers.

There are examples of various programs that we talk about in the guidebook. They really come in different shapes and sizes Professor Ken built it into the curriculum as a service assignment. As I explained that is great. It might pull in 25 to 30 students in the class that way.

Campus wide recruiting campaign posts a lot of information. A lot of the EAC grantees followed this model they might have gotten 150 students by just getting the word out.
22 provides five extra credits. At large universities they have ten political science classes each one with 200 students. It's a pool of 2000 potential students all offered five extra credit points. They bring in 250 students easily to be poll workers. I just added this one the university sent out a mass email. That is not really a program that is an ongoing relationship but in fact it can work because in Cleveland in a recent primary I ended up contacting the President of Cleveland State and a community college and a four year college and they all sent out massive emails to their students. Faculty and staff saying they needed people who could come and work at the elections. And they got a huge turnout despite the fact it was the week of finals.

We are going to be running three pilot projects that are basically designed to field test our guide book. The criteria there is having strong interest from the election official and from the school. We are really excited in conducting this project.

Some major findings just a few of them. The emphasis in these programs is developing that
relationship. We are talking about having sustainable program you want to have the time for relationships building. And on the colleges side if you want to incorporate it into curriculum and into classes you have to get your faculty at least a semester before. They are going to be tweaking their curriculum and they need that time ahead to make that a reality. It is really important to start early to get everyone on board because if you're going to have a university wide policy of excused absences on election days of poll workers you better get working nine or ten months ahead of time in order for it to go through the university system.

Let's see, Jennifer mentioned you don't want to see Uncle Sam needs you but with college students really stressing the important in your message that they play that this is not just some boring game but that in fact explaining the importance of poll workers which is in the democratic process students find interesting and indeed motivates them. That said skip down to my last point which are the two best incentives which by far blew out every other incentive you could
possibly think of.

First one is money and the second one is extra credit. So if you can work it through a college or university and professors to build it into their curriculum, fabulous. The students eat that up. And again students are cash starved.

Training on campus indeed should be very hands on, role playing, lots of questions. In our focus groups students complained about not being-- feeling intimidated to ask questions. So lots of question and answers. And emphasis on the etiquette and intergenerational communication.

Again off year elections are not sexy, it's going to be easiest to get college students engaged for the Presidential elections. But that said, indeed there are many examples of students working primary. And other students working in between presidential elections. It is not impossible but you need to recognize that.

In getting students you will be surprised how often or an assignment will pop up just a week before when you thought you had everybody signed up and they
can't work on election days. So getting that commitment from the University or college is really important. Quickly on the legal impediments. Indeed most states require poll workers to be registered voters of the state, usually of the county and in fact usually a resident of the precinct that they are going to be working in. Now again that policy practice issue comes into play there a lot. That can be a big problem for a poor college student. Sometimes they don't want to change their registration from their home town to where they are at college. And then on the flip side some states restrict college students from registering to vote in their college town. That can also be a big legal impediment.

Political affiliation: Only six states don't provide require some sort of political affiliation. Now at the county level they are not necessarily relying on political party lists to get their poll workers. And the time requirements as I mentioned students really don't want to commit to more than one election so if they are required to sign on the line to work for two straight years every election they are going to balk.

And please sent me your ideas if you know of any projects out there I would love to hear about them.
And as you read through it any comments about format or language I would be more than happy to receive them any questions?

MR. BERNARD: Louie Bernard, Louisiana.

I wanted to ask Jennifer did you find somewhere that a split shift program that was really working. And B., was it the responsibility for the poll worker to find the partner or the election official?

MS. COLLINS-FOLEY: Interestingly enough we really tried to find a split shift program that really worked and we haven't found one. We found that most jurisdictions have tried it and given it up entirely. I talked to five different jurisdictions in Virginia last week. They said try this city or try Arlington I finally gave up. And then there are some that keep it just for the sake of showing that they are flexible. For example in Los Angeles County we found that poll workers don't want to do it. They don't want to find their own partner and they don't want to split the stipend. But we had to keep offering it just so we could say that we do. So we have a contract, you know and especially we found is that election officials are very reluctant to do this because you compromise the integrity of the process. What happens if the other
person doesn't show up? That is the key thing for elections officials is that integrity issue. And we found that even the jurisdictions that had tried it and given it up would never allow the lead poll worker to split a shift. That was one thing that was constant. So we had in our guidebook that was a big chapter and we moved it into a one pager. It is out there and people do it with limited success. We kept it in there and there is a whole big section of the pitfalls and challenges so that nobody had any doubt that it was not the most successful practice.

MS. MARKOWITZ: Deborah Markowitz, Vermont. In Vermont we only use split shifts. The chief election official is there all day. And one of the things we recommend is that the people who count the votes, we hand count, except in eighty precincts and we recommend that the people who count are never the same people who sat there all day because it is hard to be precise at the end of the day. And we recommend for that late shift starting at three or four in the afternoon to school teachers. And that maybe useful for you for LA of some of these hard to places. Or they are people who work as bank tellers. They are very good at counting and are very precise. It is interesting although our chief election official in
every polling place stays the same because you need continuity. But that is the only person that we recommend be there all day.

MS. FOLEY: I will definitely look into that because we are about to do a case study on your program.

MS. MARKOWITZ: You should also look at the fact that our polls open up at five in the morning. So it is a long day.

MS. JOHNSON: Carol Johnson, New Hampshire. We also do split shifts in our community in Manchester. And we do it quite successfully as well. We also have an interesting problem with people showing up for training sessions. We do a two hour training session before every single election. We have had as many eight elections in an 18 month period. What we found was as an incentive showing up we changed the ordinance that provides payment. So if they show up at the training session they get more money than if they don't show up at the training.

MS. FOLEY: I definitely will come up there as well. One of the things that is going to be in our guidebook is a discussion of the money and how there is this trend for add on's people had their base...
stipends. And then you can have all these little add-ons seem to be a trend. And we are hoping this could be used by election officials in their budgeting process. They have to go to their bosses and say hey we are at the low end of the spectrum we need to give our poll workers a raise for picking up supplies extra.

MS. BOWERS: Marilyn Bowers, South Carolina.

We were almost successful this year in getting legislation past to allow registered voters within the state to expand to the use of college students but got it knocked down. We will try again.

I don't know if anyone has thought about doing online training for poll workers I got the idea because I had do a course because I was with the EAC during activation. And we did online training. We went through the training chapter by chapter, took the test and received notice that you were certified.

When I checked into some programs that were out there they are very expensive initial cost plus yearly cost and the logistics of training large numbers prior to every election which our law requires it takes a lot of classes to do all those elections. You could reach a larger number of people by certifying them through a computer course.

MS. FOLEY: In the guidebook we have a whole
chapter on online training. And we are adding models of training that is bringing in a vendor. And also we are doing home grown versions. We are also doing—in the jurisdictions that are doing their normal training classes and using the online training as a refresher. And we are also focusing on jurisdictions that are doing their entire training online with some heavy emphasis on evaluating, whether this is effective or not. Are they getting their teenage sons go through and answer the questions. There is some good stuff in there. And again if anybody has models we are looking for them. But we have some good stuff already.

MS. KIFFMEYER: Mary Kiffmyer from Minnesota.

First of all I just wanted to mention that National Associations of Secretary's of State regularly send out surveys. Our national association can reach immediately into many states and within the states. This is something that may make it a little easier to find out where some of this things are. It could be a good resource for you. Only because even in Minnesota we have election training program and video brochures. I have not see the references here but I just wanted to suggest that maybe before you add on's or something to use our national association. We could
be a resource to help you gather some information and data. Maybe make some of those contacts you will be hearing about.

MS. FOLEY: Thank you.


We as well pay the part time workers. We choose to pay them a high rate. And we find that by doing that we can not only get housewives but we can get high school students. We use a lot of high school students that come in at 3 o'clock. We also do the add on pay for cell phone usage.

MS. LYNN-DYSON: One of the things I have not circled, Jennifer is you gave folks your contact information.

MS. FOLEY: One contact that you can use is IFES. Org.

And it is also on your feedback form at the table of contents that was a hand out.

MS. LYNN-DYSON: I think as the Election Assistance Commission moves forward through the summer on these pilot projects it will be-- and we actually get to the Fall get to the point with these manuals and
the college and the general poll worker manuals and
also with our materials that you have heard about this
afternoon with our ballot design and polling place
signage it will be extremely helpful to our agency and
to me to have feedback on marketing and distribution

of these materials.

We are very proud of them. We are pleased
that we have them. They also represent a good deal of
investment on the part of our agency and your federal
government. So these documents will do no one no good
if they are just sitting on our website and we are not
going-- and people are not downloading them. Even in
terms of actual production the old fashioned way and
sitting on peoples book shelves collecting dust. So it
would be very helpful to me to hear from you all about
marketing and distribution of these products.

My email address is: Klynndyson@EAC.com so
let me hear from you about our venues, setting, Mary
mentioned mass. We certainly anticipate this summer
through IACREAT and NASED and NEC meetings getting the
word out. But I'd like to hear if you have any other
ideas for us.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you very much for a very
successful session. We are done for the afternoon. I
am going to turn the mic over to MS. Nighswonger and let her any final remarks. Tomorrow we have a continental breakfast that starts at 8 a.m., I am told they should be set up at 7:35. We will start our first session promptly at 8:30. Tomorrow's topics are very important. We start with a presentation on management guidelines and we go throughout the morning until 4:30 on important subjects that we are doing research on. And I can't think of any other announcements to end our day. Madam Chair?

MR. NIGHSWONGER: All right. I just want to thank all off the staff for their help, the interpreters we appreciate their long day. And also our court reporter. And I think if there are no objections we will adjourn for the evening. (Thereupon, the above meeting was adjourned for the evening at approximately 5:35 o'clock, p.m.)
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QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE EAC

1. How did states prepare for HAVA’s provisional voting requirements?

2. How did preparation and performance vary between states that had previously had some form of Provisional Ballot and those did not?

3. How did litigation affect the implementation of Provisional Voting?

4. How effective was provisional voting in enfranchising qualified voters?

5. Did State and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots?

6. Did local election officials have a clear understanding of how to implement provisional voting?
TO ANSWER THOSE QUESTIONS

- Surveyed 400 local election officials
- Reviewed the EAC's Election Day Survey
- Analyzed states' experience with provisional voting:
  - use of statewide registration database
  - treatment of out-of-precinct ballots
  - use of different approaches to voter ID
  - consistency
  - time period allowed for ballot evaluation
- Collected provisional voting statutes and regulations
- Analyzed litigation
Variation among the states

- In 2004 nationwide about 1.9 million provisional ballots cast, 1.2 million, or just over 63%, were counted.

- The percentage of provisional ballots in the total vote varied by a factor of 1,000 -- from a high of 7% in Alaska to Vermont's 0.006%.

- The portion of provisional ballots cast that were counted ranged from 96% in Alaska to 6% in Delaware.
Some sources of variation among states

Experience
Share of provisional ballots in the total vote was 6 times greater in states that had used provisional ballots before than in states where the provisional ballot was new.

Administrative Arrangements
Time to evaluate ballots
-- States that provided less than one week counted an average of 35.4% of their ballots.
-- States that permitted more than 2 weeks counted 60.8%.

Voter registration data bases
-- States with voter registration databases counted an average of 20% of the provisional ballots cast.
-- States without databases counted 44%. [1]
Variation within states

Rate of counting provisional ballots varied by as much as 90% to 100% among counties in the same state.

Resources available to administer provisional voting varied.---The Election Day Study found that staffing problems appeared to be particularly acute for jurisdictions in the lowest income and education categories.
--Small, rural jurisdictions and large, urban jurisdictions reported higher rates of an inadequate number of poll workers.
--Jurisdictions in poor areas reported more inactive voter registrations and more provisional ballots cast.
--Richer areas had more poll workers per polling place and reported lower rates of staffing problems per precinct.
1. How did states prepare for HAVA's provisional voting requirements?

Most election officials received provisional voting instructions from state government. The type and amount of instruction received varied widely across the states.

Almost all provided training or written instruction to precinct-level poll workers on how to administer provisional ballots.

- Only about 1 in 10 made available to poll workers a voter registration database.

- Almost equally rare were training and written procedures for poll workers on the counting of provisional ballots.
2. How did preparation and performance vary between states that had previously had some form of provisional ballot and those that did not?

Local election officials in the “old” states felt more confident.

18 states were new to provisional voting; 25 others had experience.

“New” state officials felt:

-- Voters did not receive enough information about where to cast a provisional ballot in order to be counted.
-- More funding was needed to educate voters about their rights to cast a provisional ballot.

Provisional ballots in “old states”: more than 2% of the total vote, 4 times the proportion in “new” states.

Counting provisional ballots in the final vote, the “old” states averaged 58% nearly double the average (33%) in “new” states.
Question 3: How did litigation affect the implementation of Provisional Voting?

Pre-election litigation clarified voters' rights to:

- Sue in federal court to remedy violations of HAVA
- Receive provisional ballots, even though they would not be counted
- Be directed to the correct precinct
- Most pre-election litigation occurred too late to influence how states implemented provisional voting.
4. How effective was provisional voting in enfranchising qualified voters?

Provisional ballots enfranchised 1.2 million voters, or 1.01% of turnout, who otherwise would have been turned away.

The number of voters who could be helped by provisional voting may be about 2.5 – 3 million. Provisional voting might be about 50% effective.

There is room for improvement.

Legislative activity gives evidence that states were not satisfied with the effectiveness of their provisional voting systems.

Those voting with provisional ballots in states with experience were enfranchised more frequently than those in the “new” states.
Question 5: Did State and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots?

Little consistency existed among and within states. The use of provisional ballots was not distributed evenly across the country. A few states accounted for most of the ballots cast.

Share of provisional ballots in the total vote was six times greater in experienced states than in new states.

More rigorous the state’s Voter ID requirements the smaller the percentage of provisional ballots that were counted.

“New” states with registration databases counted 20% of the ballots cast. Those without databases counted more than double that rate (44%).
Question 5: Did state and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots?

In-precinct versus out-of-precinct states had different outcomes.

States that allowed out-of-precinct ballots counted 56% of the provisional ballots.

States that recognized only ballots cast in the proper precinct counted an average of 42% of provisional ballots cast.

In “old” states, this difference was greater.

52% of ballots cast were counted in states requiring in-district ballots, 70% were counted in those allowing out-of-precinct ballots.
Question 5: Did State and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots?

States that provide a longer the time to evaluate provisional ballots counted a higher proportion of those ballots.

14 states permitted less than 1 week: 35.4%
15 states permitted 1 – 2 weeks: 47.1%
14 states permitted more than 2 week: 60.8%

Effect felt most strongly in states where more than 1% of the overall turnout was of provisional ballots.

Less than 1 week: 58.6%
1 – 2 weeks: 65.0%
More than 2 weeks: 73.8%.
Question 5: Did State and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots?

Conclusions
States have latitude in how they meet HAVA requirements.
A considerable degree of variation among the states is to be expected.
If that variation stems from differences in political culture among the states, it is likely to persist. If it reflects a learning curve for “new” states, consistency may increase more quickly.
Question 6: Did local election officials have a clear understanding of how to implement provisional voting?

8 out of 10 county-level elections officials reported receiving instructions from their state government.

4 out of 10 local election officials felt poll workers needed more training to understand their responsibilities.

Objectively, how well did the process appear to be managed?

Lack of consistency among and within states indicates wide differences in understanding by election officials.

The number of states that have amended statutes on provisional voting to include poll worker training is a sign of dissatisfaction with the level of understanding in 2004.
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EAC

BEST PRACTICES
The importance of clarity

EAC should emphasize the importance of clarity in the rules by which each state governs provisional voting. Does the provisional ballot system:

1. Distribute, collect, record, and tally provisional ballots with sufficient accuracy to be seen as procedurally legitimate by both supporters and opponents of the winning candidate?

2. Place administrative demands on local jurisdictions that are realistically related to the staff and other resources available?

3. Display variation within the state great enough to cause concern that the system may not be administered uniformly from county to county?
Lessons of litigation for achieving clarity

Look to litigation from the 2004 election to shape new statutes or regulations that will increase the clarity of provisional voting procedures, increase predictability, and bolster confidence in the system.

1. Litigation clarified the right of voters to receive provisional ballots, even though the election officials were certain they would not be counted.

2. Lawsuits prompted election officials to take better care in instructing precinct officials on how to notify voters about the need to go to the correct precinct in order to cast a countable ballot.
EAC should recommend to the states that they:

- Promulgate clear standards for evaluating provisional ballots, and provide training for the officials who will apply those standards.

- Provide materials for local jurisdictions to train poll workers on such procedures as how to locate polling places for potential voters who show up at the wrong place.

- Make clear that the only permissible requirement to obtain a provisional ballot is an affirmation that the voter is registered in the jurisdiction and eligible to vote in an election for federal office.

  -- Provide poll workers the training they need to understand their duty to give those voters a provisional ballot.
EAC should recommend quality improvement

Begin a systematic quality improvement program by collecting data on the provisional voting process. Data collected should include:

- Specific reasons why provisional ballots were not counted
- Measures of variance among jurisdiction
- Time required to evaluate ballots by jurisdiction
- Provisional votes cast and counted by jurisdiction
Assess each stage of the provisional voting process

Before the election
• Clear information for voters on websites and in sample ballots.
• Training materials in every jurisdiction make poll workers familiar with the options available to voters.

At the polling place
• Design of provisional ballot.
• Estimate supply of provisional ballots needed at polling places.

Evaluating provisional ballots
• Define and adopt a reasonable period for voters who lack ID or other eligibility information bearing to provide it.
• A voter’s provisional ballot should count so long as the voter cast that ballot at the correct polling site even if at the wrong precinct within that location.
• Follow written procedure or checklist to record why a provisional ballot is rejected.
Assess each stage of the provisional voting process

Post-election

Best practice is for states to consider how to complete all steps in the evaluation of ballots and challenges to those determinations within the five weeks available in presidential elections.

Provide timely information to voters about the disposition of their provisional ballot.

-- Are they now registered for future elections?
-- If not, what they need to do to become registered?
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Tom/Karen:

Here is an email from Dan Lowenstein (presenter in LaJolla and co-editor of Election Law Journal) who made some suggestions on names for the voter fraud work we are trying to do. Perhaps a call to Bruce Cain at Berkeley would be appropriate.

Karen, what do you think?

RAY MARTINEZ III
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 566-3100 (W)
(202) 566-3127 (FAX)
www.eac.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message and all attachments, if any, are intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete it from your computer.

Ray,

Before I read Rick's message, Steve Ansolabehere was the first name that came to my mind. This assumes you are looking for part-time, not full-time consultants. I would categorize Steve as very moderate left. I am not certain he is Democrat but would be very surprised to learn he is not. But the main thing about him is that he calls things as he sees them. So if you found a Republican with the same characteristics, that would be ideal. Charles Bullock of the University of Georgia would be a possibility. (Actually, I'm not sure of his party either, but I think he may be a Republican.)

I would also suggest you talk to Bruce Cain in the Institute of Governmental Studies at Berkeley. He is very savvy and knows more political scientists than Rick and I do.
When I have questions about the political science profession, he's usually the person I go to. His phone number is 510-642-1739. He is also going to be running a UC office in Washington, so he will be more or less living there for the indefinite future. He is someone you ought to get to know.

Best,

Daniel Lowenstein
UCLA Law School
405 Hilgard
Los Angeles, California 90095-1476
310-825-5148

-----Original Message-----
From: Rick Hasen [mailto:Rick.Hasen@lls.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2005 11:56 AM
To: rmartinez@eac.gov
Cc: Lowenstein, Daniel
Subject: Re: Follow-up

We are now editing articles for our next issue, which is due out in October. We need to get everything to the printer for this issue in mid-July. So we'd need something from you by early July if it were to make it into that issue. Our deadlines after that are about three months later for each issue.

As far as researchers, I give my highest recommendation to Steve Ansolabehere of MIT, who has already done a bit of research on this issue. He is truly one of the top political scientists in the country working in this field, and he is careful and very fair (I don't know whether I'd count him as "left" or "right").

Dan may have other ideas.

Rick

rmartinez@eac.gov wrote:

Rick / Dan:

Thanks for the follow-up. As I mentioned to Dan in La Jolla, I do want to commit to doing a paper for ELJ. Aside from my own interest in election law and election administration, I think it is important for your readers to gain a better understanding of the role of the EAC and all that we are doing, particularly in the area of voting system standards and certification. Please tell me what the new deadline is and I will make sure to get you an outline of my intended submission, and of course, a timely draft for your consideration. Thanks again to both of you for the continued
opportunity.

On a related note, in Section 241 of HAVA, Congress gives the EAC a laundry list of possible research topics related to improving the process of election administration. Among the suggested topics are the following:

"(6) Nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office;
(7) Identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation."

In order to get this research project started, the EAC would like to engage two research consultants who could bring some level of knowledge and expertise to the table and help the commissioners to come to an agreement on the framework and/or scope of such a research project. Rather than sending something out on the listserve, I thought I would directly solicit your opinions about any names in the academic field that you think we ought to consider. The reason we are looking to employ two consultants is because we would like to achieve a political balance -- one from the left, and one from the right, so to speak. Any thoughts you have on this would be greatly appreciated.

Regards,

RAY MARTINEZ III
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 566-3100 (W)
(202) 566-3127 (FAX)
www.eac.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message and all attachments, if any, are intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete it from your computer.

--
Rick Hasen
William H. Hannon Distinguished Professor of Law
Loyola Law School
919 Albany Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-1211
(213) 736-1466
(213) 380-3769 - fax
rick.hasen@lls.edu
http://electionlawblog.org
http://www.lls.edu/academics/faculty/hasen.html
In his note regarding the Eagleton contract, Hans has raised some of the same concerns I raised from the beginning of any discussions I had regarding this contract with our staff, and at our first formal meeting with Eagleton. In reviewing their work product from time to time, I continue to have concerns about a lack of balanced input and have repeatedly voiced them with staff and with Eagleton. I did this when the initial peer review group was proposed and again during their presentation at our meeting in Pasadena (the outreach slide in their public presentation showed outreach to seven groups, of which only one could be considered conservative-leaning). Now, as I have just had the opportunity to read their July progress report, it appears that Eagleton seems to be going into a larger analysis of the voter fraud issue than was authorized in the contract. My suspicion is that Dan Tokaji is injecting his views into this to dismiss or diminish the concerns some people may have about voter fraud. I could be wrong, but his previous writings lead me to believe otherwise.

I only found one mention of voter fraud in the contract with Eagleton. It is in Section 3.5 regarding provisional voting, where it discusses “minimizing opportunity for voter fraud.” Yet, on page 4 of the July progress report from Eagleton, in describing their work plan for the next month it states: “we will expand upon vote fraud research and examine further the relationship between instances of vote fraud and ensuing election reforms.” This clearly seems to be going beyond the mandate we gave them as I thought they were going to be looking at voter fraud relating to provisional voting (as the contract calls for), not voter fraud as it relates to election reforms. While voter fraud was never mentioned in the contract regarding the voter ID issue, page 5 of their July report indicates that their narratives “will include an appraisal of the prevalence and nature of vote fraud.” In addition to this, page 6 describes a look into the “relationship between voter ID regime and vote fraud.”

Voter fraud is clearly an issue that is perceived differently from the Right and from the Left. I have struggled with determining what a clear definition of voter fraud is myself, and therefore want to obtain various perspectives and good analysis on this issue before I formulate a solid conclusion in my mind. It has been my understanding all along that the whole voter fraud/voter intimidation issue is going to studied by the EAC using a balanced group of consultants—not Eagleton and Moritz, who are likely to focus on just on the number of prosecutions of voter fraud, rather than the complaints made or the fact that many election officials are frustrated that some prosecutors don’t take their complaints about voter fraud seriously. I am not convinced at this point that we will get a balanced and objective study from Eagleton/Moritz on voter fraud. I am puzzled on why they seem to be expending a significant portion of their time on this and would want to know if we somehow authorized them to do more research into the voter fraud issue.

On page 7 of their July report Eagleton indicates that communications with the EAC on the Peer Review Group “were not clear or timely.” I would like to know what this refers to. Also, I may have missed it, but do not recall seeing the final list of who is serving as the Peer Review group.

The August 15th copy of the July report that I received from Karen did not include the attachment of the financial report of expenses incurred. I would like to see that attachment.

Outside of our NIST work, this contract represents our largest single outside expenditure of our operational funds. Any single expenditure of $500,000+ needs to be closely monitored. I, for one, am not going to sign off on any report that appears to have been written from a biased viewpoint, especially one that doesn't appear to be interested in hearing from conservative organizations or right-leaning researchers, or seems to minimize any input from them. I've already had questions from congressional
staff and others on why we picked Eagleton and Moritz, as they are perceived by some as biased against Republicans. I assured the critics that we have insisted all along on an objective study from Eagleton. An unbalanced or biased study from them will not only hurt my credibility, but also that of the EAC. I’m not suggesting that we stop their work, but I do want Tom and Julie to inform them in no uncertain terms that we will not accept a report that does not seriously consider all viewpoints on provisional voting and the voter ID issue, and that any study or interpretations they present to us reflect a diversity of opinions on these subjects. We also need for staff to determine whether their considerable work into the voter fraud area is authorized in the contract. We should not be paying for and receiving work we did not authorize.

The contract clearly calls for "alternative approaches" on voter ID requirements and "alternatives" on provisional voting. I agreed to support this contract to Eagleton because I was assured that we would receive a variety of approaches from their work, and not just those from a liberal perspective.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
To: Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc: Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV@EAC, Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV@EAC, Raymundo Martinez/EAC/GOV@EAC

Subject: Eagleton

Paul:

I am directing this email only to the commissioners, because I don't think we should air our disagreements among staff until we have at least had a chance to discuss controversial issues with each other in person. It appears from Gracia's email that we will have a chance to do so next week in Denver.

In the meantime, I feel compelled to respond to your email regarding Eagleton.

(1) As I stated last night in my email to Hans, we have an on-going responsibility to monitor the expenditure of all our federal funds, including to government contractors who are contractually obligated to deliver unbiased research. However, I will remind you that we did not contract with Eagleton merely to provide a compilation of state laws and procedures. Rather, we contracted with Eagleton (and indirectly with Moritz through Eagleton) to provide both research AND analysis of provisional voting and voter ID. Invariably, the analysis portion of their final product will be from a professional (and institutional) perspective, and will NOT represent any one researcher's personal point of view. If it does, then Eagleton and Moritz risk damaging their credibility not just with the EAC, but with other federal government agencies which undoubtedly contract with their respective institutions on other projects. I doubt seriously that either institution would risk such damage and allow one team member to inject bias into the work. Moreover, the peer review group that is (or has) been assembled by Eagleton is designed to cure any lingering concerns about potential institutional or personal bias...Eagleton has been responsive to your feedback on this issue, to the point where they have removed all perspective representatives of the advocacy community on the peer review group (because they felt they could not achieve political "balance" from the advocacy groups). If there is some person (or persons) which you would like to see Eagleton include in the review group, it is my understanding that such inclusion is but a mere phone call away.

(2) You will recall that at our meeting last week, I raised the exact same concern about the Eagleton progress report, and asked for clarification from staff regarding the details of this particular work (i.e., fraud) on the part of Eagleton. I expect staff (or us directly) to ask questions of Eagleton (as we would any contractor) and determine if their work in this area is within the scope of work (and contract) we all agreed to. If it isn't then we re-direct them, just as we have done, for example with Kim Brace and EDS.

(3) Finally, I must express my disappointment, Paul, regarding your comments on Professor Tokagi that you chose to include in your email. While I may disagree with Hans on his particular analysis of the perceived personal bias of this contract, at least his allegations regarding Professor Tokagi's potential bias are grounded in fact (and he recited them as such in his email). You, on the other hand, have chosen to accuse Professor Tokagi of manipulating the work on this project based on your "suspicion." With all due respect, that unfortunate accusation borders, in my view, on a breach of professional decorum and I cannot let it go without response.

We clearly have some political issues that are increasingly being injected into nearly every discussion at the EAC table. I have stated both to you and Gracia individually that I believe this trend in part represents a "maturity" of the EAC and I am not uncomfortable with it. However, if we are going to bring accusations of subjectivity and bias to the table, then I will expect that such a filter will be applied across the board to ALL projects undertaken by the EAC, and that such a filter will be based solidly on fact, and not on innuendo, personal hunches or suspicions.
I send this email, as always, with the highest degree of respect and friendship toward you. And yet, my disappointment is evident in your comments regarding an esteemed and respected member of the legal academic community (and someone whom I regard as a personal friend.)

I look forward to our continued discussion on this matter. And as for the substance of Hans' concern regarding Moritz, I stand by my email which I sent to everyone last night.

Regards,

RAY MARTINEZ III
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 566-3100 (W)
(202) 566-3127 (FAX)
www.eac.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message and all attachments, if any, are intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete it from your computer.
Since we are about to hire Tova Wang (and two others) to be our consultants/researchers on the voter fraud study, I thought I would give you a heads-up about a well-written commentary that Tova just published. It is attached below. Paul's newfound political "fervor" still has me riled-up, needless to say. Hope your travels are going well.

ID and Voting Rights
Laws requiring voters to present very specific forms of ID are becoming the voting rights barrier of the 21st Century.

Tova Andrea Wang
August 29, 2005

Laws requiring all voters to present very specific forms of identification before exercising their right to vote are rapidly becoming the voting rights barrier of the 21st Century. Last Friday, the Department of Justice approved a new Georgia law requiring every voter to show a government-issued photo ID. The Department of Justice was required to review the measure and "preclear" it because that state is covered by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Although many legal scholars and voting rights advocates had argued the Department should deny its implementation because it would lead to disenfranchisement of minority voters, the Department evidently did not agree. Indiana passed similar legislation this year, and several groups have sued the state on the grounds that it violates the Voting Rights Act.

Next up is Arizona. Last week, after months of resisting, the governor of Arizona signed off on a plan for implementing Proposition 200, which required identification from all voters. Arizona's new rule is that all voters must show government issued photo identification or a tribal identification to vote. Alternatively, the voter may present two current pieces of identification from a narrow list of potential documents that show the voter's name and current address, such as a utility and phone bills.

The most problematic provision is this: if the voter is not able to present a government issued photo ID or these two documents to the satisfaction of the poll worker, that voter is simply disenfranchised, asked to leave the polling place without casting a ballot. The voter may not even cast a provisional ballot. For example, if the voter brings a gas bill and a water bill, but the poll worker decides the water bill is not "dated within ninety days of the election," that person will be absolutely denied the right to vote. In addition to being a violation of the Help America Vote Act's mandate that any voter who shows up at the polls and believes he or she is registered and eligible to vote must be given a provisional ballot, this raises serious voting rights issues.
As a group of preeminent voting rights scholars have argued in Georgia, under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, a covered jurisdiction may not implement a change in its election laws or practices unless the jurisdiction demonstrates the change will be free of any racially discriminatory purpose or effect. The objective of Section 5 "has always been to insure that no voting-procedure changes would be made that would lead to a retrogression in the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise."

As in Georgia, Arizona—especially given the possibility of a complete denial of the vote—has not met that burden of proof. It is up to the state to demonstrate that the ID requirement, which contemplates complete disenfranchisement of certain voters, will not have a discriminatory impact. So, for example, has the state examined whether most voters have or have easy access to the necessary documents? Have state officials investigated what groups are likely to lack the kinds of identification required? Since the law puts the burden on the state, the state must undertake these types of inquiries before it is permitted to go forward with this scheme—for there is a great deal of evidence indicating that it is indeed minorities who lack even one form let alone two forms of the types of identification contemplated.

The difficulty is that the poor and minorities are least likely to own motor vehicles and possess a driver's license—the most commonly accepted form of identification. Indeed, in 1994, the U.S. Department of Justice found that African-Americans in Louisiana were 4 to 5 times less likely to have government-sanctioned photo ID than white residents. As a result, the Department denied pre-clearance for that state's proposed photo ID requirement because it "would lead to retrogression in the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise."

The evidence continues to mount. A June 2005 study by the University of Wisconsin found that less than half (47 percent) of Milwaukee County African American adults and 43 percent of Hispanic adults have a valid drivers license compared to 85 percent of white adults outside Milwaukee. One Arizona county reported in February that it was forced to reject nearly 75 percent of new voter registration forms for failure to provide adequate proof of citizenship.

Furthermore, for those who do not have the kinds of up-to-date non-photo ID necessary—and many minority and urban voters, for example those who live in multiple family dwellings simply will not—getting identification from the government will present costs and burdens for voters who simply want to exercise their constitutional right to vote. A certified copy of a birth certificate costs from $10.00 to $45.00, depending on the state; a passport costs $85.00; and certified naturalization papers cost $19.95. It may not be so very easy for people who work more than one job or have small children to take the time during business hours, drive to a Department of Drivers Services, and wait on line to get necessary identification. Indeed, most of the state's offices are open 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. Has the state researched the potential disparate impacts on getting non-photo ID? If not, it has not met its burden under the Act.
There has been a great deal of controversial discussion over the Voting Rights Act recently because some sections—including Section 5—are due to expire. The Act was passed in order to eliminate procedures aimed at the disenfranchisement of particular groups. That it is still necessary is being demonstrated today in Arizona and Georgia.

**Tova Andrea Wang** is a senior program officer and Democracy Fellow at The Century Foundation, where this article first appeared.

RAY MARTINEZ III
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 566-3100 (W)
(202) 566-3127 (FAX)
www.eac.gov
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I took a telephone call this morning from Paul Vinovich. He had attempted to reach Gracia, but since she was not here, he asked Sheila if I was in the office so he spoke to me.

Paul was very upset with comments that Tova Wang had made at yesterday's AEI's meeting in which she basically indicated that voter fraud did not exist in the USA. He asked how a person who believes that voter fraud does not exist—or not seem at least willing to listen to both sides—can be hired by the EAC to do a study on voter fraud/voter intimidation. I explained to Paul (as I have now had to explain to many others) that Tova was "balanced" on the study with Job Severbrov. He did not know Job but was well-aware of Tova's positions and was concerned that her public comments indicate that she will not be fair in looking at this issue. I explained to Paul that we were monitoring the work of our consultants on this study and no report would be issued publicly without the support of at least three commissioners. I sent him some background information on Job. I think this study will need close monitoring.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdeggregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
What Paul V said is NOT at all an accurate statement of what Tova said. I was there. This is very
dissapointing to read. I may call Mr. V myself.

I watched and heard what was said and by whom. I will be glad to brief you tomorrow morning.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Paul DeGregorio

From: Paul DeGregorio
To: Gracia Hillman; Donetta Davidson; Raymundo Martinez; Juliet Thompson;
Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Subject: Call from Paul Vinovich

I took a telephone call this morning from Paul Vinovich. He had attempted to reach Gracia, but since she
was not here, he asked Sheila if I was in the office so he spoke to me.

Paul was very upset with comments that Tova Wang had made at yesterday's AEI's meeting in which she
basically indicated that voter fraud did not exist in the USA. He asked how a person who believes that
voter fraud does not exist--or not seem at least willing to listen to both sides--can be hired by the EAC to
do a study on voter fraud/voter intimidation. I explained to Paul (as I have now had to explain to many
others) that Tova was "balanced" on the study with Job Severbrov. He did not know Job but was
well-aware of Tova's positions and was concerned that her public comments indicate that she will not be
fair in looking at this issue. I explained to Paul that we were monitoring the work of our consultants on this
study and no report would be issued publicly without the support of at least three commissioners. I sent
him some background information on Job. I think this study will need close monitoring.
I am suggesting that we have our 9:30 discussion tomorrow to cover a couple of things:

1. The four of us need to spend some "quality" time together. Tomorrow will be a good time to pin down the earliest date when we will all be in DC and can devote a 1/2 day or so to discuss election of officers, etc. Perhaps on tomorrow we can develop an agenda for those discussions.

2. Defining balance for the make-up of the Working Group for our Voter Fraud/Intimidation project.
For our private time discussions, I propose that we add the composition of the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation Working Group to our list of topics to discuss.

As you will recall, we did not complete the discussion because Paul was not able to participate.
Peg:

Following is the guidance that the commissioners are providing with respect to the composition of the working group for the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation project and the selection process.

8 Member Working Group

Participants to be chosen by the two consultants in consultation with you. There are two slots that will require consensus. If consensus can't be reached, then you should make the decision. If there is real disagreement among the three of you, then the commissioners will make the selection.

The participation process prescribed below provides for political balance. As always, we ask that the group be diverse with respect to participation of men, women and minorities.

4 people from the Academic, Legal and Advocacy sectors - 2 to be chosen by Tova and 2 to be chosen by Job. We support your recommendation that there be at least one academic in the working group to help advise and comment on the construct of the database and you should provide that guidance to Tova and Job.

2 State Level Election Officials - 1 selected by Tova and 1 selected by Job

1 Nonpartisan local election official (selected by you or by consensus among the 3 of you)

1 Representative from DOJ - you had recommended a man who was retired from the Voting Section or perhaps someone else with similar credentials to be selected by you or by consensus among the three of you. We assume that Craig Dosantos (sp) will participate in this project as an "advisor" and therefore would not take up a slot on the working group.

I will be on travel on Friday (tomorrow), however please feel free to call me on my cell should you have questions or need additional clarification.

Many thanks for your terrific work.

Gracia M. Hillman
Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel.: 202-566-3100
Fax: 202-566-1392
www.eac.gov
Paul:

I've taken a shot at a draft agenda, but we have much work to do on this item. As you will see, my current vision, at least with regard to the Standards Board, is to have a series of presentations regarding all of our research projects, particularly those in which written draft reports will be ready for consideration, such as the provisional voting study and the voter ID study. However, there are too many research projects on the plate right now, and not enough time in a day and a half to be able to present all of them to both the Standards Board and BOA (not to mention "fatigue factor" if we overload these folks during this meeting). So, I've had to prioritize.

Anyway, attached is what I have come up with, and at the very bottom of the draft agenda, you will see the research projects that I left off the list. Next steps are for you to develop a similar draft agenda for the BOA, and I would suggest that you do something similar for the BOA, such that we will have concurrent session going on (Standards Board in one room, BOA in another)...for example, when the briefing for provisional voting is taking place for the SB members, you can be having a concurrent session for the BOA in another room on voter ID. Then we switch. (Same type of format for Day 2). This will allow us to have concurrent sessions going on simultaneously but we'll have to coordinate the schedule of these sessions. In the current draft agenda, I have the two boards coming together in the afternoon of the second day, but we may want them to start with a joint plenary session and end with a joint plenary session (though that is tough because they each have group-specific business to conduct when they first arrive -- at least the Standards Board does, such as adoption of permanent bylaws).

Anyway, this is still VERY MUCH a work in progress, so I welcome your feedback. Also, I think we need to get Tom and Karen involved in this discussion very soon, and then kick it over to the other commissioners for their input once you and I have agreement on a rough draft. After that, I will then want to send it to Peggy Nighswonger so that she can share it with the Executive Board to get their input before it goes final.

I'll wait to hear back from you.

DRAFT AGENDA (Standards Board) 2006.doc

RAY MARTINEZ III
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 566-3100 (W)
(202) 566-3127 (FAX)
www.eac.gov
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MEMORANDUM

TO: MEMBERS OF EAC STANDARDS BOARD
FROM: PEGGY NIGHSWONGER, CHAIR, EXECUTIVE BOARD
       RAY MARTINEZ, EAC COMMISSIONER
DATE: APRIL 10, 2006
SUBJECT: UPCOMING MEETING OF STANDARDS BOARD, MAY 23-24, 2006

The next meeting of the EAC Standards Board (to be held jointly with the EAC Board of Advisors) will be held in Washington, D.C. on Tuesday, May 23 and Wednesday, May 24, 2006 at the Hamilton Crown Plaza hotel. We hope you will be able to attend this important meeting, which will focus on consideration and discussion of a number of ongoing election administration research projects currently underway by the EAC. Additionally, there will also be a discussion regarding recent work conducted by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) regarding voter verifiable audit trail. (Please see the draft agenda attached for additional information.)

As was the case with our previous meetings of the EAC Standards Board, the EAC will pay the cost of travel, hotel and a Federal per diem for any member of the Standards Board wishing to attend the May 2006 meeting. Upon receipt of this memorandum, please contact the EAC’s travel agent, Adventure Travel, at (877) 472-6718 to make your travel arrangements. Additionally, if you have any questions or need assistance in making your travel plans, please call __________________________ (email address is ________________).

Thank you in advance for you willingness to join us in Washington, D.C. We look forward to seeing you soon.
Tuesday, May 23, 2006

1:00 – 2:30 a.m.  PLENARY SESSION
Session Chaired by Peggy Nighswonger
Chair, Executive Board

Appointment of Parliamentarian
Adoption of Agenda
Review of Meeting Book Materials
Presentation of Proposed Permanent Bylaws
Juliet Thompson, EAC General Counsel
Kevin Kennedy, Executive Director, State Elections Board, Wisconsin
Joanne Armbruster, Atlantic County Superintendent of Elections, New Jersey
William Campbell, City Clerk, City of Woburn, MA.

2:30 – 2:45 a.m.  BREAK

2:45 – 4:00 p.m.  PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT ON PROVISIONAL VOTING

Presentors:
Thomas O’Neil: Project Manager, EAC Provisional Voting
Ingrid Reed: Director, Eagleton Institute New Jersey Project
Dan Tokaji: Associate Director, Election Law@Moritz
Resource Person: Juliet Thompson, EAC General Counsel

4:00 – 4:15 p.m.  BREAK

4:15 – 5:30 p.m.  PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT ON VOTER IDENTIFICATION
Presentors:
Thomas O'Neil: Project Manager, EAC Provisional Voting
Ingrid Reed: Director, Eagleton New Jersey Project
Dan Tokaji: Associate Director, Election Law@Moritz
Resource Person: Juliet Thompson, EAC General Counsel

NOTE: Attendees on their own for dinner.

Wednesday, May 24, 2006

8:00 a.m. CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST

8:30 – 9:30 a.m. PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT ON POLL WORKER RECRUITMENT, TRAINING AND RETENTION (INCLUDING COLLEGE POLL WORKERS)

Presentors:
Tracy Warren, Poll Worker Institute
Jeannette Senecal, League of Women Voters
Dora Rose, Center for Election Integrity, Cleveland State University
Resource Person: Karen Lynn-Dyson, EAC Research Manager

9:30 – 10:30 a.m. PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT ON VOTE COUNT/RECOUNT

Presentors:
Dr. Thad Hall, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Utah
Dr. Michael Alvarez, Professor of Political Science, California Institute of Technology
Resource Person: Juliet Thompson, EAC General Counsel

10:30 – 10:45 a.m. BREAK

10:45 – 11:30 a.m. PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT ON IMPROVING DATA COLLECTION

Presentors:
Karen Lynn-Dyson, Research Director, Election Assistance Commission
Laiza Otero, Research Associate, Election Assistance Commission
Resource Person: Brian Hancock, Research Associate

11:30 – 12:15 p.m. PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT ON VOTER FRAUD/VOTER INTIMIDATION

Presentors:
Job Serebrov, Associate, The Nixon Law Firm
Tova Wang, Democracy Fellow, The Century Foundation
Resource Person: Juliet Thompson, EAC General Counsel

12: 15- 1:30 p.m.  LUNCH

PRESENTATION REGARDING PROPOSED MODULE FOR VOTER
VERIFIABLE PAPER AUDIT TRAIL (VVPAT) OF THE VOLUNTARY VOTING
SYSTEM GUIDELINES (VVSG)

Presentors:
Mark Skall, NIST
John Wack, NIST

1:30 – 3:15 p.m.  JOINT PLENARY SESSION
Session Jointly Chaired by Peggy Nighswonger, Chair, Executive
Board and Beverly Kaufman, Chair, Board of Advisors

Discussion and deliberation.

3:15 – 3:30 p.m.  BREAK

3:30 – 5:00 p.m.  JOINT PLENARY SESSION (CONTINUED)
Session Jointly Chaired by Peggy Nighswonger, Chair, Executive
Board and Beverly Kaufman, Chair, Board of Advisors

Discussion and deliberation.

5:00 p.m.  ADJOURN

* Not included in the current list of projects briefed:

- Design for Democracy updates and improvements to ballot design and polling-place signage.
- Public Access Portal research.
- Katrina Voting Assistance Relief research.
- Legal Online clearinghouse of election law materials.
I see only 2 consultants on the Tally Vote for the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation project. What happened to the third consultant?

Remind me how it is that EAC can sole source a contract to NASED? I don't have an objection; I am merely seeking information.

Thank you,
Gracia M. Hillman
Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-566-3100
Fax: 202-566-1392
www.eac.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message is from a federal agency. All attachments, if any, are intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete this message from your computer.
Hi Devon,

I just wanted to check in and see how the nexis searching and sorting is going. Have you made any progress? Any questions come up? Let us know. Thanks.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Devon:

In preparation for this afternoon's teleconference, you may want to review the attached list of Nexis search terms. If you have any questions, we can discuss them before the teleconference or, if I can't provide answers, we can ask our consultants who prepared the list. — Peggy
Nexis Word Search Terms

November 28, 2005

The following are the terms that should be entered to search for news articles from 2000 to the present. The list assumes the intern has little experience with Nexis – there are ways to do the searches with far fewer terms than those below. We can train the intern if that is a better way to go.

Election and fraud
Voter and fraud
Vote and fraud
Voter and challenge
Vote and challenge
Election and challenge
Election and irregularity
Election and irregularities
Election and violation
Election and stealing
Ballot box and tampering
Ballot box and theft
Ballot box and stealing
Election and officers
Election and Sheriff
Miscount and votes
Election and crime
Election and criminal
Vote and crime
Vote and criminal
Double voting
Multiple voting
Dead and voting
Election and counting and violation
Election and counting and error
Vote and counting and violation
Vote and counting and error
Voter and intimidation
Voter and intimidating
Vote and intimidation
Denial and voter and registration
Voter identification
Vote and identification
Voter and racial profiling
Vote and racial profiling
Voter and racial
Vote and racial
Voter and racial and challenge
Vote and racial and challenge
Voter and deny and racial
Vote and deny and racial
Voter and deny and challenge
Vote and deny and challenge
Voter and deny and black
Vote and deny and black
Voter and black and challenge
Vote and black and challenge
Voter and deny and African American
Vote and deny and African American
Voter and African American and challenge
Vote and African American and challenge
Election and black and challenge
Election and African American and challenge
Voter and deny and Hispanic
Voter and deny and Latino
Vote and deny and Hispanic
Vote and deny and Latino
Voter and Hispanic and challenge
Voter and Latino and challenge
Vote and Hispanic and challenge
Vote and Latino and challenge
Election and Hispanic and challenge
Election and Latino and challenge
Voter and deny and Native American
Vote and deny and Native American
Voter and Native American and challenge
Vote and Native American and challenge
Election and Native American and challenge
Voter and deny and Asian American
Vote and deny and Asian American
Voter and Asian American and challenge
Vote and Asian American and challenge
Voter and Asian American and challenge
Election and Asian American and challenge
Voter and deny and Indian
Vote and deny and Indian
Voter and Indian and challenge
Vote and Indian and challenge
Election and Indian and challenge
Poll tax
Voting and test
Absentee ballot and deny
Absentee ballot and reject
Absentee ballot and challenge
Vote and challenge
Voter and challenge
Election and challenge
Vote and police
Voter and police
Poll and police
Vote and law enforcement
Voter and law enforcement
Poll and law enforcement
Vote and deceptive practices
Voter and deceptive practices
Election and deceptive practices
Voter and deceive
Voter and false information
Dirty tricks
Vote and felon
Vote and ex-felon
Disenfranchisement
Disenfranchise
Law and election and manipulation
Vote and purging
Vote and purge
Registration and removal
Registration and purging
Registration and purge
Vote buying
Vote and noncitizen
Voter and noncitizen
Vote and selective enforcement
Identification and selective
Election and misinformation
Registration and restrictions
Election and administrator and fraud
Election and official and fraud
Provisional ballot and deny
Provisional ballot and denial
Affidavit ballot and deny
Affidavit ballot and denial
Absentee ballot and coerce
Absentee ballot and coercion
Registration and destruction
Voter and deter
Vote and deterrence
Voter and deterrence
Ballot integrity
Ballot security
Ballot security and minority
Ballot security and black
Ballot security and African American
Ballot security and Latino
Ballot security and Hispanic
Ballot security and Native American
Ballot security and Indian
Vote and suppression
Minority and vote and suppression
Black and vote and suppression
African American and vote and suppression
Latino and vote and suppression
Hispanic and vote and suppression
Native American and vote and suppression
Vote and suppress
Minority and vote and suppress
African American and vote and suppress
Latino and vote and suppress
Native American and vote and suppress
Vote and depress
Jim Crow
Literacy test
Voter and harass
Voter and harassment
Vote and mail and fraud
Poll and guards
Election and consent decree
Vote and barrier
Voting and barrier
Voter and barrier
Election and long line
Voter and long line

Poll worker and challenge
Poll worker and intimidate
Poll worker and intimidation
Poll worker and intimidating
Poll worker and threatening
Poll worker and abusive
Election official and challenge
Election official and intimidate
Election official and intimidation
Election official and intimidating
Election official and threatening
Election official and abusive
Poll watcher and challenge
Poll watcher and intimidate
Poll watcher and intimidating
Poll watcher and intimidation
Poll watcher and abusive
Poll watcher and threatening
Poll inspector and challenge
Poll inspector and intimidate
Poll inspector and intimidating
Poll inspector and intimidation
Poll inspector and abusive
Poll inspector and threatening
Poll judge and challenge
Poll judge and intimidate
Poll judge and intimidating
Poll judge and intimidation
Poll judge and abusive
Poll judge and threatening
Poll monitor and challenge
Poll monitor and intimidate
Poll monitor and intimidating
Poll monitor and intimidation
Poll monitor and abusive
Poll monitor and threatening
Election judge and challenge
Election judge and intimidate
Election judge and intimidating
Election judge and intimidation
Election judge and abusive
Election judge and threatening
Election monitor and challenge
Election monitor and intimidate
Election monitor and intimidating
Election monitor and intimidation
Election monitor and abusive
Election monitor and threatening
Election observer and challenge
Election observer and intimidate
Election observer and intimidating
Election observer and intimidation
Election observer and abusive
Election observer and threatening
Tamar:

Don't worry about responding to this email, as I know you have to pay attention in class.

I questioned the length of the search term list and also thought that there would be ways to combine some of the search terms. It has been awhile since I have done a Westlaw search, however, which is why I need your input during the teleconference. Yes, I recognize that going through the list of search terms and printing off or saving the resulting references will take time. I'll need you to provide that feedback to our consultants so that we all are on the same page.

Devon has not done a Nexis search before; but, if EAC has access to that database, she is willing to conduct that search. The work would go along with other help she is providing. She will be sorting through my huge files of press clippings on voting fraud, will PDF the sorted clippings, and drop the PDF files onto CDs for our consultants' review.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov
Tamar and Devon:

The phone numbers and email addresses for Tova and Job follow. I would appreciate it if you would cc: me on any emails you send to them and summarize any phone calls with them. That way, I can be kept in the loop without serving as a roadblock or go-between. Thanks! --- Peggy

Tova Wang (New York)
Phone: 212-452-7704
Email: wang@tcf.org

Job Serebrov (Arkansas - one hour earlier time zone)
Phone: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
Hi Devon,

I just wanted to check in and see how the nexis searching and sorting is going. Have you made any progress? Any questions come up? Let us know. Thanks.

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Peg,

Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think I omitted sending you these specific summaries that are based on complex cases that could not be adequately described within the confines of the nexis article excel spreadsheets. If we can, these should be included, probably on the disc. Sorry.

Tova Andrea Wang  
Democracy Fellow  
The Century Foundation  
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021  
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534  

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Summary of Wisconsin Voting Irregularities November 2004

Instances of Illegal Voting, Milwaukee:
A probe led by U.S. Attorney Steve Biskupic and Milwaukee County District Attorney Michael McCann found about 200 cases of illegal felon voting and at least 100 cases of other forms of illegal voting in the city of Milwaukee. Of these, 14 were prosecuted:

10 were instances of felons voting while on probation or parole:
5 are awaiting trial. (one of them is DeShawn Brooks)
1 has been acquitted
1 has been found guilty in trial (Kimberly Prude)
3 have reached plea agreements (Milo Ocasio)
[names: Ethel M. Anderson, Correan F. Edwards, Jiyto L. Cox, Joseph J. Gooden]

4 were instances of double voting:
1 produced a hung jury (Enrique Sanders)
1 was found incompetent to stand trial and his case was dismissed
1 initially pleaded guilty but now wants a trial.
1 is awaiting trial.

Two of those accused of double voting were driven to multiple polling places in a van, but the identity of the driver of the vehicle is not known, and the DA does not suspect conspiracy.

In addition to these, four people were charged with felonies in the Milwaukee County Circuit Court; two cases were filed against people accused of sending in false registration cards under the auspices of the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now; the other two were felons who voted illegally.

Instances of Illegal Voting, Statewide:
The Legislative Audit Bureau, a nonpartisan research agency, released its analysis of state-wide 2004 election results in September 2005. The agency reviewed the names, addresses, and birthdates of over 348,000 individuals credited with having voted in November 2004, from the electronic voter registration records of 6 cooperating municipalities, and compared them to lists from the Department of Corrections of felons serving sentences on election day, and to lists from the municipalities (to check up on...
double-voting) and to lists from the US Social Security Administration. LAB’s search revealed 105 “questionable” votes:

- 98 ballots cast by ineligible felons, 57 of which were in Madison, 2 in Waukesha, 15 in Eau Claire, 16 in Appleton, 1 in the Village of Ashwaubenon
- 2 instances of double-voting (one in Madison, one in Waukesha).
- 4 votes counted despite the voter’s having died two weeks or less before the election.
- 1 case in which a 17-year-old voted in Madison.  

The LAB referred the names of these people to the appropriate District Attorney for prosecution, and several cases are awaiting trial.

It should be noted that this study is not a complete survey of election returns state-wide in Wisconsin; the LAB’s analysis is based on the voting records of the six municipalities that provided the LAB with sufficient information to conduct this study.

It should also be noted that the LAB discovered significant error in the data provided them by these municipalities, including:

- 91 records in which the individual’s birthdate was incorrectly recorded as later than November 2, 1986
- 97 cases in which a person was mistakenly recorded as having voted twice
- More than 15,000 records were missing birthdates, making it more difficult to determine voter eligibility by comparing these records to lists of felons and deceased persons.

General Findings
Both reports (the Legislative Audit Bureau’s and the report of the Joint Task Force on Election Reform convened in Milwaukee) that did in-depth studies of the Wisconsin election returns in 2004 found that there was no evidence of systematic, wide-spread fraud. As the above statistics indicate, there are very few cases in which an individual intentionally voted illegally, and the majority of the discovered instances of fraudulent voting involved felons who were unaware that they were committing a crime. Certainly the number of fraudulent votes, intentional and unintentional, is dwarfed by the amount of administrative error – and the amount of potential there was for fraud.

Registration Irregularities

---

8 Borowski, Greg J. “State audit digs up wider vote problems; Thousands of voters on rolls more than once.” Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel. September 17, 2005
Duplicate Registrations: In the data from the six participating municipalities, LAB found 3116 records for individuals who appear to be registered more than once in the same municipality (0.9% of the records they reviewed). These duplications were primarily the result of name changes, in which the registrar neglected to remove the old name from the registration list, previous addresses that were not deleted, and misspellings and other typographical errors.

Deceased Voters: the LAB study found 783 persons who were deceased, but whose records had not been eliminated from the registration lists. Most of the municipalities participating in the survey rely on obituaries and notifications from family members to purge their voter registration lists of deceased voters.

Felons: Comparing a list of felons from the Department of Corrections to their voter registration data lists, LAB found 453 felons who were registered to vote. This is largely because, although municipal clerks are informed of federal felony convictions, they have no way of obtaining records on state felony convictions.  

11 Legislative Audit Bureau Report: pg 43-47.
Summary of South Dakota Election Irregularities in 2002 and 2004

2002
In fall 2002, one of South Dakota’s Senators, Democrat Tim Johnson, was up for re-election, and was engaged in a very close race with his Republican challenger, John Thune. Both parties were engaged in a massive voter registration effort, and registered over 24,000 new voters in the five months between the June primary and the November election, increasing the number of registered voters in the state from around 452,000 to 476,000.\footnote{Kafka, Joe. “More people registered to vote.” \textit{Associated Press State and Local Wire}. October 29, 2002.}

A month before the election, several counties reported irregularities in some of the voter registration documents they’d received. In response to these reports, South Dakota Attorney General, Mark Barnett, with the state US Attorney and the FBI, launched an investigation.\footnote{Kafka, Joe. “Voter registration fraud being investigated.” \textit{Associated Press State and Local Wire}. October 11, 2002.} Because of the importance of the race in determining the partisan balance of power in the Senate, the voter registration discrepancies got a good deal of national press, including a number of editorials accusing American Indians of stuffing ballot boxes.\footnote{“Barnett: No evidence that fraud affected vote.” \textit{Associated Press State and Local Wire}. Sioux Falls, South Dakota. November 21, 2002.} The following allegations were also picked up by out-of-state newssources, including Fox News and the Wall Street Journal:

- Supporters of Thune, who lost the election by 524 votes, collected 47 affidavits from poll watchers claiming voting irregularities.
- Allegations were made that three individuals were offered money by Johnson supporters to vote.

Barnett, who was alerted to the affidavits when he read an early media report that referred to them, stated that these allegations were either false or didn’t warrant concern. “Most of the stuff that’s in those other 47 affidavits are the kind of problems that we see in every election. People parking too close to the polling place with a sign in their window, people shooting their mouths off at the polling place. The kind of things that local election officials generally do a pretty good job of policing.”\footnote{Kafka, Joe. “Woman charged in voter-fraud case, other claims false.” \textit{Associated Press State and Local Wire}. Pierre, South Dakota. December 14, 2002.} The allegations of voter bribery were false.

Though most of the allegations of fraud that were filed turned out to be false, Attorney General Barnett’s investigation did uncover two cases of voter registration fraud:

- The most high-profile case was that of Becky Red Earth-Villeda. Ms. Red Earth-Villeda was hired by the state Democratic party to register voters on the American Indian reservations. She was charged with 19 counts of forgery. No fraudulent voting was associated with Ms. Red Earth-Villeda, nor was there any evidence
that fraudulent voting occurred in the state. All charges were dropped in January 2004, when, in court, it was determined by the state handwriting specialist that Ms. Red Earth-Villeda had not forged the signatures.

Lyle Nichols. Mr. Nichols was arrested for submitting five forged voter registration cards to his county office. He was working for an organization called the Native American Voter Registration Project, and was paid $3 for each registration. The five charges were dropped after Mr. Nichols pleaded guilty to possession of a forgery, and was sentenced with 54 days in jail, which is how much time he'd already spent there because of the charges.

2004

In October 2004, just before the general election, eight people working for a campus GOP Get-out-the-Vote organization resigned their positions after they were accused of submitting absentee ballot requests that had not been notarized properly. Because many of these ballot requests had already been processed and the ballots themselves had been cast, county auditors decided not to pursue the issue.

Besides this incident, there were no reports of voter registration or voting irregularities in the run-up to the November 2004 election, as there were in 2002. However, as with the primary and special elections in June 2004, there were complaints about voter intimidation from American Indians attempting to vote, as well as difficulties with the adoption of the state's new photo identification regulations (after the 2002 election, the state legislature passed more stringent requirements about the kind of identification voters would need to provide at the polls.)

Incidents:

Voter Intimidation: The Four Directions Committee, an organization dedicated to helping American Indians register to vote and get to the polls, got a temporary restraining order on several Republican supporters who, they alleged, had been setting up video equipment outside of polling places on American Indian reservations and following around American Indians who voted early and recording their license plates.

Vote Buying: A Republican election monitor from Virginia, Paul Brenner, claimed that Senator Tom Daschle's campaign was paying people to vote. Local county auditors

---

believe Brenner started the rumor himself. As there was no evidence for either side, the claims were not taken seriously.  

---

Summary of Election Irregularities in Washington State 2004

The 2004 Washington state gubernatorial election was decided by one of the narrowest margins in American electoral history; 261 votes – less than a millionth of the 2.8 million votes cast statewide - separated the leading candidate, Republican Dino Rossi, from his competitor, Democrat Christine Gregoire. The state law-mandated recount that followed brought the margin down to 42 votes, and the subsequent hand recount ordered by the state Democratic Party gave Gregoire the lead, with 129 more votes than Rossi.

The race was so close that the parties decided to go to court to dispute the tally – the Republicans wanted the election results set aside and to have a revote; the Democrats sought a court-legitimated win. Each side set out into the field to find a way to swing the election in their favor. The trial and accompanying investigation, which lasted through the spring of 2005, revealed a litany of problems with the state’s election system:

- The process by which absentee ballots are matched to the voters who requested them led to discrepancies between the number of absentee ballots received and the number of votes counted.¹
- After the final certification of the election results, King County discovered 96 uncounted absentee ballots, Pierce county found 64, and Spokane County found eight; all had been misplaced following the election, but there was no mechanism for reconciling the number of absentee ballots received with the number counted.²
- Hundreds of felons who were ineligible to vote were able to cast ballots because they were not aware that they needed to apply to have their voting rights reinstated.³
- The system for verifying the eligibility of voters who had cast provisional ballots was found to be questionable.⁴
- Due to poll worker error, about 100 provisional ballots were improperly cast, and a hundred more were counted, though they were not verified as having been cast by eligible voters.⁵

The trial also revealed that most of these problems were the result of understaffing and human error.⁶ In total, 1,678 ballots were proven to have been cast illegally, but none of these votes was subtracted from the candidates’ totals because no evidence was produced in court as to how each individual voted.⁷ Further, despite the scrutiny that the election

⁴ Roberts, Gregory. “GOP contrasts elections offices; Chelan County’s work better than King’s, judge in gubernatorial case told.” The Seattle Post-Intelligencer. May 25, 2005.
⁵ Ervin, Keith. “Prosecutors to challenge 110 voters; They are said to be felons – 2 counties discover uncounted ballots.” The Seattle Times. April 29, 2005.
⁶ Ervin, Keith. “King County ballot numbers don’t add up; 4000 discrepancies – Review of records finds flaws at each stage of the election; voting, processing, counting.” The Seattle Times. May 25, 2005.
returns revealed, and the extensive discussion of voter fraud throughout the investigation, just eight cases of voter fraud were discovered:

- 4 people were accused of casting absentee ballots for their deceased spouses.  
- A mother and daughter were charged with the absentee ballot of the mother’s husband who had died earlier in the year
- 1 man cast the ballot of the deceased prior resident of his home.
- A homeless resident of Seattle cast two ballots, one in the name of Dustin Ocoilain.

---

9 Ervin, Keith. “6 accused of casting multiple votes; King County voters face criminal charges - Jail time, fines possible.” Seattle Times. June 22, 2005.
Plus, I found a few typos on the nexis analysis. Sorry about this.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
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Major Vote Buying Cases Summary

Between 2001 and 2006, allegations and convictions for vote buying and conspiracies to buy votes were concentrated in three states: Illinois, West Virginia and Kentucky.

In East St. Louis, Illinois, nine individuals, including a former city council member and the head of the local Democratic Party, Charles Powell, Jr., were convicted or pled guilty to vote buying and conspiracy to commit election fraud during the 2004 general election. The government's conspiracy case was almost entirely based on taped conversations in which the defendants discussed buying votes for $5 and whether this would be adequate. Federal prosecutors alleged that the vote buying was financed with $79,000 transferred from the County Democratic Party shortly before the election, although county officials have not been charged. Four defendants were convicted of purchasing or offering to purchase at least one vote directly, while Democratic Party chairman was only convicted of conspiracy. Earlier, three precinct officials and one precinct worker pled guilty to buying votes for $5 or $10 in that same election.

Eastern Kentucky has witnessed a series of vote buying cases over the last several years. The most recent revolved around Ross Harris, a Pike County political fundraiser and coal executive, and his associate Loren Glenn Turner. Harris and Turner were convicted in September 2004 of vote buying, mail fraud, and several other counts. Prosecutors alleged Harris and Turner conspired to buy votes and provided the necessary funds in an unsuccessful 2002 bid for Pike County district judge by former State Senator Doug Hays. Harris supplied nearly $40,000, Turner laundered the money through straw contributors, and the cash was then disbursed in the form of $50 checks ostensibly for 'vote hauling', the legal practice of paying campaign workers to get voters to the polls which is notorious as a cover for buying votes. Harris attempted to influence the race on behalf of Hays in order to get revenge on Hays' opponent for a personal matter.

A grand jury initially indicted 10 individuals in connection with the Harris and Turner case, including Hays and his wife, and six campaign workers. Of the remaining defendants, only one, Tom Varney, also a witness in the Hays case, pled guilty. The others were either acquitted of vote buying charges or had vote buying charges dropped. Prosecutors have announced that their investigation continues into others tied to Harris and may produce further indictments.

The Harris case follows a series of trials related to the 1998 Knott County Democratic primary. Between 2003 and 2004, 10 individuals were indicted on vote buying charges, including a winning candidate in those primaries, Knott County judge-executive Donnie Newsome, who was reelected in 2002. In 2004 Newsome and a supporter were sent to jail and fined. Five other

---

3 “2 found guilty in pike county vote-fraud case; Two-year sentences possible,” Lexington Herald Leader, September 17, 2004.
5 “Pike Election Trial Goes To Jury” Lexington Herald Leader, January 1, 2006.
defendants pled guilty to vote buying charges, and three were acquitted. The primary means of vote buying entailed purchasing absentee votes from elderly, infirm, illiterate or poor voters, usually for between $50 and $100. This resulted in an abnormally high number of absentee ballots in the primary.\(^7\) Indictments relating to that same 1998 primary were also brought in 1999, when 6 individuals were indicted for buying the votes of students at a small local college. Five of those indicted were convicted or pled guilty.\(^8\)

Absentee vote buying was also an issue in 2002, when federal prosecutors opened an investigation in Kentucky's Clay County after an abnormal number of absentee ballots were filed in the primary and the sheriff halted absentee voting twice over concerns.\(^9\) Officials received hundreds of complaints of vote-buying during the 2002 primary, and state investigators performed follow up investigations in a number of counties, including Knott, Bell, Floyd, Pike, and Maginoff.\(^10\) No indictments have been produced so far.

So far, relatively few incidents of vote-buying have been substantially identified or investigated in the 2004 election. Two instances of vote buying in local 2004 elections have been brought before a grand jury. In one, a Casey County man was indicted for purchasing votes in a local school board race with cash and whiskey.\(^11\) In the second, the grand jury chose not to indict an individual accused of offering to purchase a teenager's vote on a local proposal with beer.\(^12\)

An extensive vote buying conspiracy has also been uncovered in southern West Virginia. The federal probe, which handed down its first indictment in 2003, has yielded more than a dozen guilty pleas to charges of vote buying and conspiracy in elections since the late 1980s. As this area is almost exclusively dominated by the Democratic Party, vote-buying occurred largely during primary contests.

The first phase of the probe focused on Logan County residents, where vote buying charges were brought in relation to elections in 1996, 2000, 2002 and 2004. In an extraordinary tactic, the FBI planted the former mayor of Logan City, Tom Esposito, as a candidate in a state legislative race. Esposito's cooperation led to guilty pleas from the Logan County Clerk, who pled guilty to selling his vote to Esposito in 1996,\(^13\) and another man who took money from Esposito for the purpose of vote buying in 2004.\(^14\)

Guilty pleas were also obtained in connection with former county sheriff Johnny Mendez, who pled guilty to buying votes in two primary elections in order to elect candidates including

---

\(^7\) "Knott County, KY., Judge Executive sentenced on vote-buying conspiracy charges," Department of Justice, March 16, 2004.

\(^8\) "6 men accused of vote fraud in '98 Knott primary; Charges include vote buying and lying to FBI"


\(^12\) "Man in beer vote case files suit" The Cincinnati Enquirer, March 17, 2005.

\(^13\) "Two plead to vote fraud; Logan clerk sold vote; politician tried to buy votes" Charleston Gazette, December 14, 2005.

\(^14\) "Logan man gets probation in vote-fraud scandal" Charleston Gazette, March 1, 2006.
himself. In 2000, with a large amount of funding from a prominent local lawyer seeking to influence a state delegate election for his wife, Mendez distributed around $10,000 in payments to voters of $10 to $100. Then, in the 2004 primary, Mendez distributed around $2,000 before his arrest. A deputy of Mendez', the former Logan police chief, also pled guilty to a count of vote buying in 2002.

Prosecutors focusing on neighboring Lincoln County have alleged a long-standing vote-buying conspiracy extending back to the late 1980s. The probe identified Lincoln County Circuit Clerk Greg Stowers as head of a Democratic Party faction which routinely bought votes in order to maintain office. Stowers pled guilty in December 2005 to distributing around $7,000 to buy votes in the 2004 primary. The Lincoln County Assessor, and Stowers' longtime political ally, Jerry Allen Weaver, also pled guilty to conspiracy to buy votes. These were accompanied by four other guilty pleas from party workers for vote buying in primaries. While most specific charges focused on vote buying in the 2004 primary, defendants also admitted buying votes as far back as the 1988, 1990, and 1992 primaries.

The leading conspirators would give party workers candidate slates and cash, which workers would then take to the polling place and use to purchase votes for amounts between $10 and $40 and in one instance, for liquor. Voters would be handed the slate of chosen candidates, and would then be paid upon exiting the polling place. In other cases, the elected officials in question purchased votes in exchange for non-cash rewards, including patronage positions, fixed tickets, favorable tax assessments, and home improvements.

The West Virginia probe is ongoing, as prosecutors are scrutinizing others implicated during the proceedings so far, including a sitting state delegate, who may be under scrutiny for vote buying in a 1990 election, and one of the Lincoln county defendants who previously had vote buying charges against him dropped.

---

13 "Mendez confined to home for year Ex-Logan sheriff was convicted of buying votes" Charleston Gazette, January 22, 2005.
17 "Clerk says he engaged in vote buying" Charleston Gazette, December 30, 2005.
18 "Lincoln clerk, two others plead guilty to election fraud" Charleston Daily Mail, December 30, 2005.
Nexis Search Articles Analysis

Note: The search terms used were ones agreed upon by both Job Serebrov and Tova Wang and are available upon request. A more systematic, numerical analysis of the data contained in the Nexis charts is currently being undertaken. What follows is an overview.

Recommendation: In phase 2, consultants should conduct a Nexis search that specifically attempts to follow up on the cases for which no resolution is evident from this particular initial search.

Overview of the Articles

Absentee Ballots

According to press reports, absentee ballots are abused in a variety of ways:

1. Campaign workers, candidates and others coerce the voting choices of vulnerable populations, usually elderly voters
2. Workers for groups and individuals have attempted to vote absentee in the names of the deceased
3. Workers for groups, campaign workers and individuals have attempted to forge the names of other voters on absentee ballot requests and absentee ballots and thus vote multiple times

It is unclear how often actual convictions result from these activities (a handful of articles indicate convictions and guilty pleas), but this is an area in which there have been a substantial number of official investigations and actual charges filed, according to news reports where such information is available. A few of the allegations became part of civil court proceedings contesting the outcome of the election.

While absentee fraud allegations turn up throughout the country, a few states have had several such cases. Especially of note are Indiana, New Jersey, South Dakota, and most particularly, Texas. Interestingly, there were no articles regarding Oregon, where the entire system is vote by mail.

Voter Registration Fraud

According to press reports, the following types of allegations of voter registration fraud are most common:

1. Registering in the name of dead people
2. Fake names and other information on voter registration forms
3. Illegitimate addresses used on voter registration forms
4. Voters being tricked into registering for a particular party under false pretenses
5. Destruction of voter registration forms depending on the party the voter registered with

There was only one self evident instance of a noncitizen registering to vote. Many of the instances reported on included official investigations and charges filed, but few actual convictions, at least from the news reporting. There have been multiple reports of registration fraud in California, Colorado, Florida, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, South Dakota and Wisconsin.

**Voter Intimidation and Suppression**

This is the area which had the most articles in part because there were so many allegations of intimidation and suppression during the 2004 election. Most of these remained allegations and no criminal investigation or prosecution ensued. Some of the cases did end up in civil litigation.

This is not to say that these alleged activities were confined to 2004 – there were several allegations made during every year studied. Most notable were the high number of allegations of voter intimidation and harassment reported during the 2003 Philadelphia mayoral race.

A very high number of the articles were about the issue of challenges to voters' registration status and challengers at the polling places. There were many allegations that planned challenge activities were targeted at minority communities. Some of the challenges were concentrated in immigrant communities.

However, the tactics alleged varied greatly. The types of activities discussed also include the following:

- Photographing or videotaping voters coming out of polling places.
- Improper demands for identification
- Poll watchers harassing voters
- Poll workers being hostile to or aggressively challenging voters
- Disproportionate police presence
- Poll watchers wearing clothes with messages that seemed intended to intimidate
- Insufficient voting machines and unmanageably long lines

Although the incidents reported on occurred everywhere, not surprisingly, many came from “battleground” states. There were several such reports out of Florida, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

**“Dead Voters and Multiple Voting”**

There were a high number of articles about people voting in the names of the dead and voting more than once. Many of these articles were marked by allegations of big numbers of people committing these frauds, and relatively few of these allegations
Turning out to be accurate according to investigations by the newspapers themselves, elections officials and criminal investigators. Often the problem turned out to be a result of administrative error, poll workers mis-marking of voter lists, a flawed registration list and/or errors made in the attempt to match names of voters on the list with the names of the people who voted. In a good number of cases, there were allegations that charges of double voting by political leaders were an effort to scare people away from the voting process.

Nonetheless there were a few cases of people actually being charged and/or convicted for these kinds of activities. Most of the cases involved a person voting both by absentee ballot and in person. A few instances involved people voting both during early voting and on Election Day, which calls into question the proper marking and maintenance of the voting lists. In many instances, the person charged claimed not to have voted twice on purpose. A very small handful of cases involved a voter voting in more than one county and there was one substantiated case involving a person voting in more than one state. Other instances in which such efforts were alleged were disproved by officials.

In the case of voting in the name of a dead person, the problem lay in the voter registration list not being properly maintained, i.e. the person was still on the registration list as eligible to vote, and a person taking criminal advantage of that. In total, the San Francisco Chronicle found 5 such cases in March 2004; the AP cited a newspaper analysis of five such persons in an Indiana primary in May 2004; and a senate committee found two people to have voted in the names of the dead in 2005.

As usual, there were a disproportionate number of such articles coming out of Florida. Notably, there were three articles out of Oregon, which has one hundred percent vote-by-mail.

Vote Buying

There were a surprising number of articles about vote buying cases. A few of these instances involved long-time investigations in three particular jurisdictions as detailed in the vote buying summary. There were more official investigations, indictments and convictions/pleas in this area. All of these cases are concentrated in the Midwest and South.

Deceptive Practices

In 2004 there were numerous reports of intentional disinformation about voting eligibility and the voting process meant to confuse voters about their rights and when and where to vote. Misinformation came in the form of flyers, phone calls, letters, and even people going door to door. Many of the efforts were reportedly targeted at minority communities. A disproportionate number of them came from key battleground states, particularly Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. From the news reports found, only one of these instances was officially investigated, the case in Oregon involving the destruction...
of voter registration forms. There were no reports of prosecutions or any other legal proceeding.

Non-citizen Voting

There were surprisingly few articles regarding noncitizen registration and voting – just seven all together, in seven different states across the country. They were also evenly split between allegations of noncitizens registering and noncitizens voting. In one case charges were filed against ten individuals. In one case a judge in a civil suit found there was illegal noncitizen voting. Three instances prompted official investigations. Two cases, from this nexis search, remained just allegations of noncitizen voting.

Felon Voting

Although there were only thirteen cases of felon voting, some of them involved large numbers of voters. Most notably, of course, are the cases that came to light in the Washington gubernatorial election contest (see Washington summary) and in Wisconsin (see Wisconsin summary). In several states, the main problem has the large number of ineligible felons that remained on the voting list.

Election Official Fraud

In most of the cases in which fraud by elections officials is suspected or alleged, it is difficult to determine whether it is incompetence or a crime. There are several cases of ballots gone missing, ballots unaccounted for and ballots ending up in a worker’s possession. In two cases workers were said to have changed peoples’ votes. The one instance in which widespread ballot box stuffing by elections workers was alleged was in Washington State. The judge in the civil trial of that election contest did not find that elections workers had committed fraud. Four of the cases are from Texas.
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List of Experts Interviewed

Wade Henderson, Executive Director, Leadership Conference for Civil Rights

Wendy Weiser, Deputy Director, Democracy Program, The Brennan Center

William Groth, attorney for the plaintiffs in the Indiana voter identification litigation

Lori Minnite, Barnard College, Columbia University

Neil Bradley, ACLU Voting Rights Project

Nina Perales, Counsel, Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund

Pat Rogers, attorney, New Mexico

Rebecca Vigil-Giron, Secretary of State, New Mexico

Sarah Ball Johnson, Executive Director of the State Board of Elections, Kentucky

Stephen Ansolobohere, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Chandler Davidson, Rice University

Tracey Campbell, author, Deliver the Vote

Douglas Webber, Assistant Attorney General, Indiana, (defendant in the Indiana voter identification litigation)

Heather Dawn Thompson, Director of Government Relations, National Congress of American Indians

Jason Torchinsky, Assistant General Counsel, American Center for Voting Rights

Robin DeJarnette, Executive Director, American Center for Voting Rights

Joseph Rich, former Director of the Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

Joseph Sandler, Counsel to the Democratic National Committee

John Ravitz, Executive Director, New York City Board of Elections

John Tanner, Director, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

Kevin Kennedy, Executive Director of the State Board of Elections, Wisconsin

Deliberative Process Privilege
Evelyn Stratton, Justice, Supreme Court of Ohio

Tony Sirvello, Executive Director, International Association of Clerks, Recorders, Election Officials and Treasurers
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Analysis of the September 15, 2005 Voter Fraud Report Submitted to the New Jersey Attorney General

By The Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law and Dr. Michael McDonald of George Mason University

General

A September 15, 2005 Report submitted to the New Jersey Attorney General included lists of purportedly illegitimate votes in New Jersey in the 2004 general election, including lists of 10,969 individuals who purportedly voted twice and lists of 4,756 voters who were purportedly dead or incarcerated in November 2004. For the present Analysis of the Report, the lists of voters submitted to the New Jersey Attorney General, as well as a copy of the New Jersey county voter registration files were obtained, and an initial investigation of the report’s claims was conducted. The analysis shows that the lists submitted are substantially flawed.

The Analysis is based on methodology only: its authors did not gain access to original documents related to registration or original pollbook records; only recently were copies of the counties’ original registration data files acquired and compiled, which contain some notable gaps; and the lists submitted to the Attorney General contain significant errors and little documentation, which complicated the analysis. Nonetheless, the analysts say that information collected is sufficient for generally assessing the quality of evidence presented to support the September 15 report. Analysis of the suspect lists reveals that the evidence submitted does not show what it purports to show: cause for concern that there is serious risk of widespread fraud given the state of the New Jersey voter registration rolls.

These suspect lists were compiled by attempting to match the first name, last name, and birth date of persons on county voter registration files. Entries that supposedly “matched” other entries were apparently deemed to represent the same individual, voting twice. This methodology was similar to the method used in compiling the notoriously inaccurate Florida “purge lists” of suspected ineligible felons in 2000 and 2004. As Florida’s experience shows, matching names and birth dates in the voter registration context can easily lead to false conclusions – as was almost certainly the case here.

This Analysis reveals several serious problems with the methodology used to compile the suspect lists that compromise the lists’ practical value. For example, the data used in the Report from one county appears to be particularly suspect and anomalous, and may have substantially skewed the overall results. In addition, middle initials were ignored throughout all counties, so that “J_____ A. Smith” was presumed to be the same person as “J_____ G. Smith.” Suffixes were also ignored, so that fathers and sons – like “B_____ Johnson” and “B_____ Johnson, Jr.” – were said to be the same person.

Underlying many of the entries on these lists, and similar lists compiled in Florida and elsewhere, is a presumption that two records with the same name and date of birth must
represent the same person. As explained in this analysis, this presumption is not consistent with basic statistical principles. Even when votes appear to have been cast in two different cities under the same name and birth date, statistics show that voter fraud is not necessarily to blame. With 3.6 million persons who voted in the 2004 election in New Jersey, the chance that some have the same name and birth date is not far-fetched.

Analysis of the Claim of Double Voting by 4,497 Individuals

Attempts to match data on one list to data on another list will often yield “false positives:” two records that at first appear to be a match but do not actually represent the same person. The natural incidence of “false positives” for a matching exercise of this scale – especially when, as here, conducted with relatively little attention to detail – readily explains the ostensible number of double votes.

1,803 of these 4,397 records of ostensibly illegal votes seem to be the product of a glitch in the compilation of the registration files. These records reflect two registration entries by the same person from the same address, with a notation next to each that the individual has voted. For example, 55-year-old W____ A. Connors, living at 253 B____ Ave. in a New York commuter suburb, is listed on the data files with an (erroneous) first registration date in 1901 and a second registration date in 1993; Mr. Connors is thus represented twice on the data files submitted. Each of these entries also indicates that W____ A. Connors at 253 B____ Ave voted in 2004. There is no credible indication, however, that Mr. Connors actually voted twice; indeed, given the clearly erroneous registration date on the files, it is far more likely that data error is to blame for the doubly logged vote as well.

More plausibly, the bulk of these 1,803 records may be traced to irregularities in the data processing and compilation process for one single county: the Middlesex County registration file accounts for only 10% of registered voters in the state but 78% of these alleged double votes. The suspect lists themselves contain an acknowledgment that the problem in Middlesex is probably not fraud: 99% of these Middlesex voters are labeled on the lists submitted to the Attorney General with a notation that the record is “less likely” to indicate an illegal double vote.

Another 1,257 entries of the 4,397 records probably represent similar data errors – also largely driven by a likely glitch in the Middlesex County file, which is also vastly over represented in this category. These records show ever-so-slight variations in records listed with the same date of birth at the same address: for example, the same first and last names, but different middle initials or suffixes (e.g., J____ T. Kearns, Sr., and J____ T. Kearns, Jr., both born the same day and living at the same address; or J____ E. Allen and J____ P. Allen, born the same day and living at the same address).

Approximately 800 of the entries on the list likely represent different people, with different addresses and different middle initials or suffixes. For example, W____ S. Smith, living in a northern New Jersey town, and W____ C. Smith, living in another town two hours away, share the same date of birth but are not the same person. Nor are
T____ Brown, living in a New York commuter suburb, and T____ H. Brown, Jr., living in a small town over an hour west, despite the fact that they also share the same birth date. About three-quarters of the entries in this category reveal data that affirmatively conflict – for example, a middle initial (“W____ S.”) in one case, and a different middle initial (“W____ C.”) in another, listed at different addresses. There is absolutely no good reason to conclude that these individuals are in fact the same, when the available evidence indicates the contrary.

For approximately 200 of the entries in this category, however, less information is available. These entries show a middle initial (“J____ W. Davis”) in one case, and no middle initial (“J____ Davis”) in another – again, at different addresses. The lack of the middle initial is ambiguous: it could mean that one of the J____ Davis in question has no middle name, or it could mean that the middle initial was simply omitted in a particular registration entry. Although these entries involve less conclusive affirmative evidence of a false match than the entries noted above, there is still no good reason to believe that “J____ W. Davis” and “J____ Davis,” at different addresses, represent the same person.

Of the individuals remaining, there are serious concerns with the accuracy of the dates of birth. Seven voters were apparently born in January 1, 1880 – which is most likely a system default for registrations lacking date-of-birth information. For 227 voters, only the month and year of birth are listed: this means only that two voters with the same name were born in the same month and year, an unsurprising coincidence in a state of several million people.

That leaves approximately 289 votes cast under the same name and birth date – like votes cast by “P____ S. Rosen,” born in the middle of the baby boom – but from two different addresses. It may appear strange, but there may be two P____ S. Rosens, born on the same date in 1948 – and such coincidences are surprisingly common. For any one person, the odds of someone else having the same name and birth date is small. But because there are so many voters in New Jersey, a sizable number will have the same name and birth date simply by chance. In a group of just 23 people, it is more likely than not that two will share the same birthday. For 40 people, the probability is 90%. Many, if not most, of the 289 alleged double votes of persons registered at different addresses most likely reflect two separate individuals sharing a first name, last name, middle initial, and birth date.

The September 15 Report makes much of the raw potential for foul play based on the unsurprising fact that there are voters who appear on the New Jersey registration rolls more than once. As noted above, many of the names identified reflect two different individuals and not simply duplicate entries. But there is no doubt that there are duplicate entries on New Jersey’s registration rolls. It is well known that voter registration rolls contain “deadwood” – registration entries for individuals no longer living at a given address or deceased. There is no evidence, however, that these extra registrations are used for widespread illegal voting. Moreover, the problem of deadwood will soon be largely resolved: both the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 and the Help America
Vote Act of 2002 require states to implement several systems and procedures as of January 1, 2006, that will clean the voter rolls of duplicate or invalid entries while protecting eligible voters from unintended disfranchisement.
The Federal Crime of Election Fraud
By Craig Donsanto

In The Federal Crime of Election Fraud, Donsanto addresses the role of the United States Department of Justice in matters of election fraud. Specifically, it answers the most frequently asked questions concerning the federal law enforcement role in election matters. Particularly, what sort of election-related conduct is potentially actionable as a federal crime, what specific statutory theories apply to frauds occurring in elections lacking federal candidates on the ballot, what federalism, procedural, and policy considerations impact on the federalization of this type of case, and how Assistant United States Attorneys should respond to this type of complaint.

Donsanto indicates that as a general rule, the federal crime of voter fraud embraces only organized efforts to corrupt the election process itself: i.e., the registration of voters, the casting of ballots, and the tabulation and certification of election results. Moreover, this definition excludes all activities that occur in connection with the political campaigning process, unless those activities are themselves illegal under some other specific law or prosecutorial theory. This definition also excludes isolated acts of individual wrongdoing that are not part of an organized effort to corrupt the voting process. Finally, Donsanto points out that mistakes and other gaffs that inevitably occur are not included as voter fraud. Where mistakes occur on a significant enough level to potentially affect the outcome of an election, the appropriate remedy is an election contest brought by the loser seeking civil judicial redress through the appropriate state election contest process.

Along with the limits discussed above, prosecuting election fraud offenses in federal court is further complicated by the constitutional limits that are placed on federal power over the election process. The conduct of elections is primarily a state rather than a federal activity.

Donsanto lists four types of election fraud: schemes to purposely and corruptly register voters who either do not exist, or who are known by the putative defendant to be ineligible to vote under applicable state law; schemes to cast, record or fraudulently tabulate votes for voters who do not participate in the voting act at all; schemes to corrupt the voting act of voters who do participate in the voting act to a limited extent; and, schemes to knowingly prevent voters qualified voters from voting.

Donsanto lists four situations where federal prosecution is appropriate: Where the objective of the conduct is to corrupt the outcome of a federal elective contest, or where the consequential effect of the corrupt conduct impacts upon the vote count for federal office; Where the object of the scheme is to discriminate against racial, ethnic or language minority groups, the voting rights of which have been specifically protected by federal statues such as the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. section 1973 et seq.; Where federalization is required in order to redress longstanding patters of electoral fraud, either at the request of state or local authorities, or in the face of longstanding inaction by state authorities who appear to be unwilling or unable to respond under local law; and, Where
there is a factual basis to believe that fraudulent registration or voting activity is sufficiently connected to other forms of criminal activity that perusing the voter fraud angle will yield evidence useful in the prosecution of other categories of federal offense.

Donsanto lists four advantages to federal prosecution: voter fraud investigations are labor intensive. Local law enforcement agencies often lack the manpower and the financial resources to take these cases on; voter fraud matters are always politically sensitive and very high profile endeavors at the local level. Local prosecutors (who are usually themselves elected) often shy away from prosecuting them for that reason; the successful prosecution of voter fraud cases demands that critical witnesses be examined under oath before criminal charges based on their testimony are filed. Many states lack the broad grand jury process that exists in the federal system; and, the defendants in voter fraud cases are apt to be politicians - or agents of politicians - and it is often impossible for either the government or the defendant to obtain a fair trial in a case that is about politics and is tried to a locally-drawn jury. The federal court system provides for juries to be drawn from broader geographic base, thus often avoiding this problem.

Several prosecutorial theories used by United States Attorneys to federalize election frauds are discussed. These include: schemes by polling officers to violate their duty under state law to safeguard the integrity of the election process by purposefully allowing void ballots to be cast (stuffing the ballot box), or by intentionally rendering fraudulent vote tallies which can be prosecuted as civil rights violations under 18 U.S.C. sections 241 or 242; schemes to stimulate or reward voter registration by offering or giving voters things having monetary value violate the “payment for registering” clause of 42 U.S.C. section 19731(c); schemes to register voters fraudulently through providing election officials materially false information about the voter's eligibility for the franchise; and, schemes to obtain and cast ballots that are materially defective in nonfederal elections can still be prosecuted under 18 U.S.C. section 1341. There are also some other federal statutes involved in election fraud cases such as 18 U.S.C. section 597 that prohibits making expenditures for the specific purpose of stimulating voters to cast ballots for candidates seeking the federal offices of Senator, Congressman or President and 42 U.S.C. section 1973i (e) that prohibits voting more than once in elections where federal candidates are on the ballot.

Donsanto lists four questions used by prosecutors in evaluating the credibility of election complaints: does the substance of the complaint assuming it can be proven through investigation - suggest a potential crime; is the complaint sufficiently fact-specific that it provides leads for investigators to pursue; is there a federal statute that can be used to federalize the criminal activity at issue; and, is there a special federal interest in the matter that warrants federalization rather than deferral to state law enforcement.

All federal election investigations must avoid the following: non-interference in elections unless absolutely necessary to preserve evidence; interviewing voters during active voting periods; seizing official election documentation; investigative activity inside open polls; and prosecutors must adhere to 18 U.S.C. section 592, prohibiting the stationing of armed men at places where voting activity is taking place.
Finally, Donsanto indicates that election crimes based on race or language minority status are treated as civil rights matters under the Voting Rights Act.
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Major Vote Buying Cases Summary

Between 2001 and 2006, allegations and convictions for vote buying and conspiracies to buy votes were concentrated in three states: Illinois, West Virginia and Kentucky.

In East St. Louis, Illinois, nine individuals, including a former city council member and the head of the local Democratic Party, Charles Powell, Jr., were convicted or pled guilty to vote buying and conspiracy to commit election fraud during the 2004 general election. The government’s conspiracy case was almost entirely based on taped conversations in which the defendants discussed buying votes for $5 and whether this would be adequate. Federal prosecutors alleged that the vote buying was financed with $79,000 transferred from the County Democratic Party shortly before the election, although county officials have not been charged. Four defendants were convicted of purchasing or offering to purchase at least one vote directly, while Democratic Party chairman was only convicted of conspiracy. Earlier, three precinct officials and one precinct worker pled guilty to buying votes for $5 or $10 in that same election.

Eastern Kentucky has witnessed a series of vote buying cases over the last several years. The most recent revolved around Ross Harris, a Pike County political fundraiser and coal executive, and his associate Loren Glenn Turner. Harris and Turner were convicted in September 2004 of vote buying, mail fraud, and several other counts. Prosecutors alleged Harris and Turner conspired to buy votes and provided the necessary funds in an unsuccessful 2002 bid for Pike County district judge by former State Senator Doug Hays. Harris supplied nearly $40,000, Turner laundered the money through straw contributors, and the cash was then disbursed in the form of $50 checks ostensibly for ‘vote hauling’, the legal practice of paying campaign workers to get voters to the polls which is notorious as a cover for buying votes. Harris attempted to influence the race on behalf of Hays in order to get revenge on Hays’ opponent for a personal matter.

A grand jury initially indicted 10 individuals in connection with the Harris and Turner case, including Hays and his wife, and six campaign workers. Of the remaining defendants, only one, Tom Varney, also a witness in the Hays case, pled guilty. The others were either acquitted of vote buying charges or had vote buying charges dropped. Prosecutors have announced that their investigation continues into others tied to Harris and may produce further indictments.

The Harris case follows a series of trials related to the 1998 Knott County Democratic primary. Between 2003 and 2004, 10 individuals were indicted on vote buying charges, including a winning candidate in those primaries, Knott County judge-executive Donnie Newsome, who was reelected in 2002. In 2004 Newsome and a supporter were sent to jail and fined. Five other

---

3 “2 found guilty in pike county vote-fraud case; Two-year sentences possible,” Lexington Herald Leader, September 17, 2004.
5 “Pike Election Trial Goes To Jury” Lexington Herald Leader, January 1, 2006.
defendants pled guilty to vote buying charges, and three were acquitted. The primary means of vote buying entailed purchasing absentee votes from elderly, infirm, illiterate or poor voters, usually for between $50 and $100. This resulted in an abnormally high number of absentee ballots in the primary. Indictments relating to that same 1998 primary were also brought in 1999, when 6 individuals were indicted for buying the votes of students at a small local college. Five of those indicted were convicted or pled guilty.

Absentee vote buying was also an issue in 2002, when federal prosecutors opened an investigation in Kentucky's Clay County after an abnormal number of absentee ballots were filed in the primary and the sheriff halted absentee voting twice over concerns. Officials received hundreds of complaints of vote-buying during the 2002 primary, and state investigators performed follow up investigations in a number of counties, including Knott, Bell, Floyd, Pike, and Maginoff. No indictments have been produced so far.

So far, relatively few incidents of vote-buying have been substantially identified or investigated in the 2004 election. Two instances of vote buying in local 2004 elections have been brought before a grand jury. In one, a Casey County man was indicted for purchasing votes in a local school board race with cash and whiskey. In the second, the grand jury chose not to indict an individual accused of offering to purchase a teenager's vote on a local proposal with beer.

An extensive vote buying conspiracy has also been uncovered in southern West Virginia. The federal probe, which handed down its first indictment in 2003, has yielded more than a dozen guilty pleas to charges of vote buying and conspiracy in elections since the late 1980s. As this area is almost exclusively dominated by the Democratic Party, vote-buying occurred largely during primary contests.

The first phase of the probe focused on Logan County residents, where vote buying charges were brought in relation to elections in 1996, 2000, 2002 and 2004. In an extraordinary tactic, the FBI planted the former mayor of Logan City, Tom Esposito, as a candidate in a state legislative race. Esposito's cooperation led to guilty pleas from the Logan County Clerk, who pled guilty to selling his vote to Esposito in 1996, and another man who took money from Esposito for the purpose of vote buying in 2004.

Guilty pleas were also obtained in connection with former county sheriff Johnny Mendez, who pled guilty to buying votes in two primary elections in order to elect candidates including

8 "6 men accused of vote fraud in '98 Knott primary; Charges include vote buying and lying to FBI"
13 "Two plead to vote fraud; Logan clerk sold vote; politician tried to buy votes" Charleston Gazette, December 14, 2005.
14 "Logan man gets probation in vote-fraud scandal" Charleston Gazette, March 1, 2006.
himself. In 2000, with a large amount of funding from a prominent local lawyer seeking to
influence a state delegate election for his wife, Mendez distributed around $10,000 in payments
to voters of $10 to $100. Then, in the 2004 primary, Mendez distributed around $2,000 before
his arrest.\footnote{Mendez confined to home for year Ex-Logan sheriff was convicted of buying votes" Charleston Gazette, January 22, 2005.} A deputy of Mendez’, the former Logan police chief, also pled guilty to a count of
vote buying in 2002.\footnote{Ex-Logan police sentenced for buying votes" Associated Press, February 15, 2005.}

Prosecutors focusing on neighboring Lincoln County have alleged a long-standing vote-buying
conspiracy extending back to the late 1980s. The probe identified Lincoln County Circuit Clerk
Greg Stowers as head of a Democratic Party faction which routinely bought votes in order to
maintain office. Stowers pled guilty in December 2005 to distributing around $7,000 to buy
votes in the 2004 primary. The Lincoln County Assessor, and Stowers’ longtime political ally,
Jerry Allen Weaver, also pled guilty to conspiracy to buy votes.\footnote{"Clerk says he engaged in vote buying" Charleston Gazette, December 30, 2005.} These were accompanied by
four other guilty pleas from party workers for vote buying in primaries. While most specific
charges focused on vote buying in the 2004 primary, defendants also admitted buying votes as
far back as the 1988, 1990, and 1992 primaries.

The leading conspirators would give party workers candidate slates and cash, which workers
would then take to the polling place and use to purchase votes for amounts between $10 and $40
and in one instance, for liquor. Voters would be handed the slate of chosen candidates, and
would then be paid upon exiting the polling place. In other cases, the elected officials in question
purchased votes in exchange for non-cash rewards, including patronage positions, fixed tickets,
favorable tax assessments, and home improvements.\footnote{Lincoln clerk, two others plead guilty to election fraud" Charleston Daily Mail, December 30, 2005.}

The West Virginia probe is ongoing, as prosecutors are scrutinizing others implicated during the
proceedings so far, including a sitting state delegate, who may be under scrutiny for vote buying
in a 1990 election, and one of the Lincoln county defendants who previously had vote buying
charges against him dropped.\footnote{Next phase pondered in federal vote-buying probe" Associated Press, January 1, 2006.}
Great -- thanks so much and apologies for the false alarm.

-----Original Message-----
From: dromig@eac.gov [mailto:dromig@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2006 8:51 AM
To: wang@tcf.org
Cc: psims@eac.gov
Subject: RE: I'm sorry

This article is on the CD, it is located in the "Nexis Article Charts" folder.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

Thats good. I'm probably just getting crazy, trying to make sure everything is perfect. Devon, maybe you can check? Otherwise I'll check it when it comes. Thanks. And be well Peg.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2006 8:23 AM
To: Tova Andrea Wang
Subject: Re: I'm sorry
Tova:
I think you did send this --- or is this a revised version of one you sent earlier? It should be on the CD in the packet you should receive today.. (Can't check that right now as I am at the clinic.) If I put anything on the CD that you want to highlight at the meeting, let me know and we'll make copies for those attending.
Peggy

------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Tova Wang" [wang@tcf.org]
Sent: 05/15/2006 09:07 AM
To: Margaret Sims
Cc: Devon Romig
Subject: I'm sorry

I don't think I sent this to you either. Can we hand it out at the meeting as an addendum? Its another summary that would have gone in the news article section. I'm usually so organized, I'm very embarrassed. Too many things! Thanks

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
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Devon,
Just checking – did you send this yet? I also do not have the e-ticket.
Kathy

---

From: dromig@eac.gov [mailto:dromig@eac.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2006 4:59 PM
To: Rogers, Kathy
Subject: RE: Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation Working Group, May 18th, 2006

Thank you, I will fax you a copy of your travel authorization form as soon as it is available. Please remember to bring this form with you on your day of travel, there is a small possibility that you may be asked to present this form at the airport.

Best Regards,

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Hi Devon:
Judy said you had inquired about hotel reservations for J.R. Perez and Kathy Rogers. They are booked at the Sheraton College Park Hotel for arrival on May 17 and departure on May 18. J. R. Perez confirmation number is 51423 and Kathy Rogers confirmation number is 51424. I apologize for not getting them to you earlier.

Kind Regards,
Marvin

Marvin Brokaw
ADTRAV Meetings and Incentives
4555 Southlake Parkway
Birmingham, AL 35244
(205)444-4800 ext. 3501 - phone
(205)444-4822 - fax
e-mail - marvin.brokaw@adtrav.com
visit our website at www.adtrav.com
For some reason, I thought Job was not available next week. If we do set up a teleconference, I'll need to do it later in the week (Thursday afternoon or on Friday).

Peggy

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Tova Wang" [wang@tcf.org]  
Sent: 04/20/2006 10:58 AM  
To: Margaret Sims  
Cc: Devon Romig  
Subject: wg meeting

Hi Peg,

I think I might have told you only that I am unavailable on the 5th. I'm actually unavailable on the 4th as well. Any news on this front? We should also arrange a conference call next week about preparing for the meeting, don't you think? Thanks Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Attached is a list of folks who will be attending the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group meeting. I have asterisked the names that will require tent cards. I am working on a seating chart so that we can be sure the Ds and the Rs aren't all seated together in a "them vs. us" pattern. --- Peggy
Oops! I hit send prematurely. Here is the attachment. --- Peggy

Please forward list...there was no attachment. thanks!

Attached is a list of folks who will be attending the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group meeting. I have asterisked the names that will require tent cards. I am working on a seating chart so that we can be sure the Ds and the Rs aren't all seated together in a "them vs. us" pattern. --- Peggy
Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group Attendees
May 18, 2006

The Honorable Todd Rokita*
Indiana Secretary of State

Kathy Rogers*
Director of Elections, Georgia Office of the Secretary of State

J.R. Perez*
Guadalupe County Elections Administrator, TX

Jon Greenbaum*
Director, Voting Rights Project, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law
(Representing Working Group member Barbara Arnwine, Executive Director,
Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law and Leader of Election Protection Coalition)

Robert Bauer*
Partner, Perkins Coie

Benjamin Ginsberg*
Partner, Patton Boggs LLP

Mark (Thor) Hearne II
Partner-Member, Lathrop & Gage

Barry Weinberg*
Former Deputy Chief and Acting Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S.
Department of Justice

EAC Invited Technical Advisor:
Craig Donsanto*
Director, Election Crimes Branch, U.S. Department of Justice

EAC Commissioners, Consultants & Staff
Job Serebrov*
EAC Consultant

Tova Wang*
EAC Consultant

Paul DeGregorio*
EAC Chairman
Ray Martinez*
EAC Vice Chairman

Gavin Gilmour*
EAC Associate General Counsel

Peggy Sims*
EAC Staff

Edgardo Cortés*
EAC Staff

Elle Collver
EAC Staff

Devon Romig
EAC Intern

* To be seated at table with name tents.

Will stop by to greet, but will not sit at table

Tom Wilkey
EAC Executive Director

Julie Thompson-Hodgkins
EAC General Counsel
To: dromig@eac.gov

cc

Subject: Seating Chart

May 18 Seating Chart.doc
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tova Wang</td>
<td>EAC Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honorable Todd Rokita</td>
<td>Indiana Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bauer</td>
<td>Partner, Perkins Coie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark (Thor) Hearne II</td>
<td>Partner-Member, Lathrop &amp; Gage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Greenbaum</td>
<td>Director, Voting Rights Project, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Ginsberg</td>
<td>Partner, Patton Boggs LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Rogers</td>
<td>Director of Elections, Georgia Office of the Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Weinberg</td>
<td>Former Deputy Chief and Acting Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. Perez</td>
<td>Guadalupe County Elections Administrator, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Sims</td>
<td>EAC Staff &amp; COTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Donsanto</td>
<td>Director, Election Crimes Branch, DOJ (Technical Consultant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Martinez</td>
<td>EAC Vice Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul DeGregorio</td>
<td>EAC Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin Gilmour</td>
<td>EAC Associate General Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgardo Cortés</td>
<td>EAC Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Devon,

I have the authorization for J.R. Perez but I need to get the authorizations for the other 3 as well.

Let me know.

Dottie Simmons
ADTRAV Meetings and Incentives
205-444-4833-ext.3212
Thanks!

-----Original Message-----
From: dromig@eac.gov [mailto:dromig@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 11:10 AM
To: dottie.simmons@adtrav.com
Subject: Re: Trave authorizations

Dottie,

I just received the approved authorizations, I will fax them to you now.

Thanks!

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

Devon,

I have the authorization for J.R.Perez but I need to get the authorizations for the other 3 as well.

Let me know.

Dottie Simmons
ADTRAV Meetings and Incentives
205-444-4833-ext.3212
Dear Nathan,

Here is the information that you requested.

Secretary Rokita was recommended by one of our consultants, Job Serebrov, to participate in the Voting Fraud - Voter Intimidation Project Working Group. This working group will last for one day and it will be held in Washington, DC. The purpose of this working group is to bring together experts and representatives of organizations that are knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation in order to foster a discussion on related issues and preliminary research.

The following are a list of the other potential participants; Barbara Arnwine, Robert Bauer, Craig Donsanto, Mark Hearne III, David Norcross, Kathy Rogers, and Barry Weinberg

We are hoping to hold this meeting in May, between the 1st and the 19th (excluding the following dates; 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14). Please let me know any and all of the dates that would be the most convenient for Secretary Rokita.

Best,

Devon Romig
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite #1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)566-2377
www.eac.gov
Dear Nathan,

Here is the information that you requested.

Secretary Rokita was recommended by one of our consultants, Job Serebrov, to participate in the Voting Fraud - Voter Intimidation Project Working Group. This working group will last for one day and it will be held in Washington, DC. The purpose of this working group is to bring together experts and representatives of organizations that are knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation in order to foster a discussion on related issues and preliminary research.

The following are a list of the other potential participants; Barbara Arnwine, Robert Bauer, Craig Donsanto, Mark Hearne III, David Norcross, Kathy Rogers, and Barry Weinberg

We are hoping to hold this meeting in May, between the 1st and the 19th (excluding the following dates; 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14). Please let me know any and all of the dates that would be the most convenient for Secretary Rokita.

Best,

Devon Romig
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite #1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)566-2377
www.eac.gov
Bryan,

The date of this meeting was May 18, 2006

Thanks,

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Dear Meeting Participants,

Thank you for confirming your participation in the upcoming Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation Working Group Meeting in Washington, D.C. This meeting will take place at our office from 1:00 PM to 5:30 PM on Thursday May 18th, 2006.

The Election Assistance Commission (EAC) will cover the cost of your flight, the cost of your hotel room and provide you with a daily per diem. The cost of the airfare and the hotel stay will be paid directly by the EAC, as long as you book your travel through Adventure Travel.

To coordinate your flight and hotel stay, please contact Marvin Brokaw of Adventure Travel at (205) 444-4800, ext. 3501. Please note that the eligible dates of the hotel accommodation include the evenings on May 17th and May 18th. Once you have contacted him and you have received the itinerary via e-mail you must forward me a copy immediately so that I can complete a travel authorization form.

I have included two attachments with this email; the first attachment is a letter that contains important information that you will need to know before calling the travel agent and the second attachment provides some general information that should help you get around the city during your trip.

In addition to your travel itinerary, I will also need the following information by the close of business this Friday May 12, 2006 in order to complete your travel authorization:

Full Name:
Title:
Entity for whom you work:
Address to Which the Reimbursement Check Will Be Mailed:
Work Telephone:
Fax Number:
Social Security #: (if uncomfortable e-mailing this, feel free to call me):

Feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

Per Diem Letter VFVI.doc Logistics Sheet VFVI.doc
Dear Meeting Participant:

On behalf of the entire U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), I would like to thank you for agreeing to attend the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation Working Group Meeting on May 18th, 2006.

The EAC will pay for your roundtrip airfare and hotel, and based on your dates of travel to attend our meeting and will pay a daily per diem to cover meals not provided by EAC and incidental expenses (M&IE). Car rental costs or mileage incurred through the use of a rental car are not reimbursable, as well as costs associated with redcaps, baggage delivery, long distance telephone calls, pay per view cable, room service, laundry service, and wet bars. These charges, if used, must be borne by you at the time services were rendered. Ground transportation (ex. metro, bus, taxi), hotel parking, airport parking, and any mileage incurred using your privately owned vehicle will be reimbursed.

The EAC will provide hotel accommodations. If you are traveling from one of the following States than you are authorized for a two-night hotel room stay in Washington D.C.; Georgia, Indiana, Missouri, New Mexico and Texas.

The per diem rates listed below provide a guide for you to use in order to calculate your per diem for your stay. A discounted per diem rate is applicable if any travel occurs on that day. For example, if you arrive on May 17th and leave on May 18th, both of these days will be considered travel days and you will receive the discounted rate. I will provide you with a travel reimbursement form at the meeting.

The current federal per diem rates are as follows;

- Meals & Incidentals Expenses (M&IE) = $64 per day (the discounted rate for the first and last day of travel is $48)
- Mileage for Personally Owned Vehicle = $.445 per mile

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (202) 566-2377 or via email at dromig@eac.gov.
May 18, 2006 – EAC Meeting

Logistics Fact Sheet

Date: Thursday, May 18th, 2006
Time: 1:00PM – 5:00PM
Location: U.S. Election Assistance Commission – Conference Room
1225 New York Ave, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel. (202) 566-3100

Transportation: Via Metro – take blue, orange, or red line to Metro Center; walk up to New
York Ave (2 blocks from Metro – corner of New York Ave and 12th St.)

Bus service at Metro Center:
11Y (on 14th St.)
42 (on 11th St.)
52, 53, 54 (on 14th St.; also 54 on F St. between 11th & 14th)
66, 68 (on 11th St.)
80 (on H St.)
D1, D3, D6 (on 13th St.)
G8 (on 11th St. north of H, on H St. west of 11th)
P17, P19 (inbound on 11th St.; outbound on 13th St.)
P6 (on 11th St.)
S2, S4 (on 11th St.)
W13 (inbound on 11th St.; outbound on 13th St.)
X2 (on H St.)

From Reagan National Airport:
- take blue line Metro towards Largo Town Center; exit at Metro Center station
- taxi services available (fare will be approximately $15-$20)

Parking:
Parking garage available behind building on I Street, NW.

Contact:
For more information, contact the U.S. Election Assistance Commission at (202) 566-3100.
Dottie,

I just received the approved authorizations, I will fax them to you now.

Thanks!

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
"Dottie Simmons" <dottie.simmons@adtrav.com>

"Dottie Simmons" <dottie.simmons@adtrav.com> To dromig@eac.gov
05/16/2006 10:27 AM
Subject Trave authorizations

Devon,

I have the authorization for J.R.Perez but I need to get the authorizations for the other 3 as well.

Let me know.

Dottie Simmons
ADTRAV Meetings and Incentives
205-444-4833-ext.3212
Yes, I have received the itineraries for Rogers, Hearne and Perez.

Thanks!

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Thanks!

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Ms. Simmons,

Thanks again for the itineraries. Can you tell me what hotels that J.R. Perez and Kathy Rogers are staying at?

Best,

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Thanks so much!

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Dottie,

Can you send me your fax number? Once I get it I will start faxing the travel authorizations to you.

Thanks,

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
I have attached the list of the working groups participants. Peggy, you may want to double check this list incase I have left anyone out.

In place of name tags we just used the tent cards for the APIA working group. This seemed to be effective because it was easier to identify the person who was speaking but we could use both.

Meeting Participants for VFVI Working Group.doc

Peggy,

In preparation for the logistics of this week's working group, I need to know how many people to expect for the meeting. Also, if you still need me to make name tags, I will need a list of attendees and the Avery label size.

Also, I will need help from Laiza on the table tents, or we can see if she has the time to help with that.

Thanks!

Elle
# Meeting Participants for VFVI Working Group

## OUT OF STATE PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Point of Contact</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>City, State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark (Thor) Hearne</td>
<td>Partner-Member</td>
<td>Bethany Schuler</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bschuler@lathropgage.com">bschuler@lathropgage.com</a>; <a href="mailto:mhearme@lathropgage.com">mhearme@lathropgage.com</a></td>
<td>BS (314) 613 – 2510; MH 314-613-2522; Fax 314-613-2550</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. Perez</td>
<td>Election Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>830-303-6363; Fax 830-303-6373</td>
<td>Seguin, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Rokita</td>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Nathan Cane</td>
<td><a href="mailto:assistant@sos.in.gov">assistant@sos.in.gov</a></td>
<td>NC 317-232-6536; TR 317-232-6531; Fax 317-233-3283</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Rogers</td>
<td>Director of Elections</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:krogers@sos.state.ga.us">krogers@sos.state.ga.us</a></td>
<td>404-657-5380; Fax 404-651-9531</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## LOCAL AREA PARTICIPANTS (NOT ELIGIBLE FOR TRAVEL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Point of Contact</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>City, State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jon Greenbaum (Representing Barbara Amwine)</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Valerie Johnson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vjohnson@lawyerscommittee.org">vjohnson@lawyerscommittee.org</a>; <a href="mailto:barnwine@lawyerscommittee.org">barnwine@lawyerscommittee.org</a></td>
<td>VJ (202) 662-8382; BA 202-662-8300; Fax 202-783-0857</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert F. Bauer</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Donna Lovecchio</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dlovecchio@perkinscoie.com">dlovecchio@perkinscoie.com</a>; <a href="mailto:Rbauer@perkinscoie.com">Rbauer@perkinscoie.com</a></td>
<td>202-434-1602; Fax 202-434-1690</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin L. Ginsberg</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bethesda, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Weinberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>301-493-5343</td>
<td>Bethesda, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig C. Donsanto</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cdonsanto@usdoj.gov">cdonsanto@usdoj.gov</a></td>
<td>VJ 202-514-1421; Fax 202-514-3003</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not emailed
I have arranged for a transcriptionist to be at the meeting but I am not sure about the snacks for the break.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Elieen L. Collver/EAC/GOV

Elieen L. Colver/EAC/GOV
05/15/2006 03:19 PM
To Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc dromig@eac.gov
Subject Re: working group

Sounds great. It did seem to work just fine for our Asian Language group. Is there going to be a transcriptionist? If so, has anyone taken care of that?

Did you still want to provide the cookies or snacks, or shall I get that from Cafe Mozart (where I am planning to get the coffee). I can just buy a few boxes of cookies for the break.

Elle

Elle L.K Colver
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
office: (202) 566-2256
blackberry: (202) 294-9251
www.eac.gov

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
05/15/2006 02:48 PM
To Elieen L. Colver/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc dromig@eac.gov
Subject Re: working group

014618
Elle:
I think our number will be about 21 (with the Working Group members, consultants, possible EAC Commissioners and staff, and the court reporter). I'll have a better idea of the final list after I brief Commissioners tomorrow morning. Devon noted that they used only tent cards for the Asian Language Working Group. That might be sufficient for this group and would cut back on some of the work we have to do in preparation. --- Peggy

Eileen L. Collver/EAC/GOV
05/15/2006 12:19 PM
To: Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc: Laiza N. Otero/EAC/GOV@EAC, dromig@eac.gov@EAC
Subject: working group

Peggy,

In preparation for the logistics of this week's working group, I need to know how many people to expect for the meeting. Also, if you still need me to make name tags, I will need a list of attendees and the avery label size.

Also, I will need help from Laiza on the table tents, or we can see if she has the time to help with that.

Thanks!

Elle

Elle L.K Collver
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
office: (202) 566-2256
blackberry: (202) 294-9251
www.eac.gov
You are welcome!

Adventure Travel should send you all of your travel information once they verify the travel authorization. If you do not receive your itinerary by Monday morning please let me know.

It is a good idea to carry your travel authorization with you at the airport because occasionally (although very rarely) some of our guests have been asked to show their authorization numbers.

Let me know if you have any other questions.

Best Regards,

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

Thank you, Devon. I have not heard from the travel agency since I picked the travel times, and do not have an itinerary, nor hotel information. The last time I traveled to the EAC I did not receive this form till afterwards. Is there something I may need this for in advance or during my travel?

J.R. Perez
Elections Administrator
Guadalupe County

-----Original Message-----
From: dromig@eac.gov
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 12:12 PM
To: "J. R. Perez"
Subject: Travel Authorization Form

Mr. Perez,
I have just faxed your travel authorization form.

Best Regards,

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Thank you, I will fax you a copy of your travel authorization form as soon as it is available. Please remember to bring this form with you on your day of travel, there is a small possibility that you may be asked to present this form at the airport.

Best Regards,

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Tim at Carol reporting said the transcript will be here today or tomorrow.

Devon Romig  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.566.2377 phone  
202.566.3128 fax  
www.eac.gov

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

Have we had any word about the transcript for the 5-18-06 Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group meeting? Our consultants each need a copy so that they can draft the final report? If we have it in electronic form, so much the better. --- Peggy
I will call the transcript company and ask them about it.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
06/07/2006 09:47 AM
To dromig@eac.gov, jwilson@eac.gov
cc
Subject Transcript of 5-18-06 Working Group Meeting

Have we had any word about the transcript for the 5-18-06 Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group meeting? Our consultants each need a copy so that they can draft the final report? If we have it in electronic form, so much the better. --- Peggy
Peggy,

Here is the summary that you requested. Let me know if this works.

Thanks!

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Overview of Current Research Project

- Current research performed Tova Wang and Job Serebrov
  - the current research has been a challenge because of the need for the information to be collected and analyzed in a scientific manner
    - especially when working the "perception" of intimidation
  - Both consultants cross-checked each others work in order to maintain a bipartisan balance
  - Literature was anecdotal, not much follow-up on the articles
  - No interviews with DA’s and only one interview with a judge
  - Absentee ballots seemed to be the biggest problem
  - The articles found that most of reported vote buying is concentrated in the Midwest and the South
  - Very little non-citizen voting, dead voting and impersonation was reported

Purpose of Current Working Group

- To provide background information for current research
- To brainstorm for potential research ideas

Talking Points of Working Group

- Discussion of value of research because of the language of section 241 of HAVA; where is the methodology?
- History of the definition of “fraud”
- Most voter fraud happens outside of the polling centers
- Research must address existing problems, not perceived problems
- Intimidation is a subset of suppression, and considered to be physical or economic threat and/or coercion
- Suppression that is not a form of intimidation is intended to interfere with voting rights and the election process without physical or economic threat and/or coercion
- Department of Justice primarily investigated individual cases of voter fraud
- Risk analysis can be used as an indicator of legitimacy for the need to allocate funding to research in the area of voter fraud
- Current statewide database list will be useful in the deterrence of voter fraud
Ideas for Future EAC Activities

- Bipartisan observers/poll watchers
  - Used in the collection of data
  - Used to deter fraud
- Surveys
  - Survey of state laws
    - Specific states
  - Survey of local election officials
  - Voter surveys (this suggestion was rejected by the panel)
  - Survey state election offices
  - Survey use of administrative complaint procedures
- Follow up on initial reports of fraud/intimidation from the survey of news articles
- Better poll worker training
- Longer hours for polling centers
  - Including hours on weekends
- Fewer polling center locations
  - More qualified poll workers
- Absentee balloting process
  - Methodology of “for cause” absentee voting
- Risk-analysis for voting fraud
  - Who?
  - What part of process?
    - ease of use
  - Which elections?
- Broaden scope of interviews to local officials and district attorneys
- Analysis
  - Phone logs from toll-free lines for election concerns
  - Federal observer reports
  - Local newspapers
  - State District Court Cases
  - Determination of challenging a voter at the polls (in some states there is little or no cause required to challenge a voter's eligibility)
- Academic statistical research
- Search and match procedures for voter registration list maintenance and voter fraud identification (subject to confirmation)
- Election courts
- Model statutes
Peggy,

Here are the notes from the meeting.

Summary of VFVI Meeting.doc

Thanks!

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Overview of EAC Research

- Poll worker recruiting, training and retention
- Management guidelines for voting systems
- Vote counting and recounting
- Provisional voting
- Voter Identification

Recommendations for Future Research by Working Group Members

- Bipartisan observers/poll watchers
  - Used in the collection of data
  - Used to deter fraud

- Surveys
  - Survey of state laws
    - Specific states
  - Survey of local election officials
  - Voter surveys (this suggestion was rejected by the panel)
  - Survey state election offices
  - Survey use of administrative complaint procedures

- Follow up on initial reports of fraud/intimidation from the survey of news articles

- Absentee balloting process
  - Methodology of "for cause" absentee voting

- Risk-analysis for voting fraud
  - Who?
  - What part of process?
    - ease of use
    - Which elections?
- Broaden scope of interviews to local officials and district attorneys

- Analysis
  - Phone logs from toll-free lines for election concerns
  - Federal observer reports
  - Local newspapers

- Academic statistical research

- Search and match procedures for voter registration list maintenance and voter fraud identification (subject to confirmation)

- Election courts

- Model statutes
Great, I will get it scheduled.

Devon Romig  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.566.2377 phone  
202.566.3128 fax  
www.eac.gov  
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

---

Devon:  
We have the OK from Tom to obtain a court reporter. Per his response (attached), please coordinate with Joyce. Also, I understand the reporter for the Asian Language Working Group arrived late. Please find out how we can ensure the one for our meeting arrives on time. Thanks! --- Peggy

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 05/10/2006 10:31 AM -----

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV

Yes, please let Joyce know and she will get someone  
Tom
Tom:
I understand that EAC hired a court reporter for the Asian Language Working Group meeting. I would like to do the same for the May 18 Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group meeting, but I did not include funds in my budget for this service. Do we have funds that could be used for this purpose? (See Devon's cost estimate below.) --- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 05/10/2006 10:18 AM ---
Devon E. Romig/EAC/GOV

Peggy,
I spoke to the people who usually handle the EAC court reporting. They charge $9.00 per page with an average of 40 pages per hour. This service would cost about $1800.00.

The turn around time for the transcript is 10 to 15 days. The transcripts comes in a bound paper copy and an electronic copy.
I can also check around for different prices.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Peggy,

I spoke to the people who usually handle the EAC court reporting. They charge $9.00 per page with an average of 40 pages per hour. This service would cost about $1800.00.

The turn around time for the transcript is 10 to 15 days. The transcripts comes in a bound paper copy and an electronic copy.

I can also check around for different prices.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Peggy,

A possible hotel suggestion for Job might be the Sheraton College Park in Beltsville, MD. They have room availability for the nights of the 17th and the 18th for $159.00 a night.

They have what is called the Sheraton Sweet Sleeper Bed. More information at:

This hotel is a little out of the way but the members of the Asian Language Working Group and others have stayed there. The hotel does offer a shuttle to and from Reagan airport and the metro.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
No, but I have left a message for her assistant and I am waiting for her to return my call. I will let you know as soon as I hear anything.

Devon Romig  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.566.2377 phone  
202.566.3128 fax  
www.eac.gov  

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV  
05/09/2006 11:19 AM  
To dromig@eac.gov  
cc  
Subject May 18 Meeting

Did Barbara Arnwine's office indicate who they propose to send in her place? --- Peggy
Hi Devon:

We have heard from Mark Hearne and Todd Rokita. They are both flying in and out on the 18th and will not need hotel rooms. We're kind of waiting to see if Perez and Rogers need rooms before booking any hotel. As soon as we get approval of Hearne and Rokita air schedules and get them booked, we'll forward their itineraries to you.

Kind Regards,

Marvin

-----Original Message-----
From: dromig@eac.gov [mailto:dromig@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2006 8:31 AM
To: marvin.brokaw@adtrav.com
Cc: psims@eac.gov
Subject: May 18th Meeting at EAC

Hello Marvin,

I just wanted to follow up with the voicemail message that I left for you yesterday. We will be holding a meeting at our offices in Washington DC on May 18, 2006. I have informed the out of state attendees to contact you for their travel arrangements.

We have been authorized to pay for the attendees airfare and hotel arrangements. Please note that all of the participants are authorized for a two night hotel room stay, as long as the dates are May 17th and 18th.

I attached the list of the meeting participants that will be contacting you about their travel arrangements for the May 18th meeting in Washington DC.
Let me know if you have any questions for me or if you need any more information from me.

Thanks for your help!

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Peggy,

I have called each of the participants. So far I have a definite confirmation from Kathy Rogers.

Here is the list of the out of town participants for the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation Project Working Group:

Mark Hearne II - St. Louis, MO
Todd Rokita - Indianapolis, IN
Kathy Rogers - Atlanta, GA

Possible Participant:

Patrick Rogers - New Mexico

Thanks,

Devon Romig
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite #1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)566-2377
Peggy,

I just spoke to Mr. Norcross's assistant, he cannot attend the meeting on the 18th, he will be out of town at another event.

Devon Romig
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite #1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)566-2377
Peggy,

I just spoke to Nathan Cane (Secretary Rokita's assistant). He did not have any new information but they are going to have a scheduling meeting tomorrow morning and he will ask specifically about the afternoon of May 18th. I also reminded him to find out any of the days that he was not available or any of the days that he had could attend the meeting in the morning or the afternoon.

Thanks,

Devon
Peggy,

I just received an update about Ms. Arnwine's schedule. She is not available on May 9th.

Thanks,

Devon
Peggy,

Here is the most updated version of the list that I have available.

[Attachment: Work Group Contact-Availability Info.xls]

Thanks,

Devon Romig
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite #1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)566-2377
### AVAILABILITY IN MAY

| FIRST NAME | LAST NAME |  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |  6 |  7 |  8 |  9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
|------------|-----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Barbara    | Arwine    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Robert F.  | Bauer     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Craig C.   | Donsanto  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Mark (Thor)| Hearne II |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| David A.   | Norcross  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Todd       | Rokita    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Kathy      | Rogers    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Barry      | Weinberg  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |

- Available
- Not Available
- Consultants Not Available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ADDRESS 1</th>
<th>ADDRESS 2</th>
<th>ADDRESS 3</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>SALUTATION</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>FAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Amwine</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law</td>
<td>1401 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20005</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>202-662-8300</td>
<td>202-783-0857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig C.</td>
<td>Donsanto</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Election Crimes Branch</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Justice</td>
<td>1400 New York Avenue, NW, 12th Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20005</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>202-514-1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark (Thor)</td>
<td>Hearne II</td>
<td>Partner-Member</td>
<td>Lathrop &amp; Gage, LC</td>
<td>The Equitable Building</td>
<td>10 South Broadway,</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>63102-1708</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>314-613-2522</td>
<td>314-613-2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David A.</td>
<td>Norcross</td>
<td>Sustaining Member</td>
<td>Blank Rome, LLP</td>
<td>Watergate, Twelfth Floor</td>
<td>600 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20037</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>202-772-5898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Rokita</td>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>State House, Room 201</td>
<td>200 West Washington Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>46204</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>317-232-6531, Asst 317-232-6536</td>
<td>317-233-3283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Director of Elections</td>
<td>Office of the Secretary of State</td>
<td>West Tower Suite 1104</td>
<td>2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>30334-1505</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>404-657-5380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Weinberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>301-493-5343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:barnwine@lawyerscommittee.org">barnwine@lawyerscommittee.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cConsante@usdoj.gov">cConsante@usdoj.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Rivers, Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Cane, Executive Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:assistant@sos.in.gov">assistant@sos.in.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:krogers@sos.state.ga.us">krogers@sos.state.ga.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No, but I have left a message for her assistant and I am waiting for her to return my call. I will let you know as soon as I hear anything.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

Did Barbara Arnwine's office indicate who they propose to send in her place? --- Peggy
Hi Devon:
We have heard from Mark Hearne and Todd Rokita. They are both flying in and out on the 18th and will not need hotel rooms. We're kind of waiting to see if Perez and Rogers need rooms before booking any hotel. As soon as we get approval of Hearne and Rokita air schedules and get them booked, we'll forward their itineraries to you.

Kind Regards,
Marvin

-----Original Message-----
From: dromig@eac.gov [mailto:dromig@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2006 8:31 AM
To: 
Cc: psims@eac.gov
Subject: May 18th Meeting at EAC

Hello Marvin,

I just wanted to follow up with the voicemail message that I left for you yesterday. We will be holding a meeting at our offices in Washington DC on May 18, 2006. I have informed the out of state attendees to contact you for their travel arrangements.

We have been authorized to pay for the attendees airfare and hotel arrangements. Please note that all of the participants are authorized for a two night hotel room stay, as long as the dates are May 17th and 18th.

I attached the list of the meeting participants that will be contacting you about their travel arrangements for the May 18th meeting in Washington DC.
Let me know if you have any questions for me or if you need any more information from me.

Thanks for your help!

Devon Romig  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.566.2377 phone  
202.566.3128 fax  
www.eac.gov
Peggy,

I have called each of the participants. So far I have a definite confirmation from Kathy Rogers.

Here is the list of the out of town participants for the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation Project Working Group:

Mark Hearne II - St. Louis, MO
Todd Rokita - Indianapolis, IN
Kathy Rogers - Atlanta, GA

Possible Participant:

Patrick Rogers - New Mexico

Thanks,

Devon Romig
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite #1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)566-2377
Peggy,

I just spoke to Mr. Norcross's assistant, he cannot attend the meeting on the 18th, he will be out of town at another event.

Devon Romig
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite #1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)566-2377
Peggy,

I just spoke to Nathan Cane (Secretary Rokita's assistant). He did not have any new information but they are going to have a scheduling meeting tomorrow morning and he will ask specifically about the afternoon of May 18th. I also reminded him to find out any of the days that he was not available or any of the days that he had could attend the meeting in the morning or the afternoon.

Thanks,

Devon
Peggy,

I just received an update about Ms. Arnwine's schedule. She is not available on May 9th.

Thanks,

Devon
Peggy,

The sections that you listed below are also empty in our copy. I have attached a copy of the complete table of contents with all of the section that are empty in our copy of the 2004 DOJ training binder.

Thanks,

Devon

TOC-BallotAccess2.doc

Devon:
One of our consultants noted that there are several sections appear to be missing from the 2004 DOJ training binder. She wasn't sure if it is because of what DOJ sent over to EAC or a problem in the photocopying. From what she can see, some of the table of contents is missing and tabs 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23 and 26 are all empty. I think we must have provided the T of C because I don't see one in the binder. Can you please retrieve the binder and check this out for me? Thanks! --- Peggy
## Table of Contents

| DEO Directory                                      | 1 |
| NASS Contract List                                | 2 |
| NASED Contract List                               | 3 |
| Voting Rights Statutes-Summary                    | 4 |
| PANEL 1                                            | 5 |
| John Tanner; Susanna Lorenzo-Giguere              | 6 |
| Rebecca Wertz                                     | 7 |
| Hans A. Von Spakosky; ADA                         | 8 |
| PANEL 2                                            | 9 |
| Gaye Tenoso                                        | 10 |
| Joseph D. Rich                                    | 11 |
| PANEL 3                                            | 12 |
| Hans A. Von Spakosky; HAVA                        | 13 |
| Chris Herreñ                                      | 14 |
| PANEL 4                                            | 15 |
| July 21, 2004                                      | 16 |
| PANEL 5                                            | 17 |
| Craig C. Donsanto                                 | 18 |
| PANEL 6                                            | 19 |
| Craig C. Donsanto                                 | 20 |
| PANEL 7                                            | 21 |
| Ernie Locker                                      | 22 |
| PANEL 8                                            | 23 |
| J. Patton Meadows                                 | 24 |
| Daniel Butler                                     | 25 |
| PANEL 9                                            | 26 |
| Karen Rochlin                                     | 27 |
| Richard Pilger                                    | 28 |
No, but I have left a message for her assistant and I am waiting for her to return my call. I will let you know as soon as I hear anything.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

Did Barbara Arnwine's office indicate who they propose to send in her place? --- Peggy
Peggy,

I just spoke to Nathan Cane (Secretary Rokita's assistant). He did not have any new information but they are going to have a scheduling meeting tomorrow morning and he will ask specifically about the afternoon of May 18th. I also reminded him to find out any of the days that he was not available or any of the days that he had could attend the meeting in the morning or the afternoon.

Thanks,

Devon
No, but I have left a message for her assistant and I am waiting for her to return my call. I will let you know as soon as I hear anything.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

Did Barbara Arnwine's office indicate who they propose to send in her place? --- Peggy
Thats good. I'm probably just getting crazy, trying to make sure everything is perfect. Devon, maybe you can check? Otherwise I'll check it when it comes. Thanks. And be well Peg.

-----Original Message-----
From: psims@eac.gov [mailto:psims@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2006 8:23 AM
To: Tova Andrea Wang
Subject: Re: I'm sorry

Tova:
I think you did send this --- or is this a revised version of one you sent earlier? It should be on the CD in the packet you should receive today. (Can't check that right now as I am at the clinic.) If I put anything on the CD that you want to highlight at the meeting, let me know and we'll make copies for those attending.

Peggy

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
I don't think I sent this to you either. Can we hand it out at the meeting as an addendum? It's another summary that would have gone in the news article section. I'm usually so organized, I'm very embarrassed. Too many things! Thanks

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704 fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tef.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Dear Tova,

I am working with Peggy Sims in order to set a date for the Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Project Working Group. I have been trying to reach Barbara Arnwine in order to find out which days in May she is potentially available to attend this meeting but all of my attempts have been unsuccessful.

I would appreciate any help that you could provide in this matter.

Sincerely,

Devon Romig
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite #1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)566-2377
Mr. Gordon,
Per our conversation, EAC chair Donetta Davidson asked our IG to review the circumstances surrounding both the voter ID and vote fraud and voter intimidation projects. Go here for more info, which includes some of the inquiries we’ve gotten from Congress about these projects.

I’m already working on your request, and I will keep you apprised of my progress. Call if you need anything or have questions about the material you just picked up.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
No problem. I can't WAIT to get the new request. See you later this afternoon.

Jeannie Layson  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 202-566-3100  
www.eac.gov  
"Gordon, Greg" <ggordon@mcclatchydc.com>

I'll get the new request to you this afternoon and will phone you before walking over. Thanks, Jeanne.

Greg Gordon  
National Correspondent  
McClatchy Newspapers Washington Bureau  
202-383-0005  
ggordon@mcclatchydc.com  

From: jlayson@eac.gov [mailto:jlayson@eac.gov]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 12:25 PM  
To: Gordon, Greg  
Subject: Your FOIA request

Hello Greg,  
Just following up from our conversation yesterday -- your FOIA request regarding emails b/w staff and commishes and Tova Wang and Job Serebrov is ready. I can have someone walk it over if you want. Also, don't forget to send your other request, which as I understood it is emails/correspondence b/w DOJ and EAC commissioners and staff regarding vote fraud and voter intimidation. If that's the case, I'll go ahead and start pulling this info.

Thanks. If you need to call me my number is 202-566-3103.
Just wanted to let you know that I called her today to tell her that I would be sending some responsive documents per her FOIA request about the vote fraud project that were not included in my previous response. Mostly these are emails that were not provided to me before, as well as a few memos and letters that were also not provided.

She said she was getting ready to send an appeal based on the belief that I did not provide her all of the emails and relevant letters, memos, and other documents. She noted that most of the emails involved only two EAC staffers. I explained that the new documents I was sending would include emails from additional staffers. However, I believe the bulk of what she has includes CCs of other staffers, so another search would only turn up duplicates, but I will verify that.

Wendy also asked about all of the attachments in the emails. I told her it would have taken many months to print all of those out and make the determination whether they were releasable under FOIA. She offered to identify the attachments they would like to see, and I told her that would be helpful. She also noted that in my letter, I estimated that she was received about 1,500 pages. She said they counted and there were only 800. I told her I estimated the page count, and she accepted that.

I asked her if she would consider holding off on the appeal until she received the additional documents, as they may satisfy her appeal. She agreed, and I told her I would send everything by the end of next week. She also requested that I send a scanned copy. I explained that only one of our scanners was working, and that it did not have the capacity to scan huge files.

I will keep you apprised...

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Curtis,

In reference to FOIA requests about the vote fraud and voter intimidation and voter ID projects, and whether EAC should respond while the Office of Inspector General reviews circumstances surrounding these projects, I have come to a decision regarding this issue. After speaking with EAC's general counsel and reviewing your response to the chair's questions about communication during your review, I conclude that as EAC's FOIA officer, I must continue to follow the law and respond to FOIA requests regarding these topics. I will certainly provide copies of my responses to your reviewers and answer any questions you have. However, per your recommendation, I will decline answering questions from the media and the public until your review is complete. Please let me know if you have questions, and I appreciate your cooperation and counsel in this matter.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV

To Jeannie Layson /EAC/GOV@EAC

cc Juliet E. Hodgkins /EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey /EAC/GOV@EAC

Subject Re: Need your help ASAP

Jeannie:

I did not receive your request in time to type responses on my blackberry by 2 PM, given the information needed. Here are the answers to your questions:

1. Why did we only contact DOJ officials regarding the accuracy of their interviews?

As far as I know, we didn't contact DOJ officials about this except in response to concerns they had previously expressed to us. Also, I don't believe we ever allowed DOJ to edit the summaries. (I certainly didn't.) I believe the consultants and I discussed the idea of having all the interviewees review their respective interview summaries, but the consultants objected to the idea and there were concerns that the all of the money remaining available was needed to complete the final report.

Craig Donsanto, Election Crimes Branch, saw the summary of his interview among the documents provided to the Working Group (prior to the meeting of that group), and pointed out an important factual error. The summary, as originally written, portrayed DOJ as switching from the prosecution of conspiracies to the prosecution of individuals. I was present at this interview and this was not what Craig had said, nor is it supported by the information available on the election crimes pursued by that branch. DOJ continues to pursue conspiracies and, in addition, has begun to pursue individuals (specifically, double voting, felon voting and alien voting) in an effort to deter others from election crime.

To my knowledge, John Tanner, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, had not seen the consultants' full summary of his interview; but he expressed concern to Tova Wang and EAC about the consultants' characterization of the interviews with Donsanto and him that had been included in the May 2006 status report. Per HAVA requirements, the Voting Section is represented on the Advisory Board. Tanner pointed to the following errors:

- First, the consultants stated that DOJ was not pursuing voter suppression cases. Tanner responded that "[t]he Department has brought two 11(b) cases, one of the two in this Administration. The focus of DOJ activity has shifted, in fact, to voter suppression as there are fewer cases over voter dilution (challenges to at-large election systems, etc.) being brought by anyone as the number of jurisdictions with at-large election systems has shrunk dramatically. This Administration has, in fact, brought far more voter-suppression cases ... than ever in the past, including a majority of all cases under Sections 203 and 208 of the Act, and such key recent Section 2 cases as US v. City of Boston and US v. Long County, Georgia."

- Second, the consultants implied that DOJ is not pursuing instances of unequal implementation of ID rules. Tanner's response was that "[c]hallenges based on race and unequal implementation of ID rules are indeed actionable and we have brought lawsuits, such as in Boston and Long County; we have not identified instances of such discrimination in which we have not taken action."

Tanner also pointed to the consultants' refusal during the interview to define what they meant by "voter intimidation", which Tanner suspected did not jibe with the meaning of the term in federal prosecutions and probably contributed to misunderstandings. (Federal voter intimidation prosecutions require the threat of economic or physical harm.)

By the way, both of these officials are career attorneys, not political appointees. They have years of service at DOJ, working under a number of different administrations.

014667
2. Exactly what did we change and why?

In the case of the Donsanto interview summary, I spoke with our consultants and asked them to make the correction. At first, they both refused. Later, they revised the summary to be a little less blatant, but the implication that there had been a complete change in approach remained. We revised the summary to clearly indicate that prosecution of conspiracies continues. The revised paragraph is on page 4 of the published summary. We also added an intro paragraph similar to other interview summaries submitted by the consultants to summarize the enforcement authority of the Election Crimes Branch and to distinguish it from the Voting Section, Civil Rights Division.

In the case of the actual John Tanner interview summary, we added an intro paragraph similar to other interview summaries submitted by the consultants to summarize the enforcement authority of the Voting Section and to distinguish it from the Election Crimes Branch. We also moved the consultants’ note about the refusal to share certain internal working papers to the end of the summary because it seemed to distract from the main interview points if left as an introduction.

Making the distinction between the Election Crimes Branch and the Voting Section is important. The Voting Section brings cases involving "systemic" discrimination because federal voting statutes focus on discriminatory action by local governments. It is criminal statutes that involve malfeasance by individuals and that are enforced by the Election Crimes Branch through Us Attorneys’ offices. The difference is key to understanding federal election law enforcement.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

Peg,
If possible, I need answers for these questions in reference to the vote fraud/voter intimidation project by 2 p.m. today for an inquiry for Congressional Quarterly:

1. Why did we only contact DOJ officials regarding the accuracy of their interviews?

2. Exactly what did we change and why?

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
I sent this comparison to the committee. It shows in track changes the changes that were made to the interview summaries (I assume that is what you are looking for).

Summaries of Interviews with Donsanto-Tanner revised.pdf

Juliet T. Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

Peg,
If possible, I need answers for these questions in reference to the vote fraud/voter intimidation project by 2 p.m. today for an inquiry for Congressional Quarterly:

1. Why did we only contact DOJ officials regarding the accuracy of their interviews?
2. Exactly what did we change and why?

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Interview with Craig Donsanto, Director, Elections Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, U.S. Department of Justice
January 13, 2006

The Department of Justice's (DOJ) Election Crimes Branch is responsible for supervising federal criminal investigations and prosecutions of election crimes.

Questions

How are Prosecution Decisions Made?

Craig Donsanto must approve all investigations that go beyond a preliminary stage, all charges, search warrant applications and subpoenas and all prosecutions. The decision to investigate is very sensitive because of the public officials involved. If a charge seems political, Donsanto will reject it. Donsanto gives possible theories for investigation. Donsanto and Noel Hillman will decide whether to farm out the case to an Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA). Donsanto uses a concept called predication. In-other-words, there must be enough evidence to suggest a crime has been committed. The method of evaluation of this evidence depends on the type of evidence and its source. There are two types of evidence---factual (antisocial behavior) and legal (antisocial behavior leading to statutory violations). Whether an indictment will be brought depends on the likelihood of success before a jury. Much depends on the type of evidence and the source. Donsanto said he “knows it when he sees it.” Donsanto will only indict if he is confident of a conviction assuming the worst case scenario – a jury trial.

A person under investigation will first receive a target letter. Often, a defendant who gets a target letter will ask for a departmental hearing. The defendant’s case will be heard by Donsanto and Hillman. On occasion, the assistant attorney general will review the case. The department grants such hearings easily because such defendants are likely to provide information about others involved.

The Civil Rights Division, Voting Rights Section makes its own decisions on prosecution. The head of that division is John Tanner. There is a lot of cooperation between the Voting Section and the Election Crimes Branch.

Does the Decision to Prosecute Incorporate Particular Political Considerations within a State Such as a One Party System or a System in which the Party in Power Controls the Means of Prosecution and Suppresses Opposition Complaints?

Yes. Before, the department would leave it to the states. Now, if there is racial animus involved in the case, there is political bias involved, or the prosecutor is not impartial, the department will take it over.

Does it Matter if the Complaint Comes from a Member of a Racial Minority?
No. But if the question involves racial animus, that has also always been an aggravating factor, making it more likely the Department will take it over.

What Kinds of Complaints Would Routinely Override Principles of Federalism?

Federalism is no longer big issue. DOJ is permitted to prosecute whenever there is a candidate for federal office on the ballot.

Are There Too Few Prosecutions?

DOJ can’t prosecute everything.

What Should Be Done to Improve the System?

The problem is asserting federal jurisdiction in non-federal elections. It is preferable for the federal government to pursue these cases for the following reasons: federal districts draw from a bigger and more diverse jury pool; the DOJ is politically detached; local district attorneys are hamstrung by the need to be re-elected; DOJ has more resources – local prosecutors need to focus on personal and property crimes—fraud cases are too big and too complex for them; DOJ can use the grand jury process as a discovery technique and to test the strength of the case.

In *U.S. v. McNally*, the court ruled that the mail fraud statute does not apply to election fraud. It was through the mail fraud statute that the department had routinely gotten federal jurisdiction over election fraud cases. 18 USC 1346, the congressional effort to “fix” McNally, did not include voter fraud.

As a result, the department needs a new federal law that allows federal prosecution whenever a federal instrumentality is used, e.g. the mail, federal funding, interstate commerce. The department has drafted such legislation, which was introduced but not passed in the early 1990s. A federal law is needed that permits prosecution in any election where any federal instrumentality is used.

Other Information

The Department has held four symposia for *District Election Officers (DEOs)* and FBI agents since the initiation of the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative. In 2003, civil rights leaders were invited to make speeches, but were not permitted to take part in the rest of the symposium. All other symposia have been closed to the public. (Peg will be sending us the complete training materials used at those sessions. These are confidential and are the subject of FOIA litigation).

There are two types of attorneys in the division: prosecutors, who take on cases when the jurisdiction of the section requires it; the US Attorney has recused him or herself; or when the US Attorney is unable to handle the case (most frequent reason) and braintrust attorneys who analyze the facts, formulate theories, and draft legal documents.
Donsanto provided us with three case lists: Open cases (still being investigated) as of January 13, 2006 — confidential; election fraud prosecutions and convictions as a result of the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative October 2002-January 13, 2006; and cases closed for lack of evidence as of January 13, 2006.

If we want more documents related to any case, we must get those documents from the states. The department will not release them to us.

Although the number of election fraud related complaints have not gone up since 2002, nor has the proportion of legitimate to illegitimate complaints of fraud, the number of cases that the department is investigating and the number of indictments the department is pursuing are both up dramatically.

Since 2002, the department has brought more cases against alien voters, felon voters, and double voters than ever before. Previously, cases were only brought against conspiracies when there was a pattern or scheme to corrupt the process rather than individual offenders acting alone. For deterrence purposes, charges were not brought against individuals—those cases went un-prosecuted. This change in direction, focus, and level of aggression was by the decision of the Attorney General. The reason for the change was for deterrence purposes. The Attorney General decided to add the pursuit of individuals who vote when not eligible to vote (noncitizens, felons) or who vote more than once.

The department is currently undertaking three pilot projects to determine what works in developing the cases and obtaining convictions and what works with juries in such matters to gain convictions:

1. Felon voters in Milwaukee.
2. Alien voters in the Southern District of Florida. FYI — under 18 USC 611, to prosecute for “alien voting” there is no intent requirement. Conviction can lead to deportation. Nonetheless, the department feels compelled to look at mitigating factors such as was the alien told it was OK to vote, does the alien have a spouse that is a citizen.
3. Double voters in a variety of jurisdictions.

The department does not maintain records of the complaints that come in from DEOs, U.S attorneys and others during the election that are not pursued by the department. Donsanto asserted that U.S. attorneys never initiate frivolous investigations.

According to the new handbook, the department can take on a case whenever there is a federal candidate on the ballot.
Interview with John Tanner, Director, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

February 24, 2006

The Department of Justice’s (DOJ) Voting Section is charged with the civil enforcement of the Voting Rights Act, the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA), the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA), and Title III of the Help America Vote Act (HAVA).

Note: Mr. Tanner’s reluctance to share data, information and his perspective on solving the problems presented an obstacle to conducting the type of interview that would help inform this project as much as we would have hoped. Mr. Tanner would not give us any information about or data from the section’s election complaint intake records; data or even general information from the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system; its formal process for tracking and managing work activities in pursuing complaints and potential violations of the voting laws; and would give us only a selected few samples of attorney observer reports; reports that every Voting Section attorney who is observing elections at polling sites on Election Day is required to submit. He would not discuss in any manner any current investigations or cases the section is involved in. He also did not believe it was his position to offer us recommendations as to how his office, elections, or the voting process might be improved.

Authority and Process

The Voting Section, in contrast to the Public Integrity Section as Craig Donsanto described it, typically focuses only on systemic problems resulting from government action or inaction, not problems caused by individuals. Indeed, the section never goes after individuals because it does not have the statutory authority to do so. In situations in which individuals are causing problems at the polls and interfering with voting rights, the section calls the local election officials to resolve it.

Federal voting laws enforced by the section only apply to state action, so the section only sues state and local governments — it does not have any enforcement power over individuals. Most often, the section enters into consent agreements with governments that focus on poll worker training, takes steps to restructure how polls are run, and deals with problems on Election Day on the spot. Doing it this way has been most effective — for example, while the section used to have the most observers in the South, with systematic changes forced upon those jurisdictions, have made it so now the section now does not get complaints from the South.

The section can get involved even where there is no federal candidate on the ballot if there is a racial issue under the 14th and 15th Amendments.

When the section receives a complaint, attorneys first determine whether it is a matter that involves individual offenders or a systemic problem. When deciding what to do
with the complaint, the section errs on the side of referring it criminally to avoid having any because they do not want civil litigation to complicate a possible criminal case.

When a complaint comes in, the attorneys ask questions to see if there are even problems there that the complainant is not aware are violations of the law. For example, in the Boston case, the attorney did not just look at Spanish language cases under section 203, but also brought a Section 2 case for violations regarding Chinese and Vietnamese voters. When looking into a case, the attorneys look for specificity, witnesses and supporting evidence.

Often, lawsuits bring voluntary compliance.

**Voter Intimidation**

Many instances of what some people refer to as voter intimidation are more unclear now. For example, photographing voters at the polls has been called intimidating, but now everyone is at the polls with a camera. It is hard to know when something is intimidation and it is difficult to show that it was an act of intimidation.

The fact that both parties are engaging in these tactics now makes it more complicated. It makes it difficult to point the finger at any one side.

The inappropriate use of challengers on the basis of race would be a violation of the law. Mr. Tanner was unaware that such allegations were made in Ohio in 2004. He said there had never been a formal investigation into the abusive use of challengers.

Mr. Tanner said a lot of the challenges are legitimate because you have a lot of voter registration fraud as a result of groups paying people to register voters by the form. They turn in bogus registration forms. Then the parties examine the registration forms and challenge them because 200 of them, for example, have addresses of a vacant lot.

However, Mr. Tanner said the department was able to informally intervene in challenger situations in Florida, Atkinson County, Georgia and in Alabama, as was referenced in a February 23 Op-Ed in USA Today. Mr. Tanner reiterated the section takes racial targeting very seriously.

Refusal to provide provisional ballots would be a violation of the law that the section would investigate.

Deceptive practices are committed by individuals and would be a matter for the Public Integrity Section. Local government would have to be involved for the voting section to become involved.

Unequal implementation of ID rules, or asking minority voters only for ID would be something the section would go after. Mr. Tanner was unaware of allegations of this in 2004. He said this is usually a problem where you have language minorities and the poll workers cannot understand the voters when they say their names. The section has never
formally investigated or solely focused a case based on abuse of ID provisions. However, implementation of ID rules was part of the Section 2 case in San Diego. Mr. Tanner reiterated that the section is doing more than ever before.

When asked about the section’s references to incidents of vote fraud in the documents related to the new state photo identification requirements, Mr. Tanner said the section only looks at retrogression, not at the wisdom of what a legislature does. In Georgia, for example, everyone statistically has identification, and more blacks have ID than whites. With respect to the letter to Senator Kit Bond regarding voter ID, the section did refer to the perception of concern about dead voters because of reporting by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution. It is understandable that when you have thousands of bogus registrations that would be concerns about polling place fraud. Very close elections make this even more of an understandable concern. Putting control of registration lists in the hands of the states will be helpful because at this higher level of government you find a higher level of professionalism.

It is hard to know how much vote suppression and intimidation is taking place because it depends on one’s definition of the terms—they are used very loosely by some people. However, the enforcement of federal law over the years has made an astounding difference so that the level of discrimination has plummeted. Registration of minorities has soared, as can be seen on the section’s website. Mr. Tanner was unsure if the same was true with respect to turnout, but the gap is less. That information is not on the section’s website.

The section is not filing as many Section 2 cases as compared to Section 203 cases because many of the jurisdictions sued under Section 2 in the past do not have issues anymore. Mr. Tanner said that race based problems are rare now.

NVRA has been effective in opening up the registration process. In terms of enforcement, Mr. Tanner said they do what they can when they have credible allegations. There is a big gap between complaints and what can be substantiated. Mr. Tanner stated that given the high quality of the attorneys now in the section, if they do not investigate it or bring action, that act complained of did not happen.

Recommendations
Mr. Tanner did not feel it was appropriate to make recommendations.

Note: Mr. Tanner’s reluctance to share data, information and his perspective on solving the problems presented an obstacle to conducting the type of interview that would help inform this project as much as we would have hoped. We did not have access to any information about or data from the section’s election complaint in-take phone logs or data or even general information from the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system—its formal process for tracking and managing work activities in pursuing complaints and potential violations of the voting laws. Only a selected few samples of attorney-observer reports were provided, reports that every Voting Section attorney who is observing
elections at poll sites on Election Day is required to submit. Mr. Tanner would not discuss any current investigations or cases the section is involved in.
As far as I know, you are absolutely correct! Julie did the bulk of the rewrite and used my analyses of the preliminary info submitted by our contractors. I know that I had no contact with the administration regarding this study. --- Peggy

The St. Louis Post Dispatch wrote an editorial that said the administration edited our report. I am almost absolutely sure that is not true, but I wanted to confirm that with you before I request a correction. Thanks.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
I did not request that the White House or administration review our report, nor did I send it to them.

Juliet T. Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
04/17/2007 01:16 PM
To psims@eac.gov, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC, jthompson@eac.gov
cc
Subject Vote fraud report

The St. Louis Post Dispatch wrote an editorial that said the administration edited our report. I am almost absolutely sure that is not true, but I wanted to confirm that with you before I request a correction. Thanks.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Subject: Statement for PDF'ing

Hillman Statement on the release of the voting fraud report 12.01.06 (DRAFT).doc
STATEMENT BY ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSIONER GRACIA HILLMAN ON
"THE EAC REPORT ON VOTING FRAUD AND VOTER INTIMIDATION STUDY"

Washington, D.C. – December 7 – Today the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) voted on the findings of the "Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Study" and accepted recommendations to conduct a comprehensive study to assess all claims, charges and prosecutions of voting crimes. This report, which was largely based on anecdotal information, was months in development and is the result of two independent researchers' assessment of what characterizes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the United States.

Today's vote sets in motion the EAC's acceptance of the researchers' and subsequent working group's core recommendation that the matter of voting fraud and voter intimidation deserves more than just an anecdotal assessment, but rather a "comprehensive survey and study of the information available from investigatory agencies, prosecutorial bodies and courts on the number and types of complaints, charges and prosecutions of election crimes" based on "hard data on complaints, charges and prosecutions".

While I would have liked this report to have been made to the recent 2006 mid-term elections, I am confident that the EAC is on the right path toward next steps which include:

1) A comprehensive survey/study on voting fraud and voter intimidation based on hard data by the end of calendar year 2007, and
2) By mid-2008, a set of standards/best practices for state election officials and prosecuting authorities to use in assessing legitimate claims and bringing them to justice.

For the EAC's full report and news release on the "Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Study" please visit www.eac.gov.
I do not have anything. Thanks.

Rosemary E. Rodriguez
Commissioner
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-566-3104
Facsimile: 202-566-3127
www.eac.gov
rrodriguez@eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

04/12/2007 08:38 AM

Today I will circulate a formal FOIA request to all of you. Please note that this request is from a journalist. The information I circulate will include a copy of the original request, which was made by the DC bureau of McClatchy Newspapers. An abbreviated version of the request follows:

"Copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Election Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for EAC."

Some of you have provided similar information in the past, but I will need another complete submission that includes any related files that may have been generated since your last submission.

Please anticipate a formal request to be distributed to everyone today, and take note that the deadline to provide this information is April 30. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is little polling place fraud or at least much less than is claimed, including voter impersonation, &quot;dead&quot; voters, non-citizen voting and felon voters.</td>
<td>Harry Van Sickle &amp; Larry Boyle</td>
<td>No data support. Cited local case of voter intimidation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharon Priest</td>
<td>No data support - anecdotal references.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas Webber</td>
<td>No prosecuted cases of polling place fraud, &quot;but it does happen&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Ravitz</td>
<td>No data source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin Kennedy</td>
<td>Wisconsin case in spring of 2003 or 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lori Minnite</td>
<td>Securing the Vote report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Weiser</td>
<td>Brennan Center report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neil Bradley</td>
<td>No data source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Identification requirements are the modern version of voter intimidation and suppression.</td>
<td>Joe Rich</td>
<td>No data source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wade Henderson</td>
<td>No data source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Groth</td>
<td>No data source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heather Dawn Thompson</td>
<td>Cases in <strong>South Dakota</strong> – No ID, can’t vote; some voters lived up to 60 miles away and suppression by party structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cases in <strong>Minnesota</strong> – would not allow tribal ID.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American communities</td>
<td>Heather Dawn Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Power of the native vote and active participation has resulted in an increase in intimidation tactics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Non-Indians running elections in Native communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Photo ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poll Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vote Buying and Fraud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| South Dakota |
| See above Voter ID. |
| U.S. Attorney chose Election Day to give out subpoenas. |
| No data source. |

| Rebecca Vigil-Giron |
| No data source |
Peg,
No problem. I will cull from what you sent earlier. I just wanted to make sure there were no other records that had been generated since then.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

Margaret Sims /EAC/GOV
To Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Re: FOIA Request

Jeannie:
I haven't had any relevant emails with Job or Tova that occurred after the batch I gave you in response to the Brennan Center FOIA. I last heard from Tova in August 2006 and included that message in the stuff I sent you earlier. Job and I corresponded in February 2007 about how his pay had been reported (what amounts were reported in which tax year). As there was no discussion of the research project itself, I don't think that is relevant.

If you could reuse the information I provided last time, I would really appreciate it. (It took me hours to pull that together and I would rather not have to repeat that.) I think the stuff I sent you earlier also included correspondence with Working Group and other folks outside of the EAC, which would need to be culled... --- Peggy

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
Today I will circulate a formal FOIA request to all of you. Please note that this request is from a journalist. The information I circulate will include a copy of the original request, which was made by the DC bureau of McClatchy Newspapers. An abbreviated version of the request follows:

"Copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Election Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for EAC."

Some of you have provided similar information in the past, but I will need another complete submission that includes any related files that may have been generated since your last submission.

Please anticipate a formal request to be distributed to everyone today, and take note that the deadline to provide this information is April 30. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Today I will circulate a formal FOIA request to all of you. Please note that this request is from a journalist. The information I circulate will include a copy of the original request, which was made by the DC bureau of McClatchy Newspapers. An abbreviated version of the request follows:

"Copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Election Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for EAC."

Some of you have provided similar information in the past, but I will need another complete submission that includes any related files that may have been generated since your last submission.

Please anticipate a formal request to be distributed to everyone today, and take note that the deadline to provide this information is April 30. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Okay... I think this is manageable.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
— Forwarded by Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV on 04/11/2007 01:02 PM ——

"Gordon, Greg"
<ggordon@mcclatchydc.com>
04/11/2007 10:32 AM

April 11, 2007

Ms. Jeannie Layson
Director of Communications
Suite 110
1225 New York Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
Fax: 202-566-3127
Phone: 202-566-3100
HAVAinfo@eac.gov

Dear Ms. Layson:

This is an official request under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C., 552 as amended.

I am writing on behalf of McClatchy Newspapers to request copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Elections Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for the EAC.
In the event that this request results in research or copying, McClatchy Newspapers requests a public interest fee waiver because the material being sought is likely to be used in a newspaper story. We would argue strongly that there is a significant public interest in our reviewing the material being sought. As the nation's second largest newspaper group with 32 daily newspapers and a new service serving 400 newspapers, McClatchy easily qualifies as acting in the public interest.

If possible, I would appreciate your expediting this request, especially any emails transmitted after the draft report was submitted, because of the obvious topical import of these documents.

Should this letter prompt questions, please feel free to phone me at 202-383-0005. Thanks for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gregory Gordon
McClatchy Newspapers
Washington correspondent

Greg Gordon
National Correspondent
McClatchy Newspapers Washington Bureau
202-383-0005
ggordon@mcclatchydc.com
The stated purpose of the EAC's recently released "fraud report" was not to draw conclusions about fraud, but determine how the subject should be studied by the EAC. As such, it would inappropriate for the EAC to make unsupported conclusions regarding fraud in its preliminary report. Such speculative statements would only serve to compromise its future effort to study this matter in an nonpartisan fashion.
Take a look at these and see if you agree that the changes are technical.

Juliet T. Hodgkins  
General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3100  

----- Forwarded by Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV on 04/04/2007 05:34 PM -----  
Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV  
12/01/2006 03:23 PM  

Commissioners,

Per your request, please see attached the proposed edits to the summaries of the interviews with Craig Donsanto and John Tanner.

Please get me your comments by Monday COB so that we can finalize this document in time for the meeting next week.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins  
General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3100  

Summaries of Interviews with Donsanto-Tanner redacted-revised.doc
The Department of Justice's (DOJ) Election Crimes Branch is responsible for supervising federal criminal investigations and prosecutions of election crimes.

Questions

How are Prosecution Decisions Made?

Craig Donsanto must approve all investigations that go beyond a preliminary stage, all charges, search warrant applications and subpoenas and all prosecutions. The decision to investigate is very sensitive because of the public officials involved. If a charge seems political, Donsanto will reject it. Donsanto gives possible theories for investigation. Donsanto and Noel Hillman will decide whether to farm out the case to an Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA). Donsanto uses a concept called predication. In other words, there must be enough evidence to suggest a crime has been committed. The method of evaluation of this evidence depends on the type of evidence and its source. There are two types of evidence—factual (antisocial behavior) and legal (antisocial behavior leading to statutory violations). Whether an indictment will be brought depends on the likelihood of success before a jury. Much depends on the type of evidence and the source. Donsanto said he “knows it when he sees it.” Donsanto will only indict if he is confident of a conviction assuming the worst case scenario—a jury trial.

A person under investigation will first receive a target letter. Often, a defendant who gets a target letter will ask for a departmental hearing. The defendant's case will be heard by Donsanto and Hillman. On occasion, the assistant attorney general will review the case. The department grants such hearings because such defendants are likely to provide information about others involved.

The Civil Rights Division, Voting Rights Section makes its own decisions on prosecution. The head of that division is John Tanner. There is a lot of cooperation between the Voting Section and the Election Crimes Branch.

Does the Decision to Prosecute Incorporate Particular Political Considerations within a State Such as a One Party System or a System in which the Party in Power Controls the Means of Prosecution and Suppresses Opposition Complaints?

Yes. Before, the department would leave it to the states. Now, if there is racial animus involved in the case, there is political bias involved, or the prosecutor is not impartial, the department will take it over.

Does it Matter if the Complaint Comes from a Member of a Racial Minority?

No. But if the question involves racial animus, that has also always been an aggravating
What Kinds of Complaints Would Routinely Override Principles of Federalism?

Federalism is no longer big issue. DOJ is permitted to prosecute whenever there is a candidate for federal office on the ballot.

Are There Too Few Prosecutions?

DOJ can't prosecute everything.

What Should Be Done to Improve the System?

The problem is asserting federal jurisdiction in non-federal elections. It is preferable for the federal government to pursue these cases for the following reasons: federal districts draw from a bigger and more diverse jury pool; the DOJ is politically detached; local district attorneys are hamstrung by the need to be re-elected; DOJ has more resources—local prosecutors need to focus on personal and property crimes—fraud cases are too big and too complex for them; DOJ can use the grand jury process as a discovery technique and to test the strength of the case.

In U.S. v. McNally, the court ruled that the mail fraud statute does not apply to election fraud. It was through the mail fraud statute that the department had routinely gotten federal jurisdiction over election fraud cases. 18 USC 1346, the congressional effort to "fix" McNally, did not include voter fraud.

As a result, the department needs a new federal law that allows federal prosecution whenever a federal instrumentality is used, e.g. the mail, federal funding, interstate commerce. The department has drafted such legislation, which was introduced but not passed in the early 1990s. A federal law is needed that permits prosecution in any election where any federal instrumentality is used.

Other Information

The Department has held four symposia for District Election Officers (DEOs) and FBI agents since the initiation of the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative. In 2003, civil rights leaders were invited to make speeches, but were not permitted to take part in the rest of the symposium. All other symposia have been closed to the public.

There are two types of attorneys in the division: prosecutors, who take on cases when the jurisdiction of the section requires it; the US Attorney has recused him or herself; or when the US Attorney is unable to handle the case (most frequent reason) and braintrust attorneys who analyze the facts, formulate theories, and draft legal documents.

Cases
Donsanto provided us with three case lists: cases still being investigated as of January 13, 2006 – confidential; election fraud prosecutions and convictions as a result of the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative October 2002-January 13, 2006; and cases closed for lack of evidence as of January 13, 2006.

If we want more documents related to any case, we must get those documents from the states. The department will not release them to us.

Although the number of election fraud related complaints have not gone up since 2002, nor has the proportion of legitimate to illegitimate complaints of fraud, the number of cases that the department is investigating and the number of indictments the department is pursuing are both up dramatically.

Since 2002, the department has brought more cases against alien voters, felon voters, and double voters than ever before. Previously, cases were only brought against conspiracies to corrupt the process rather than individual offenders acting alone. For deterrence purposes, the Attorney General decided to add the pursuit of individuals who vote when not eligible to vote (noncitizens, felons) or who vote more than once. The department is currently undertaking three pilot projects to determine what works in developing the cases and obtaining convictions and what works with juries in such matters to gain convictions:

1. Felon voters in Milwaukee.

2. Alien voters in the Southern District of Florida. FYI – under 18 USC 611, to prosecute for “alien voting” there is no intent requirement. Conviction can lead to deportation. Nonetheless, the department feels compelled to look at mitigating factors such as was the alien told it was OK to vote, does the alien have a spouse that is a citizen.

3. Double voters in a variety of jurisdictions.

The department does not maintain records of the complaints that come in from DEOs, U.S attorneys and others during the election that are not pursued by the department. Donsanto asserted that U.S. attorneys never initiate frivolous investigations.

*According to the new handbook, the department can take on a case whenever there is a federal candidate on the ballot*
Interview with John Tanner, Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

February 24, 2006

The Department of Justice’s (DOJ) Voting Section is charged with the civil enforcement of the Voting Rights Act, the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA), the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA), and Title III of the Help America Vote Act (HAVA).

Authority and Process

The Voting Section, in contrast to the Public Integrity Section as Craig Donsanto described it, typically focuses only on systemic problems resulting from government action or inaction, not problems caused by individuals. Indeed, the section never goes after individuals because it does not have the statutory authority to do so. In situations in which individuals are causing problems at the polls and interfering with voting rights, the section calls the local election officials to resolve it.

Federal voting laws enforced by the section only apply to state action, so the section only sues state and local governments – it does not have any enforcement power over individuals. Most often, the section enters into consent agreements with governments that focus on poll worker training, takes steps to restructure how polls are run, and deals with problems on Election Day on the spot. Doing it this way has been most effective – for example, while the section used to have the most observers in the South, with systematic changes forced upon those jurisdictions, the section now does not get complaints from the South.

The section can get involved even where there is no federal candidate on the ballot if there is a racial issue under the 14th and 15th Amendments.

When the section receives a complaint, attorneys first determine whether it is a matter that involves individual offenders or a systemic problem. When deciding what to do with the complaint, the section errs on the side of referring it criminally to avoid having any civil litigation complicate a possible criminal case.

When a complaint comes in, the attorneys ask questions to see if there are even problems there that the complainant is not aware are violations of the law. For example, in the Boston case, the attorney did not just look at Spanish language cases under section 203, but also brought a Section 2 case for violations regarding Chinese and Vietnamese voters. When looking into a case, the attorneys look for specificity, witnesses and supporting evidence.

Often, lawsuits bring voluntary compliance.

Voter Intimidation
Many instances of what some people refer to as voter intimidation are more unclear now. For example, photographing voters at the polls has been called intimidating, but now everyone is at the polls with a camera. It is hard to know when something is intimidation and it is difficult to show that it was an act of intimidation.

The fact that both parties are engaging in these tactics now makes it more complicated. It makes it difficult to point the finger at any one side.

The inappropriate use of challengers on the basis of race would be a violation of the law. Mr. Tanner was unaware that such allegations were made in Ohio in 2004. He said there had never been a formal investigation into the abusive use of challengers.

Mr. Tanner said a lot of the challenges are legitimate because you have a lot of voter registration fraud as a result of groups paying people to register voters by the form. They turn in bogus registration forms. Then the parties examine the registration forms and challenge them because 200 of them, for example, have addresses of a vacant lot.

However, Mr. Tanner said the department was able to informally intervene in challenger situations in Florida, Atkinson County, Georgia and in Alabama, as was referenced in a February 23 Op-Ed in USA Today. Mr. Tanner reiterated the section takes racial targeting very seriously.

Refusal to provide provisional ballots would be a violation of the law that the section would investigate.

Deceptive practices are committed by individuals and would be a matter for the Public Integrity Section. Local government would have to be involved for the Voting Section to become involved.

Unequal implementation of ID rules, or asking minority voters only for ID would be something the section would go after. Mr. Tanner was unaware of allegations of this in 2004. He said this is usually a problem where you have language minorities and the poll workers cannot understand the voters when they say their names. The section has never formally investigated or solely focused a case based on abuse of ID provisions. However, implementation of ID rules was part of the Section 2 case in San Diego. Mr. Tanner reiterated that the section is doing more than ever before.

When asked about the section's references to incidents of vote fraud in the documents related to the new state photo identification requirements, Mr. Tanner said the section only looks at retrogression, not at the wisdom of what a legislature does. In Georgia, for example, everyone statistically has identification, and more blacks have ID than whites. With respect to the letter to Senator Kit Bond regarding voter ID, the section did refer to the perception of concern about dead voters because of reporting by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution. It is understandable that when you have thousands of bogus registrations that there would be concerns about polling place fraud. Very close elections make this even more of an understandable concern. Putting control of registration lists in the hands
of the states will be helpful because at this higher level of government you find a higher level of professionalism.

It is hard to know how much vote suppression and intimidation is taking place because it depends on one’s definition of the terms – they are used very loosely by some people. However, the enforcement of federal law over the years has made an astounding difference so that the level of discrimination has plummeted. Registration of minorities has soared, as can be seen on the section’s website. Mr. Tanner was unsure if the same was true with respect to turnout, but the gap is less. That information is not on the section’s website.

The section is not filing as many Section 2 cases as compared to Section 203 cases because many of the jurisdictions sued under Section 2 in the past do not have issues anymore. Mr. Tanner said that race based problems are rare now.

NVRA has been effective in opening up the registration process. In terms of enforcement, Mr. Tanner said they do what they can when they have credible allegations. There is a big gap between complaints and what can be substantiated. Mr. Tanner stated that given the high quality of the attorneys now in the section, if they do not investigate it or bring action, that act complained of did not happen.

Recommendations
Mr. Tanner did not feel it was appropriate to make recommendations.

Note: We contend that Mr. Tanner’s reluctance to share data, information and his perspective on solving the problems presented an obstacle to conducting the type of interview that would help inform this project as much as we would have hoped. We did not have access to any information about or data from the section’s election complaint intake phone logs or data or even general information from the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system-its formal process for tracking and managing work activities in pursuing complaints and potential violations of the voting laws. Only a selected few samples of attorney-observer reports were provided, reports that every Voting Section attorney who is observing elections at poll sites on Election Day is required to submit. Mr. Tanner would not discuss any current investigations or cases the section is involved in.
They already have, and asked me not to share it and to delete it.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Juliet E. Hodgkins
Sent: 04/02/2007 11:51 AM EDT
To: Jeannie Layson
Subject: Re: the aftermath

Wonder how long it will take them to realize that they sent this to you?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 04/02/2007 11:58 AM EDT
To: Tom Wilkey; Juliet Hodgkins
Subject: Fw: the aftermath

Tim from Eagleton sent me this email by mistake. Interesting...

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV on 04/02/2007 11:55 AM -----
"Thomas O'Neill"

04/02/2007 11:41 AM
John, Based on the 6 article Layson sent and the others that I distributed over the weekend, I conclude this: We lost the battle, but won the war.

I am concerned about the news that Rush Holt's election reform bill would make the EAC permanent. Perhaps we could arrange to talk to him during the 2 week House Easter break and make some suggestions about how the EAC should be restructured before it is made permanent. (Ray Martinez would, I believe, have much to contribute on that topic.)

Tom

From: jlayson@eac.gov [mailto:jlayson@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2007 10:56 AM
To: tim.vercellotti@rutgers.edu; john.weingart@rutgers.edu
Subject: the aftermath

I'm sure both of you have already seen the commentary, but just in case you haven't, here it is. Also, I'll let you know if I get any more inquiries about it. Thanks again.

- EAC Finally Releases Previously Withheld 9 Month Old Report on 'Voter ID' Concerns After Congressional Prodding
- BREAKING: Federal Election Agency Plays Politics with Voter ID Study (EAC voter ID study)
- Project Vote: Federal Election Agency Plays Politics With Voter ID Study (more Project Vote)
- Is The EAC Being Appropriately Cautious or Cowardly on Voter Identification Research? (Rick Hasen)
- Conflicted loyalties? (Donna Brazile: EAC "...can't even agree upon a definition of 'voter fraud,' much less prove its existence")

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
I'm sure both of you have already seen the commentary, but just in case you haven't, here it is. Also, I'll let you know if I get any more inquiries about it. Thanks again.

- EAC Finally Releases Previously Withheld, 9 Month Old Report on 'Voter ID' Concerns After Congressional Prodding
- BREAKING: Federal Election Agency Plays Politics with Voter ID Study (EAC voter ID study)
- Project Vote: Federal Election Agency Plays Politics With Voter ID Study (more Project Vote)
- Is The EAC Being Appropriately Cautious or Cowardly on Voter Identification Research? (Rick Hasen)
- Conflicted loyalties? (Donna Brazile: EAC "....can't even agree upon a definition of 'voter fraud,' much less prove its existence")

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Jeannie Layson /EAC/GOV
03/29/2007 02:31 PM
To PFessler@npr.org
cc
Subject your questions

Pam,
Per your question, Congressman Hinchey requested that the following be sent to the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government: EAC’s assessment report on CIBER, Inc., the draft report submitted to EAC regarding voter fraud and intimidation, and the draft report submitted to EAC concerning voter identification. The assessment report on CIBER, Inc. and the final culmination of the voter fraud and intimidation research - Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Further Study -- are available at www.eac.gov, but we also provided hard copies to the committee.

Regarding the voter ID research project, as I mentioned at our Feb. public meeting EAC Chair Donetta Davidson requested that staff review the initial research provided by Eagleton and produce a final report, which would include recommendations for further study on this subject. However, we provided the Committee the initial information Eagleton provided to EAC.

Regarding the voter fraud and intimidation research, we provided the Committee EAC's final report and all of the information provided by the consultants. At a May 2006 public meeting of our Standards Board and Board of Advisors, the EAC project manager for this research presented a staff update on the project. Go here to view the public meeting agenda, page 3. The update the project manager gave at this public meeting has been made available to anyone who asked for it, and I've attached it for your review. The final culmination of this project can be found here. Go to page 24, where you will find links to attachments, which provide the data reviewed by the consultants. The commissioners adopted this report, including four recommendations for further study at a public meeting in Dec. 2006. The final report includes all of the recommendations put forth by the consultants as well the research they provided. (Consultants provided 16 suggestions for further study. See pages 16-22.)

Please let me know if you would like to speak with EAC Chair Davidson if you need sound or something for attribution. She'd also be glad to discuss our approach for these research projects. Again, my direct number is 202-566-3103 or you can reach me on my cell after 5:30.

VFVI Study Status 5-17-06.pdf
Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov

014703
Status Report on the
Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Research Project

May 17, 2006
INTRODUCTION

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the tasks listed in the statute is the development of:

- nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office [section 241(b)(6)]; and

- ways of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)].

EAC's Board of Advisors recommended that the agency make research on these matters a high priority.

FOCUS OF CURRENT RESEARCH

In September 2005, the Commission hired two consultants with expertise in this subject matter, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, to:

- develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;

- perform background research (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;

- establish a project working group, in consultation with EAC, composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation;

- provide the description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation and the results of the preliminary research to the working group, and convene the working group to discuss potential avenues for future EAC research on this topic; and

- produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future research, if any;

As of the date of this report, the consultants have drafted a definition of election fraud, reviewed relevant literature and reports, interviewed persons from government and private sectors with subject matter expertise, analyzed news reports of alleged election fraud, reviewed case law, and established a project working group.
DEFINITION OF ELECTION FRAUD

The consultants drafted a definition of election fraud that includes numerous aspects of voting fraud (including voter intimidation, which is considered a subset of voting fraud) and voter registration fraud, but excludes campaign finance violations and election administration mistakes. This draft will be discussed and probably refined by the project working group, which is scheduled to convene on May 18, 2006.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The consultants found many reports and books that describe anecdotes and draw broad conclusions from a large array of incidents. They found little research that is truly systematic or scientific. The most systematic look at fraud appears to be the report written by Lori Minnite, entitled “Securing the Vote: An Analysis of Election Fraud”. The most systematic look at voter intimidation appears to be the report by Laughlin McDonald, entitled “The New Poll Tax”. The consultants found that books written about this subject all seem to have a political bias and a pre-existing agenda that makes them somewhat less valuable.

Moreover, the consultants found that reports and books make allegations but, perhaps by their nature, have little follow up. As a result, it is difficult to know when something has remained in the stage of being an allegation and gone no further, or progressed to the point of being investigated or prosecuted or in any other way proven to be valid by an independent, neutral entity. This is true, for example, with respect to allegations of voter intimidation by civil rights organizations, and, with respect to fraud, John Fund’s frequently cited book, “Stealing Elections”.

Consultants found that researchers agree that measuring something like the incidence of fraud and intimidation in a scientifically legitimate way is extremely difficult from a methodological perspective and would require resources beyond the means of most social and political scientists. As a result, there is much more written on this topic by advocacy groups than social scientists.

Other items of note:

- There is as much evidence, and as much concern, about structural forms of disenfranchisement as about intentional abuse of the system. These include felon disenfranchisement, poor maintenance of databases and identification requirements.

- There is tremendous disagreement about the extent to which polling place fraud, e.g. double voting, intentional felon voting, noncitizen voting, is a serious problem. On balance, more researchers find it to be less of a problem than is commonly described in the political debate; but some reports say it is a major problem, albeit hard to identify.
• There is substantial concern across the board about absentee balloting and the opportunity it presents for fraud.

• Federal law governing election fraud and intimidation is varied and complex and yet may nonetheless be insufficient or subject to too many limitations to be as effective as it might be.

• Deceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004.

• Voter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities, although the American Center for Voting Rights uniquely alleges it is focused on Republicans.

**Recommendations**

The consultants recommend that subsequent EAC research include a follow up study of allegations made in reports, books and newspaper articles. They also suggest that the research should focus on filling the gap between the lack of reports based on methodical studies by social or political scientists and the numerous, but less scientific, reports published by advocacy groups.

**INTERVIEWS**

The consultants jointly selected experts from the public and private sector for interviews. The consultants' analysis of their discussions with these members of the legal, election official, advocacy, and academic communities follows.

**Common Themes**

• There is virtually universal agreement that absentee ballot fraud is the biggest problem, with vote buying and registration fraud coming in after that. The vote buying often comes in the form of payment for absentee ballots, although not always. Some absentee ballot fraud is part of an organized effort; some is by individuals, who sometimes are not even aware that what they are doing is illegal. Voter registration fraud seems to take the form of people signing up with false names. Registration fraud seems to be most common where people doing the registration were paid by the signature.

• There is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud, or at least much less than is claimed, including voter impersonation, "dead" voters, noncitizen voting and felon voters. Those few who believe it occurs often enough to be a concern say that it is impossible to show the extent to which it happens, but do point to instances in the press of such incidents. Most people believe that false registration forms have not resulted in polling place fraud,
although it may create the perception that vote fraud is possible. Those who believe there is more polling place fraud than reported/investigated/prosecuted believe that registration fraud does lead to fraudulent votes. Jason Torchinsky from the American Center for Voting Rights is the only interviewee who believes that polling place fraud is widespread and among the most significant problems in the system.

- Abuse of challenger laws and abusive challengers seem to be the biggest intimidation/suppression concerns, and many of those interviewed assert that the new identification requirements are the modern version of voter intimidation and suppression. However there is evidence of some continued outright intimidation and suppression, especially in some Native American communities. A number of people also raise the problem of poll workers engaging in harassment of minority voters. Other activities commonly raised were the issue of polling places being moved at the last moment, unequal distribution of voting machines, videotaping of voters at the polls, and targeted misinformation campaigns.

- Several people indicate that, for various reasons, DOJ is bringing fewer voter intimidation and suppression cases now, and has increased its focus on matters such as noncitizen voting, double voting, and felon voting. Interviews with DOJ personnel indicate that the Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, focuses on systemic patterns of malfeasance in this area. While the Election Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, continues to maintain an aggressive pursuit of systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process (including voter suppression), it also has increased prosecutions of individual instances of felon, alien, and double voting.

- The problem of badly kept voter registration lists, with both ineligible voters remaining on the rolls and eligible voters being taken off, remains a common concern. A few people are also troubled by voters being on registration lists in two states. They said that there was no evidence that this had led to double voting, but it opens the door to the possibility. There is great hope that full implementation of the new requirements of HAVA – done well, a major caveat - will reduce this problem dramatically.

**Common Recommendations:**

- Many of those interviewed recommend better poll worker training as the best way to improve the process; a few also recommended longer voting times or voting on days other than election day (such as weekends) but fewer polling places so only the best poll workers would be employed.

- Many interviewed support stronger criminal laws and increased enforcement of existing laws with respect to both fraud and intimidation. Advocates from across the spectrum expressed frustration with the failure of the Department of Justice to pursue complaints.
With respect to DOJ’s Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, John Tanner indicated that fewer cases are being brought because fewer are warranted – it has become increasingly difficult to know when allegations of intimidation and suppression are credible since it depends on one’s definition of intimidation, and because both parties are doing it. Moreover prior enforcement of the laws has now changed the entire landscape – race based problems are rare now. Although challenges based on race and unequal implementation of identification rules would be actionable, Mr. Tanner was unaware of such situations actually occurring and his office has not pursued any such cases.

Craig Donsanto of DOJ’s Election Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, says that while the number of election fraud related complaints have not gone up since 2002, nor has the proportion of legitimate to illegitimate claims of fraud, the number of cases DOJ is investigating and the number of indictments his office is pursuing are both up dramatically. Since 2002, in addition to pursuing systematic election corruption schemes, DOJ has brought more cases against alien voters, felon voters and double voters than ever before. Mr. Donsanto would like more resources so that his agency can do more and would like to have laws that make it easier for the federal government to assume jurisdiction over voter fraud cases.

- A couple of interviewees recommend a new law that would make it easier to criminally prosecute people for intimidation even when there is not racial animus.
- Several advocate expanded monitoring of the polls, including some associated with the Department of Justice.
- Almost everyone hopes that administrators will maximize the potential of statewide voter registration databases to prevent fraud.
- Challenge laws, both with respect to pre-election day challenges and challengers at the polls, need to be revised by all states to ensure they are not used for purposes of wrongful disenfranchisement and harassment.
- Several people advocate passage of Senator Barak Obama’s “deceptive practices” bill.
- There is a split on whether it would be helpful to have nonpartisan election officials – some indicated they thought even if elections officials are elected as non partisan officials, they will carry out their duties in biased ways nonetheless. However, most agree that elections officials pursuing partisan agendas are a problem that must be addressed in some fashion. Suggestions included moving election responsibilities out of the secretary of states’ office; increasing transparency in the process; and enacting conflict of interest rules.
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- A few recommend returning to allowing use of absentee ballots "for cause" only if it were politically feasible.

- A few recommend enacting a national identification card, including Pat Rogers, an attorney in New Mexico, and Jason Torchinsky from ACVR, who advocates the proposal in the Carter-Baker Commission Report.

- A couple of interviewees indicated the need for clear standards for the distribution of voting machines.

NEWS ARTICLES

Consultants conducted a Nexis search of related news articles published between January 1, 2001 and January 1, 2006. A systematic, numerical analysis of the data collected during this review is currently being prepared. What follows is an overview of these articles provided by the consultants.

Absentee Ballots

According to press reports, absentee ballots are abused in a variety of ways:

- Campaign workers, candidates and others coerce the voting choices of vulnerable populations, usually elderly voters.

- Workers for groups and individuals have attempted to vote absentee in the names of the deceased.

- Workers for groups, campaign workers and individuals have attempted to forge the names of other voters on absentee ballot requests and absentee ballots and thus vote multiple times.

It is unclear how often actual convictions result from these activities (a handful of articles indicate convictions and guilty pleas), but this is an area in which there have been a substantial number of official investigations and actual charges filed, according to news reports where such information is available. A few of the allegations became part of civil court proceedings contesting the outcome of the election.

While absentee fraud allegations turn up throughout the country, a few states have had several such cases. Especially of note are Indiana, New Jersey, South Dakota, and most particularly, Texas. Interestingly, there were no articles regarding Oregon, where the entire system is vote by mail.
Voter Registration Fraud

According to press reports, the following types of allegations of voter registration fraud are most common:

- Registering in the name of dead people;
- Fake names and other information on voter registration forms;
- Illegitimate addresses used on voter registration forms;
- Voters being tricked into registering for a particular party under false pretenses; and
- Destruction of voter registration forms depending on the party the voter registered with.

There was only one self evident instance of a noncitizen registering to vote. Many of the instances reported included official investigations and charges filed, but few actual convictions, at least from the news reporting. There have been multiple reports of registration fraud in California, Colorado, Florida, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Voter Intimidation and Suppression

This is the area which had the most articles, in part because there were so many allegations of intimidation and suppression during the 2004 election. Most of these remained allegations and no criminal investigation or prosecution ensued. Some of the cases did end up in civil litigation.

This is not to say that these alleged activities were confined to 2004 – there were several allegations made during every year studied. Most notable were the high number of allegations of voter intimidation and harassment reported during the 2003 Philadelphia mayoral race.

A very high number of the articles were about the issue of challenges to voters’ registration status and challengers at the polling places. There were many allegations that planned challenge activities were targeted at minority communities. Some of the challenges were concentrated in immigrant communities.

However, the tactics alleged varied greatly. The types of activities discussed also include the following:

- Photographing or videotaping voters coming out of polling places;
- Improper demands for identification;
• Poll watchers harassing voters;
• Poll workers being hostile to or aggressively challenging voters;
• Disproportionate police presence;
• Poll watchers wearing clothes with messages that seemed intended to intimidate; and
• Insufficient voting machines and unmanageably long lines.

Although the incidents reported on occurred everywhere, not surprisingly, many came from “battleground” states. There were several such reports out of Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

“Dead Voters and Multiple Voting”

There were a high number of articles about people voting in the names of the dead and voting more than once. Many of these articles were marked by allegations of big numbers of people committing these frauds, and relatively few of these allegations turning out to be accurate according to investigations by the newspapers themselves, elections officials, and criminal investigators. Often the problem turned out to be a result of administrative error, poll workers mis-marking voter lists, a flawed registration list and/or errors made in the attempt to match names of voters on the list with the names of the people who voted. In a good number of cases, there were allegations that charges of double voting by political leaders were an effort to scare people away from the voting process.

Nonetheless there were a few cases of people actually being charged and/or convicted for these kinds of activities. Most of the cases involved a person voting both by absentee ballot and in person. A few instances involved people voting both during early voting and on Election Day, which calls into question the proper marking and maintenance of the voting lists. In many instances, the person charged claimed not to have voted twice on purpose. A very small handful of cases involved a voter voting in more than one county and there was one substantiated case involving a person voting in more than one state. Other instances in which such efforts were alleged were disproved by officials.

In the case of voting in the name of a dead person, the problem lay in the voter registration list not being properly maintained, i.e. the person was still on the registration list as eligible to vote, and a person took criminal advantage of that. In total, the San Francisco Chronicle found five such cases in March 2004; the AP cited a newspaper analysis of five such persons in an Indiana primary in May 2004; and a senate committee found two people to have voted in the names of the dead in 2005.
As usual, there were a disproportionate number of such articles coming out of Florida. Notably, there were three articles out of Oregon, which has one hundred percent vote-by-mail.

**Vote Buying**

There were a surprising number of articles about vote buying cases. A few of these instances involved long-time investigations concentrated in three states (Illinois, Kentucky, and West Virginia). There were more official investigations, indictments and convictions/pleas in this area.

**Deceptive Practices**

In 2004 there were numerous reports of intentional disinformation about voting eligibility and the voting process meant to confuse voters about their rights and when and where to vote. Misinformation came in the form of flyers, phone calls, letters, and even people going door to door. Many of the efforts were reportedly targeted at minority communities. A disproportionate number of them came from key battleground states, particularly Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. From the news reports found, only one of these instances was officially investigated, the case in Oregon involving the destruction of completed voter registration applications. There were no reports of prosecutions or any other legal proceeding.

**Non-citizen Voting**

There were surprisingly few articles regarding noncitizen registration and voting – just seven all together, in seven different states across the country. They were also evenly split between allegations of noncitizens registering and noncitizens voting. In one case, charges were filed against ten individuals. In another case, a judge in a civil suit found there was illegal noncitizen voting. Three instances prompted official investigations. Two cases, from this Nexis search, remained just allegations of noncitizen voting.

**Felon Voting**

Although there were only thirteen cases of felon voting, some of them involved large numbers of voters. Most notably, of course, are the cases that came to light in the Washington gubernatorial election contest (see Washington summary) and in Wisconsin (see Wisconsin summary). In several states, the main problem was the large number of ineligible felons that remained on the voting list.

**Election Official Fraud**

In most of the cases in which fraud by elections officials is suspected or alleged, it is difficult to determine whether it is incompetence or a crime. There are several cases of ballots gone missing, ballots unaccounted for and ballots ending up in a worker's possession. In two cases workers were said to have changed peoples' votes. The one
instance in which widespread ballot box stuffing by elections workers was alleged was in Washington State. The judge in the civil trial of that election contest did not find that elections workers had committed fraud. Four of the cases are from Texas.

**Recommendation**

The consultants recommend that subsequent EAC research should include a Nexis search that specifically attempts to follow up on the cases for which no resolution is evident from this particular initial search.

**CASE LAW RESEARCH**

After reviewing over 40,000 cases from 2000 to the present, the majority of which came from appeals courts, the consultants found comparatively few applicable to this study. Of those that were applicable, the consultants found that no apparent thematic pattern emerges. However, it appears to them that the greatest areas of fraud and intimidation have shifted from past patterns of stealing votes to present problems with voter registration, voter identification, the proper delivery and counting of absentee and overseas ballots, provisional voting, vote buying, and challenges to felon eligibility.

**Recommendation**

Because so few cases provided a picture of these current problems, consultants suggest that subsequent EAC research include a review of state trial-level decisions.

**PROJECT WORKING GROUP**

Consultants and EAC worked together to select members for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group that included election officials and representatives of advocacy groups and the legal community who have an interest and expertise in the subject matter. (See Attachment A for a list of members.) The working group is scheduled to convene at EAC offices on May 18, 2006 to consider the results of the preliminary research and to offer ideas for future EAC activities concerning this subject.

**FINAL REPORT**

After convening the project working group, the consultants will draft a final report summarizing the results of their research and the working group deliberations. This report will include recommendations for future EAC research related to this subject matter. The draft report will be reviewed by EAC and, after obtaining any clarifications or corrections deemed necessary, will be made available to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors for review and comment. Following this, a final report will be prepared.
Attachment A

Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project Working Group

The Honorable Todd Rokita
Indiana Secretary of State
Member, EAC Standards Board and the Executive Board of the Standards Board

Kathy Rogers
Georgia Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State
Member, EAC Standards Board

J.R. Perez
Guadalupe County Elections Administrator, TX

Barbara Arnwine
Executive Director, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law
Leader of Election Protection Coalition
(To be represented at May 18, 2006 meeting by Jon M. Greenbaum, Director of the Voting Rights Project for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law)

Robert Bauer
Chair of the Political Law Practice at the law firm of Perkins Coie, DC
National Counsel for Voter Protection, Democratic National Committee

Benjamin L. Ginsberg
Partner, Patton Boggs LLP
Counsel to national Republican campaign committees and Republican candidates

Mark (Thor) Hearne II
Partner-Member, Lathrop & Gage, St Louis, MO
National Counsel to the American Center for Voting Rights

Barry Weinberg
Former Deputy Chief and Acting Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

EAC Invited Technical Advisor:

Craig Donsanto
Director, Election Crimes Branch, U.S. Department of Justice
Fine -- except for the typo in the third paragraph.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----
From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 03/29/2007 02:01 PM EDT
To: Juliet Hodgkins
Subject: is this okay for NPR?

Pam,

Per your question, Congressman Hinchey requested three documents be sent to the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government: EAC’s assessment report on CIBER, Inc., the draft report submitted to EAC regarding voter fraud and intimidation, and the draft report submitted to EAC concerning voter identification. The assessment report on CIBER, Inc. and the final culmination of the voter fraud and intimidation research – Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Further Study -- are available at www.eac.gov, but we also provided hard copies to the committee.

Regarding the voter ID research project, as I mentioned at our Feb. public meeting EAC Chair Donetta Davidson requested that staff review the initial research provided by Eagleton and produce a final report, which would include recommendations for further study on this subject. However, we provided the Committee the initial information Eagleton provided to EAC.

Regarding the voter fraud and intimidation research, we provided the Committee EAC's final report and all of the information provided by the consultants. At a May 2006 public meeting of our Standards Board and Board of Advisors, the EAC project manager for this research presented a staff update on the project. Go here to view the public meeting agenda, page 3. The update the project manager gave at this public meeting has been made available to anyone who asked for it. The final culmination of this project can be found here. Go to page 24, where you will find links to attachments, which provide the data reviewed by the consultants. The commissioners adopted this report, including four recommendations for further study at a public meeting in Dec. 2006. The final report includes all of the recommendations put forth by the consultants as well the research they provided. (Consultants provided 16 suggestions for further study. See pages 16-22.)

Please let me know if you would like to speak with EAC Chair Davidson if you need something for attribution. She'd also be glad to discuss our approach to both of these research projects. Again, my direct number is 202-566-3103 or
you can reach me on my cell after 5:30 a.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Here's the latest press release and the document they are actually voting on. Jennifer -- it would be great if you would work with me to come up with a roll out strategy. Nothing elaborate, as this may happen rather quickly. Also, I am working on some Q&A.

VoterID release lhunter edits.doc  Voter ID edited 32107- with changed footnote.doc

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
WASHINGTON – The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive, multi-year study focused on voter identification laws. After concluding that initial research covering only one election cycle was not sufficient to draw any conclusions, the Commission declined to adopt a report based on the initial research, but to release all of the information to the public. The information is available at www.eac.gov.

“Many new voter identification laws have been enacted recently, and the Commission began working to determine the impact of these new laws,” said EAC Chair Donetta Davidson. “However, after careful consideration of the initial research conducted by our contractor, the Commission decided this important issue deserves a more in-depth research approach and that it should be examined beyond only one election cycle. The bottom line is that the research raises more questions than provides answers.”

EAC’s strategy for moving forward is based upon an examination of the initial research and the testimony and discussion about this research project at the Commission’s February 8, 2007 public meeting. For more information about the public meeting agenda, transcript, and testimony go to http://www.eac.gov/Public_Meeting_020807.asp.

EAC’s future research on this topic will be expanded to include more than one election cycle, environmental and political factors, and the numerous changes in state laws and regulations related to voter identification requirements that have occurred since 2004. EAC comprehensive research approach will undertake the following activities:

- Conduct an ongoing state-by-state review, reporting and tracking of voter identification requirements. This will include tracking states’ requirements which require a voter to state his or her name, to sign his or her name, to match his or her signature to a signature on file, to provide photo or non-photo identification or to swear an affidavit affirming his or her identity.

- Establish a baseline of information that will include factors that may affect or influence Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) voter participation, including various voter identification requirements, the competitiveness of a race and certain environmental or political factors. EAC will use some of the information collected by Eagleton as well as additional data from the states to develop this baseline.

- Convene a working group of advocates, academics, research methodologists and election officials to discuss EAC’s next study of voter identification. Topics to be discussed include methodology, specific issues to be covered in the study and timelines for completing an EAC study on voter identification.
• Study how voter identification provisions that have been in place for two or more Federal elections have impacted voter turnout, voter registration figures, and fraud. Included in this study will be an examination of the relationship between voter turnout and other factors such as race and gender. Study the effects of voter identification provisions, or the lack thereof, on early, absentee and vote-by-mail voting.

• Publish a series of best practice case studies which detail a particular state’s or jurisdiction’s experiences with educating poll workers and voters about various voter identification requirements. Included in the case studies will be detail on the policies and practices used to educate and inform poll workers and voters.

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA). It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

###
EAC Study of Voter Identification Requirements

Background

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) authorizes the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to conduct periodic studies of election administration issues. In May 2005, EAC contracted with Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey through its Eagleton Institute of Politics ("Contractor") to perform a review and legal analysis of state legislation, administrative procedures and court cases, and to perform a literature review on other research and data available on the topic of voter identification requirements. Further, the Contractor was asked to analyze the problems and challenges of voter identification, to hypothesize alternative approaches and to recommend various policies that could be applied to these approaches.

The Contractor performed a statistical analysis of the relationship of various requirements for voter identification to voter turnout in the 2004 election. Drawing on its nationwide review and legal analysis of state statutes and regulations for voter identification, the contractor compared states with similar voter identification requirements and drew conclusions based on comparing turnout rates among states for one election – November 2004. For example, the turnout rate in 2004 in states that required the voter to provide a photo identification document was compared to the turnout rate in 2004 in states with a requirement that voters give his or her name in order to receive a ballot. Contractor used two sets of data to estimate turnout rates: 1) voting age population estimates and 2) individual-level survey data from the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau.

The Contractor presented testimony summarizing its findings from this statistical and data analysis at the February 8, 2007 public meeting of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission. The Contractor's testimony, its summary of voter identification requirements by state, its summary of court decisions and literature on voter identification and related issues, an annotated bibliography on voter identification issues and its summary of state statutes and regulations affecting voter identification are attached to this report and can also be found on EAC's website, www.eac.gov.

EAC Declines to Adopt Draft Report

1 In 2004, three of the states that authorized election officials to request photo identification allowed voters to provide a non-photo ID and still vote a regular ballot and two others permitted voters who lacked photo ID to vote a regular ballot by swearing and affidavit.
2 The July 2004 estimates for voting age population were provided by the U.S. Census Bureau. These data did not differentiate between citizens and non-citizens; because these numbers include non-citizens, the Contractor applied the percentage of citizens included in voting age population statistics in 2000 to the U.S. Census Bureau estimated voting age population in 2004. Thus, 2004 estimates of voting age population include persons who are not registered to vote.
3 The Current Population Survey is based on reports from self-described registered voters who also describe themselves as U.S. citizens.
EAC finds the Contractor's summary of States' voter identification requirements and its summary of state laws, statutes, regulations and litigation surrounding the implementation of voter identification requirements, to be a first step in the Commission's efforts to study the possible impact of voter identification requirements.

However, EAC has concerns regarding the data, analysis, and statistical methodology the Contractor used to analyze voter identification requirements to determine if these laws have an impact on turnout rates. The Contractor used a single election's statistics to conduct this analysis. The two sets of data came from the Census Bureau and included persons who were not eligible to and did not vote. The first analysis using averaged county-level turnout data from the U.S. Census showed no statistically significant correlations. So, a second analysis using a data set based upon the Current Population Survey (which was self-reported and showed a significantly higher turnout rate than other conventional data) was conducted that produced only some evidence of correlation between voter identification requirements and turnout. Furthermore, the initial categorization of voter identification requirements included classifications that actually require no identification at all, such as "state your name." The research methodology and the statistical analysis used by the Contractor were questioned by independent working and peer review groups comprised of social scientists and statisticians. The Contractor and the EAC agree that the report raises more questions than provides answers. Thus, EAC will not adopt the Contractor's study and will not issue an EAC report based upon this study. All of the material provided by the Contractor is attached.

Further EAC Study on Voter Identification Requirements

EAC will engage in a longer-term, more systematic review of voter identification requirements. Additional study on the topic will include more than one Federal election cycle, additional environmental and political factors that effect voter participation, and the numerous changes in state laws and regulations related to voter identification requirements that have occurred since 2004.

EAC will undertake the following activities:

- Conduct an ongoing state-by-state review, reporting and tracking of voter identification requirements. This will include tracking states' requirements which require a voter to state this or her name, to sign his or her name, to match his or her signature to a signature on file, to provide photo or non-photo identification or to swear an affidavit affirming his or her identify.

- Establish a baseline of information that will include factors that may affect or influence Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) voter participation, including various voter identification requirements, the competitiveness of a race and certain environmental or political factors. EAC will use some of the information collected by Eagleton as well as additional data from the states to develop this baseline.

• In 2007, convene a working group of advocates, academics, research methodologists and election officials to discuss EAC's next study of voter identification. Topics to be discussed include methodology, specific issues to be covered in the study and timelines for completing an EAC study on voter identification.

• Study how voter identification provisions that have been in place for two or more Federal elections have impacted voter turnout, voter registration figures, and fraud. Included in this study will be an examination of the relationship between voter turnout and other factors such as race and gender. Study the effects of voter identification provisions, or the lack thereof, on early, absentee and vote-by-mail voting.

• Publish a series of best practice case studies which detail a particular state's or jurisdiction's experiences with educating poll workers and voters about various voter identification requirements. Included in the case studies will be detail on the policies and practices used to educate and inform poll workers and voters.
No problem. Just let me know if I can be of further assistance or if you'd like to discuss this with the EAC chair.

Jeannie Layson  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 202-566-3100  
www.eac.gov

thanks a lot for your help and especially for your follow up call last night. it was above and beyond the call of duty.

Marie Cocco
recommendations for further study at a public meeting in Dec. 2006.
(Consultants provided 16 suggestions for further study. See pages 16-22.)

As a small agency of 23 employees, including the four commissioners, it is
necessary for the agency to contract with consultants to gather the
initial data for these projects. After EAC receives the initial data, the
agency reviews the data for accuracy and then releases a final report.

Please let me know if you would like to speak with EAC Chair Davidson if
you need something for attribution. She'd also be glad to discuss our
approach to both of these research projects. Again, my direct number is
you can reach me on my cell after 5:30 a

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov

<<< VF-VIStudyStatus5-17-06.pdf >>

Get a FREE Web site, company branded e-mail and more from Microsoft Office
Live! http://clk.atdmt.com/MRT/go/mcrssaub0050001411mrt/direct/01/
Attached, please find my edits. My intention was to try to explain in English how the Contractor conducted the study in the 2nd graph of the background statement. I realize I left some information out; for example, how he ran the numbers based on maximum and minimum id requirements. I am open to any suggestions on how to better describe what they did; however, despite reading the report and Appendix C many times, I am still do not understand exactly how the study was conducted. I think we should run the 2nd graph by the Contractor to ensure its accuracy.

Commissioners-

Commissioner Hunter noted that several changes to the draft that she had recommended were not included in the latest draft that I sent to Julie and Jeannie. had.

Attached please find this new version which I hope accurately reflects her suggestions; we are asking that everyone take a look at this version.

Please get me your comments and recommended edits by Monday.

Thanks-
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
EAC Statement on Future Study of Voter Identification Requirements

Background

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) authorizes the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to conduct periodic studies of election administration issues. In May 2005, EAC contracted with Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey through its Eagleton Institute of Politics ("Contractor") to perform a review and legal analysis of state legislation, administrative procedures and court cases, and to perform a literature review on other research and data available on the topic of voter identification requirements. Further, the Contractor was asked to analyze the problems and challenges of voter identification, to hypothesize alternative approaches and to recommend various policies that could be applied to these approaches.

The Contractor performed a statistical analysis of the relationship of various requirements for voter identification to voter turnout in the 2004 election. The contractor compared states with similar voter identification requirements and drew conclusions based on comparing turnout rates among states for one election--November 2004. For example, the turnout rate in 2004 in states with a photo identification requirement was compared to the turnout rate in 2004 in states without a requirement that voters sign their name in order to receive a ballot. Contractor used two sets of data to estimate turnout rates: 1) voting age population estimates and 2) individual-level survey data from the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. The contractor and the EAC agree that the report raises more questions than provides answers.

The Contractor presented testimony summarizing its findings from this statistical and data analysis at the February 8, 2007 public meeting of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission. The Contractor's testimony, its summary of voter identification requirements by State, its summary of court decisions and literature on voter identification and related issues, an annotated bibliography on voter identification issues and its summary of state statutes and regulations affecting voter identification are attached to this report and can also be found on EAC's website, www.eac.gov.

EAC Recommendations for further study and next steps

EAC finds the Contractor’s summary of States’ voter identification requirements and its summary of state laws, statutes, regulations and litigation surrounding the

1 The July 2004 estimates for voting age population were provided by the U.S. Census Bureau. Because these numbers include non-citizens, the Contractor reduced the numbers by the same percentage the U.S. Census Bureau estimated non-citizens in 2000. Estimates of voting age population include persons who are not registered to vote.

2 The Current Population Survey is based on reports from self-described registered voters who also describe themselves as U.S. citizens.

implementation of voter identification requirements, to be a first step in the Commission’s consideration of voter identification requirements.

However, EAC has concerns regarding the research and statistical methodology the Contractor chose to employ in order to analyze voter identification requirements and the potential variation in turnout rates based on the type of voter identification requirements. EAC is not adopting the report submitted by the Contractor and, therefore, is not releasing the report.

EAC will engage in a longer-term, more systematic review of voter identification requirements. Additional study on the topic will include more than one Federal election cycle, additional environmental and political factors that effect voter participation, and the numerous changes in state laws and regulations related to voter identification requirements that have occurred since 2004.

EAC will undertake the following activities:

- Conduct an ongoing state-by-state review, reporting and tracking of voter identification requirements. This will include tracking states’ requirements which require a voter to state this or her name, to sign his or her name, to match his or her signature to a signature on file, to provide photo or non-photo identification or to swear an affidavit affirming his or her identity.

- Establish a baseline of information that will include factors that may affect or influence Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) voter participation, including various voter identification requirements, the competitiveness of a race and certain environmental or political factors. EAC will use some of the information collected by Eagleton as well as additional data from the states to develop this baseline.

- Convene, by mid-2007, a working group of advocates, academics, research methodologists and election officials to discuss EAC’s next study of voter identification. Topics to be discussed include methodology, specific issues to be covered in the study and timelines for completing an EAC study on voter identification.

- Study how voter identification provisions that have been in place for two or more Federal elections have impacted voter turnout, voter registration figures, and fraud. Study the effects, including voter turnout, voter registration, and fraud, of voter identification provisions, or the lack thereof, on early, absentee and vote-by-mail voting. Included in this study will be an examination of the relationship between voter turnout and other factors such as race and gender.

- Publish a series of best practice case studies which detail a particular state’s or jurisdiction’s experiences with educating poll workers and voters about various
voter identification requirements. Included in the case studies will be detail on the policies and practices used to educate and inform poll workers and voters.
Hello all,

A columnist from the WaPo has asked for info about both the voter ID and the fraud and intimidation reports. This was prompted by the accusation that the president was concerned that the fired prosecutors were not aggressively pursuing voter fraud cases. She had heard that we were refusing to release this information, so I am trying to demonstrate otherwise, as well as show that we have discussed these projects numerous times in public meetings. Please take a look at my draft email to her and let me know if you have any suggestions. She needs to hear back from me by 4 p.m. Thanks for your help with this.

Ms. Cocco,

Per your questions, go here to view the testimony regarding voter ID from our Feb. 2 public meeting. As I mentioned, at this meeting EAC Chair Donetta Davidson requested that staff review the initial research provided by Eagleton and produce a final report, which would include recommendations for further study on this subject. Currently, staff is working to finalize the voter ID report.

Regarding the voter fraud and intimidation research, at a May 2006 public meeting of our Standards Board and Board of Advisors, the EAC project manager for this research presented a staff update on the project. Go here to view the agenda, page 3. The document you referred to was the update the project manager gave at this public meeting, and it has been made available to anyone who asked for it. The final culmination of this project can be found here, and links to the attachments provided by the consultants are available by going to page 24 of this report. The commissioners adopted this report at a public meeting in Dec. 2006.

As a small agency of 23 employees, including the four commissioners, it is necessary for the agency to contract with consultants to gather the initial data for these projects. After EAC receives the initial data, the agency reviews the data for accuracy and then releases a final report.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Hello, Peg.

I thought you might be interested in the fraud report that Project Vote just released.

Widespread "voter fraud" is a myth promulgated to suppress voter participation, according to a new Project Vote report released today. "The Politics of Voter Fraud" finds that fraudulent voting, or the intentional corruption of the voting process by voters, is extremely rare. Yet, false or exaggerated claims of fraudulent voting are commonly made in close electoral contests, and later cited by proponents of laws that restrict voting. The report is authored by Lorraine Minnite, Ph.D., Barnard College, Columbia University.

Best regards,

Jo-Anne
THE POLITICS OF VOTER FRAUD

by Lorraine C. Minnite, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
Barnard College, Columbia University

PROJECT VOTE

Washington DC Office
739 8th Street SE, Suite 202
Washington, DC 20003

Arkansas Office
2101 South Main Street
Little Rock, AR 72206

1-800-546-8683

www.projectvote.org
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THE POLITICS OF VOTER FRAUD
KEY FINDINGS

• **Voter fraud is the “intentional corruption of the electoral process by the voter.”** This definition covers knowingly and willingly giving false information to establish voter eligibility, and knowingly and willingly voting illegally or participating in a conspiracy to encourage illegal voting by others. All other forms of corruption of the electoral process and corruption committed by elected or election officials, candidates, party organizations, advocacy groups or campaign workers fall under the wider definition of election fraud.

• **Voter fraud is extremely rare.** At the federal level, records show that only 24 people were convicted of or pleaded guilty to illegal voting between 2002 and 2005, an average of eight people a year. The available state-level evidence of voter fraud, culled from interviews, reviews of newspaper coverage and court proceedings, while not definitive, is also negligible.

• **The lack of evidence of voter fraud is not because of a failure to codify it.** It is not as if the states have failed to detail the ways voters could corrupt elections. There are hundreds of examples drawn from state election codes and constitutions that illustrate the precision with which the states have criminalized voter and election fraud. If we use the same standards for judging voter fraud crime rates as we do for other crimes, we must conclude that the lack of evidence of arrests, indictments or convictions for any of the practices defined as voter fraud means very little fraud is being committed.

• **Most voter fraud allegations turn out to be something other than fraud.** A review of news stories over a recent two year period found that reports of voter fraud were most often limited to local races and individual acts and fell into three categories: unsubstantiated or false claims by the loser of a close race, mischief and administrative or voter error.

• **The more complex are the rules regulating voter registration and voting, the more likely voter mistakes, clerical errors, and the like will be wrongly identified as “fraud.”** Voters play a limited role in the electoral process. Where they interact with the process they confront an array of rules that can trip them up. In addition, one consequence of expanding voting opportunities, i.e. permissive absentee voting systems, is a corresponding increase in opportunities for casting unintentionally illegal ballots if administrative tracking and auditing systems are flawed.

• **There is a long history in America of elites using voter fraud allegations to restrict and shape the electorate.** In the late nineteenth century when newly freed black Americans were swept into electoral politics, and where blacks were the majority of the electorate, it was the Democrats who were threatened by a loss of power, and it was the Democratic party that erected new rules said to be necessary to respond to alleged fraud by black voters. Today, the success of voter registration drives among minorities and low income people in recent years threatens to expand the base of the Democratic party and tip the balance of power away from the Republicans. Consequently, the use of baseless voter fraud allegations for partisan advantage has become the exclusive domain of Republican party activists.
• The historically disenfranchised are often the target of voter fraud allegations. Fraud allegations today typically point the finger at those belonging to the same categories of voters accused of fraud in the past – the marginalized and formerly disenfranchised, urban dwellers, immigrants, blacks, and lower status voters. These populations are mostly found among those still struggling for full inclusion in American life.

• Better data collection and election administration will improve the public discussion of voter fraud and lead to more appropriate policies. We need better data, better election administration, transparency and more responsible journalism to improve public understanding of the legitimate ways in which electoral outcomes can be distorted and manipulated. This will help ensure that new laws and rules to prevent fraud are narrowly targeted to solve legitimate problems rather than used as a strategy to shape the electorate for partisan advantage.
INTRODUCTION

The claim that voter fraud threatens the integrity of American elections is itself a fraud. It is being used to persuade the public that deceitful and criminal voters are manipulating the electoral system. No available evidence suggests that voters are intentionally corrupting the electoral process, let alone in numbers that dilute and cancel out “the lawful votes of the vast majority of Americans.” The lack of evidence is not due to a failure to codify voter fraud as a crime, nor is it due to the inability or unwillingness of local law enforcement agencies to investigate or prosecute potential cases of voter fraud. In fact, when we probe most allegations of voter fraud we find errors, incompetence and partisanship. The exaggerated fear of voter fraud has a long history of scuttling efforts to make voting easier and more inclusive, especially for marginalized groups in American society. With renewed partisan vigor fantasies of fraud are being spun again to undo some of the progress America has made lowering barriers to the vote.

The purpose of this report is to disentangle the myth from the reality and to separate the politics of voter fraud from legitimate administrative concerns about the integrity of the electoral process. To make the argument, we present a usable definition of voter fraud, discuss the problem of evidence, and explain how and why the dynamics of electoral competition drive the use of baseless fraud claims in American politics. We present several contemporary examples to illustrate how poor election administration and voter mistakes are misleadingly labeled “fraud.” Recent allegations against voter registration campaigns highlight the need for an analysis sensitive to the partisanship and race and class issues just beneath the surface of most voter fraud claims. The last section of the report makes policy recommendations for improving public understanding and removing the canard of voter fraud from the election reform debate. The appendix discusses what to look for in evaluating voter fraud allegations.

U.S. Senate Republican Policy Committee, “Putting An End to Voter Fraud,” (February 15, 2005); available online at http://rpc.senate.gov/_files/Feb1504VoterFraud50.pdf.

THE POLITICS OF VOTER FRAUD
DEFINING VOTER FRAUD

Conceptual clarity is important in evaluating evidence of fraud. We begin with a discussion of what voter fraud is and what it is not. The first problem in defining voter fraud is that as a crime, it defies precise legal meaning. In fact, there is no single accepted legal definition of voter fraud. We have fifty different state electoral systems and fifty state criminal codes governing the administration of elections, plus a federal code that applies in national elections, and no uniform standards. In fact, some states do not actually criminalize 'voter fraud,' although they all criminalize acts that are commonly lumped together under the term, such as illegal voting, providing false information to register to vote, and multiple voting. The legal incoherence contributes to popular misunderstandings.

We need a basic definition of voter fraud that cuts through the confusion without violating the way voter fraud is diversely treated in state and federal law. We can start with the U.S. Department of Justice's definition of election fraud and apply it to election crimes committed by voters. The Justice Department defines election fraud as "conduct that corrupts the process by which ballots are obtained, marked, or tabulated; the process by which election results are canvassed and certified; or the process by which voters are registered." Voter fraud is a sub-intentional corruption category of election fraud, or the intentional corruption of the electoral process by voters.

This covers knowingly and willingly giving false information to establish voter eligibility, and knowingly and willingly voting illegally or participating in a conspiracy to encourage illegal voting by others. Apparent acts of fraud that result from voter mistakes or isolated individual wrongdoing or mischief making not aimed at corrupting the voting process should not be considered fraud, though sometimes these acts are prosecuted as such. All other forms of corruption of the electoral process and corruption committed by elected or election officials, candidates, party organizations, advocacy groups or campaign workers fall under the wider definition of election fraud.

Voter fraud is the intentional corruption of the electoral process by voters.

............................................................

2 There are many examples of states that criminalize what we think of as voter fraud without calling it voter fraud. Georgia, for example, has no election code offense for "voter fraud," but it does provide stiff penalties for "repeat voting" and "voting by unqualified elector." See, for example O.C.G.A. § 21-2-560 et seq. In New Hampshire, the crime of voting more than once is called "wrongful voting." See, N.H.R.S. § 63-659.34. In Alaska, voter impersonation, voting more than once, and registering to vote without being entitled to register are all simply called "voter misconduct." See, Ala. Statutes § 15.56.040 et seq.

3 Craig C. Donsanto and Nancy Stewart, Federal Prosecution of Election Offenses, 6th Edition, U.S. Department of Justice, Criminal Division, Public Integrity Section (January 1995), 21 (herein cited as "DOJ Manual").

4 Fraud is commonly defined as "deception deliberately practiced with a view to gaining an unlawful or unfair advantage" (emphasis added). See Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary, Version published 1913 by the C. & G. Merriam Co. (Springfield, Mass.), under the direction of Noah Porter, D.D., LL.D. Criminal intent is a feature of the election crime codes of most states and the federal system, although a showing of intent is not always required to obtain a conviction for some forms of voter fraud such as "alien voting" (voting by a non-citizen).

5 The proper venue for challenging mistakes that may have affected the outcome of an election is to follow state statutory procedures for an election challenge or contest. See, Barry H. Weinberg, The Resolution of Election Disputes: Legal Principles That Control Election Challenges (Washington, D.C.: IFES, 2006).

6 This definition of voter fraud is simpler and more coherent than others offered. See, for example, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study (December 2006), 13-16; available online
Allegations of "voter fraud" should be analyzed to determine 1) who is alleged to have committed the fraud, and 2) which stage of the electoral process is alleged to have been corrupted. This approach will go a long way toward clarifying whether electoral integrity is being breached and what needs to be done to secure the process (see the appendix for further discussion of how to identify fraud).

Moreover, although it is simple, it preserves the meaning of "fraud" in the electoral context as outlined by the Justice Department. The Department's manual for training U.S. Attorneys in investigating and prosecuting election crimes divides "election frauds" into two categories, one that involves the participation of voters and another that does not. Those election fraud crimes involving the participation of voters include vote buying schemes, absentee ballot frauds, voter intimidation schemes, migratory-voting (or floating-voter) schemes, and voter "assistance" frauds, in which the wishes of the voters are ignored or not sought. See, Donsanto and Stewart (1995), 22-24. Acts of voter intimidation which are included in the election fraud definitions offered in both the EAC Report and the DOJ Manual are excluded here. While the intimidation of voters certainly corrupts the electoral process, it is a crime that more directly involves the deprivation of rights guaranteed by law and for that reason should be treated separately from acts of deceit.
VOTER FRAUD AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIDENCE

How prevalent is voter fraud? A 2005 U.S. Senate Republican Policy Committee report claimed that "voter fraud continues to plague our nation's federal elections, diluting and canceling out the lawful votes of the vast majority of Americans" (emphasis added). This would be shocking if it were true. But the Committee made it without providing a single piece of evidence to support or clarify the claim. It cited no surveys, no statistics, no studies, no credible evidence whatsoever to back up its warning that election results are routinely distorted by fraud in the United States.

Evidence of voter fraud like all other crimes comes from law enforcement efforts to combat it
The Committee cited no data because there is very little to cite. Evidence of voter fraud like evidence of other forms of criminal behavior is primarily produced by law enforcement efforts to detect and prosecute it. And the available evidence here suggests that voters rarely commit voter fraud. As in the case of all other kinds of crime, it is simply unacceptable to allege law breaking without providing at least some supporting evidence.

What is that evidence? At the national level, a major new project at the U.S. Department of Justice, the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative (BAVII) has resulted in only a handful of convictions. According to the Attorney General, since the inception of the program in 2002, "we've made enforcement of election fraud and corruption offenses a top priority." The result? Government records show that only 24 people were convicted of or pleaded guilty to illegal voting between 2002 and 2005, an average of eight people a year. This includes 19 people who were ineligible to vote, five because they were still under state supervision for felony convictions, and 14 who were not U.S. citizens; and five people who voted twice in the same election, once in Kansas and again in Missouri.

7 U.S. Senate Republican Policy Committee (2005).
8 The idea that voter fraud is first and foremost a crime reaches substantially the federal concept of election fraud which "applies only to activity that is appropriately remedied through criminal prosecution, as distinguished from other less severe remedies such as election contest litigation or administrative relief." See, Craig C. Donsanto, "The Federal Crime of Election Fraud," prepared for the Russian election reform website, Democracy.Ru, n.d.; available online at www.democracy.ru/english/library/international/eng_1999-11.htm.
9 On the origins of BAVII, see Jeffrey Toobin, "Annals of Law: Poll Positions," The New Yorker (September 20, 2004). Very little information about the program's overall scope and performance has been released by the Justice Department's Public Integrity Section; annual press releases announce the numbers of investigations and convictions obtained, and the Public Integrity Section's annual reports to Congress briefly discuss some of the cases, but efforts to acquire more information about the program have been stymied by the Criminal Division's failure to respond to a Freedom of Information Act request filed in July 2005. Nevertheless, it is difficult to imagine that the Department would withhold information about closed cases of deceitful voters, and therefore likely that the limited information it has released so far is all there is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASTING A FALSE BALLOT</th>
<th>Dismissed</th>
<th>Acquitted</th>
<th>Plead Guilty</th>
<th>Convicted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>False claim of eligibility</td>
<td>Non-citizen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple voting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In addition, the BAVII uncovered several vote buying schemes that have resulted in the convictions or guilty pleas of about 30 people, though most of those convicted were party and election officials, candidates for public office and elected officials, and in one case, the commander of a local VFW post. The vote buying cases involved a handful of elections in the Appalachia regions of eastern Kentucky and West Virginia, East St. Louis, Illinois and Caldwell County, North Carolina.

The available state-level evidence of voter fraud, culled from interviews, reviews of newspaper coverage and court proceedings, while not definitive, is also negligible. There are no reliable, officially compiled, national or even statewide statistics on voter fraud. Even though many criminal acts associated with "voter fraud" are classified as felonies, voter fraud fails to appear in the F.B.I.'s uniform crime reports. There are no publicly available criminal justice databases that include voter fraud as a category of crime. No states collect and publish statistics on voter fraud.

The lack of evidence is not due to a failure to codify voter fraud as a crime

If fraud is such a persistent concern of those who run elections, government agencies responsible for election administration should collect statistics on it, as they do in other serious matters, certainly other crimes. It is not as if the states have failed to detail the ways voters could corrupt elections. There are hundreds of examples drawn from state election codes and constitutions that illustrate the precision with which the states have criminalized voter and election fraud.

If we use the same standards for judging voter fraud crime rates as we do for other crimes, which is to calculate the incidence of crime from law enforcement statistics on arrests, indictments and convictions, we must conclude that the lack of evidence of arrests, indictments or convictions for any of the practices defined as voter fraud means very little fraud is being committed relative to the millions of votes cast each year in state, local and federal elections.

---

12 Lori Minnite and David Callahan, Securing the Vote: An Analysis of Election Fraud (New York: Demos: A Network for Ideas and Action, 2003). The author is engaged in a more thorough analysis of state-level voter fraud data and investigations which will be published in her forthcoming book. To date, the findings only confirm Minnite and Callahan's earlier conclusions.

13 This is an urgent concern. Law professor Spencer Overton persuasively argues for a more empirical cost-benefit approach to evaluating the value and constitutionality of new restrictive photo identification voting requirements. As Overton notes, this approach is hampered by the lack of systematic data on fraud. See, Spencer Overton, "Voter Identification," Michigan Law Review 105(2007), 631-682.

14 The California Secretary of State's Office compiled information on electoral fraud cases referred to its office from 1994 to 2003. The data were analyzed in an unpublished conference paper (see, R. Michael Alvarez and Frederick J. Boehmke, "Contemporary Election Fraud: A Quantitative Analysis of Election Fraud Cases in California," paper prepared for Election Fraud Conference, Center for Public Policy and Administration, The University of Utah, and the Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project, Salt Lake City, Utah, September 29-30, 2006; available online at www.vote.caltech.edu/events/2006/FraudConf/AlvBmk-paper.pdf), but they are not publicly available.

THE POLITICS OF VOTER FRAUD
Examples Of How States Criminalize “Voter Fraud”

- In Texas, a person can be convicted of a third degree felony if he or she “votes or attempts to vote in an election in which the person knows the person is not eligible to vote; knowingly votes or attempts to vote more than once in an election; or knowingly impersonates another person and votes or attempts to vote as the impersonated person.”

- California’s election code has dozens of provisions that prohibit illegal activity associated with elections. It prohibits fraudulent registration, including registering under a false name, registering under a false address, and registering a non-existent person. It makes it a felony for a person to vote in an election that he or she is not entitled to vote in, to vote more than once, or impersonate another voter. Moreover, it is a felony in California to “give, offer, or promise any office, place, or employment, or promise to procure or endeavor to procure any office, place, or employment to or for any voter, or to or for any other person, in order to induce that voter at any election to vote or not vote for a particular candidate.”

- Pennsylvania law gives the power to monitor elections to county boards of elections, and imposes a substantial number of penalties on people engaging in election fraud. Giving or receiving money in exchange for voting a certain way in an election can bring up to seven years in prison and $15,000 in fines. Any person convicted of perjury “regarding any material matter or thing relating to any subject being investigated, heard, determined or acted upon by any county board of elections, or member thereof, or by any court or judge thereof, judge of election, inspector of election, or overseer” can receive up to five years in prison and a $10,000 fine. Any person voting when they are not registered to vote, or voting more than once can be punished the same.

- Nineteenth century language in the Alabama Constitution disqualifies from voting “all idiots and insane persons” and those convicted of crimes like murder, arson, and rape, but also wife battering, bigamy, sodomy, miscegenation and vagrancy. It also disqualifies from voting any person convicted of “selling or offering to sell his vote or the vote of another, or of buying or offering to buy the vote of another, or of making or offering to make a false return in any election by the people or in any primary election to procure the nomination or election of any person to any office, or of suborning any witness or registrar to secure the registration of any person as an elector.”

- In Minnesota, it is a felony to submit more than one absentee ballot, assist another in submitting more than one absentee ballot, or alter another’s absentee ballot in any way.

---

1 Tex. Gov’t Code Ann. § 64.012.
2 Cal. Gov’t Code § 18520.
4 Constitution of Alabama (1901), Section 182.
The lack of evidence of voter fraud is not due to law enforcement agencies ignoring their duties

Even if crime reports underestimate true crime rates because some crimes go unreported or undetected, or because criminal behavior is sometimes addressed by means other than prosecution, crime is still measured as a function of law enforcement efforts to address it. Under the rule of law, enforcement efforts establish the core evidence of crime. It is difficult to conceive of whole categories of criminal behavior that go almost completely undetected or ignored by law enforcement officials at all levels of government across the U.S. today. And yet, those who believe there is a lot of voter fraud despite the lack of evidence frequently fall back on this argument. When confronted they charge the paucity of evidence is due to the government’s failure to undertake the investigations and prosecutions that would produce it. A more plausible explanation is that voters are not committing fraud, leaving little to investigate or prosecute.

The lack of evidence of voter fraud is not due to the inability of law enforcement agencies to pursue voter fraud investigations

Some argue that local officials are ill-equipped to detect voter fraud and poorly motivated to pursue investigations and prosecutions of voter fraud given their lack of expertise and resources and the public’s demand for attention to more serious or violent crimes. If election crime, perhaps like international securities fraud or organized crime, were beyond the ken of local officials to investigate, then we might expect a dearth of prosecutions and little evidence of voter fraud. This is another explanation offered by those who argue that there is a lot of fraud despite the lack of evidence. Local officials, the argument goes, can’t or won’t prosecute fraud for a variety of reasons. The detection and prosecution of voter fraud, however, is not beyond the ken of local officials. In fact, as the Justice Department manual on how to investigate and prosecute election crime argues, “there are several reasons why election crime prosecutions may present an easier means of obtaining convictions than do other forms of public corruption.” They are, 1) “election crimes usually occur largely in public,” 2) “election crimes often involve many players,” and 3) “election crimes tend to leave a paper trail.” Without any evidence to support it, the notion that local law enforcement officials are unable or unwilling to investigate or prosecute voter fraud lacks merit. But, as the saying goes, if you repeat a rumor enough times people will start to believe it.
“FRAUD” THAT IS NOT FRAUD

A review of hundreds of news reports on voter fraud appearing over a recent two year period found that with few exceptions, fraud allegations and cases reported in the press were limited to local electoral contests and individual acts, and fell into three basic categories:

1) unsubstantiated or false allegations of voter fraud made by the losers of close elections.\(^\text{18}\)

2) mischief; and,

3) claims that later turn out to be based on cases of voter error or administrative mistakes, not fraud.

Here are some examples:

Examples of fraud alleged by election losers

- Pittsburgh City Council President Bob O’Connor lost a close primary race to incumbent Mayor Tom Murphy and charged voter fraud cost him the election. Pittsburgh election officials allowed the two campaigns to review balloting while monitoring each other. Mayor Murphy’s campaign found 81 ineligible voters in a sampling of 71 of the city’s 404 precincts. The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette reviewed Murphy’s data and found only three clearly improper ballots. The O’Connor campaign claimed it found 142 votes cast by people whose voter registration cards were missing but would not share its data with the Post-Gazette for independent verification.\(^\text{19}\)

- The Pasco County Canvassing Board of Port Richey, Florida, denied a request for a recount filed by Bob Leggiere who lost to the incumbent by nine votes. Leggiere claimed that voter fraud and II ballots that did not register a vote for mayor were the cause of his defeat. He charged that owners of a gambling boat operation voted illegally because their boat, which was their legal residence, was outside the city limits, suggesting that “because of their gambling boat interests, they have attempted to take control of the city elections.” The canvassing board informed Leggiere that he needed to file a protest with the board or a complaint in court, which he declined to do.\(^\text{20}\)

Examples of fraud as mischief

- A Ventura County, California woman was arrested and charged with voter fraud when her ex-husband noticed the names of two of their underage children on a list of registered voters in the March 2000 primary and turned her in. The woman was charged with fraudulently registering her 10- and 15-year old daughters, one of her daughter’s friends, her ex-husband who was already registered, and a number of fictitious people.\(^\text{21}\)


\(^\text{19}\) James O’Toole, “Voting Errors Suggest No Fraud,” Pittsburgh Post-Gazette (June 17, 2001), B17.

\(^\text{20}\) Chase Squires and Matthew Waite, “Fraud Alleged in Port Richey Vote,” St. Petersburg Times (April 12, 2001), B4.

\(^\text{21}\) “Woman Faces Vote Fraud Charges,” The San Diego Union-Tribune (October 29, 2000), A3.
• Prosecutors in West Palm Beach, Florida agreed not to charge a woman who registered her poodle, "Cocoa Fernandez," as a Republican on the condition that the woman stay out of trouble for a year. She averted a third-degree felony charge carrying a maximum 5-year prison term and a $5,000 fine.22

• A story appeared in the Marquette University student paper that 174 of 1,000 students surveyed said they voted more than once in the November 2000 presidential election. Another 170 claimed to have voted for write-in candidates, but the official canvass of the voting precincts surrounding the Marquette campus recorded only 12 write-in votes for president. One student told ABC News, the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel and the Marquette student paper that he voted four times. He later recanted when a list of voters from his precinct did not include his name at all. The Milwaukee County District Attorney said he had no evidence of any student voting more than once. The student who told the media he voted four times was later charged with selling other students fake Ohio drivers licenses he printed using his dorm room computer.23

Examples of fraud as voter error

• The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel conducted a two-month review of 203,000 votes cast in Milwaukee and found that 361 felons still under state supervision cast votes in 2000. This was in violation of an "often misunderstood state law" that disqualifies felons on probation or parole from voting. Ninety percent of the 361 illegal votes were cast by African Americans living in central city neighborhoods, most with convictions for welfare fraud, forgery and other property offenses. The newspaper reasoned that the illegal votes probably went to Al Gore, since 92 percent of African Americans in the state voted for Gore. They estimated that if disqualified felons elsewhere in the state voted illegally at the same rate obtained in Milwaukee, as many as 1,100 illegal votes could have been cast statewide, a significant number given Gore's margin of victory was only 5,708 votes. None of the illegal voters contacted by the paper knew they were prohibited from voting, and a review of parole and probation procedures suggested they were never informed.24 Charges were filed against three people but later dropped when prosecutors couldn't prove those charged knew they were breaking the law.

• A voter inadvertently filled out five ballots in a local election in Montgomery County, Texas. "It (the five ballots, sic) was just handed to me and I just put them in the box," said the culprit, 52-year old Ruben Jones, "I wasn't paying attention." An election judge allowed one of Jones' votes to count resulting in a tie at 83 votes each between two candidates who were then forced into a run-off. Fraud was charged. The city attorney acknowledged the judge's mistake but could not overturn his decision to allow one of the votes to count. There was no provision in Texas election law for overruling an election judge on such matters.25

Examples of cases of administrative incompetence and mistakes leading to misplaced allegations of voter fraud in St. Louis and Milwaukee are discussed in detail below.

22 "In Brief/Florida: No Charges, But Pooch Can't Punch Ballot," Los Angeles Times (December 17, 2001), A23.
23 "Marquette Student Admits He Didn't Vote Four Times," Chicago Sun-Times (November 16, 2000), 3; "Voter Fraud Inquiries Lead to Charges Against 3 in Milwaukee," St. Louis Post-Dispatch (December 21, 2000), A8.
24 Dave Umhoefer and Jessica McBride, "361 Felons Voted Illegally in Milwaukee; Law Is Poorly Understood, Rarely Invoked Here," Milwaukee Journal Sentinel (January 21, 2001), 1A.
THE POLITICS OF VOTER FRAUD CLAIMS

There are many reasons why electoral reform is difficult to achieve, chief among them the benefits the status quo bestows on politicians in charge of making the rules. Voting rights advocates working to expand the electorate and make voting easier for more citizens must also overcome recurring arguments that reform will encourage more voter fraud. Indeed, the specter of voter fraud has been manipulated by elites to restrict and shape the electorate for nearly two centuries.

The Late Nineteenth Century and the “Good Government” Defense

The electoral reforms of the Progressive era dismantled Populist voting majorities and reflected the reformers’ class and anti-immigrant biases. Following the turmoil of the election of 1896 when new immigrants, struggling farmers, and wage workers flooded into the electorate, wealthy elites pressed for tighter regulation of the electoral process. They promoted personal voter registration systems that had the effect of de-mobilizing the poor and working classes. The reformers’ rhetoric fastened on fraud and the need to eliminate it in order to protect ‘the Democracy.’ The perception of fraud and widespread electoral corruption gave their efforts moral ballast which obscured the class conflict at the center of the struggle for the vote.

For Progressive era elites, voter registration was good government and universal voting was directly associated with corruption and voter fraud. Municipal reformers drawn from the ranks of the new middle and upper class professional strata assumed the lower classes possessed inferior moral capacities that produced unscrupulous behavior in politics. They wrestled control of government away from the older political machine organizations by imposing administrative reforms on the electoral process. These reforms deliberately privatized and personalized the social act of voting in order to undercut the machine’s capacity to mobilize majorities through ethno-religious and other group-based appeals.

The specter of voter fraud has been manipulated by elites to restrict and shape the electorate for nearly two centuries.

---

28 After the Civil War, the electorate was demobilized in different ways in the North and South. Black disenfranchisement was pursued through the use of violence and terror; and institutionalized through the re-writing of Southern state constitutions between 1890 and 1910. Mississippi pioneered the “Southern system” of burdensome residency requirements, periodic registration, poll taxes, literacy and “understanding” requirements, and exacting disqualification provisions, all designed to strip black men of the vote without reliance on overt racial classifications (Cunningham (1991), 377). There is a large scholarly literature on this subject. See, for example, classic works by V.O. Key, Southern Politics in State and Nation. (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1949); and J. Morgan Kousser, The Shaping of Southern Politics: Suffrage Restriction and the Establishment of the One-Party South, 1880-1910 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974). On efforts to reshape the electorate outside of the South during this period, see, Walter Dean Burnham, “The Appearance and Disappearance of the American Voter,” in Walter Dean Burnham, The Current Crisis in American Politics (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983); and Paul Kleppner, Who Voted? The Dynamics of Electoral Turnout, 1870-1980 (New York: Praeger, 1982). For a fascinating account of how nineteenth century voters behaved at the polls on Election Day, see Richard Franklin Bensel, The American Ballot Box in the Mid-Nineteenth Century (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
Much has been written about the colorful and varied forms of political corruption in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{29} The debate over the extent of fraud among scholars, however, has failed to settle the question of whether it accounted for the extraordinarily high levels of turnout that disappeared with the adoption of personal voter registration systems.\textsuperscript{30} Nor is it certain that the new voter registration laws were responsible for reducing the election fraud they were aimed at eliminating. But, election fraud documented by the reformers usually involved organized efforts by election officials and politicians, not by the voters who were the intended target of restrictive reforms like voter registration.\textsuperscript{31}

Nevertheless, voting rights have been won. Most of the conditions that once gave rise to what we would characterize as fraudulent practices today, such as ballots produced and distributed by the political parties, have changed. In the nineteenth century, election fraud was sometimes perpetrated by partisans acting together to steal elections. Local party organizations competed for voters and controlled votes through patronage, and the stakes were high. In those days, parties, patronage and fraud were intertwined. Today, local party organizations are weak to nonexistent, in part because their access to patronage has all but disappeared. They no longer control lucrative franchises, run police and fire departments, set utility rates or build large-scale public works. The demise of local parties and patronage over the last century has undermined the logic and eroded the means of committing voter fraud.

The demise of local parties and patronage over the last century has undermined the logic and eroded the means of committing voter fraud.

The Civil Rights Era and Beyond

With each significant effort to protect and extend the right to vote, opponents have argued that the expansion of the franchise, whether through federal protections for voting rights or through reduced structural barriers to the franchise, would lead to more voter fraud. The threat of fraud was taken up by congressional opponents of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; it was raised in the conflict over extending the Act during the first Reagan Administration; and again, in more recent debates over the National Voter Registration Act.\textsuperscript{32} It is the very success of these reforms that explains why fraud claims have re-emerged as a principle form of voter intimidation. The victories of the civil rights movement make it no longer easy or acceptable to suppress voting through the use of terrorism or violence, or with a poll tax or a literacy test. Today the intimidation is more subtle.

The dynamics of electoral competition in a two-party plurality system also contribute to the resurgence of the specter of voter fraud. When elections are close, the logic of competition drives opponents to fierce conflict. The winner in a two-party system needs only one vote more than his or her opponent; 51 percent of the votes wins it all, 49 percent wins nothing. Competing parties in

\textsuperscript{29} See, for example, Glenn C. Altschuler and Stuart M. Blumin, Rude Republic: Americans and Their Politics in the Nineteenth Century (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); and Tracy Campbell, Deliver the Vote: A History of Election Fraud, an American Political Tradition – 1724-2004 (New York: Carroll & Graf, 2005).
\textsuperscript{32} For an important account of the movement to reform voter registration laws leading to the passage of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, see Margaret M. Groarke, Expanding Access to the Vote: An Analysis of Voter Registration Reform in the United States, 1970-1993 (Ph.D. diss., Department of Political Science, City University of New York, 2000).
close elections fight hard to maximize their chances of winning that 51 percent because the closer the election, the fewer the number of voters that are needed to shift victory to one party or the other. Tight elections produce the biggest pay-off for the smallest shifts in vote share.

Theoretically, parties or campaigns can produce a shift by expanding votes for themselves or constraining votes for their opponents, or even pursuing both practices at the same time. But expanding the vote carries higher risks for incumbents. Elected officials try to preserve the majorities that elect them and are wary of the threat new voters pose. Both parties, therefore, are wary of expansion. Since the success of the Voting Rights Act prohibits them from carving out their majorities in ways that directly violate laws protecting voting rights, they shape and manage their electorates by more subtle means, through the rules that govern the electoral process. Both parties seek to control, enforce and bend electoral rules to their advantage. As the political scientist, E.E. Schattschneider once observed,

In politics as in everything else it makes a great difference whose game we play. The rules of the game determine the requirements for success.... and go to the heart of political strategy.34

For example, today, Republican party officials and incumbents support restrictive interpretations of the rules governing voter qualifications when they anticipate that tightening access to the vote will hurt their rivals. They insist that the votes of legitimate, qualified voters are threatened by the votes of ineligible voters, justifying their support for restrictive identification requirements.35 The Democrats resist these efforts when they think the new rules will threaten their own party base; but if the new rules aren't likely to threaten the base, the Democrats, whose elected officials share the same interest in a stable, predictable electorate as their Republican colleagues, compromise and endorse new restrictions. The Democrats' concession to the inclusion of an identification requirement for first time voters who register to vote by mail in the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA), in the face of widespread opposition on the part of voting rights advocates, is a case in point.36 New HAVA voter identification requirements apply to a diffuse category of new voters whose party loyalties were unknown and therefore in adding this rule at the national level, neither party could claim an uncontested advantage or disadvantage. In the partisan wrangling over the bill, the important questions about the extent of voter fraud and the effectiveness of new rules in combating it were lost.

Given the particular party and competitive dynamics of the current period, the use of baseless voter fraud allegations for partisan advantage has become the exclusive domain of Republican party activists.

33 Or a plurality when the occasional third party candidate is in the race.
35 U.S. Senate, Republican Policy Committee (2005).
In a competitive electoral environment it is easier and safer for the parties to try to stabilize the base and reduce the opposition’s support than it is for either to recruit new voters. Given the particular party and competitive dynamics of the current period, the use of baseless voter fraud allegations for partisan advantage has become the exclusive domain of Republican party activists.

Take the American Center for Voting Rights (ACVR). This organization established a presence on the Internet in March 2005, just six days before a Republican-controlled U.S. House Administration Committee hearing on problems in the 2004 Ohio election, and was the only “voting rights” group allowed to testify. Although ACVR claims it is nonpartisan, its founders, leadership, and staff have strong ties to the Republican party. Its report on “Voter Fraud, Intimidation and Suppression in the 2004 Presidential Election,” professes to be “the most comprehensive and authoritative review of the facts surrounding allegations of vote fraud, intimidation and suppression made during the 2004 presidential election.” It is little more than a compendium of poorly scrutinized newspaper articles sensationalizing election shenanigans allegedly instigated in all but two instances by Democrats. Despite the not so veiled partisanship and absence of credentials, ACVR has achieved remarkable influence advocating for strict, government-issued photo identification requirements and promoting the idea that American elections are riddled with voter fraud. Its leader, attorney and political operative, Mark F. (Thor) Hearne, II, is a serial expert witness before Congress and other government bodies on the need for photo ID. His testimony repeatedly relies for evidence on anecdotes and misleading news reports that grossly overstate the problem of voter fraud.

The systematic use of baseless voter fraud allegations is strategic and in this sense rational, if unethical. In the late nineteenth century when freedmen were swept into electoral politics and where blacks were the majority of the electorate, it was the Democrats who were threatened by a loss of power, and it was the Democratic party that erected new rules they claimed were necessary to respond to the alleged fraud of black voters.

Today, the success of voter registration drives among minorities and low income people in recent years threatens to expand the base of the Democratic party and tip the balance of power away from the Republicans. Therefore, it is not difficult to understand why party operatives might seek to strategically generate enough public support for new restrictions on the vote that will disproportionately hinder opposition voters. These efforts are misleadingly labeled “the electoral integrity” movement because after two hundred years struggling for the vote and winning it from below, ordinary voters are not so easily discredited in the name of democracy. Efforts to do so must appeal to misplaced moral sensibilities like the idea that “integrity” trumps rights. In the end, baseless voter fraud claims are essentially political acts because the contested history of party, race and class in American politics makes them so.

37 See bradblog.com (www.bradblog.com/ACVR.htm) for a collection of articles on the ACVR by Brad Friedman and his colleagues.
38 Dimitri Vassilaros, “'Study' is Political Fraud,” Pittsburgh Tribune-Review (August 8, 2005); available online at: www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/s_360812.htm.
THE USUAL SUSPECTS

The Historically Disenfranchised Are Often the Alleged Perpetrators of Voter Fraud

Fraud allegations typically point the finger at those belonging to the same categories of voters accused of fraud in the past — the marginalized and formerly disenfranchised, urban dwellers, immigrants, blacks, and lower status voters. The targeting is not overt, the language is rarely explicitly racial. Instead, fraud claims tap into older elite associations of political corruption with minorities, big city machine organizations, and the poor. Allegations of voter fraud resonate with the public because they revive a familiar culture of corruption and legends about election fraud that enliven American political history. Today, the alleged culprits are mostly found among those still struggling for full inclusion in American life. This makes them suspect. That they are more likely to identify with one party than the other makes them doubly vulnerable to fraud accusations and to the collateral damage of high stakes competitive partisan politics.

Why Voter Registration Drives Are Vulnerable to Fraud Claims

Since at least the 1960s, the voter registration drive has played a central role in black politics and broader efforts to engage the electoral participation of low-income groups. The intensity of voter registration activities has waxed and waned over the years, with a recent upsurge in third party voter registration drive activity since the disputed 2000 presidential election. By 2004, approximately 12 million registered voters (or 8.5 percent of all registered voters) had registered as a result of a voter registration drive.

How Americans Were Registered To Vote in 2004 (Numbers in Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Voters</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Went to a town hall or county/government registration office</td>
<td>9,677</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a department of motor vehicles agency</td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By mail</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled out form at a registration drive</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered at polling places</td>
<td>8,078</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled out a form at a school, hospital, or on campus</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a public assistance agency</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8,819</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>22,901</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL | 141,408 | 100%


41 In the 1980s, white Christian conservatives and other middle class groups adopted the registration drive with considerable success, but it remains an iconic expression of black political aspiration.


43 The table reports method of registration for all registered voters, excluding missing cases. The data are estimates with sampling and non-sampling error, and are weighted by age, sex, race, Hispanic ancestry, and state of residence to partially correct for bias due to under-coverage.
Those registering through drives were more likely to be people of color and of lower income than other registered voters.

**Method of Registration by Race and Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Filled Out Form at Registration Drive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whites only, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks only, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (all races)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian only, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Family Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $15,000</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 or more</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The number of low income drive registrants is three times the number of low income voters registering at public assistance agencies mandated by the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (NVRA) to provide registration opportunities. Just four percent of registered voters with total annual family income below $15,000 (approximately 470,000 people) were registered to vote through a public assistance agency. This compares to approximately 1.328,000 low income voters, or 11.6 percent of those with less than $15,000 in annual family income, who said they were registered through a registration drive. It is clear that despite the intent of NVRA to open registration opportunities to low income Americans, thousands of eligible citizens would be left out of the electoral process were it not for the third party groups who register and encourage them to vote.

Competitive or high interest elections like those of the last six years increase incentives to mobilize voters, including the recruitment of new voters—not only to the parties, but to all the other groups who believe they have a stake in the outcome. The use of thousands of volunteers and temporary workers in these drives contributes to the potential for mistakes and duplication in the registration process. This is one of the consequences of essentially “outsourcing” voter registration to the private sector rather than placing the burden of registration on the state as is done in many of the European democracies. If voter registration were mandatory like paying taxes, voter registration drives would not be necessary.

---

45 The table compares only those registered voters who could identify their method of registration. Data on income are limited to people living in families. Family income is the combined income of all family members over the previous year and includes money from jobs, net income from business, farm or rent, pensions, dividends, interest, Social Security payments and any other money income received by family members who are 15 years of age or older.


With the upsurge in voter registration activity has come more media attention to the handful of cases in which organizations have been accused of submitting fraudulent registration applications to local elections officials. No amount of fraud in the registration process is acceptable, but the accusations that voter fraud "is breaking out all over" as a result of "a coordinated effort by members of some organizations to rig the electoral system through voter registration fraud" that put "thousands of fictional voters" on the rolls are unsupported by any credible evidence anyone has been able to bring to bear. In fact, the suspicions about a vast "left-wing" or "Liberal Democrat-sponsored" conspiracy to commit voter registration fraud border on the paranoid.\footnote{Michelle Malkin, September 29, 2004 blog entry; available online at http://michellemalkin.com/archives/000596.htm.}

According to available government data, between October 2002 and September 2005, the federal government prosecuted just 33 people for various misdemeanor and felony crimes related to any form of election fraud that could have involved voter registration.\footnote{American Center for Voting Rights Legislative Fund, "Vote Fraud, Intimidation and Suppression in the 2004 Presidential Election," ACVR Legislative Fund Report (August 2, 2005), 35; available online at www.ac4vr.com/reports/072005/080205report.pdf.} All but two people indicted were prosecuted for falsifying information about their own eligibility to vote, including: 20 people in four states who were prosecuted for registering or voting but who were ineligible under state law because they lacked U.S. citizenship; and ten people who voted in the 2004 presidential election in Milwaukee who were prosecuted for falsely certifying that they were eligible to vote when they were still under state supervision for felony convictions.\footnote{See, for example, the postings of "Dean," on democratvotefraud.blogspot.com (accessed in October 2006). This blog collects dozens of news articles from the 2004 election, most of which report allegations of campaign dirty tricks and voter registration fraud, and discuss protests against new "anti-fraud" measures adopted in some states like Ohio, all perpetrated by Democrats or their supporters. Under the title, "Liberal Democrat Vote Fraud," Dean explains, "We all saw the results of the 2000 American election. This time, I'm personally going to fight back in the only way that I can, with a blog that documents as many news reports about Democrat fraud as I can."}

Ten of the 33 -- five of the non-citizen cases and five of the felon cases -- were either acquitted of the charges against them or had their indictments dismissed.\footnote{U.S. Department of Justice, Criminal Division, Public Integrity Section, "Election Fraud Prosecutions and Convictions; Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative, October 2002 – September 2005" (n.d.); available online at http://cha.house.gov/media/pdfs/DOJdoc.pdf. Several of these people technically were not charged with voter registration fraud, but with making false statements to government agencies (i.e., a driver's license bureau or the INS) regarding their citizenship status or eligibility to vote. This number includes cases of illegal voting due to ineligibility, assuming they must have involved registration fraud, even if it wasn't charged.} At least 19 of the 23 people convicted were alleged to have voted illegally because they were ineligible to vote, but notably, these people registered to vote and voted using their real names, hardly acts of conspiracy or of criminals trying to get away with committing fraud. Only two people were prosecuted for crimes related to fabricated voter registration applications for other people. One pleaded guilty to making false statements to a grand jury in connection with 11 fraudulent registration forms. The other, a St. Martinville, Louisiana city councilwoman running in a hotly contested race for re-election in 2002, pleaded guilty to conspiring to submit false address

\textbf{Between October 2002 and September 2005, the federal government prosecuted just 33 people for various misdemeanor and felony crimes related to any form of election fraud that could have involved voter registration.}
information on two voter registration cards for people who did not live in her district. Those people voted to help the councilwoman win re-election by a slim margin.53

**Federal Prosecutions of Voter Registration Fraud 2002 – 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTER REGISTRATION</th>
<th>DISPOSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>False claim of eligibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-citizen</td>
<td>4 1 3 13 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felon</td>
<td>4 1 3 2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False statements to grand jury about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) votes registration forgery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspiracy to submit false information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on (2) voter registration applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>8 2 8 15 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All but two of those charged with making false claims about their eligibility to register (two non-citizens who were convicted) were also charged with casting a false or fraudulent ballot, as reported above.


Registration drives in recent years have been more effective in registering low income voters than the agency-based requirements of the NVRA. Successful voter drives hold the potential for adding significant new numbers of voters to the rolls and threatening the balance of power between the two parties. Their effectiveness has made them a target for fraud allegations. Their own sporadic failings in the production of duplicate or improperly filled out registration cards, sloppy oversight, poor quality control, and occasional fraud have only fueled the allegations. Such problems are inevitable as long as voter registration is not mandated or universal.

---

CASE STUDIES

The following case studies are illustrative of the politics of voter fraud claims. They do not tell us anything about the incidence of voter fraud in American elections today. That question is central and addressed above. It has always been difficult to measure fraud or even specify it, and it is important to stress that until better evidence comes to light, we will not be able to compile comprehensive statistics on levels of cheating by voters. Researchers are hampered in studying voter fraud because government agencies fail to track it and are often unresponsive to information requests. We can, however, make educated guesses from the available evidence, and what studies there are suggest voters rarely commit fraud. It is only in the public interest that we learn from real cases of voter fraud so that we can better understand where our electoral systems are truly vulnerable. Spurious cases of fraud like those discussed here are equally instructive because they expose the shrewd and partisan manipulation that makes real election reform so difficult.

The case studies presented below demonstrate the ways these partisan interests, database and clerical errors and incompetent electoral administration are sometimes exploited to exaggerate the problem of voter fraud. The intent of the exaggeration is to intimidate the general public and even law makers into believing that American elections face a security threat from a rising tide of deceitful and criminal voters. Unfortunately, in numerous places election administration is in crisis, and in general, faces much larger challenges from changing technology, inadequate resources, poor staffing and training, and especially, partisan manipulation. These are real issues deserving of attention, good ideas, resources and a democratic spirit. They won't be adequately addressed as long as the voter fraud hoax confuses and distracts us from confronting them.

ACORN and the Mac Stuart Affair

One important example of how the politics of fraud claims are used to manipulate the public about the threat of voter fraud is the political pillorying of ACORN for alleged wide scale registration fraud in the 2004 and 2006 election cycles.

ACORN (Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now) is the largest community-based organization of low and moderate income people in the U.S. It organizes locally and has developed ballot campaigns for a range of issues such as campaign finance reform and raising the minimum wage. Opponents of ACORN's minimum wage ballot initiative program deployed allegations of voter registration fraud, which then generated official investigations, media coverage and litigation, as a strategy to undermine ACORN's ability to qualify and pass referenda in several states.\(^\text{54}\) One of these cases involved a disgruntled former employee named Mac Stuart who for a while became a cause célèbre of ACORN's enemies and the pundits who fuel the fraud paranoia. The Mac Stuart affair is instructive because it highlights how politics construct the fraud debate.

In November 2003, Mac Stuart was hired by Florida ACORN and put to work as a petition gatherer collecting signatures supporting the placement of a Florida Minimum Wage Amendment on the

\(^{54}\) "ACORN Defeats Anti-Voter Legal Attacks; Group's Voter Registration Efforts Vindicated as Baseless Lawsuits Collapse," Common Dreams Progressive Newswire (December 14, 2005); Joni James, "Voter Fraud Charges Collapse," St. Petersburg Times (December 15, 2005).
2004 ballot. When Stuart was fired for suspicion of his involvement in an illegal check cashing scheme a few months later, he filed a Florida whistle blower lawsuit against ACORN claiming the organization engaged in a variety of illegal practices. He was represented by partisan attorneys at Rothstein, Rosenfeldt, Adler, a Fort Lauderdale law firm, and spoke secretly with an official at the Florida Chamber of Commerce which was in the midst of opposing ACORN’s efforts to raise the state’s minimum wage. Stuart provided his attorneys with 179 applications, many of them for Republican registrants, he claimed had been collected and withheld by ACORN.\textsuperscript{55}

In the course of petitioning for signatures, ACORN workers conducted voter registration activities to ascertain whether signatories were registered to vote. Stuart’s lawsuit claimed that petitioners were paid an additional $2.00 for each completed registration card they collected; that ACORN illegally copied the voter registration cards its workers collected and sold its lists for a profit; that ACORN committed fraud by failing to deliver registration cards for people who designated “Republican” as their party affiliation, and otherwise collected cards from ineligible individuals such as convicted felons. Stuart maintained that in July 2004, he refused to participate in these illegal activities and was fired in retaliation under the pretext that he had attempted to cash another person’s check.\textsuperscript{56}

His lawyers filed a second suit against ACORN on behalf of 11 people whose names were among the allegedly withheld voter registration applications Stuart had provided.\textsuperscript{57} Rothstein, Rosenfeldt, Adler attorneys claimed ACORN had deprived their clients of their constitutional right to vote and committed fraud against them.

After Stuart was fired, he held a news conference and contacted television and print news reporters claiming that “there was a lot of fraud committed” by ACORN, asserting the organization knowingly submitted thousands of invalid registration cards while storing away cards for people designating their party affiliation as Republican. Stuart’s allegations were immediately picked up by news organizations such as the \textit{Washington Times}, the \textit{Florida Times-Union}, and other Florida newspapers, and began to spread on rightwing Internet blogs. The Florida Department of Law Enforcement took the unusual step of announcing an investigation into ACORN.\textsuperscript{58} In fact, for a while, Stuart’s assertions were taken as fact and repeatedly reported as evidence that ACORN routinely engaged in fraud to promote its “radical political agenda.”\textsuperscript{59} That is, until the real facts about Stuart came to light and his case collapsed in court.

**Fraud charges collapse but the damage continues**

ACORN denied, and Stuart failed to prove, that canvassers were paid by the card to collect voter registration applications. ACORN’s copying of voter registration applications was an element of their quality control program and well within the bounds of Florida law.\textsuperscript{60} Finally, ACORN denied, and Stuart failed to produce evidence, that the organization prejudiced Republican voter registration applicants or misleadingly solicited registration cards from ineligible applicants. ACORN countersued Stuart for defamation and libel. On December 6, 2005, the matter of

\textsuperscript{55} Brittany Wallman and Alva James-Johnson, “Filled-In Voter Forms Surface,” South Florida Sun-Sentinel (October 27, 2004); Jeremy Milarsky, “Ex-Worker Sues Activist Group,” South Florida Sun-Sentinel (October 21, 2004).

\textsuperscript{56} Mac Stuart v. ACORN, U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida, Miami Division, Case No. 04-2276-civ (2004).


\textsuperscript{58} News Release, “FDLE Investigates Statewide Voter Fraud,” Florida Department of Law Enforcement (October 21, 2004).


\textsuperscript{60} Nothing in Florida’s election code prohibits private, third-party voter registration organizations from photocopying the voter registration applications they collect before submitting them to local elections officials.
Mac Stuart v. ACORN was dismissed with prejudice by a federal judge, exonerating ACORN of any and all wrongdoing. ACORN prevailed in their counterclaims and won a judgment of defamation against Stuart.

ACORN also prevailed in the second Rothstein, Rosenfeldt, Adler suit. Shortly after it was filed, nine of the 11 plaintiffs asked to be dismissed from the case. As ACORN's lawyers deposed the remaining two plaintiffs it became clear that their lawyers had not asked them if they were qualified to vote, if they had completed the applications Stuart had given the attorneys or whether the plaintiffs were in fact Republicans. One of the two was not qualified to vote, neither remembered completing the application used as the basis for the complaint and both said that, inconsistent with their applications, they were not Republicans and never would have checked off that they were. Stuart was inconsistent in his testimony in how he obtained the applications in the first place. This case, too, was dismissed with prejudice.

The Florida Department of Law Enforcement investigation found no evidence of illegal or fraudulent activity by ACORN. A public records request by Project Vote asking all Florida counties for any documents related to voter fraud elicited just three alleged cases of illegal activity, only one of which involved temporary ACORN workers.

The problem is that the end of this story has received considerably less media attention than the unfounded claims of organized voter fraud on the part of ACORN. Opponents of ACORN continue to spread false rumors that the organization engages in voter fraud. For example, the Employment Policies Institute (EPI) issues dozens of press releases and “reports” attacking ACORN every year. EPI is a non-profit organization that in 2004 paid over $600,000 in “management” fees to its executive director’s publicity firm which lobbies on behalf of the hotel, restaurant, alcoholic beverages and tobacco industries. Those industries are opposed to ACORN’s efforts to raise the minimum wage in Florida and elsewhere. As late as July 2006, months after ACORN was fully vindicated in court, EPI was still claiming they engaged in a “pattern and practice” of voter fraud, citing the Mac Stuart affair as more evidence of ACORN’s “widespread practice of fraud.”

Voter fraud allegations used to restrict voter registration programs

With ACORN under a cloud, Florida passed a law that carried stiff penalties for organizations failing to turn in voter registration applications later than ten days after they were collected. The law’s reporting requirements were so draconian the League of Women Voters ended 77 years of voter registration activity in the state because it feared it could not comply and would be bankrupted if there were problems with just 16 registration forms collected by its volunteers. A federal judge later blocked the implementation of the law as unconstitutional.

---

62 Telephone interview with Brian Mellor, Senior Counsel, Project Vote (April 13, 2006).
63 Mellor interview (2006).
65 A “pattern and practice” of wrongdoing evokes conspiracy and as a legal term refers to the crime of racketeering. See, Employment Policies Institute, Rotten ACORN: America’s Bad Seed (July 2006), 18-19; available online at www.rottenacorn.com/downloads/060728_badSeed.pdf. In fact, ACORN, along with America Coming Together, the NAACP Voter Fund, and the Ohio AFL-CIO were defendants in an Ohio lawsuit that alleged the groups conspired to engage in a series of “predicate” or related acts of forgery, document tampering and drug trafficking in order to produce fraudulent voter registration cards. See, Rubick v. America Coming Together, et al., State of Ohio, County of Wood, Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 04-CV650 (2004). Plaintiffs complaint argued each fraudulent card submitted represented a predicate act. Under the federal Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act or RICO, a person or group can be charged with racketeering by a U.S. Attorney if they commit any two of 35 crimes (27 federal crimes and eight state crimes) within a 10-year period and the prosecutor believes those charged committed the crimes with similar purpose or results.
The Perils of List Matching

A common source of fraud claims is a list matching exercise gone wrong. The ready availability of high powered computing capacity and an ever expanding range of public records databases, have created a cottage industry of software programs and list management consultants ready to match lists for hire.

When databases contain errors or compile data differently, matching them against one another can cause a high degree of what statisticians call “false positive” errors or matches that are not really matches. A prime example is the infamous felon purge list compiled by a private firm for the Florida Secretary of State’s office in 2000. That list joined data on convicted felons with the voter registration rolls using rules that matched only the first four letters of the first name, 90 percent of the last name and an approximate date of birth. The result was a highly inaccurate list of people whom the Secretary of State wanted to prevent from voting.

Voting in Connecticut and beyond

In October 2002, the Republican National Committee (RNC) claimed that in the course of “updating” its voter files, it discovered over 722,000 people nationwide were registered to vote in more than one state, and that at least 600 of these had voted more than once in a single election. In Connecticut, the Secretary of State was alarmed. The RNC released a report that said 7,700 registered voters in Connecticut were also on the rolls in other states and that 54 of them had voted more than once in the 2000 election. Secretary Susan Bysiewicz, a Democrat, asked the RNC for the names of the duplicate registrants and voters. “I am surprised by the numbers,” she said, “it sounds like a lot. We have two million (registered) voters, so I suppose it’s possible; but in four years we haven’t prosecuted one instance of voter fraud.”

At first the RNC refused to release the names and criticized Bysiewicz for not finding the problem first. When they finally turned over the names of the 54 alleged double voters, Bysiewicz found their claims baseless. Her office conducted a week long investigation of every suspect voter produced by the RNC and found that 29 had never voted in Connecticut, but did vote in another state; 18 voted in Connecticut, but not in the other state named in the report; four names had different birth dates than those on the RNC list, and three were turned over to criminal investigators because out-of-state data could not be obtained for verification.


68 The U.S. Civil Rights Commission conducted an investigation into the 2000 election in Florida and concluded, “Many people appear on the [felon purge] list incorrectly.” One in seven people on the felon purge list supplied to the supervisor of the Miami-Dade election office was erroneously listed and therefore put at risk of disenfranchisement. These people were disproportionately African American. See, U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Voting Irregularities in Florida During the 2000 Presidential Election (2001), chapter I. See also a disclaimer for the inaccuracy of the felon purge list posted on ChoicePoint’s website (“Choicepoint’s Mythical Role in Elections Past and Present,” posted August 7, 2006; available online at www.choicepoint.com/news/statement_08072006.htm). ChoicePoint is the parent company of Database Technologies (DBT), the firm hired for the period 1998 to 2000 by the Florida Division of Elections to create its voter exception list. ChoicePoint claims, “DBT Online was not required to provide a list of exact name matches. Rather, the matching logic only required a 90 percent name match, which produced “false positives” or partial matches of the data. Moreover, the Division of Elections required that DBT Online perform ‘nickname matches’ for first names and to ‘make it go both ways.’ Thus, the name Deborah Ann would also match the name Ann Deborah. At a meeting in early 1999, the supervisors of elections expressed a preference for exact matches on the list as opposed to a ‘fairly broad and encompassing’ collection of names. DBT Online advised the Division of Elections that it could produce a list with exact matches. Despite this, the Division of Elections nevertheless opted to cast a wide net for the exclusion lists.”

69 “Thousands Registered to Vote in Two or More States,” The Associated Press State and Local Wire (October 9, 2002).

Double dipping in New Jersey

A few years later, in time for the next federal election cycle, the New Jersey state Republican party (RSC) claimed it had researched voter registration files in a number of states and found evidence of multiple voting. In September 2005, the state party sent a stern letter to New Jersey Attorney General Peter Harvey threatening a lawsuit for failing to enforce state election laws governing the voter registration rolls.\(^1\)

The basis for the RSC claims was their own "exhaustive investigation" of voter files from New Jersey's 21 counties, matched internally county to county on first name, last name and date of birth, as well as against the voter registration files of five other states, New York, Pennsylvania, Florida, North Carolina and South Carolina. In addition, the RSC matched the New Jersey county files against lists of deceased persons from state and federal databases and other commercially available lists. Based on their analysis, the RSC said it found evidence of widespread multiple voting in the November 2004 general election – 4,397 people alleged to have voted more than once in New Jersey, and 6,572 people who "appear to have" voted in New Jersey and another state. Moreover, the RSC claimed that 4,755 dead people had voted and warned the problem could be even worse since the state's rolls contained tens of thousands of duplicate records and the names of some well known felons in the state.

There is little doubt that New Jersey's county voter registration lists contained registration records for people who moved away or died. The existence of so-called "deadwood" on voter registration records across the country is well-known. But the presence of deadwood is not in and of itself evidence of voter fraud.

A subsequent more thorough analysis of the data files the RSC supplied to the state suggests major problems with the accuracy of the RSC analysis and therefore the veracity of their claims. The Brennan Center for Justice working with Dr. Michael McDonald, an elections expert at George Mason University, concluded that "these lists simply do not prove what they purport to prove."\(^2\) Their report uncovered methodological errors in the RSC's list matching techniques, such as omitting middle initials and suffixes like "Jr.," which resulted in the listing of duplicate records for the same person then counted by the RSC as voting twice (from the same address). Mismatches of different people were presumed to be the same person, and again counted as voting twice. Statistical and database experts know that relying solely on non-unique identifiers such as name and date of birth to match records produces a high rate of false positives.\(^3\) The Brennan Center/McDonald detailed analysis of the alleged 4,397 double votes recorded in the New Jersey county voter files accounted for them all as the likely product of false positives, errors in the data, duplicate records for the same person, and the statistical likelihood that two people will share the same name and birth date.

Voting from the grave in Detroit

Yet one more example of the damage flawed list matching efforts can inflict comes from an oft-cited news item appearing in the Detroit News in February 2006. The article, written by Lisa M. Collins, was headlined, "In Mich. Even Dead Vote," and continued, "From Holland to Detroit,

---

\(^1\) Letter from Mark D. Sheridan to Hon. Peter C. Harvey, dated September 15, 2005. Copy in author's possession. Election administration is decentralized to the county level in New Jersey, with the Attorney General serving as the state's chief elections officer.
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votes were cast by 132 dead people; Detroit’s voting records are riddled with inaccuracies, casting doubt on elections’ integrity.”74 The allegations of voting from the grave in Detroit, a poor and majority black city, are repeatedly cited by conservative bloggers in their litany of purported evidence that voter fraud is rampant in America.

But a full reading of the article itself indicates that the News did not attribute these irregularities to voter fraud. Instead, they suggested the irregularities were more likely due to clerical errors.75 Influential Republican political operative, Mark F. (Thor) Hearne, paid counsel to the Bush-Cheney 2004 re-election campaign and a member of the U.S. Elections Assistance Committee’s Voter Fraud – Voter Intimidation Working Group, as well as Missouri’s HAVA Advisory Commission, nevertheless repeated the misleading allegations of dead people voting in Detroit when he testified before a U.S. Senate panel in July 2006.76 Versions of his testimony have appeared as a feature article in the magazine of the Bar Association of Metropolitan St. Louis,77 and again as testimony given to the U.S. Elections Assistance Commission in December 2006.78

This time the list matching was not performed by an elected official and presidential campaign co-chair, as it was in Florida, or a political party, as it was in the Connecticut and New Jersey examples. It was done by a newspaper which presented no assurances that it had the kind of expertise in computer programming, statistics, or records management required to make an accurate evaluation.79

On March 5, 2006, the News printed a letter from Kelly Chesney, the Communications Director for the Michigan’s Republican Secretary of State, which challenged the implication that dead people were voting in Michigan. Chesney reported that an analysis of the 132 alleged deceased voters found that this was the number of absentee ballots mailed out to voters who subsequently died in the weeks before Election Day. Of the 132 absentee ballots, she said “97 were never returned, and 27 were voted and returned prior to the voters’ deaths.”80 This substantial correction to the implications of voter fraud in Michigan has been roundly ignored by activists who continue to cite what is now an out-dated news item reporting erroneous information.


75 “Clerical errors [in the Michigan voter file are] so pervasive that it is difficult to determine in many instances who actually voted;” and citing Mark Grebner, the list vendor and political consultant upon whose research the News relied, “…Grebner says he’s never found evidence of organized fraud in Detroit.” See, Collins (2006).


77 Mark F. (Thor) Hearne, II, “The Missouri Voter’s Protection Act: Real Election Reform for All Missouri Voters,” St Louis Lawyer, June, 2006; available online at www.bams.org/members/stlawyer/archive/06/june06.html#feature.


79 In fact, the News admitted in the article that they “did not review every vote cast, but instead targeted voter records based on several factors, such as the voter’s birth year or voting history. Though limited and somewhat random searches were done, each search found voting records in error or highlighted names of voters who in fact could not have voted.” This is hardly an adequate methodology.

80 Editorial and Opinions, Special Letter, “Claims That the ‘Dead’ Voted Were Wrong,” Detroit News (March 5, 2006).
St. Louis: More Bad Lists, Even Worse Election Administration

St. Louis, another majority black city with budget problems, presents a case study for how the mishandling of voter registration and elections procedures can be misperceived as fraud.

Whose mess on Election Day 2000?

There is little doubt that in the past St. Louis experienced election fraud and public corruption. St. Louis politics were long organized by political machines and fraud has a storied past which for some, at least, condemns the politics of the present. In 2000, the historical memory of fraudulent elections, bribery, conspiracies, ballot tampering, and voting from the grave colored the rush to judgment when administrative mismanagement and shockingly poor record-keeping combined to produce troubling election irregularities. Before the irregularities could be sorted out, they were seized upon by partisans. One of them, Missouri's senior Republican senator, Kit Bond, claimed the problems were evidence of a Democratic party-driven "major criminal enterprise designed to defraud voters," instead of what an extensive federal probe later determined to them to be — procedural incompetence and official failure to abide by the law.

For many voters attempting to cast ballots in the 2000 presidential election, Election Day in St. Louis was a chaotic mess. Many long-time voters were told that they were not registered to vote when they showed up at polling sites where they had cast ballots in the past. To re-establish their legitimacy, many of these rejected voters were told to go down to the St. Louis Election Board's headquarters at 300 North Tucker Boulevard and cast a ballot there since the phone lines to the Board were jammed and election judges staffing the polling sites were unable to establish whether such voters' names had been moved to an "inactive" list of registered voters.

The illegal "Inactive" list

It was this controversial inactive list and the failure of the St. Louis Elections Board to comply with the NVRA that later formed the basis for a federal lawsuit alleging the Board "denied or significantly impaired the voting rights" of thousands of city voters before the election.

Missouri law requires bi-partisan control of election administration. Local boards of election have equal representation of Democrats and Republicans as do positions staffed by the boards. The St. Louis Board has had problems maintaining accurate voter registration rolls, and leading up to the 2000 election, there were still no clear rules for specifying when a voter should be dropped from the rolls.

---

81 Secretary of State Matt Blunt, Mandate For Reform: Election Turmoil in St. Louis, November 7, 2000 (July 24, 2001); available online at (herein cited as 'Blunt Report'), 39-46.
82 For an excellent example of the rush to judgement, see chapter four, 'Politically Active after Death,' in John Fund's Stealing Elections: How Voter Fraud Threatens Our Democracy (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2004).
83 For a tale of Depression-era ballot tampering linked to public corruption and waterfront development schemes in St. Louis, see chapter 7 "The Real Foundations of the Gateway Arch," in Tracy Campbell, Deliver the Vote: A History of Election Fraud, An American Political Tradition, 1742-2004 (New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2005). See also, Bruce Rushton, "Dead Man Voting," Riverfront Times (April 24, 2002). For Sen. Bond's remarks, see Carolyn Tuft, "Bond Wants Federal Investigation of Problems at City Polls; He Accuses Democrats of 'Criminal Enterprise' in Keeping Polls Open Late; Democrats Criticize Election Board," St. Louis Post-Dispatch (November 10, 2000). According to the Riverfront Times, "In his letters to... two federal agencies, Bond wrote... of a 'deliberate scheme' planned in advance so unregistered voters could vote illegally: "There is reason to believe that collusion existed to commit voter fraud and voter fraud occurred on a wide scale throughout the city of St. Louis." See, Safir Ahmed, "Slimin' the City: When It Comes to Election Day Problems in St. Louis, the Politicians' Rhetoric Doesn't Match the Reality," Riverfront Times (November 15, 2000).
84 U.S. v. Board of Election Commissioners for the City of St. Louis, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Missouri, "Stipulation of Facts and Consent Order," Civil Action No. 4:02cv001235 CEJ (August 14, 2002), 5; (herein cited as 'St. Louis Election Board Consent Order').
Between 1994 and 2000, the Board conducted a series of mail canvasses of its voter registration rolls, none of which complied with the requirements of the NVRA. Based on these improper canvasses, the Board removed more than 50,000 names of voters who had been on the rolls in 1996, and "made no effort to notify inactive voters that their registration status had changed, that their names would not appear on the voter registration lists provided to election judges in each voting precinct, or that they would face additional administrative steps on election day before they would be permitted to vote." This number represented roughly 40 percent of the total number of votes cast in St. Louis in the 1996 election, and was about twice the national and state averages for the proportion of inactive voters on the rolls. Moreover, for all elections it conducted after 1994, the Board failed to provide precinct election judges a list of any of the voters it had designated as "inactive." This failure created mass confusion at polling sites when many legitimate voters showed up to vote and were told they were no longer registered.

In the days leading to the November 7, 2000, election, the unprecedented administrative reclassification of thousands of active voter registration records in the overwhelmingly Democratic city was seen by Democrats, including national party officials with the Gore-Lieberman campaign, as an illegitimate Republican party-sponsored effort to restrict Democratic voting. When he spoke at a Gore-Lieberman campaign event, Democratic Congressional hopeful William Lacy Clay, Jr., told supporters not to "let anyone turn you away from the polls," and warned, "If it requires leaving the polls open a little longer, we're going to get a court order to do it."91

The showdown
In fact, this is exactly what happened. Voters stood in line for hours. First, they had to check in with precinct workers, then, for those whose names were no longer on the precinct voter registration lists, they stood in another line to plead their case before their precinct’s election judge. When many of these officials were unable to confirm their registration status with headquarters because they couldn’t get through to elections officials at the Board, they sent voters down to the Board’s office to try to resolve the problems on their own. According to news reports, "It made for a wild hour at Board’s downtown office,

where hundreds of voters turned away from the polls because they were not registered or had problems voting filled the lobby throughout the day. By early evening, the lobby was shoulder to shoulder with people who wanted to vote."93

In the afternoon, the Democrats and the Gore-Lieberman campaign filed suit in a state circuit court requesting the polls remain open for an additional three hours to accommodate voters victimized by the inaccessible and inaccurate inactive list.

---

26, 2004), 10; (herein cited as 'Mo. State Auditor's Report').

87 Section 8(d)(2) of 42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6(d). See, St. Louis Election Board Consent Order, 3.

88 St. Louis Election Board Consent Order, 4.

89 In 1996, 122,003 votes were cast in the general election in the City of St. Louis. In 2002, according to records from the Federal Election Commission, both nationwide and for the state of Missouri, 12 percent of all voters on the rolls were classified as "inactive," compared to 22 percent in the City of St. Louis. See, Mo. State Auditor's Report, 15.

90 St. Louis Election Board Consent Order, 4.


92 The State Auditor found that the St. Louis Election Board frequently failed to secure the minimum number of precinct-level election judges as required by state law. Section 115.081, RSMo 2000, mandates four election judges, two from each major political party, for each polling place at each primary and general election, or about 1,600 election judges per major election. The Auditor found that the Board has not been able to attract more than 1,200 such judges in recent elections. See, Mo. State Auditor's Report, 24.

93 Scott (2000); see also, Ahmed (2000).
St. Louis Circuit Judge Evelyn Baker complied, but her order was overturned within 45 minutes of the regular poll closing time (7 PM) by a three-judge appeals panel. The St. Louis City Board of Elections successfully argued she lacked jurisdiction to change state law. Elections officials estimated that only about 100 extra people had been permitted to vote by Judge Baker’s order. Republican officials charged there may have been a “preconceived plan” to misuse the judicial process to keep the polls open longer than their statutorily mandated closing time, as well as an “organized campaign” (by the Democrats) to abuse the procedure by which voters obtain court orders to vote, resulting in voter fraud and the casting of hundreds of illegal votes.94

In a 51-page report, Republican Secretary of State Matt Blunt outlined the possible violations of law committed in the City of St. Louis by alleged illegal voters. He referred to an unspecified conspiracy “to create bedlam so that election fraud could be perpetrated,”95 and to corrupt election judges put in place to manipulate the results of the election. The report claimed that, 1) 342 persons obtained court orders to vote even though the information provided by them on affidavits suggested they were properly disqualified from voting; 2) 62 convicted federal felons and 52 Missouri felons voted in either the City of St. Louis or St. Louis County; 3) 14 votes were cast in the names of dead people; 4) that there was a high probability of multiple voting by dozens of people; 5) 79 votes were cast by people registering to vote from vacant lots; and 6) 45 election judges were not registered to vote and therefore disqualified to serve.

Many of Blunt’s allegations have been disproved or significantly weakened by the discovery of major records management problems at the Elections Board that resulted in grossly inaccurate voter rolls. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch conducted a canvass of over 2,000 alleged vacant lot addresses from which thousands of St. Louis voters were supposedly registered and found buildings on virtually all of them. The lots had been misclassified by the city assessor or misread by elections officials. They concluded that “most of the 79 people on the state’s suspect voter list from last fall probably shouldn’t be on it,” including the city’s budget director whose ten-year old condominium was mislabeled as a vacant lot.96

The claim that more than 100 felons may have illegally voted is also unreliable since the data upon which it was based was inconclusive, as the report itself admits.97 Later investigations by the State Auditor did find that three years after the 2000 election fiasco, St. Louis’s voter rolls still included the names of over 2,000 felons prohibited by state law from voting or registering to vote. But the Auditor found no conspiracy to commit voter fraud on the part of voters and questioned instead why the Elections Board had failed to remove the names from their lists when they had been provided with monthly and quarterly felony conviction reports from state and federal authorities.

Like the Blunt Commission, the State Auditor also found thousands of duplicate records of voters registered to vote in St. Louis and elsewhere in the state, but only 28 instances across three recent election cycles in which a voter may have voted more than once. Without further investigation it is impossible to know whether these 28 cases represent actual illegal behavior or are more likely the product of clerical errors in the Board’s voter registration files.

Throughout the months following the election, Republicans and Democrats alike called for a federal investigation, each side charging the other with fraud or with suppressing the vote. Both sides expected to be vindicated. The federal investigation provided a decisive end to the Blunt Commission’s allegation that corrupt election judges allowed hundreds of patently unqualified voters to vote.

94 Blunt Report, 21-35.
95 Blunt Report, 36.
96 Jo Mannies and Jennifer LaFleur, “City Mislabeled Dozens as Voting From Vacant Lots; Property Records Appear To Be In Error, Survey Finds; Just 14 Ballots Are Found Suspect,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch (November 5, 2001): Al.
97 Blunt Report, 24, note 63.
St. Louis Board of Elections forced into federal consent decree

After an F.B.I. investigation that involved subpoenaing all of the registration and voting records from the St. Louis Elections Board for the months before the election, the Justice Department made a surprise announcement. They told the Board they were planning to sue them for violating the NVRA and threatening the voting rights of thousands of eligible voters in St. Louis by erroneously purging their records from the active voter file. The Board was forced into a consent decree that stipulated how they would change their procedures for maintaining accurate registration records, complying with federal requirements for notifying voters of their status on the list, and with handling voters whose names are not on the active voter list on election day.

Four years after the St. Louis Elections Board signed the consent decree acknowledging these failures, Mark (Thor) Hearne, the St. Louis lawyer and influential Republican activist, submitted Senate testimony that included citations to materials he produced after 2002 that ignored the Board’s culpability and repeated misleading allegations of voter fraud in St. Louis.

---

*Hearne (June 2006), (July 10, 2006), and (December 2006).*

**THE POLITICS OF VOTER FRAUD**
**Milwaukee: The Coup de Grâce**

In 2000, Vice President Al Gore won Wisconsin by just under 6,000 votes out of more than 2.5 million cast. Heading into the last months of the 2004 presidential campaign candidates George W. Bush and John Kerry were neck-and-neck in the polls in Wisconsin and the race was once again projected to be razor close. As a battleground state Wisconsin attracted attention from the national campaigns and a host of non-profit and political consulting organizations that poured money, staff and volunteers into the state to increase voter registration before Election Day.

By September, the voter registration drives and heightened national interest in Wisconsin as a battleground state led elections director Kevin Kennedy to report that elections officials across the state had been swamped by an unprecedented increase of over 200,000 new applications submitted by mail.99 The intensified focus on Wisconsin by outside voter registration groups pouring their volunteers into the state was unparalleled in recent elections, an anomaly associated with Wisconsin’s swing state status and the closeness of the presidential contest – in Wisconsin and the nation – just four years before.100

Pre-election news coverage in Wisconsin focused on three controversies: problems associated with some of the voter registration drives; a dispute between county and city officials over the number of ballots to be printed and provided to the city of Milwaukee; and a flap over thousands of alleged “bad addresses” on Milwaukee’s voter registration list.

Procedural breakdowns and discrepancies in the voter registration records were associated with what Kennedy called “volume” problems, but they helped create a climate of suspicion about the quality of record keeping at the Milwaukee elections commission and the commission’s ability to run a “clean” election.101 The pre-election disputes repeatedly invoked the language of “voter fraud,” though no evidence was produced that voters were intentionally committing it. The climate of distrust made it difficult to see clerical mistakes, illegible handwriting, and workload problems leading to backlogged voter registration applications as human error or problems related to resource issues. Instead, foul-ups and mistakes were assumed to be evidence of fraud perpetrated by partisans trying to “steal elections.”

**Imperfect voter registration drives and simple human error, however, are not the same as voter fraud, nor do they inevitably lead to fraudulent voting.**

**Voter registration problems**

Intensified political competition and the influx of outside organizations, campaign workers and volunteers into Wisconsin in the months and weeks before the election contributed to an inevitably flawed voter registration process. Duplicate registration cards, improperly filled out cards, cards from people who are not eligible to vote or who don’t live in the district in which the card was submitted are not uncommon in the chaotic pre-election atmosphere of an intense political campaign. Imperfect voter registration drives and simple human error, however, are not the same as voter fraud, nor do they inevitably lead to fraudulent voting. As the Milwaukee case demonstrates, however, these deficiencies are easily exploited by partisans.

---


Since voters can register to vote on Election Day, pre-election voter registration drives have been less common in Wisconsin than elsewhere.

How many ballots for Milwaukee?

As stories of potential voter registration fraud circulated in the press, a political fight erupted in Milwaukee. In October the chief elections official in Milwaukee asked the county elections board for 260,000 extra ballots in anticipation of record turnout. Under Wisconsin law counties print and pay for all ballots for their localities. Milwaukee county elections officials rejected the request, with County Executive Scott Walker writing in support of the county board's decision to give Milwaukee roughly the same number of ballots it had received in the previous presidential election. In 2000, the number of ballots on hand exceeded the eligible voting population in Milwaukee by at least 200,000. But in planning for the number of ballots needed, local officials must compensate for the fact that in order to scan and count the ballots after they are cast, a barcode is assigned that prevents ballots from being counted outside the ward in which they are issued. In other words, unused ballots can't be moved around from ward to ward to cover shortfalls. Estimating probable turnout involves estimating turnout in each ward rather than citywide. This could have the effect of inflating the overall estimated number of ballots needed citywide. In 2004 Milwaukee requested 938,000 ballots for a voting population of about 424,000. The county board agreed to give the city 679,000 ballots, and a firestorm of protest erupted when County Executive Walker defended the decision by suggesting that he was concerned about potential voter fraud and didn’t want people to be able to "grab" extra ballots at the polling site.102

Milwaukee Mayor Tom Barrett accused Walker of trying to foment chaos at the polls and suppress the central city vote. Barrett is a Democrat and served as a state co-chair of John Kerry's campaign, while Walker is a Republican and served as state co-chair of George W. Bush's campaign. In press reports, the dispute was repeatedly referred to as "ugly," generating partisan recrimination on both sides. On the morning of October 14, about a hundred protesters, including students, elected officials and union activists, stormed Walker's office while he was meeting with municipal election clerks, chanting, "Let the people have their voice!" and demanding that Walker issue the extra ballots to Milwaukee. Wisconsin Governor Jim Doyle intervened by asking the state elections board to help resolve the dispute and offered state aid to pay for the extra ballots. The next day Walker and Barrett held a joint press conference on the steps of Milwaukee city hall to announce a compromise between the city and county: the county would supply the extra ballots, giving the city the 938,000 ballots it originally requested, the city would split the cost, estimated at about $40,000, and promise to return all unused ballots to the county election commission to ensure that all ballots were accounted for.103 Approximately 665,000 unused ballots were later returned to the county board of elections.104

Inaccurate lists of “potentially fraudulent voters”

At 4:57 p.m. on Wednesday, October 27, 2004, three minutes before the legal deadline for filing a complaint with the city elections commission, the state Republican Party challenged the validity of 5,619 names on the city voter rolls. State GOP chairman Rick Graber said, "This is a black eye on the city of Milwaukee and the state of Wisconsin. These 5,600 addresses could be used to allow fraudulent voting. Whether it's deliberate or not, something's wrong when you have people..."

---


from addresses that don’t exist.” First the local elections board voted 3-0 when the board’s lone Republican appointee joined the two Democrats in finding the challenge lacked sufficient evidence. The Milwaukee City Attorney, Grant Langley, conducted a review that he said in a letter to the city elections commission executive director casts “doubt on the overall accuracy” of the list supplied by the state GOP.

Then, just four days before Election Day the state GOP demanded that Milwaukee city officials require identification from 37,180 people it said its review of the city’s voter rolls turned up as living at questionable addresses. The list was produced in the same manner as the first list of 5,619 names using a computer program to match data from the city’s voter database with a U.S. Postal Service list of known addresses. It included 13,300 cases of incorrect apartment numbers and 18,200 cases of missing apartment numbers. City Attorney Langley, a non-partisan officeholder, called the GOP’s request, “outrageous,” adding, “We have already uncovered hundreds and hundreds of addresses on their (original list) that do exist. Why should I take their word for the fact this new list is good? I’m out of the politics on this, but this is purely political.” Langley’s review did find some addresses that do not appear to exist, and the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel did its own limited investigation, finding 68 questionable addresses. “Others, though,” it said, “were likely to be clerical errors.”

By Monday, officials from the state GOP and the City of Milwaukee worked out an agreement on how the registrations of voters with addresses challenged by the GOP would be dealt with at the polls. The list of 37,000 was pared back down to 5,512 and the city agreed to provide poll workers with the names of people in their wards from the list whose addresses appeared to be incomplete or inaccurate. Those people would be flagged if they showed up to vote and asked to show identification and/or re-register to update their records. At the time Wisconsin law did not require pre-registered voters to show identification to vote at the polls, they only needed to state their name and address to receive a ballot. The compromise deal with the Republican party imposed an identification requirement not mandated by law on people who made their way onto the GOP’s list.

Who bears responsibility for sloppy records and procedural meltdown?
The Journal-Sentinel reviewed Milwaukee’s voting records and found a number of unexplained discrepancies. The most troubling finding from the newspaper’s detailed computer analysis was that as many as 1,242 votes, three-quarters of them cast by people registering on site on election day, appeared to have come from invalid addresses. Another 1,305 registration cards with discernible flaws such as missing addresses or missing names were accepted from voters on election day who were then allowed to vote.

---

108 Borowski (October 31, 2004).
109 “Milwaukee Vote Deal Reached on Dubious Addresses,” The Capital Times (November 1, 2004), 5A.
110 Wisconsin allows for election day registration. Same-day registration rules require new registrants to show some form of proof of residency, or, for those lacking proof, another registered voter may vouch for them.
The newspaper opined on its own investigation and reporting:

Republicans are quick to jump on the discrepancies, real or imagined, in voting data in Milwaukee as proof of widespread fraud in the big city. In their minds, the Journal Sentinel’s findings fit that pattern. A more plausible explanation, however, is that the findings reflect the unfortunate tendency of voting systems throughout America to err.1

By the end of January, the Mayor had appointed an internal task force to review the city’s electoral procedures, and federal and county law enforcement agencies began a joint investigation into whether breakdowns in procedure, poor record-keeping, human error or fraud explained the discrepancies. On February 10, the bipartisan Joint Legislative Audit Committee of the state legislature voted unanimously to direct auditors to review voter registration and address verification procedures. All of these investigations produced clear evidence that Milwaukee’s Board of Elections was overwhelmed by its own incompetence and under-staffing on election day, resulting in massive record-keeping problems. Poll workers failed to follow procedures; the number of votes cast in Milwaukee failed to match the number of people recorded as voting; same day registration cards were not filled out properly and follow up was not performed when post-registration address verification efforts identified address discrepancies; some voters were allowed to register to vote in the wrong ward.

The dénouement

The scrutiny from federal, state and local law enforcement and elections officials produced several reports, an intensive review of voter registration practices in a number of Wisconsin cities, many recommendations for improving election administration and voter registration procedures, several later-vetoed photo ID bills in the state legislature, a variety of other legislative proposals, and very little conclusive evidence of voter fraud.

Widespread ignorance among the public and elections officials alike of Wisconsin’s seldom enforced felony disenfranchisement laws account for the hundreds of ineligible felons post-election audits have found voted since 2000. Alleged illegal felon voting constitutes nearly all of the “voter fraud” reported on by the media in Wisconsin over the last six years, and represents most of the handful of cases prosecuted by the federal government. Wisconsin election crime laws require the establishment of a willful effort to defraud. Most of those identified as ineligible have not been prosecuted because they were never informed that they lost their voting rights until they completed their entire sentence. Until recently, Wisconsin’s voter registration application form did not clearly indicate that felons on probation or parole were ineligible to vote. One of the federal cases against the dozen or so people charged with illegal (felon) voting in the 2004 election was dropped when it was revealed that the defendant had registered to vote on election day in Milwaukee using his state offender ID card.13

---


POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

This report has illustrated how the public is being manipulated about the problem of voter fraud.

Voting is a right, it's not a gift and it's not a privilege. Moreover, we can't have a democracy without the voters, and that means all voters, contributing to self-government. Therefore, layers upon layers of rules and bureaucracy to administer elections do not serve us well if they hinder electoral participation, which they do especially when the electorate expands. It is simply naïve to argue that the rules have nothing to do with turnout. On the other hand, it's true, the rules don't on their own increase turnout -- issues, passion, competition, good candidates, effective communication and a diverse media -- these are some of the factors that contribute to higher levels of electoral participation. But high interest campaigns and elections present precisely those conditions under which a complex regime of rules will have a depressing effect. When voter interest is high, partisans exploit the rules to determine the size and shape of the electorate they want.

Today partisans use the threat of voter fraud as an intimidation tactic. As our history shows, it is an old and reliable instrument for shaping the electorate by influencing the rules and procedures governing access to the vote. It is difficult to openly suppress voting in a democratic culture. The threat of fraud, however; if it's real, is enough to scare most people into accepting new rules that undermine the electoral participation of other voters - the unfortunate price, we are told, we must pay to keep our elections clean. The unraveling logic of this argument should be obvious. Unfortunately, reason flies out the window when we're scared.

We need better data, better election administration, transparency and more responsible journalism to improve public understanding of the legitimate ways in which electoral outcomes can be distorted and manipulated. Specifically:

1. States’ chief elections officers should collect and maintain data on fraud allegations and enforcement activities and routinely report this information to the public. The data and methods used to collect it should be transparent and in the public domain.

2. To protect the right to vote and improve public confidence in the electoral process improvements to statewide, centralized voter registration databases must continue. Accurate registration records and methods for instantaneously certifying voter eligibility are the best defense against voter fraud.

3. To minimize mistakes, clerical errors, and duplication, state and local elections officials need to develop good, cooperative working partnerships with third party voter registration organizations that do a service to democracy by encouraging more people to register and vote.

4. States can go further and reduce the need for registration drives by fully implementing the agency-based voter registration requirements of NVRA and instituting same-day voter registration procedures. Ultimately, the states and federal government should provide a means to automatic universal voter registration.

5. To improve public understanding of voter fraud and more balanced reporting, state elections and law enforcement officials should educate journalists to ask for and recognize evidence of fraud when reporting on fraud allegations.
APPENDIX: HOW TO IDENTIFY VOTER FRAUD

Elections are instruments of democracy. They are the mechanisms for choosing representatives of the people's will, and they are widely regulated by law. Many different actors participate in the electoral process. Legislators and administrators make and implement the rules, candidates organize campaigns to run for office, voters cast their ballots, administrators count the ballots and elected officials certify the results.

The voters' role is simple — to make choices about candidates by casting legal ballots. Voters don't set deadlines for registering to vote, nor do they make the rules about how ballots are designed, displayed, or marked. They don't decide where the polls are located, when they are open, or what voting technology will be used. Voters have nothing to do with receiving completed ballots, determining valid ballots, counting or recounting ballots, tallying election results, or ensuring that the vote totals are accurate.

Voters, like all other actors or groups in the electoral process, can only corrupt that part to which they have access. They can do this directly, for example, by providing false information about their identity and/or eligibility in order to vote illegally, or indirectly through participation in a conspiracy, usually with others who have more authority and access to the marking and counting of ballots than the voters themselves possess.

If the alleged fraud does not involve voters it should not be considered voter fraud.

The first step in confronting any allegation of voter fraud is to identify who is alleged to have committed the fraud and to figure out if any voters are involved. If the alleged fraud does not involve voters it should not be considered voter fraud.

The second step is to identify which part of the electoral process was corrupted by fraud. Given their limited access, voters can only corrupt the registration and voting phases. They can't corrupt the vote tallying and counting phases where most election fraud has occurred in the past because they lack access to votes after they've cast them. A fraudulent ballot

---

14 The most thorough analysis of election fraud in the early twentieth century is the landmark 1929 study of voter registration procedures for the Brookings Institution by the inventor of the punch card voting machine, Joseph P. Harris. See, Joseph P. Harris, The Registration of Voters in the U.S. (Baltimore: The Lord Baltimore Press, 1929). Harris was a public administration reformer who promoted government modernization and the use of scientific administrative practices to remove politics from the business of governing. He concluded that elections were more badly managed than just about any other area of public administration and that political machines were responsible for much of the fraud he analyzed. The case studies of election fraud in Chicago, Philadelphia and Louisville, Kentucky, Harris presents all involved large scale conspiracies orchestrated by politicians and political machines which Harris thought rigged elections through ballot box stuffing and the manipulation of the count. His conclusion that most fraud occurred during the vote counting stage spurred him to invent the Votomatic Vote Recorder (the first punch card voting machine) which Harris hoped would reduce opportunities for election fraud by removing the ballot counting function from precinct workers. See, Joseph P. Harris, Oral History, interview by Harriet Nathan, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, California, 1980, available from http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/ROHO/Vote.
is one that was not cast legally. But the definition of a legal ballot varies according to the rules that qualify eligible voters to vote and govern the procedures for casting a ballot in the different states.

**Fraud in Voter Registration**

To its earliest proponents, voter registration was intended as an anti-fraud safeguard. Registration fraud is typically punished less severely than fraud in voting and this is as it should be. What matters most to the integrity of electoral outcomes is the casting and counting of an illegal ballot. A person who provides false information on a voter registration application but never casts a ballot is less of a threat to electoral integrity than one who negates or dilutes the will of the voters by casting an illegal ballot. This is not to say that voter registration fraud is a negligible crime or should be tolerated. The available evidence suggests voter registration fraud is rare, but when it does occur, if it goes undetected it can compromise the accuracy of the voter rolls. When it’s caught it burdens the elections and law enforcement officials who find it and must address it.

Since voters can perpetrate it, even if they rarely do, for purposes of this report we will consider voter registration fraud a form of voter fraud, along with all forms of illegal voting. However, when voter registration fraud is committed by a campaign volunteer or a paid canvasser, we should not consider the crime ‘voter fraud.’ Doing so only adds to public confusion about what should be done to eliminate opportunities for fraud.

**Fraud in Voting**

Under most state and federal laws a vote is considered illegal when it is cast improperly by an unqualified or ineligible voter. The voter must be qualified and the vote cast according to the rules governing the act of voting under state and federal law. Both elements – the voter and the act of voting – must be legal or the vote is illegal.

**The difference between an eligible and a qualified voter**

To be legal, an *eligible* voter must be *qualified* by the state to vote. This raises questions about the difference between an ‘eligible’ voter and a ‘qualified’ voter. The centuries long struggle for the franchise in the U.S. established a common law right to vote and constitutional bans on voter discrimination by race, color, gender, or age (over the age of 18), but no constitutional right to vote. The lack of an affirmative right to vote in the Constitution and the delegation of authority to the states to determine voter qualifications and oversee election administration are peculiar features of American democracy. The Constitution explicitly grants the states the power to set voter qualifications, reserving authority to Congress to regulate only “the times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives.”

“Eligible” voters are those whose age and citizenship status, and in some cases absence of a felony conviction allows them to be credentialed or “qualified” by the states as legitimate or legal voters. “Qualified” voters, therefore, are those eligible voters who complete a state’s procedures for casting a legal ballot.

Because the Constitution vests power to ‘qualify’ voters in the states, as long as they do not unconstitutionally discriminate against people by race, color, gender or age, they may make different rules for qualifying voters, and they do. This is why the definition of a legal vote varies across the states, especially with regard to residency and felony disqualification rules. Consider,

---

113 For an example of how the voter fraud label is commonly misused, see “2 Signature Gathers Sentenced in Orange County Voter Fraud Case,” Associated Press (1/4/07), 17 News Online, available online at www.kget.com/news/state/story.aspx?content_id=6b487562-37ae-43e9-a5b0-49667469d5e1.  
116 But, “the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.” See, U.S. Constitution, Article I, section 4.
for example, the ballot of an otherwise eligible and qualified voter with a felony conviction who is no longer under state supervision. If that citizen lived in Maine and registered to vote by or on Election Day, his or her vote would count as a legal ballot. If that citizen lived and voted in Florida where a felony conviction eliminates the right to vote until clemency is granted, he or she could be prosecuted for casting an illegal ballot.

In fact, states make lots of rules for qualifying voters. The most important is the requirement that all eligible voters register. All states except North Dakota require eligible voters to register before casting a ballot.\(^\text{107}\) Thus, all states except North Dakota qualify eligible voters by requiring them to meet certain conditions in order to register their names on the rolls of legitimate or valid voters. Voter registration, therefore, is a means of voter qualification, and in nearly all states, otherwise eligible voters must be registered properly or the vote they cast is illegal.\(^\text{118}\) In addition, ineligible voters, such as those disqualified by state law for a felony conviction or because they do not possess U.S. citizenship,\(^\text{119}\) could register to vote either mistakenly or by deceit, thus appearing on the voter rolls as 'qualified' voters despite their ineligibility. Their votes would be treated as legal votes when in fact they would be illegal.

There are a few known cases of ineligible persons such as non-citizens making it on to the voter registration rolls due to a misunderstanding about who has the right to vote in American elections, or to mistakes made by elections officials who misinformed such applicants or failed to note their lack of citizenship. One involves the case of Mohsin Ali, a long-time legal permanent resident living in Florida at the time of his arrest for "alien voting." He pleaded guilty but claimed a clerk in the Department of Motor Vehicles issued a voter registration application to him when he renewed his license. In a letter begging the judge to intercede with immigration authorities considering Ali's deportation back to Pakistan, Ali claimed he told the clerk he was a Florida resident but not a U.S. citizen.\(^\text{120}\) He states that the clerk told him as the husband of an American citizen he was eligible to vote. When Ali received a voter registration card in the mail he assumed he was qualified to vote and voted in the 2000 presidential election.\(^\text{121}\)

Voters have limited access to the electoral process, but where they do interact with it they confront an array of rules that can trip them up and change depending on where they live. The more rules and restrictions, the more stumbling blocks voters face when trying to cast legal ballots. For example, in Pennsylvania where a voter must qualify with an excuse when applying for an absentee ballot, it is illegal to vote that ballot if the voter's plans change and he or she remains physically present at home (barring a disability that prohibits the voter from visiting the polling place). A voter must apply for an absentee ballot a full week before Election Day. What happens if plans change or the business trip gets canceled and the voter is present on Election Day, after all? If that voter then mails in the ballot instead of striking out for the line at the polling place, that voter is breaking the law in Pennsylvania. Who knew? Who wouldn't make

\(^{107}\) North Dakota repealed its voter registration law in 1951. To vote in North Dakota eligible voters must have proper identification showing their name and current address. If they lack identification, they may still vote by filing a voter’s affidavit attesting to their identity and address, or if a poll worker knows them and can vouch for them. Poll workers use lists of previous voters to track voting on Election Day.

\(^{108}\) The courts have dealt with the question of whether voter registration is an unconstitutional burden on the vote by using a balancing test, weighing the alleged burden on rights against a state’s legitimate interest in ensuring electoral integrity. State laws mandating voter registration have been upheld repeatedly by the Supreme Court as reasonable administrative burdens on the right to vote ("a person does not have a federal constitutional right to walk up to a voting place on election day and demand a ballot," Marston v. Lewis, 410 U.S. 679, 680. (1973)).

\(^{109}\) Federal law does not require persons be U.S. citizens to vote, but all states do, as it is their constitutional prerogative to set citizenship as a condition for voter eligibility and qualification.


\(^{111}\) U.S. v. Mahsin Ali, U.S. District Court, Northern District of Florida, Tallahassee Division, Case No. 4:05cr47-WCS.
things easier and drop the ballot in the mailbox? The more complex are the rules regulating voter registration and voting, the more likely voter mistakes, clerical errors, and the like will be wrongly identified as "fraud."

Eligible voters may nevertheless fail to qualify as legal voters because they fail to register properly—usually their ballots would be considered illegal. Illegal ballots, however, may also result from qualified—or properly registered—voters failing to follow the rules for casting a ballot under state law. As the following table suggests, expanding rules create more ways to cast an illegal ballot than a legal one.

### Voter Eligibility, Voter Registration and Legal Balloting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voter</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>Voter Is</th>
<th>Vote Is Cast</th>
<th>Ballot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Qualified</td>
<td>Improperly</td>
<td>Illegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Improperly</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Illegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Qualified</td>
<td>Improperly</td>
<td>Illegal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As states and localities continue to loosen restrictions on the time and place for casting a legal ballot, qualified voters will face more options for casting their ballots. The lack of uniformity increases complexity of the rules and unintended consequences proliferate. For example, the growth of early and mail voting is generally considered positive because these reforms make voting more convenient by opening up more avenues for casting legal ballots. Voters in many states may now cast their ballots at a town clerk's office two weeks before the election, by mail, or in person at the polling booth on Election Day. But one consequence of expanding voting opportunities is a corresponding increase in opportunities for casting unintentionally illegal ballots if administrative tracking and auditing systems are flawed.

In fact, several recent cases of alleged voter fraud involved legal voters who mailed in their ballots and then showed up at the polls on Election Day because they either forgot mailing in their ballots or; distrusting the absentee balloting process, wanted to be sure that their votes were counted by voting again. They used their real names to try to vote twice because they were confused. Poor record management on the part of elections officials was the problem, but voters got the blame. As the options and rules expand they increase the possibility that voter misunderstandings will be labeled 'voter fraud.'

---

12 See, for example, Susan Greene and Karen Crummy, "Voter Fraud Probed in State; Double Dippers, Felons Targeted," Denver Post (March 24, 2005).
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 Claims of “Voter Fraud” Often Manufactured, Exaggerated for Political Purposes, Says New Report from Project Vote

(Washington, DC) Widespread “voter fraud” is a myth promulgated to suppress voter participation, according to a new Project Vote report released today. “The Politics of Voter Fraud” finds that fraudulent voting, or the intentional corruption of the voting process by voters, is extremely rare. Yet, false or exaggerated claims of fraudulent voting are commonly made in close electoral contests, and later cited by proponents of laws that restrict voting. The report is authored by Lorraine Minnite, Ph.D., Barnard College, Columbia University.

“I set out to study what situations generated incidents of voter fraud and, after researching the laws and examining the existing evidence, I found that voter fraud did not occur with enough frequency or was enough of a significant factor in elections to model or study,” Minnite said. “Instead, in this report, I examined circumstances in which claims of voter fraud were made and how they came to receive widespread public attention.”

Analysis of federal government records concludes that only 24 people were convicted of or pleaded guilty to illegal voting between 2002 and 2005, an average of eight people a year. The available state-level evidence of fraudulent voting, culled from interviews, reviews of newspaper coverage and court proceedings paints a similar picture.

“We shouldn’t base public policy on urban legends but on sound facts. It’s clear from this report that fraudulent voting isn’t threatening the integrity of our elections; we do know that erecting additional bureaucratic obstacles to voting discourages legitimate voters,” said Project Vote Deputy Director Michael Slater.

The report includes case studies in which accusations of “voter fraud” received widespread media attention. Each one demonstrates the way in which partisan politics exploit administrative errors or minor problems to create the illusion of systemic fraud.

While there is little evidence of fraudulent voting, the case is clear that voting rules restrict voter turnout. A recent study by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University found that laws requiring voters to show a document establishing identity reduce minority voter turnout. Researchers found that in the 2004 election, all voters, in states requiring voters to present documentation establishing their identity at the polls, were 2.7 percent less likely to vote than voters in states where no documentation was required. Latinos were 10 percent less likely to vote, Asian-Americans 8.5 percent less likely to vote and African Americans 5.7 percent less likely to vote.

A survey by the Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law found that 11 percent of Americans, more than 21 millions citizens, did not have a current
government-issued photo ID. Low-income, minority and elderly Americans disproportionately lack current government-issued photo ID.

To help improve public understanding and make the electoral system as efficient as possible, the report recommends: better voter fraud data collection and dissemination by states' chief elections officers, maintenance of accurate voter registration databases, cooperative relationships between non-partisan civic groups engaged in voter registration and elections officials, education of the media, and the institution of automatic universal voter registration.

###

*Project Vote is the leading technical assistance and direct service provider to the civic participation community. Since its founding in 1982, Project Vote has provided professional training, management, evaluation and technical services on a broad continuum of key issues related to voter engagement and participation in low-income and minority communities.*

To download the report, go to: http://projectvote.org/fileadmin/ProjectVote/Publications/Politics_of_Voter_Fraud_Final.pdf
Julie and Jeannie:

Thank you for the quick turn around on drafting a response to Tova Wang.

I have made substantial edits because I think the first draft offered too much information, which is not germane to Tova's complaint. Additionally, too much verbiage masks the strength of our good report and seemed to obscure the main points in our response.

I hope you will find the attached helpful.

BTW, who will sign the letter?
December 8, 2006

Ms. Tova Wang
(Address)
(Address)

Dear Ms. Wang:

We are writing in response to your December 7, 2006 memorandum. As you know, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) issued its first report on election crimes last week, based in large part on the work that was done for EAC by Job and you. The report containing the full and complete summaries of every interview conducted as well as every book, article, report or case that was reviewed. Rather than provide the synopsis of these interviews, EAC provided the individual summaries so readers could reach their own conclusions about the substance of the interviews.

Upon reviewing initial information about the Department of Justice interviews contained in the status report that was provided to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors and the information provided at the working group meeting in May 2006, those persons interviewed at the Department of Justice did not agree with certain characterizations of their statements contained in these materials. Therefore, EAC exercised its responsibility to make clarifying edits. The Department of Justice is an important prosecutorial agency engaged in enforcing Federal anti-fraud and anti-intimidation laws. Thus, it was important to EAC to assure that the summary of their comments did not lend confusion to an already complex and hotly-debated topic.

The report on voting fraud and voter intimidation will stand as adopted on December 7, 2006. Again we thank you for the contributions you made to the EAC’s initial research of these important issues.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

---

Deleted: The U.S. Election Assistance Commission believes that voting fraud and voter intimidation are very important, complex topics that should be studied and reported on fairly and accurately. As a clearinghouse of election administration information, EAC is committed to providing complete and comprehensive information to the election community and the public.

Deleted: In its December 2006 report on voting fraud and voter intimidation, EAC honored this commitment by providing the readers of its report with only readers with the entire created by the consultants.

Deleted: It is incumbent upon us to provide them with the best and most complete data and research that we can.

Deleted: With regard to the interviews of two of the personnel from the Department of Justice, EAC made clarifying edits.

Deleted: EAC created the draft report and provided the entirety of the supporting documentation to the public.

Deleted: Because of the lack of organization and cohesion in the draft provided by the consultants, that document would have led to greater confusion and division regarding the issues of voting fraud and voter intimidation. As such, EAC revised the draft report and provided the entirety of the supporting documentation to the public. For these reasons, t
Karen,
I still do not have the RFPs we received for the voter fraud/ID project. I need that information ASAP. If this was a sole source contract and there were no other RFPs received, please indicate this in your reply. Please see language from original request below:

"In the event that the EAC denies my renewed request for the voter ID and voting fraud reports or delays another week in providing those materials, we respectfully request copies of (1) all requests for proposals and contracts relating to the voter ID and voting fraud reports; and (2) all written and electronic communications concerning the voter ID and voting fraud reports between the EAC and (a) the Eagleton Institute of Politics, (b) the Moritz College of Law, (c) Tova Wang, (d) Job Serebrov, and (e) any other individuals or entities, including but not limited to outside reviewers."

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Bert A. Benavides/EAC/GOV
12/08/2006 10:46 AM

To Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
cc
bcc
Subject FOIA Request - Tova Wang

Bert A. Benavides
Special Assistant to the Executive Director
U. S. Elections Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3114

--- Forwarded by Bert A. Benavides/EAC/GOV on 12/08/2006 10:44 AM -----

Bert A. Benavides/EAC/GOV
11/15/2006 02:19 PM

To "Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc bbenavides@eac.gov
Subject RE: Conference call

Tova, due to the change in time, both Julie and Tom will be calling into the conference call from their respective residences. Thanks. Take care.

Bert A. Benavides
Special Assistant to the Executive Director
U. S. Elections Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3114
"Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>

"Tova Wang"
<wang@tcf.org>
11/09/2006 04:54 PM

To bbenavides@eac.gov
cc twilkey@eac.gov, jhodgkins@eac.gov
Subject RE: Conference call

Sounds good. I will come by the EAC since it's literally a few feet from my office. I look forward to seeing you. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
From: bbenavides@eac.gov [mailto:bbenavides@eac.gov]
Sent: Thursday, November 09, 2006 4:21 PM
To: wang@tcf.org; twilkey@eac.gov; jhodgkins@eac.gov; bbenavides@eac.gov
Cc: twilkey@eac.gov; jhodgkins@eac.gov; bbenavides@eac.gov
Subject: Conference call

Tova, Job — I have scheduled 6:00 PM EST on Wednesday, November 15 for a conference call with Tom Wilkey and Julie Thompson-Hodgkins.

Conference call in # is 866-222-9044.

Bert A. Benavides
Special Assistant to the Executive Director
U. S. Elections Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3114
Job,

I have changed the time, per your request, of the conference call scheduled for Wednesday, November 15 to 6:30 PM EST.

6:00 pm will not work for me as I am in route home. It would have to be between 6:30 and 7:00 pm your time. Remember I am one hour behind.

Job

--- bbenavides@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova, Job -- I have scheduled 6:00 PM EST on
> Wednesday, November 15 for a
> conference call with Tom Wilkey and Julie
> Thompson-Hodgkins.
Tova, due to the change in time, both Julie and Tom will be calling into the conference call from their respective residences. Thanks. Take care.

Bert A. Benavides
Special Assistant to the Executive Director
U. S. Elections Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3114

"Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>

Sounds good. I will come by the EAC since its literally a few feet from my office. I look forward to seeing you. Tova

Tova Andrea Wang, Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
1333 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.
Tova, Job – I have scheduled 6:00 PM EST on Wednesday, November 15 for a conference call with Tom Wilkey and Julie Thompson-Hodgkins.

Conference call in.

Bert A. Benavides
Special Assistant to the Executive Director
U. S. Elections Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202-566-3114
Just reminding you guys that I need all of Tom’s emails and/or correspondence regarding the FOIA request below. I need this info by the end of the day. We interpret that this request does not cover emails or correspondence among staff--only b/w Tom and the parties mentioned below. The best and most efficient way is to print everything and bring it to me. I will review all of the documents and determine what is applicable to this request, as well as redact any information not applicable.

I need each of you to respond affirmatively or negatively to the FOIA request below. If you have no documents in your possession related to this request, please reply to me with the words “no records.” If you have records, please identify them in an e-mail reply and attach them to the e-mail. If the document is not electronic, hand deliver them to me. Also, if you believe any of these related documents should be withheld, please provide a brief memo stating the reason for your position.

I need this information and/or a response by COB December 5, 2006. If you cannot comply by this date, please provide notification and an estimated time when you will provide the information and the reason why you cannot comply by the original deadline. Thanks for your cooperation. See request below:

Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center for Justice has submitted a FOIA request for the voting fraud report prepared by our consultants and the voter ID report, as well as the following information:

"In the event that the EAC denies my renewed request for the voter ID and voting fraud reports or delays another week in providing those materials, we respectfully request copies of (1) all requests for proposals and contracts relating to the voter ID and voting fraud reports; and (2) all written and electronic communications concerning the voter ID and voting fraud reports between the EAC and (a) the Eagleton Institute of Politics, (b) the Moritz College of Law, (c) Tova Wang, (d) Job Serebrov, and (e) any other individuals or entities, including but not limited to outside reviewers."
Attached are my comments and suggested edits to this section. They should show up in green; at least that is the color on my screen.

I feel very strongly and therefore I recommend that EAC explain that it made clarifying edits to some of the text in the summaries of the DOJ interviews. The consultants provided us with lots of material and that is the only section we changed. If we don't offer a straightforward explanation, then I think we invite more problems and headaches. I offered suggested language in the attached.

DOJ Interviews.doc
Interview with Craig Donsanto, Director, Elections Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, U.S. Department of Justice
January 13, 2006

The Department of Justice's (DOJ) Election Crimes Branch is responsible for supervising federal criminal investigations and prosecutions of election crimes.

Questions

How are Prosecution Decisions Made?

Craig Donsanto must approve all investigations that go beyond a preliminary stage, all charges, search warrant applications and subpoenas and all prosecutions. The decision to investigate is very sensitive because of the public officials involved. If a charge seems political, Donsanto will reject it. Donsanto gives possible theories for investigation. Donsanto and Noel Hillman will decide whether to farm out the case to an Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA). Donsanto uses a concept called predication. In other words, there must be enough evidence to suggest a crime has been committed. The method of evaluation of this evidence depends on the type of evidence and its source. There are two types of evidence—factual (antisocial behavior) and legal (antisocial behavior leading to statutory violations). Whether an indictment will be brought depends on the likelihood of success before a jury. Much depends on the type of evidence and the source. Donsanto said he "knows it when he sees it." Donsanto will only indict if he is confident of a conviction assuming the worst case scenario—a jury trial.

A person under investigation will first receive a target letter. Often, a defendant who gets a target letter will ask for a departmental hearing. The defendant's case will be heard by Donsanto and Hillman. On occasion, the assistant attorney general will review the case. The department grants such hearings because such defendants are likely to provide information about others involved.

The Civil Rights Division, Voting Rights Section makes its own decisions on prosecution. The head of that division is John Tanner. There is a lot of cooperation between the Voting Section and the Election Crimes Branch.

Does the Decision to Prosecute Incorporate Particular Political Considerations within a State Such as a One Party System or a System in which the Party in Power Controls the Means of Prosecution and Suppresses Opposition Complaints?

Yes. Before, the department would leave it to the states. Now, if there is racial animus involved in the case, there is political bias involved, or the prosecutor is not impartial, the department will take it over.

Does it Matter if the Complaint Comes from a Member of a Racial Minority?

No. But if the question involves racial animus, that has also always been an aggravating
What Kinds of Complaints Would Routinely Override Principles of Federalism?

Federalism is no longer a big issue. DOJ is permitted to prosecute whenever there is a candidate for federal office on the ballot.

Are There Too Few Prosecutions?

DOJ can’t prosecute everything.

What Should Be Done to Improve the System?

The problem is asserting federal jurisdiction in non-federal elections. It is preferable for the federal government to pursue these cases for the following reasons: federal districts draw from a bigger and more diverse jury pool; the DOJ is politically detached; local district attorneys are hamstrung by the need to be re-elected; DOJ has more resources—local prosecutors need to focus on personal and property crimes—fraud cases are too big and too complex for them; DOJ can use the grand jury process as a discovery technique and to test the strength of the case.

In *U.S. v. McNally*, the court ruled that the mail fraud statute does not apply to election fraud. It was through the mail fraud statute that the department had routinely gotten federal jurisdiction over election fraud cases. 18 USC 1346, the congressional effort to “fix” McNally, did not include voter fraud.

As a result, the department needs a new federal law that allows federal prosecution whenever a federal instrumentality is used, e.g. the mail, federal funding, interstate commerce. The department has drafted such legislation, which was introduced but not passed in the early 1990s. A federal law is needed that permits prosecution in any election where any federal instrumentality is used.

Other Information

The Department has held four symposia for District Election Officers (DEOs) and FBI agents since the initiation of the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative. In 2003, civil rights leaders were invited to make speeches, but were not permitted to take part in the rest of the symposium. All other symposia have been closed to the public.

There are two types of attorneys in the division: prosecutors, who take on cases when the jurisdiction of the section requires it; the US Attorney has recused him or herself; or when the US Attorney is unable to handle the case (most frequent reason) and braintrust attorneys who analyze the facts, formulate theories, and draft legal documents.
Donsanto provided us with three case lists: cases still being investigated as of January 13, 2006 – confidential; election fraud prosecutions and convictions as a result of the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative October 2002-January 13, 2006; and cases closed for lack of evidence as of January 13, 2006.

If we want more documents related to any case, we must get those documents from the states. The department will not release them to us.

Although the number of election fraud related complaints have not gone up since 2002, nor has the proportion of legitimate to illegitimate complaints of fraud, the number of cases that the department is investigating and the number of indictments the department is pursuing are both up dramatically.

Since 2002, the department has brought more cases against alien voters, felon voters, and double voters than ever before. Previously, cases were only brought against conspiracies to corrupt the process rather than individual offenders acting alone. For deterrence purposes, the Attorney General decided to add the pursuit of individuals who vote when not eligible to vote (noncitizens, felons) or who vote more than once. The department is currently undertaking three pilot projects to determine what works in developing the cases and obtaining convictions and what works with juries in such matters to gain convictions:

1. Felon voters in Milwaukee.

2. Alien voters in the Southern District of Florida. FYI – under 18 USC 611, to prosecute for “alien voting” there is no intent requirement. Conviction can lead to deportation. Nonetheless, the department feels compelled to look at mitigating factors such as was the alien told it was OK to vote, does the alien have a spouse that is a citizen.

3. Double voters in a variety of jurisdictions.

The department does not maintain records of the complaints that come in from DEOs, U.S attorneys and others during the election that are not pursued by the department. Donsanto asserted that U.S. attorneys never initiate frivolous investigations.

*According to the new handbook, the department can take on a case whenever there is a federal candidate on the ballot*
The Department of Justice’s (DOJ) Voting Section is charged with the civil enforcement of the Voting Rights Act, the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA), the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA), and Title III of the Help America Vote Act (HAVA).

Authority and Process

The Voting Section, in contrast to the Public Integrity Section as Craig Donsanto described it, typically focuses only on systemic problems resulting from government action or inaction, not problems caused by individuals. Indeed, the section never goes after individuals because it does not have the statutory authority to do so. In situations in which individuals are causing problems at the polls and interfering with voting rights, the section calls the local election officials to resolve it.

Federal voting laws enforced by the section only apply to state action, so the section only sues state and local governments – it does not have any enforcement power over individuals. Most often, the section enters into consent agreements with governments that focus on poll worker training, takes steps to restructure how polls are run, and deals with problems on Election Day on the spot. Doing it this way has been most effective – for example, while the section used to have the most observers in the South, with systematic changes forced upon those jurisdictions, the section now does not get complaints from the South.

The section can get involved even where there is no federal candidate on the ballot if there is a racial issue under the 14th and 15th Amendments.

When the section receives a complaint, attorneys first determine whether it is a matter that involves individual offenders or a systemic problem. When deciding what to do with the complaint, the section errs on the side of referring it criminally to avoid having any civil litigation complicate a possible criminal case.

When a complaint comes in, the attorneys ask questions to see if there are even problems there that the complainant is not aware are violations of the law. For example, in the Boston case, the attorney did not just look at Spanish language cases under section 203, but also brought a Section 2 case for violations regarding Chinese and Vietnamese voters. When looking into a case, the attorneys look for specificity, witnesses and supporting evidence.

Often, lawsuits bring voluntary compliance.

Voter Intimidation
Many instances of what some people refer to as voter intimidation are more unclear now. For example, photographing voters at the polls has been called intimidating, but now everyone is at the polls with a camera. It is hard to know when something is intimidation and it is difficult to show that it was an act of intimidation.

The fact that both parties are engaging in these tactics now makes it more complicated. It makes it difficult to point the finger at any one side.

The inappropriate use of challengers on the basis of race would be a violation of the law. Mr. Tanner was unaware that such allegations were made in Ohio in 2004. He said there had never been a formal investigation into the abusive use of challengers.

Mr. Tanner said a lot of the challenges are legitimate because you have a lot of voter registration fraud as a result of groups paying people to register voters by the form. They turn in bogus registration forms. Then the parties examine the registration forms and challenge them because 200 of them, for example, have addresses of a vacant lot.

However, Mr. Tanner said the department was able to informally intervene in challenger situations in Florida, Atkinson County, Georgia and in Alabama, as was referenced in a February 23 Op-Ed in USA Today. Mr. Tanner reiterated the section takes racial targeting very seriously.

Refusal to provide provisional ballots would be a violation of the law that the section would investigate.

Deceptive practices are committed by individuals and would be a matter for the Public Integrity Section. Local government would have to be involved for the Voting Section to become involved.

Unequal implementation of ID rules, or asking minority voters only for ID would be something the section would go after. Mr. Tanner was unaware of allegations of this in 2004. He said this is usually a problem where you have language minorities and the poll workers cannot understand the voters when they say their names. The section has never formally investigated or solely focused a case based on abuse of ID provisions. However, implementation of ID rules was part of the Section 2 case in San Diego. Mr. Tanner reiterated that the section is doing more than ever before.

When asked about the section’s references to incidents of vote fraud in the documents related to the new state photo identification requirements, Mr. Tanner said the section only looks at retrogression, not at the wisdom of what a legislature does. In Georgia, for example, everyone statistically has identification, and more blacks have ID than whites. With respect to the letter to Senator Kit Bond regarding voter ID, the section did refer to the perception of concern about dead voters because of reporting by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution. It is understandable that when you have thousands of bogus registrations that there would be concerns about polling place fraud. Very close elections make this even more of an understandable concern. Putting control of registration lists in the hands
of the states will be helpful because at this higher level of government you find a higher level of professionalism.

It is hard to know how much vote suppression and intimidation is taking place because it depends on one's definition of the terms – they are used very loosely by some people. However, the enforcement of federal law over the years has made an astounding difference so that the level of discrimination has plummeted. Registration of minorities has soared, as can be seen on the section's website. Mr. Tanner was unsure if the same was true with respect to turnout, but the gap is less. That information is not on the section's website.

The section is not filing as many Section 2 cases as compared to Section 203 cases because many of the jurisdictions sued under Section 2 in the past do not have issues anymore. Mr. Tanner said that race based problems are rare now.

NVRA has been effective in opening up the registration process. In terms of enforcement, Mr. Tanner said they do what they can when they have credible allegations. There is a big gap between complaints and what can be substantiated. Mr. Tanner stated that given the high quality of the attorneys now in the section, if they do not investigate it or bring action, that act complained of did not happen.

Recommendations

Mr. Tanner did not feel it was appropriate to make recommendations.

Consultants Note: Mr. Tanner's reluctance to share data, information and his perspective on solving the problems presented an obstacle to conducting the type of interview that would help inform this project as much as we would have hoped. We did not have access to any information about or data from the section's election complaint in-take phone logs or data or even general information from the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system-its formal process for tracking and managing work activities in pursuing complaints and potential violations of the voting laws. Only a selected few samples of attorney-observer reports were provided, reports that every Voting Section attorney who is observing elections at poll sites on Election Day is required to submit. Mr. Tanner would not discuss any current investigations or cases the section is involved in.

EAC made clarifying edits to this portion of the consultants' report.
Commissioners,

Per your request, please see attached the proposed edits to the summaries of the interviews with Craig Donsanto and John Tanner.

Please get me your comments by Monday COB so that we can finalize this document in time for the meeting next week.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005

(202) 566-3100  Summaries of Interviews with Donsanto-Tanner redacted-revised.doc
Interview with Craig Donsanto, Director, Elections Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, U.S. Department of Justice
January 13, 2006

The Department of Justice's (DOJ) Election Crimes Branch is responsible for supervising federal criminal investigations and prosecutions of election crimes.

Questions

How are Prosecution Decisions Made?

Craig Donsanto must approve all investigations that go beyond a preliminary stage, all charges, search warrant applications and subpoenas and all prosecutions. The decision to investigate is very sensitive because of the public officials involved. If a charge seems political, Donsanto will reject it. Donsanto gives possible theories for investigation. Donsanto and Noel Hillman will decide whether to farm out the case to an Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA). Donsanto uses a concept called predication. In-other-words, there must be enough evidence to suggest a crime has been committed. The method of evaluation of this evidence depends on the type of evidence and its source. There are two types of evidence---factual (antisocial behavior) and legal (antisocial behavior leading to statutory violations). Whether an indictment will be brought depends on the likelihood of success before a jury. Much depends on the type of evidence and the source. Donsanto said he “knows it when he sees it.” Donsanto will only indict if he is confident of a conviction assuming the worst case scenario – a jury trial.

A person under investigation will first receive a target letter. Often, a defendant who gets a target letter will ask for a departmental hearing. The defendant’s case will be heard by Donsanto and Hillman. On occasion, the assistant attorney general will review the case. The department grants such hearings because such defendants are likely to provide information about others involved.

The Civil Rights Division, Voting Rights Section makes its own decisions on prosecution. The head of that division is John Tanner. There is a lot of cooperation between the Voting Section and the Election Crimes Branch.

Does the Decision to Prosecute Incorporate Particular Political Considerations within a State Such as a One Party System or a System in which the Party in Power Controls the Means of Prosecution and Suppresses Opposition Complaints?

Yes. Before, the department would leave it to the states. Now, if there is racial animus involved in the case, there is political bias involved, or the prosecutor is not impartial, the department will take it over.

Does it Matter if the Complaint Comes from a Member of a Racial Minority?

No. But if the question involves racial animus, that has also always been an aggravating
What Kinds of Complaints Would Routinely Override Principles of Federalism?

Federalism is no longer big issue. DOJ is permitted to prosecute whenever there is a candidate for federal office on the ballot.

Are There Too Few Prosecutions?

DOJ can’t prosecute everything.

What Should Be Done to Improve the System?

The problem is asserting federal jurisdiction in non-federal elections. It is preferable for the federal government to pursue these cases for the following reasons: federal districts draw from a bigger and more diverse jury pool; the DOJ is politically detached; local district attorneys are hamstrung by the need to be re-elected; DOJ has more resources—local prosecutors need to focus on personal and property crimes—fraud cases are too big and too complex for them; DOJ can use the grand jury process as a discovery technique and to test the strength of the case.

In U.S. v. McNally, the court ruled that the mail fraud statute does not apply to election fraud. It was through the mail fraud statute that the department had routinely gotten federal jurisdiction over election fraud cases. 18 USC 1346, the congressional effort to “fix” McNally, did not include voter fraud.

As a result, the department needs a new federal law that allows federal prosecution whenever a federal instrumentality is used, e.g. the mail, federal funding, interstate commerce. The department has drafted such legislation, which was introduced but not passed in the early 1990s. A federal law is needed that permits prosecution in any election where any federal instrumentality is used.

Other Information

The Department has held four symposia for District Election Officers (DEOs) and FBI agents since the initiation of the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative. In 2003, civil rights leaders were invited to make speeches, but were not permitted to take part in the rest of the symposium. All other symposia have been closed to the public.

There are two types of attorneys in the division: prosecutors, who take on cases when the jurisdiction of the section requires it; the US Attorney has recused him or herself; or when the US Attorney is unable to handle the case (most frequent reason) and braintrust attorneys who analyze the facts, formulate theories, and draft legal documents.
Donsanto provided us with three case lists: cases still being investigated as of January 13, 2006 – confidential; election fraud prosecutions and convictions as a result of the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative October 2002-January 13, 2006; and cases closed for lack of evidence as of January 13, 2006.

If we want more documents related to any case, we must get those documents from the states. The department will not release them to us.

Although the number of election fraud related complaints have not gone up since 2002, nor has the proportion of legitimate to illegitimate complaints of fraud, the number of cases that the department is investigating and the number of indictments the department is pursuing are both up dramatically.

Since 2002, the department has brought more cases against alien voters, felon voters, and double voters than ever before. Previously, cases were only brought against conspiracies to corrupt the process rather than individual offenders acting alone. For deterrence purposes, the Attorney General decided to add the pursuit of individuals who vote when not eligible to vote (noncitizens, felons) or who vote more than once. The department is currently undertaking three pilot projects to determine what works in developing the cases and obtaining convictions and what works with juries in such matters to gain convictions:

1. Felon voters in Milwaukee.
2. Alien voters in the Southern District of Florida. FYI – under 18 USC 611, to prosecute for “alien voting” there is no intent requirement. Conviction can lead to deportation. Nonetheless, the department feels compelled to look at mitigating factors such as was the alien told it was OK to vote, does the alien have a spouse that is a citizen.
3. Double voters in a variety of jurisdictions.

The department does not maintain records of the complaints that come in from DEOs, U.S. attorneys and others during the election that are not pursued by the department. Donsanto asserted that U.S. attorneys never initiate frivolous investigations.

According to the new handbook, the department can take on a case whenever there is a federal candidate on the ballot.
Interview with John Tanner, Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

February 24, 2006

The Department of Justice's (DOJ) Voting Section is charged with the civil enforcement of the Voting Rights Act, the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA), the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA), and Title III of the Help America Vote Act (HAVA).

Authority and Process

The Voting Section, in contrast to the Public Integrity Section as Craig Donsanto described it, typically focuses only on systemic problems resulting from government action or inaction, not problems caused by individuals. Indeed, the section never goes after individuals because it does not have the statutory authority to do so. In situations in which individuals are causing problems at the polls and interfering with voting rights, the section calls the local election officials to resolve it.

Federal voting laws enforced by the section only apply to state action, so the section only sues state and local governments – it does not have any enforcement power over individuals. Most often, the section enters into consent agreements with governments that focus on poll worker training, takes steps to restructure how polls are run, and deals with problems on Election Day on the spot. Doing it this way has been most effective – for example, while the section used to have the most observers in the South, with systematic changes forced upon those jurisdictions, the section now does not get complaints from the South.

The section can get involved even where there is no federal candidate on the ballot if there is a racial issue under the 14th and 15th Amendments.

When the section receives a complaint, attorneys first determine whether it is a matter that involves individual offenders or a systemic problem. When deciding what to do with the complaint, the section errs on the side of referring it criminally to avoid having any civil litigation complicate a possible criminal case.

When a complaint comes in, the attorneys ask questions to see if there are even problems there that the complainant is not aware are violations of the law. For example, in the Boston case, the attorney did not just look at Spanish language cases under section 203, but also brought a Section 2 case for violations regarding Chinese and Vietnamese voters. When looking into a case, the attorneys look for specificity, witnesses and supporting evidence.

Often, lawsuits bring voluntary compliance.

Voter Intimidation
Many instances of what some people refer to as voter intimidation are more unclear now. For example, photographing voters at the polls has been called intimidating, but now everyone is at the polls with a camera. It is hard to know when something is intimidation and it is difficult to show that it was an act of intimidation.

The fact that both parties are engaging in these tactics now makes it more complicated. It makes it difficult to point the finger at any one side.

The inappropriate use of challengers on the basis of race would be a violation of the law. Mr. Tanner was unaware that such allegations were made in Ohio in 2004. He said there had never been a formal investigation into the abusive use of challengers.

Mr. Tanner said a lot of the challenges are legitimate because you have a lot of voter registration fraud as a result of groups paying people to register voters by the form. They turn in bogus registration forms. Then the parties examine the registration forms and challenge them because 200 of them, for example, have addresses of a vacant lot.

However, Mr. Tanner said the department was able to informally intervene in challenger situations in Florida, Atkinson County, Georgia and in Alabama, as was referenced in a February 23 Op-Ed in USA Today. Mr. Tanner reiterated the section takes racial targeting very seriously.

Refusal to provide provisional ballots would be a violation of the law that the section would investigate.

Deceptive practices are committed by individuals and would be a matter for the Public Integrity Section. Local government would have to be involved for the Voting Section to become involved.

Unequal implementation of ID rules, or asking minority voters only for ID would be something the section would go after. Mr. Tanner was unaware of allegations of this in 2004. He said this is usually a problem where you have language minorities and the poll workers cannot understand the voters when they say their names. The section has never formally investigated or solely focused a case based on abuse of ID provisions. However, implementation of ID rules was part of the Section 2 case in San Diego. Mr. Tanner reiterated that the section is doing more than ever before.

When asked about the section’s references to incidents of vote fraud in the documents related to the new state photo identification requirements, Mr. Tanner said the section only looks at retrogression, not at the wisdom of what a legislature does. In Georgia, for example, everyone statistically has identification, and more blacks have ID than whites. With respect to the letter to Senator Kit Bond regarding voter ID, the section did refer to the perception of concern about dead voters because of reporting by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution. It is understandable that when you have thousands of bogus registrations that there would be concerns about polling place fraud. Very close elections make this even more of an understandable concern. Putting control of registration lists in the hands
of the states will be helpful because at this higher level of government you find a higher level of professionalism.

It is hard to know how much vote suppression and intimidation is taking place because it depends on one’s definition of the terms – they are used very loosely by some people. However, the enforcement of federal law over the years has made an astounding difference so that the level of discrimination has plummeted. Registration of minorities has soared, as can be seen on the section’s website. Mr. Tanner was unsure if the same was true with respect to turnout, but the gap is less. That information is not on the section’s website.

The section is not filing as many Section 2 cases as compared to Section 203 cases because many of the jurisdictions sued under Section 2 in the past do not have issues anymore. Mr. Tanner said that race based problems are rare now.

NVRA has been effective in opening up the registration process. In terms of enforcement, Mr. Tanner said they do what they can when they have credible allegations. There is a big gap between complaints and what can be substantiated. Mr. Tanner stated that given the high quality of the attorneys now in the section, if they do not investigate it or bring action, that act complained of did not happen.

**Recommendations**
Mr. Tanner did not feel it was appropriate to make recommendations.

Note: We contend that Mr. Tanner’s reluctance to share data, information and his perspective on solving the problems presented an obstacle to conducting the type of interview that would help inform this project as much as we would have hoped. We did not have access to any information about or data from the section’s election complaint intake phone logs or data or even general information from the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system-its formal process for tracking and managing work activities in pursuing complaints and potential violations of the voting laws. Only a selected few samples of attorney-observer reports were provided, reports that every Voting Section attorney who is observing elections at poll sites on Election Day is required to submit. Mr. Tanner would not discuss any current investigations or cases the section is involved in.
Thank you. This is for the Brennan Center, so I want to do everything possible to meet their deadline.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov

Bert,
Go into my computer and look under the folder for eagleton and print out any items there and fed ex them to me so I can look at them.
We also have some hard cover letters that were sent back and forth.
My password is

Let me know if you have a problem and Henry can reset the password

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 12/01/2006 11:50 AM
To: Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Bert Benavides
Subject: FOIA request

Tom,
I know you haven't responded to my FOIA request b/c of what you've got going on, but I wanted to bring it to your attention b/c I'm pretty sure you've got some related emails. According to Karen, you and John Weingardt had email exchanges primarily after June 30. I'll need to get all of those and any letters or any other correspondence b/w the two of you. I asked for everyone to submit what they have by Monday. Perhaps Bert can begin gathering this info. See the original request below.
I need each of you to respond affirmatively or negatively to the FOIA request below. If you have no documents in your possession related to this request, please reply to me with the words "no records." If you have records, please identify them in an e-mail reply and attach them to the e-mail. If the document is not electronic, hand deliver them to me. Also, if you believe any of these related documents should be withheld, please provide a brief memo stating the reason for your position.

I need this information and/or a response by COB December 5, 2006. If you cannot comply by this date, please provide notification and an estimated time when you will provide the information and the reason why you cannot comply by the original deadline. Thanks for your cooperation. See request below:

Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center for Justice has submitted a FOIA request for the voting fraud report prepared by our consultants and the voter ID report, as well as the following information:

"In the event that the EAC denies my renewed request for the voter ID and voting fraud reports or delays another week in providing those materials, we respectfully request copies of (1) all requests for proposals and contracts relating to the voter ID and voting fraud reports; and (2) all written and electronic communications concerning the voter ID and voting fraud reports between the EAC and (a) the Eagleton Institute of Politics, (b) the Moritz College of Law, (c) Tova Wang, (d) Job Serebrov, and (e) any other individuals or entities, including but not limited to outside reviewers."

Please let me know if you would like a copy of the FOIA request.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Hello everyone,
I need each of you to respond affirmatively or negatively to the FOIA request below. If you have no documents in your possession related to this request, please reply to me with the words "no records." If you have records, please identify them in an e-mail reply and attach them to the e-mail. If the document is not electronic, hand deliver them to me. Also, if you believe any of these related documents should be withheld, please provide a brief memo stating the reason for your position.

I need this information and/or a response by COB December 5, 2006. If you cannot comply by this date, please provide notification and an estimated time when you will provide the information and the reason why you cannot comply by the original deadline. Thanks for your cooperation. See request below:

Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center for Justice has submitted a FOIA request for the voting fraud report prepared by our consultants and the voter ID report, as well as the following information:

"In the event that the EAC denies my renewed request for the voter ID and voting fraud reports or delays another week in providing those materials, we respectfully request copies of (1) all requests for proposals and contracts relating to the voter ID and voting fraud reports; and (2) all written and electronic communications concerning the voter ID and voting fraud reports between the EAC and (a) the Eagleton Institute of Politics, (b) the Moritz College of Law, (c) Tova Wang, (d) Job Serebrov, and (e) any other individuals or entities, including but not limited to outside reviewers."

Please let me know if you would like a copy of the FOIA request.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Here's my suggestions...

Voter Fraud & Intimidation edits.doc
Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
EAC REPORT ON VOTER FRAUD AND VOTER INTIMIDATION STUDY

INTRODUCTION

Voter fraud and intimidation is a phrase familiar to many voting-aged Americans. However, it means different things to different people. Voter fraud and intimidation is a phrase used to refer to crimes, civil rights violations, and, at times, even the correct application of state or federal laws to the voting process. Past study of this topic has been as varied as its perceived meaning. In an effort to help understand the realities of voter fraud and voter intimidation in our elections, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has begun this, phase one, of a comprehensive study on election crimes. In this phase of its examination, EAC has developed a definition of election crimes and adopted some research methodology on how to assess the existence and enforcement of election crimes in this country.

PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EAC STUDY

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) calls on the EAC to research and study various issues related to the administration of elections. During Fiscal Year 2006, EAC began projects to research several of the listed topics. These topics for research were chosen in consultation with the EAC Standards Board and Board of Advisors. Voter fraud and voter intimidation was a topic that the EAC as well as its advisory boards felt were important to study to help improve the administration of elections for federal office.

EAC began this study with the intention of identifying a common understanding of voter fraud and intimidation and devising a plan for a comprehensive study of these issues. This study was not intended to be a comprehensive review of existing voter fraud and voter intimidation actions, laws, or prosecutions. To conduct that type of extensive research, a basic understanding that had to first be established regarding what is commonly referred to as voter fraud and voter intimidation. Once that understanding was reached, a definition had to be crafted to refine and in some cases limit the scope of what reasonably can be researched and studied as evidence of voter fraud and voter intimidation. That definition will serve as the basis for recommending a plan for a comprehensive study of the area.

To accomplish these tasks, EAC employed two consultants, who worked with EAC staff and interns to conduct the research that forms the basis of this report. Consultants were chosen based upon their experience with the topic and to assure a bipartisan representation in this study. The consultants and EAC staff were charged (1) to research the current state of information on the topic of voter fraud and voter intimidation; (2) to develop a uniform definition of voter fraud and voter intimidation; and (3) to propose recommended strategies for researching this subject.
EAC consultants reviewed existing studies, articles, reports and case law on voter fraud and intimidation and conducted interviews with experts in the field. EAC consultants and staff then presented their initial findings to a working group that provided feedback. The working group participants were:

**The Honorable Todd Rokita**  
Indiana Secretary of State  
Member, EAC Standards Board and the Executive Board of the Standards Board  

**Kathy Rogers**  
Georgia Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State  
Member, EAC Standards Board  

**J.R. Perez**  
Guadalupe County Elections Administrator, Texas  

**Barbara Arnwine**  
Executive Director, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights under Law  
Leader of Election Protection Coalition  

**Benjamin L. Ginsberg**  
Partner, Patton Boggs LLP  
Counsel to national Republican campaign committees and Republican candidates  

Throughout the process, EAC staff assisted the consultants by providing statutes and cases on this subject as well as supervision on the direction, scope and product of this research.

The consultants drafted a report for EAC that included their summaries of existing laws, cases, studies and reports on voter fraud and intimidation as well as summaries of the interviews that they conducted. The draft report also provided a definition of voter fraud and intimidation and made certain recommendations developed by the consultants or by the working group on how to pursue further study of this subject. This document was vetted and edited by EAC staff to produce this final report.

**EXISTING INFORMATION ABOUT FRAUD AND INTIMIDATION**

To begin our study of voter fraud and voter intimidation, EAC consultants reviewed the current body of information on voter fraud and intimidation. The information available about these issues comes largely from a very limited body of reports, articles, and books.
There are volumes of case law and statutes in the various states that also impact our understanding of what actions or inactions are legally considered fraud or intimidation. Last, there is anecdotal information available through media reports and interviews with persons who have administered elections, prosecuted fraud, and studied these problems. All of these resources were used by EAC consultants to provide an introductory look at the available knowledge of voter fraud and voter intimidation.

Reports and Studies of Voter Fraud and Intimidation

Over the years, there have been a number of studies conducted about the concepts of voter fraud and voter intimidation. EAC reviewed many of these studies and reports to develop a base-line understanding of the information that is currently available about voter fraud and voter intimidation. EAC consultants reviewed the following articles, reports and books, summaries of which are available in Appendix “_”:

Articles and Reports


• The Brennan Center and Professor Michael McDonald “Analysis of the September 15, 2005 Voter Fraud Report Submitted to the New Jersey Attorney General,” The Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law, December 2005.

• Democratic National Committee, “Democracy at Risk: The November 2004 Election in Ohio,” DNC Services Corporation, 2005

• Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2002."

• Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2003."

• Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2004."


During our review of these documents, we learned a great deal about the type of research that has been conducted in the past concerning voter fraud and voter intimidation. None of the studies or reports was based on a comprehensive study, survey or review of all allegations, prosecutions or convictions of state or federal crimes related to voter fraud or voter intimidation. Most reports focused on a limited number of case studies or instances of alleged voter fraud or intimidation. For example, "Shattering the Myth: An Initial Snapshot of Voter Disenfranchisement in the 2004 Elections," a report produced by the People for the American Way, focused exclusively on citizen reports of fraud or intimidation to the Election Protection (is this DOJ?) program during the 2004 presidential election. Similarly, reports produced annually by the Department of Justice, Public Integrity Division, deal exclusively with crimes reported to and prosecuted by the United States Attorneys and/or the Department of Justice through the Public Integrity Section.

It is also apparent from a review of these articles and books that there is no consensus on the pervasiveness of voter fraud and voter intimidation. Some reports, such as "Building Confidence in U.S. Elections," suggest that there is little or no evidence of extensive fraud in U.S. elections or of multiple voting. This conflicts directly with other reports, such as the "Preliminary findings of Joint Task Force Investigating Possible Election Fraud," produced by the Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee County District
Attorney’s Office, FBI and U.S. Attorney’s Office. That report cited evidence of more than 100 individual instances of suspected double-voting, voting in the name of persons who likely did not vote, and/or voting using a name believed to be fake.

Voter intimidation is also a topic of some debate because there is little agreement on what constitutes actionable voter intimidation. Some studies and reports cover only intimidation that involves physical or financial threats, while others cover non-criminal intimidation, even legal practices, that allege suppression of the vote.

One point of agreement is that absentee voting and voter registration by third-party groups create opportunities for fraud. A number of studies cited circumstances in which voter registration drives have falsified voter registration applications or have destroyed voter registration applications of voters of a certain party. Others conclude that paying persons per voter registration application creates the opportunity and perhaps the incentive for fraud.

**Interviews with Experts**

In addition to reviewing prior studies and reports on voter fraud and intimidation, EAC consultants interviewed a number of persons regarding their experiences and research of voter fraud and voter intimidation. Persons interviewed included:

- **Wade Henderson**
  Executive Director,
  Leadership Conference for Civil Rights

- **Wendy Weiser**
  Deputy Director,
  Democracy Program, The Brennan Center

- **William Groth**
  Attorney for the plaintiffs in the Indiana voter identification litigation

- **Lori Minnite**
  Barnard College, Columbia University

- **Neil Bradley**
  ACLU Voting Rights Project

- **Nina Perales**
  Counsel,
  Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund

- **Pat Rogers**
  Attorney, New Mexico

- **Rebecca Vigil-Giron**
  Secretary of State, New Mexico

- **Sarah Ball Johnson**
  Executive Director,
  State Board of Elections, Kentucky

- **Stephen Ansolobohere**
  Massachusetts Institute of Technology

- **Chandler Davidson**
  Rice University

- **Tracey Campbell**
  Author, *Deliver the Vote*

- **Douglas Webber**
  Assistant Attorney General, Indiana

- **Heather Dawn Thompson**
These interviews in large part confirmed the conclusions that were gleaned from the articles, reports and books that were analyzed. For example, the interviewees largely agreed that absentee balloting is subject to the greatest proportion of fraudulent acts, followed by vote buying and voter registration fraud. They similarly pointed to voter registration drives by third-party groups as a source of fraud, particularly when the workers are paid per registration. Many asserted that impersonation of voters is probably the least frequent type of fraud because it was the most likely type of fraud to be discovered and due to the stiff penalties associated with this type of fraud.

Interviewees differed on what they believe constitutes actionable voter intimidation. Law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies tend to look to the criminal definitions of voter intimidation, which generally require some threat of physical or financial harm. On the other hand, voter rights advocates tended to point to activities such as challenger laws, voter identification laws, polling place locations, and distribution of voting machines as activities that can constitute voter intimidation.

Those interviewed also expressed opinions on the enforcement of voter fraud and voter intimidation laws. States have varying authorities to enforce these laws. In some states,
enforcement is left to the county or district attorney, and in others enforcement is managed by the state's attorney general. Regardless, voter fraud and voter intimidation are difficult to prove and require resources and time that many local law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies do not have. Federal law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies have more time and resources but have limited jurisdiction and can only prosecute crimes related to elections involving federal candidates. Those interviewed differed on the effectiveness of the current system of enforcement, including those who allege that prosecutions are not sufficiently aggressive and those who feel that the current laws are sufficient for prosecuting fraud and intimidation.

A summary of the each of the interviews conducted is attached as Appendix "__".

Case Law and Statutes

Consultants reviewed more than 40,000 cases that were identified using a series of search terms related to voter fraud and voter intimidation. The majority of these cases came from appeal courts. This is not surprising, since most cases that are publicly reported come from courts of appeal. Very few cases that are decided at the district court level are reported for public review.

Very few of the identified cases were applicable to this study. Of those that were applicable, no apparent thematic pattern emerged. However, it did seem (WHY DID IT "SEEM" THIS WAY? IS THERE EVIDENCE?) that the greatest number of cases reported on fraud and intimidation have shifted from past patterns of stealing votes to present problems with voter registration, voter identification, the proper delivery and counting of absentee and overseas ballots, provisional voting, vote buying, and challenges to felon eligibility.

A listing of the cases reviewed in this study is attached as Appendix "__".

Media Reports

EAC consultants reviewed thousands of media reports concerning a wide variety of potential voter fraud or voter intimidation, including:

- absentee ballot fraud,
- voter registration fraud,
- voter intimidation and suppression,
- deceased voters,
- multiple voting,
- felons voting,
- non-citizens voting,
- vote buying,
- deceptive practices, and
- fraud by election officials.
While these reports showed that there were a large number of allegations of voter fraud and voter intimidation, they provided much less information as to whether the allegations were ever formalized as complaints to law enforcement, whether charges were filed, whether prosecutions ensued, and whether any convictions were made. The media reports were enlightening as to the pervasiveness of complaints of fraud and intimidation throughout the country, the correlation between fraud allegations and the perception that the state was a "battleground" or "swing" state, and the fact that there were reports of almost all types of voter fraud and voter intimidation. However, these reports do not provide much data for analysis as to the number of complaints, charge and prosecutions of voter fraud and intimidation throughout the country.

DEFINITION OF ELECTION CRIMES

From our study of available information on voter fraud and voter intimidation, we have learned that these terms mean many things to many different people. These terms are used casually to refer to anything from vote buying to refusing to register a voter to falsifying voter registration applications. Upon further inspection, however, it is apparent that there is no common understanding or agreement of what constitutes "voter fraud" and "voter intimidation." Some think of voter fraud and voter intimidation only as criminal acts, while others include actions that may constitute civil wrongs, civil rights violations, and even legal and appropriate activities. To arrive at a common definition and list of activities that can be studied, EAC assessed the appropriateness of the terminology that is currently in use and applied certain factors to limit the scope and reach of what can and will be studied by EAC in the future.

New Terminology

The phrase "voter fraud" is really a misnomer for a concept that is much broader. "Fraud" is a concept that connotes an intentional act of deception, which may constitute either a criminal act or civil tort depending upon the willfulness of the act.

Fraud, n. 1. A knowing misrepresentation of the truth or concealment of a material fact to induce another to act to his or her detriment. • Fraud is usu. a tort, but in some cases (esp. when the conduct is willful) it may be a crime.


A "voter" is a person who is eligible to and engages in the act of voting. Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition, p. 1608. Using these terms to form a definition of "voter fraud," it means fraudulent or deceptive acts committed by the voter or in which the voter is the victim. Thus, a voter who intentionally provides false information on a voter registration application or intentionally impersonates another registered voter and attempts to vote for that person would be committing "voter fraud." Similarly, a person who knowingly provides false information to a voter about the location of the voter's polling place commits fraud on the voter.
The phrase "voter fraud" does not capture a myriad of other criminal acts that are related to elections which are not perpetrated by the voter and/or do not involve an act of deception. For example, "voter fraud" does not capture actions or willful inaction by candidates and election workers. When an election official willfully and knowingly refuses to register to vote a legally eligible person it is a crime. This is a crime that involves neither the voter nor an act of deception.

To further complicate matters, the phrases "voter fraud" and "voter intimidation" are used to refer to actions or inactions that are criminal as well as those that are potentially civil wrongs and even those that are legal. Obviously, criminal acts and civil wrongs are pursued in a very different manner. Criminal acts are prosecuted by the local, state or federal government. Generally, civil wrongs are prosecuted by the individual who believes that they were harmed. In some cases, when civil rights are involved, the civil division of the Department of Justice may become involved.

The goal of this study was to develop a common definition of what is generically referred to as "voter fraud" and "voter intimidation" that would serve as the basis of a future, comprehensive study of the existence of these problems. In order to meet that goal, we recognize that the current terminology does not accurately represent the spectrum of activities that we desire to study. Furthermore, we recognize that the resources, both financial and human capital, needed to study allegations and prosecutions of criminal acts, suits involving civil torts, and allegations of potential voter suppression through the use of legal election processes are well beyond the resources available to EAC. As such, EAC has defined "election crimes," a phrase that captures all crimes related to the voter registration and voting processes.

The Definition of an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study

Election crimes are intentional acts or willful failures to act, prohibited by state or federal law, that are designed to cause ineligible persons to participate in the election process; eligible persons to be excluded from the election process; ineligible votes to be cast in an election; eligible votes not to be cast or counted; or other interference with or invalidation of election results. Election crimes generally fall into one of four categories: acts of deception, acts of coercion, acts of damage or destruction, and failures or refusals to act.

Generally speaking, election crimes can be committed by voters, candidates, election officials, or any other members of the public who desire to criminally impact the result of an election. However, crimes that are based upon intentional or willful failure to act assume that a duty to act exists. Election officials have affirmative duties to act with regard to elections. By and large, other groups and individuals do not have such duties.

The victim of an election crime can be a voter, a group of voters, an election official, a candidate, or the public, in general. Election crimes can occur during any stage of the election process, including but not limited to qualification of candidates; voter registration; campaigning; voting system preparation and programming; voting either early, absentee, or election day; vote tabulation; recounts; and recalls.
The following are examples of activities that may constitute election crimes. This list is not intended to be exhaustive, but is representative of what states and the federal government consider criminal activity related to elections.

Acts of Deception

- Knowingly causing to be mailed or distributed, or knowingly mailing or distributing, literature that includes false information about the voter's precinct or polling place, the date and time of the election or a candidate;
- Possessing an official ballot outside the voting location, unless the person is an election official or other person authorized by law or local ordinance to possess a ballot outside of the polling location;
- Making, or knowingly possessing, a counterfeit of an official election ballot;
- Signing a name other than his/her own to a petition proposing an initiative, referendum, recall, or nomination of a candidate for office;
- Knowingly signing more than once for the proposition, question, or candidate at one election;
- Signing a petition proposing an initiative or referendum when the signer is not a qualified voter.
- Voting or attempting to vote in the name of another person;
- Voting or attempting to vote more than once during the same election;
- Intentionally making a false affidavit, swearing falsely, or falsely affirming under an oath required by a statute regarding their voting status, including when registering to vote, requesting an absentee ballot or presenting to vote in person;
- Registering to vote without being entitled to register;
- Knowingly making a material false statement on an application for voter registration or re-registration; and
- Voting or attempting to vote in an election after being disqualified or when the person knows that he/she is not eligible to vote.

Acts of Coercion

- Using, threatening to use, or causing to be used force, coercion, violence, restraint, or inflicting, threatening to inflict, or causing to be inflicted damage harm, or loss, upon or against another person to induce or compel that person to vote or refrain from voting or to register or refrain from registering to vote;
- Knowingly paying, offering to pay, or causing to be paid money or other thing of value to a person to vote or refrain from voting for a candidate or for or against an election proposition or question;
- Knowingly soliciting or encouraging a person who is not qualified to vote in an election;
- Knowingly challenging a person's right to vote without probable cause or on fraudulent grounds, or engaging in mass, indiscriminate, and groundless challenging of voters solely for the purpose of preventing voter from voting or delay the process of voting;
As an employer, attempting by coercion, intimidation, threats to discharge or to lessen the remuneration of an employee, to influence his/her vote in any election, or who requires or demands an examination or inspection by himself/herself or another of an employee’s ballot;

- Soliciting, accepting, or agreeing to accept money or other valuable thing in exchange for signing or refraining from signing a petition proposing an initiative;

- Inducing or attempting to induce an election official to fail in the official’s duty by force, threat, intimidation, or offers of reward;

- Directly or through any other person advancing, paying, soliciting, or receiving or causing to be advanced, paid, solicited, or received, any money or other valuable consideration to or for the use of any person in order to induce a person not to become or to withdraw as a candidate for public office; and

- Soliciting, accepting, or agreeing to accept money or other thing of value in exchange for registering to vote.

**Acts of Damage or Destruction**

- Removing or destroying any of the supplies or other conveniences placed in the voting booths or compartments;

- Removing, tearing down, or defacing election materials, instructions or ballots;

- Fraudulently altering or changing the vote of any elector, by which such elector is prevented from voting as the person intended;

- Knowingly removing, altering, defacing or covering any political sign of any candidate for public office for a prescribed period prior to and following the election;

- Intentionally changing, attempting to change, or causing to be changed an official election document including ballots, tallies, and returns; and

- Intentionally delaying, attempting to delay, or causing to be delayed the sending of certificate, register, ballots, or other materials whether original or duplicate, required to be sent by jurisdictional law.

**Failure or Refusal to Act**

- Intentionally failing to perform an election duty, or knowingly committing an unauthorized act with the intent to effect the election;

- Knowingly permitting, making, or attempting to make a false count of election returns;

- Intentionally concealing, withholding, or destroying election returns or attempts to do so;

- Marking a ballot by folding or physically altering the ballot so as to recognize the ballot at a later time;

- Attempting to learn or actually and unlawfully learning how a voter marked a ballot;

- Distributing or attempting to distribute election material knowing it to be fraudulent;
What is not an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study

There are some actions or inactions that may constitute crimes or civil wrongs that we do not include in our definition of "election crimes." All crimes or civil violations related to campaign finance reporting either at the state or federal level are not "election crimes" for purposes of this study and any future study conducted by EAC. Similarly, criminal acts that are unrelated to elections, voting, or voter registration are not "election crimes," even when those offenses occur in a polling place, voter registration office, or a candidate’s office or appearance. For example, an assault or battery that results from a fight in a polling place or at a candidate’s office is not an election crime. Similarly, violations of ethical provisions such as the Hatch Act are not "election crimes," and actions that do not rise to the level of criminal activity, such as a misdemeanor, relative felony or felony, are not “election crimes.”

RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW TO STUDY ELECTION CRIMES

As a part of its study, EAC sought recommendations on ways that EAC can research the existence of election crimes. EAC consultants, the working groups and some of the persons interviewed as a part of this study provided the following recommendations.

Recommendation 1: Conduct More Interviews

Future activity in this area should include conducting additional interviews. In particular, more election officials from all levels of government, parts of the country, and political parties should be interviewed. It would also be especially beneficial to talk to law enforcement officials, specifically federal District Election Officers (“DEOs”) and local district attorneys, as well as civil and criminal defense attorneys.

Recommendation 2: Follow Up on Media Research

The media search conducted for this phase of the research was based on a list of search terms agreed upon by EAC consultants. Thousands of articles were reviewed and hundreds analyzed. Many of the articles contained allegations of fraud or intimidation. Similarly, many of the articles contained information about investigations into such activities or even charges brought. (THIS SENTENCE CONTRADICTS WHAT WAS SAID EARLIER ABOUT THE LACK OF MEDIA ARTICLES ON FOLLOW UP.) Additional media research should be conducted to determine what, if any, resolutions or further activity there was in each case.

Recommendation 3: Follow Up on Allegations Found in Literature Review

13
Many of the allegations made in the reports and books that were analyzed and summarized by EAC consultants were not substantiated and were certainly limited by the date of publication of those pieces. Despite this, such reports and books are frequently cited by various interested parties as evidence of fraud or intimidation. Further research should include follow up on the allegations discovered in the literature review.

**Recommendation 4: Review Complaints Filed With “MyVote1” Voter Hotline**

During the 2004 election and the statewide elections of 2005, the University of Pennsylvania led a consortium of groups and researchers in conducting the MyVote1 Project. This project involved using a toll-free voter hotline that voters could call for poll locations, be transferred to a local hotline, or leave a recorded message with a complaint. In 2004, this resulted in more than 200,000 calls received and more than 56,000 recorded complaints.

Further research should be conducted using the MyVote1 data with the cooperation of the project leaders. While perhaps not a fully scientific survey given the self-selection of the callers, the information regarding 56,000 complaints may provide insight into the problems voters may have experienced, especially issues regarding intimidation or suppression.

**Recommendation 5: Further Review of Complaints Filed With U.S. Department of Justice**

According to a recent GAO report, the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice has a variety in ways it tracks complaints of voter intimidation. Attempts should be made to obtain relevant data, including the telephone logs of complaints and information from the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system. Further research should also include a review and analysis of the DOJ/OPM observer and “monitor field reports” (NOT SURE WHAT THIS MEANS) from Election Day.

**Recommendation 6: Review Reports Filed By District Election Officers**

Further research should include a review of the reports that must be filed by every District Election Officer to the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. The DEOs play a central role in receiving reports of voter fraud and investigating and pursuing them. Their reports back to the Department would likely provide tremendous insight into what actually transpired during the last several elections. Where necessary, information could be redacted or made confidential.

**Recommendation 7: Attend Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium**

Further activity in this area should include attending the next Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium. At this conference, prosecutors serving as District Election Officers in the 94 U.S. Attorneys’ Offices obtain annual training on fighting election fraud and voting rights abuses. These conferences are sponsored by the Voting Section of
the Civil Rights Division and the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division, and feature presentations by Civil Rights officials and senior prosecutors from the Public Integrity Section and the U.S. Attorneys’ Offices. By attending the symposium, researchers could learn more about the following: how District Election Officers are trained; how information about previous election and voting issues is presented; and how the Voting Rights Act, the criminal laws governing election fraud and intimidation, the National Voter Registration Act, and the Help America Vote Act are described and explained to participants.

**Recommendation 8: Conduct Statistical Research**

EAC should measure voter fraud and intimidation using interviews, focus groups, and a survey and statistical analysis of the results of these efforts. The sample should be based on the following factors:

- Ten locations that are geographically and demographically diverse where there have been many reports of fraud and/or intimidation;
- Ten locations (geographically and demographically diverse) that have not had many reports of fraud and/or intimidation;

EAC should also conduct a survey of elections officials, district attorneys, and district election officers. The survey sample should be large in order to be able to get the necessary subsets, and it must include a random set of counties where there have and have not been a large number of allegations.

**Recommendation 9: Explore Improvements to Federal Law**

Future researchers should review federal law to explore ways to make it easier to impose either civil or criminal penalties for acts of intimidation that do not necessarily involve racial animus and/or a physical or economic threat.

**Recommendation 10: Use Observers to Collect Data on Election Day**

Use observers to collect data regarding fraud and intimidation at the polls on Election Day. There may be some limitations to the ability to conduct this type of research, including difficulty gaining access to polling places for the purposes of observation.

**Recommendation 11: Study Absentee Ballot Fraud**

Because absentee ballot fraud constitutes a large portion of election crimes, a stand-alone study of absentee ballot fraud should be conducted. Researchers should look at actual cases to see how absentee ballot fraud schemes are conducted in an effort to provide recommendations on more effective measures for preventing fraud when absentee ballots are used.

**Recommendation 12: Use Risk Analysis Methodology to Study Fraud**
Conduct an analysis of what types of fraud people are most likely to commit.

Researchers will use that risk analysis to rank the types of fraud based on the “ease of commission” (WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?) and the impact of the fraud.

**Recommendation 13: Conduct Research Using Database Comparisons**

Researchers should compare information on databases to determine whether the voter rolls contain deceased persons and felons. In addition, the voter rolls can then be compared with the list of persons who voted to determine whether a vote was recorded by someone who is deceased or if felons actually voted.

**Recommendation 14: Conduct a Study of Deceptive Practices**

The working group discussed the increasing use of deceptive practices, such as flyers and phone calls with false and/or intimidating information, to suppress voter participation. A number of groups, such as the Department of Justice, the EAC, and organizations such as the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, keep phone logs regarding complaints of such practices. These logs should be reviewed and analyzed to see how and where such practices are being conducted and what can be done about them.

**Recommendation 15: Study Use of HAVA Administrative Complaint Procedure as Vehicle for Measuring Fraud and Intimidation**

EAC should study the extent to which states are utilizing the administrative complaint procedure mandated by HAVA. In addition, the EAC should study whether data collected through the administrative complaint procedure can be used as another source of information for measuring fraud and intimidation.

**Recommendation 16: Examine the Use of Special Election Courts**

Given that many state and local judges are elected, it may be worth exploring whether special election courts should be established to handle fraud and intimidation complaints before, during, and after Election Day. Pennsylvania employs such a system and could investigate how well that system is working.

**Accepted Recommendations**

There has never been a comprehensive study that gathered data regarding all claims, charges, and prosecutions of voting crimes. EAC feels that a comprehensive study is the most important research that it can offer the election community and the public. As such, EAC has adopted all or a part of six of the 16 recommendations made by EAC consultants and the working group.

While several of the other recommendations could be used to obtain more anecdotal information regarding election crimes, EAC believes that what is needed is a
comprehensive survey and study of the information available from investigatory agencies, prosecutorial bodies and courts on the number and types of complaints, charges and prosecutions of election crimes. Additional media reviews, additional interviews and the use of observers to collect information from voters on Election Day will only serve to continue the use of anecdotal data to report on election crimes. Hard data on complaints, charges and prosecutions exists and we should gather and use that data, rather than rely on the perceptions of the media or the members of the public as to what might be fraud or intimidation.

Some of the recommendations are beyond the scope of the current study. While election courts may be a reasonable conclusion to reach after we determine the volume and type of election crimes being reported, charged or prosecuted, it is premature to embark on an analysis of that solution without more information. Last, some of the recommendations do not support a comprehensive study of election crimes. While a risk analysis might be appropriate in a smaller scale study, EAC desires to conduct a broader survey to avoid the existing problem of anecdotal and limited scope of information.

In order to further its goal of developing a comprehensive data set regarding election crimes, EAC intends to engage in the following research activities in studying the existence and enforcement of election crimes:

**Survey Chief Election Officers Regarding Administrative Complaints**

Likely sources of complaints concerning voting crimes are the administrative complaint processes that states were required to establish as a part of complying with HAVA. Those complaint procedures were required to be in place prior to a state receiving any funds under HAVA. Citizens are permitted to file complaints under those procedures with the state’s chief election official, and those complaints must be resolved within 60 days. The procedures also allow for alternative dispute resolution of claims.

In order to determine how many of these complaints allege the commission of election crimes, EAC will survey the states’ chief election officers regarding complaints that have been filed, investigated, and resolved since January 1, 2004. EAC will use the definition of election crimes provided above in this report in its survey so that data regarding a uniform set of offenses will be collected.

**Survey State Election Crime Investigation Units Regarding Complaints Filed and Referred**

Several chief state election officials have developed investigation units focused on receiving, investigating, and referring complaints of election crimes. These units were established to bolster the abilities of state and local law enforcement to investigate allegations of election crimes. California, New York and Florida are just three examples of states that have these types of units.
EAC will use a survey instrument to gather information on the numbers and types of complaints that have been received by, investigated, and ultimately referred to local or state law enforcement by election crime investigation units since January 1, 2004. These data will help us understand the pervasiveness of perceived fraud, as well as the number of claims that state election officials felt were meritorious of being referred to local and state law enforcement or prosecutorial agencies for further action.

**Survey Law Enforcement and Prosecutorial Agencies Regarding Complaints and Charge of Voting Crimes**

While voters, candidates and citizens may call national hotlines or the news media to report allegations of election crimes, it is those complaints that are made to law enforcement that can be investigated and ultimately prosecuted. Thus, it is critical to the study of election crimes to obtain statistics regarding the number and types of complaints that are made to law enforcement, how many of those complaints result in the perpetrator being charged or indicted, and how many of those charges or indictments result in pleas or convictions.

Thus, EAC will survey law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies at the local, state and federal level to determine the number and types of complaints, charges or indictments, and pleas or convictions of election crimes since January 1, 2004. In addition, EAC will seek to obtain an understanding of why some complaints are not charged or indicted and why some charges or indictments are not prosecuted.

**Analyze Survey Data in Light of State Laws and Procedures**

Once a reliable data set concerning the existence and enforcement of election crimes is assembled, a real analysis of the effectiveness of fraud prevention measures can be conducted. For example, data can be analyzed to determine if criminal activities related to elections are isolated to certain areas or regions of the country. Data collected from the election official surveys can be compared to the data regarding complaints, charges and prosecutions gathered from the respective law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies in each jurisdiction. The effect and/or effectiveness of provisions such as voter identification laws and challenger provisions can be assessed based on hard data from areas where these laws exist. Last, analyses such as the effectiveness of enforcement can be conducted in light of the resources available to the effort.

**CONCLUSION**

Election crimes are nothing new to our election process. The pervasiveness of these crimes and the fervor with which they have been enforced has created a great deal of debate among academics, election officials, and voters. Past studies of these issues have been limited in scope and some have been riddled with bias. These are issues that deserve comprehensive and nonpartisan review. EAC, through its clearinghouse role, will collect and analyze data on election crimes throughout the country. These data not only will tell us what types of election crimes are committed and where fraud exists, but
also inform us of what factors impact the existence, prevention, and prosecution of election crimes.
Jeannie:

Here are the changes I suggested for the Vote Count-Recount and the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research projects. I don't think they will help the current situation much, as the original VF-VI description already stated that it is preliminary research. As it is preliminary research, we did not expect that it would provide a total picture of voting fraud and voter intimidation in this country. We just wanted to get some sense of what is going on, and a better idea of the direction future EAC research on the subject should take. To ensure that the research would be balanced, we had consultants and project working group members from opposing sides of the political spectrum.

According to folks intimately familiar with the development of HAVA, disputes over the extent to which voting fraud and voter intimidation existed caused Congress to add the study of these subjects to EAC's list of research projects. Given the nature of the subject (most offenders try to hide their activities, sufficient evidence is hard come by with some types of activity, and prosecution of offenses may not occur for political or budgetary reasons), it is doubtful that we will ever have completely reliable statistics on occurrences of voting fraud and voter intimidation, but we may be able to obtain better statistics than anyone else has. And we should be able to identify where in the voting process most offenses tend to occur and to explore alternatives for addressing vulnerabilities that leave the process open to corruption.

--- Peggy
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Vote Counts and Recounts
Section 241(b)(13) of HAVA allows EAC to study the laws and procedures used by each state that govern recounts of ballots cast in elections for Federal office, contests of determinations regarding whether votes are counted in such elections, and standards that define what will constitute a vote on each type of voting equipment used in the state to conduct elections for Federal office. The law also authorizes EAC to identify best practices that are used by States for recounts and contests. Consequently, in FY 2005, EAC began conducting research to develop best practices on vote count and recount laws and procedures. A major task associated with this research is the review of literature for methodologies used to establish best practices and developing definitions of what constitutes a best practice with respect to vote counts, recounts, and election contests. Major tasks specifically associated with the vote count research include: (1) reviewing and analyzing data collected on definitions of what constitutes a vote for each state by voting system, including processes for handling and counting ballots, provisions for observing the count, types of accounting and auditing procedures used to ensure an accurate accounting of each ballot cast, and time periods provided between unofficial election night tallies and certification of official results; (2) drafting a comprehensive report that includes the data analysis and state-by-state summary of definitions of what constitutes a vote for each voting system and the laws and procedures used to tally ballots; and (3) identifying best practices related to vote counting. Major tasks specifically associated with recount and election contest research include: (1) reviewing the literature on recount and contest laws and procedures; (2) drafting a comprehensive report that includes the data analysis and the State-by-State summary of definitions of what constitutes a vote and the laws and procedures used to tally ballots; and (3) identifying best practices with respect to recounts and election contests. After conducting the research, EAC will provide election officials throughout the country with recommended best practices for vote counts, recounts, and contested elections; however, jurisdictions may not be permitted to implement these practices until their State election authority or their State legislature has determined which are appropriate to implement in the State.

Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation
Sections 241(b)(6) and (7) allow EAC to conduct and make available to the public studies regarding nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office; and identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation. Building on this reference to studies of voting fraud and voting intimidation, EAC is conducting preliminary research on these topics. Activities include: (1) identifying what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections; (2) performing background research, including Federal and state-by-state administrative and case law review related to voting fraud and voter intimidation and a review of current voting fraud and voter intimidation activities taking place with key government agencies and civic and advocacy organizations; (3) identifying and convening a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation; and (4) writing a report summarizing the key findings, including suggestions for specific EAC activities to address these topics.
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Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Paul DeGregorio and I am the Chairman of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission. I would like to extend my thanks to Michael Alvarez, Thad Hall and Susan Hyde for organizing this conference and for inviting me to speak with you this afternoon.

My remarks today will focus on Voter Fraud and Voter Intimidation and how HAVA and the EAC address these issues.

The subject of voter fraud and voter intimidation can be a highly contentious issue. Since the 2004 election there has been a lot of discourse and writing about what constitutes election fraud and voter intimidation and how prevalent each may be in our society. While there are no clear numbers on the incidents of voter fraud and voter intimidation, what is clear is that the many groups are concerned about both issues and it is imperative that we continue to study and address them.

As you know, the EAC was created by The Help America Vote Act or “HAVA”. HAVA represents the first major piece of federal legislation on national election reforms. Among other provisions, Section 241 of HAVA requires the EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the tasks the EAC is to execute is the development of nationwide statistics and
methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud and voter intimidation in elections for Federal office.

In September of 2005 the Commission hired consultants to begin a study of voting fraud and voter intimidation. This research project is charged with the development of a clear definition of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in Federal elections; identifying current activities of key government agencies, civic advocacy groups, and other organizations regarding these topics; the establishment of a working group of experts to discuss these issues; and production of a report to the EAC summarizing the findings that includes recommendations for future research if any. Our staff is reviewing the report that was submitted to the EAC last month and we expect to share our findings in the near future.

The lack of any solid statistics regarding voter fraud and intimidation can be attributed to two major factors. First is because there is wide disagreement about the definitions for the terms “fraud” and “intimidation.” Some only consider it fraud if it falls under the criminal definitions of fraud. While others consider any form of an ineligible voter attempting to vote as fraud. I have even had it suggested to me that election officials who allow voters to cast ballots on touch screen machines without a voter-verified paper trail is election fraud. If that’s the case, then we have a whole lot of fraud occurring out there.

The term intimidation is also wrought with ambiguity. Some only consider it intimidation if there is a physical or mental advantage of one party over the other, while others consider any difficulty in
the voting process as being intimidation. Because of these definitional differences there has been no clear way to study the amount of fraud or intimidation because everyone is using a different definition to help shape the statistics.

Also skewing the statistics about election fraud and voter intimidation is the political agenda or bias from both sides that accompanies much of the literature about the topic. Oftentimes we see fiery rhetoric on this issue that appears to me to want to “scare” people into voting or not voting. As a result of this political bias and the ambiguity that accompanies the terms “fraud” and “intimidation,” it is difficult to know when something has risen to the level to be considered fraud or simply is an accusation with no backing.

HAVA has several provisions that not only help to combat fraud but also make voting easier. Most notably section 303 of HAVA which requires each state to create “… a single, uniform, official, centralized, interactive, computerized statewide voter registration list…” This database is to be maintained at the state level and is to contain the name and registration information of every legally registered voter in the State.

The Statewide voter registration database is to serve as the single system for storing and managing the official list of registered voters throughout the state. It will be coordinated with other agencies databases within the state in order to insure the residence status of the voter.
The Statewide Voter Database serves a very important and specific function. It helps to prevent opportunities for fraud by allowing state election officials to check their registration information against the databases of other agencies in order to insure the status of the voters. Under HAVA, state election officials are given the right to remove those names that have been checked against state agency death records. Used correctly and efficiently, this would clearly help eliminate the problem of the use of a deceased person's name to vote or allow authorities to go after those who sign a dead person's name in the initiative or candidate petition process.

Also in section 303 of HAVA, State election officials are required to regularly update the registration list, removing only those individuals who are ineligible to vote in that election while updating the status of those eligible to vote. It is in this way that HAVA is helping to eliminate opportunities for fraud by eliminating ineligible voters from registration lists, while easing the process for those voters who are eligible.

One issue that has become particularly contentious is the issue of voter identification to combat voter fraud. As many of you know voter identification laws have lead to suits in Georgia, Indiana, Missouri, Ohio and Arizona with more to follow as states pass more identification laws.

In 2005-2006 the EAC commissioned research on voter identification practices in the 2004 election. To the surprise of no one the study found a lot of disagreement regarding the need for
voter identification laws and the way these laws should be applied.

Those in favor of voter identification laws argue that their goal is to ensure that only those legally entitled to vote do so, and do so only once at each election. They propose stricter voter identification requirements to prevent one form of voter fraud -- that being multiple voting or voting by those who are not eligible.

However, opponents argue that stricter ID laws interfere with legitimate voter’s access to the ballot. They fear that some voters may lack convenient access to the required ID documents. Both sides assert that their policy will engender faith in the electoral process among citizens.

At the heart of this entire debate is the balance that needs to be struck between allowing those who are eligible to vote the ability to vote while preventing those who are not eligible to vote from voting.

From my own personal experience in traveling the world to improve the election process, especially in emerging democracies in Eastern Europe, Africa and Asia, I witnessed little, if any, resistance to ID requirements, including photo ID requirements. Indeed, I believe the Carter-Baker Commission has cited this phenomenon in their recommendations on this issue. In the recent Presidential election in Haiti, which is the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere, voters were required to show a photo ID to cast ballots. Statistics provided by IFES showed that over 3 million Haitian citizens, or about 80% of the voting age population,
registered to vote at centers that took their picture and fingerprints, and that produced the ID they used on Election Day. These IDs were paid for by the Organization of American States. On Election Day, 60% of the registered Haitians went to the polls, used their IDs, and cast ballots in the presidential election. By the way the 60% turnout matched the 2004 turnout in the US presidential election.

I cite this example and the Carter-Baker study to suggest that the first step that should be taken in order to find this balance is that more research needs to be conducted on the issue of voter identification. As was noted by the EAC’s research, the amount of evidence available on how voter identification laws impacted both voter turnout and voter fraud is limited, at best. As more and more states implement these laws more information needs to be gathered in order to discover if these laws are preventing fraud, and what their impact is on voter turnout.

Courts have also greatly disagreed on the impact of voter identification laws. A recent decision in Georgia granted a preliminary injunction to enjoin the State of Georgia from requiring photo identification to be able to cast a ballot in person. The court in reaching its decision concluded that the injury to a voter who couldn’t get the proper identification in time to vote was great and could not be tolerated. The court did point out that a State has a legitimate and important interest in attempting to combat voter fraud and in turn ensure the integrity of its elections.

This case is a perfect example of the struggle that legislatures, election officials, and courts are having with the issue of voter
fraud and voter identification. Most, if not all, recognize voter fraud as something that compromises the integrity of elections, but to what level are we willing to burden the legitimate voter to prevent this fraud from occurring?

Voter intimidation also has little valuable statistical information available. Again this is because “voter intimidation” is difficult to define and has rarely been prosecuted.

Many of the accusations of voter intimidation are brought against poll workers, most of whom are unaware of the possible intimidation taking place. For instance many of the accusations of intimidation by poll workers stem from poll workers making improper demands for identification, or poll workers questioning voters in what is a manner perceived as aggressive or intimidating. The solution to this problem is simple, proper poll worker training. Through proper training poll workers will know when and how ID or other verification documents are to be presented and the proper way to question voters at the polls. Also revisions to challenger laws can bring about more clarity about appropriate challenges and therefore less accusations of voter intimidation.

As more statistics are kept and the form and frequency of voter intimidation is better understood, states will be better prepared to prevent instances of voter intimidation and further improve the integrity of their elections. The EAC will continue work in this area so that we can hopefully see less rhetoric and more voter participation and trust in our elections.
In order to further support local election officials in this crucial election year we have released quick start guides on new voting systems, voting system security and testing, and poll worker recruitment and training. These guides provide a snapshot of processes and procedures for local election administrators to use when implementing new voting systems and security and testing older ones. It includes tips on receiving and testing equipment, poll worker training, security issues, and Election Day operations. In 2007, as part of our Clearinghouse responsibilities, we plan to distribute more comprehensive and detailed guides on these same important subjects.

In addition to the research projects that we have begun regarding election fraud and intimidation, we have several other research and data collection projects underway that will provide election officials and the public with valuable data to be used to improve the integrity of our elections. Already underway are studies on a number of topics including effective designs for ballots, polling places and websites; best practices for poll worker training, recruitment and retention, a study on vote count and recount procedures and the 2006 Election Day survey.

The HAVA College Poll Worker Program has awarded a total of almost $1 Million in grants to help recruit a new generation of poll workers. Research is underway to find the best methods to recruit train and retain college poll workers.

We are also working hard to make sure the public is kept up to date on the future of elections and how it will affect the voting process. During tenure as Chairman we have held six public
Since I will be leaving the EAC in the not-too-distant future, I would like to take a few minutes to discuss the immense accomplishments of the EAC since I became a commissioner in December of 2003:

First, we distributed the 3 billion dollars that Congress appropriated to the states to improve their voting equipment and processes. This was truly an historic event in the field of American election administration.

Also, the EAC delivered the HAVA-mandated voluntary voting system guidelines (VVSG) within proscribed the 9-month deadline. As we develop future versions of the guidelines, we will be looking into the use of new technology and devices, as well as new software that is being created for current voting systems. Next Monday we will publish in the Federal Register the draft of our new Voting System Certification Program that we expect to finalize in December. I think you will find that this program will be a lot more rigorous and transparent than anything we have ever seen before. I encourage you to review it and give us your comments.

During the past 33 months we have issued guidance to states on statewide databases, accessibility requirements and how to use HAVA funds. And our new Inspector General and his staff are working vigorously to audit and account for the funds we distributed. On a daily basis we answer questions and offer guidance for election officials throughout the USA and indeed from all over the world.
meetings throughout the country. The topics that we have covered in these meetings include: How voting systems are certified, The National Voter Registration Act, Vote Count and Recount Procedures, Poll Workers, Effective management guidelines for voting systems, effective ballot and polling place designs, better ways to serve military and other overseas voters, voter information websites, and the EAC voting system certification program. As you can see, with a staff of just 23 people--and that number includes the Commissioners--we have accomplished a great deal in our short period of existence.

Twenty one years ago, I was probably the only one in this room who was heavily engaged as a professional election administrator. I have seen a lot of change since that time and no more so than in the past 5 years. Since the passage of HAVA, the nation has experienced significant changes in the electoral process. New voting systems have been purchased, replacing the antiquated systems that had been in place for decades. New statewide databases are in place. No one should be turned away at the polls anymore as provisional voting is the law of the land. Disabled voters, elderly voters and voter with language barriers have new tools that make it easier for them to cast their ballot.

Is America better off for all this change? You bet we are. Is the system perfect and free from errors, flaws, fraud and intimidation? Certainly not.

On November 7th, can voters have full trust and confidence in the election results that come out of all of these new devices, laws and procedures? In my view, they certainly can.
It's been an honor for me to have served at this historic time on this small but remarkable federal agency that touches the lives of every American. During my time on the commission, I have come to know many of you and of your deep conviction to help American improve and strengthen our system of democracy. And I want to thank you for your work and for the strong support you have given me and the commission since our start a mere 3 years ago.

You may know that during the 10 years preceding my appointment to the EAC, I worked as hard as I could to improve the election process in many emerging democracies throughout the globe. Whether it was in Congo or Cambodia, Russia or Romania, Slovakia or Sierra Leone, those 10 years were truly a wonderful opportunity that allowed me to touch the hearts and minds of many peoples, and experience firsthand the many similarities and few differences we actually have among each other in this world. I will be forever grateful to President George W. Bush for giving me the opportunity to do and experience the exact same thing in the United States of America while on the EAC. Thank you.
We suspect that someone from the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project Working Group has been talking to reporters, tipping them off about what we are finding in our preliminary study, and referring them to our consultants (although the information could have come from anyone on the EAC boards, too). Apparently, the U.S. News & World Report reporter who contacted me also contacted both consultants working on the project.

Based on my recommendation, Tova Wang and, possibly, Job Serebrov, who are on EAC personal services contracts for our voting fraud and voter intimidation research, will seek further clarification from you about what they can and cannot say to reporters and in public fora about vote fraud and voter intimidation and about EAC's research. I have previously advised Tova and Job not to discuss the work they are doing for us as this is EAC research, the Commissioners have not yet received and accepted the final report, and the Commission has not approved their speaking about the EAC research.

**Tova plans to call you tomorrow (Tuesday, June 27) about the issue.** In addition to the reporter's inquiry, she has been invited to speak on the subject at the summer conference of the National Association of State Legislatures. She has plenty of knowledge of the subject in her own right (apart from our study), but is having trouble differentiating between her own work and the work she is doing for us. Please, just let me know what you advise her to do.

--- Peggy
Hi Peg,

Just wanted to give you the heads up that I did an interview with a reporter from The Hill today on fraud. As far as I know he is simply referring to me as a fellow at TCF and I did not discuss the project in any way.

Tova Andrea Wang
Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Peg,
My suggested edits are attached.

Chair Ltr to Donsanto-DRAFT & edits.doc
Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Tom:

In light of your announcement this morning about Peg's continued illness, I am asking who has taken the responsibility to complete EAC internal review of the information that was submitted to us by the consultants and what is the timeline for completion of that review?

I am taking far too much criticism on this to just idly sit by saying "I don't know" when EAC will release the information.

Thank you,
Gracia
Dear Ms. Layson:

Attached is a FOIA request from People For the American Way that we have also sent to you today by fax. Please do not hesitate to call me if you have any questions. Thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Judith E. Schaeffer
Deputy Legal Director
People For the American Way
jschaeffer@pfaw.org
202-467-2381 (ph.)
202-293-2672 (fax)
October 19, 2006

Ralph G. Neas  
President, People for the American Way Foundation  
2000 M Street, NW  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036

RE: October 18, 2006 Letter

Dear Mr. Neas:

Your letter of October 18, 2006 requests the release of EAC’s Voter Fraud and Intimidation Report. I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the purpose and status of this study.

In late 2005, EAC hired two consultants for the purpose of assisting EAC with two things: 1) developing a uniform definition of the phrase voter fraud, and 2) making recommendations on how to further study the existence, prosecution, and means of deterring such voter fraud. In May 2006, a status report on this study was given to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors during their public meetings. During the same week, a working group convened to react to and provide comment on the progress and potential conclusions that could be reached from the work of the two consultants.

The conversation at the working group meeting was lively on the very points that we were trying to accomplish as a part of this study, namely what is voter fraud and how do we pursue studying it. Many of the proposed conclusions that were suggested by the consultants were challenged by the working group members. As such, the consultants were tasked with reviewing the concerns expressed at the working group meeting, conducting additional research as necessary, and providing a draft report to EAC that took into account the working group’s concerns and issues.

That draft report is currently being vetted by EAC staff. EAC will release a final report from this study after it has conducted a review of the draft provided by the consultants. However, it is important to remember the purpose of this study — finding a uniform definition of voter fraud and making recommendations on how to study the existence, prosecution and deterrence of voter fraud — as it will serve as the basis of the EAC report on this study.

Thank you for your letter. You can be assured that as soon as a final report on the fraud and intimidation study is available, a copy will be made available to the public.

Sincerely,

Paul S. DeGregorio  
Chairman

Tel: (202) 566-3100  www.eac.gov  Fax: (202) 566-3189  Toll free: 1 (866) 747-1471
October 27, 2006

Via email and fax

Jeannie Layson  
Director of Communications  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue N.W.  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005

Re: FOIA Request

Dear Ms. Layson:

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, I am writing on behalf of People For the American Way to request a copy of a study concerning voter fraud conducted by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov and presented to the EAC in report form sometime subsequent to May 2006.

As you may know, I wrote to the EAC on October 18, 2006 on behalf of People For the American Way Foundation, asking for a copy of the report of this study. On October 19, I received a letter from Paul S. DeGregorio, Chair of the EAC, denying the request. (A copy of Mr. DeGregorio’s letter is attached.) According to Mr. DeGregorio, the report was a “draft” and would not be released. However, as even Mr. DeGregorio’s letter underscores, the report we are seeking is not a “draft” but rather the authors’ report of their study of voter fraud. That the Commission may, in the words of Mr. DeGregorio, “release a final report from this study” does not make the study itself a draft. In any event, the Commission should not, and in our view cannot, withhold from public disclosure this important study, which was funded by federal taxpayers.

In accordance with FOIA, I would appreciate your furnishing the requested report to us at your earliest convenience, and no later than 20 working days from today. If you deny this request in whole or in part, please cite the specific exemption(s) that you maintain allows the Commission to withhold the release of this report in whole or in part, and, as also required by law, please release any segregable portion of the report that remains after the exempted material has been deleted. We are willing to pay the statutory fee for the copying of this report.
Please do not hesitate to call our Deputy Legal Director, Judith E. Schaeffer, if you have any questions about this request. Thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ralph G. Neas
President
Gracia,

I have given the Eagleton Voter ID study a quick read.

Here are my comments (numbers refer to page numbers):

3. Of the scholars involved, the ones I know are very well respected by their peers.

4. Of the peer review group, the ones I know are also respected and represent quite different positions on the political spectrum.

6. A good statement of the tentative nature of their findings, after having clearly stated the two points of view at issue.

6-7. Limitations of model made clear.


10-12. Ideas for further research are excellent.

13-15. The summary of research on determinants of turnout includes the major studies by the top-ranked people in this subspecialty within political science.

Remainder of paper: Analysis sound and straightforward, with appropriate caveats entered. The writing, by the way, is lucid and easy to grasp by the educated lay person--something that cannot be said for many reports of this kind in government documents and academic journals!

In short, my reading of this paper leads me to believe its findings are carefully stated and fully justified, with the appropriate caveats regarding interpretation. I would be surprised if this paper, had it been submitted to a top-ranked, peer-reviewed political science journal, perhaps in abbreviated form, were not accepted for publication.

Cordially,

Chandler

Thanks. Please note that Eagleton did 2 studies for us (under one contract). One on Provisional Voting and one on Voter ID.

It is the Voter ID study that I'd appreciate you taking a look at.

Many thanks again.

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
May 24, 2005

Mr. Keith Osterhage, Director
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901

Dear Mr. Osterhage:

Enclosed is a signed contract in the amount of $560,002.00 for the provision of research assistance to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) for the development of voluntary guidance on provisional voting and voter identification procedures. The EAC has accepted the basic proposal submitted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics and has also elected to include the optional survey of local election officials. This proposal was evaluated as providing the best value to the government through a competitive source selection process. The proposal is incorporated by reference into the contract.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) was created by the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) and is charged with assisting the States in meeting the election reform requirements mandated by this legislation. One of the EAC’s principal tasks is to provide guidance to the States on the interpretation of HAVA and its requirements. The provisional voting and voter identification effort that will be supported by this contract is a major element of EAC’s Fiscal Year 2005 research agenda. The objective of this work is to develop guidance on these topics that States can utilize in the 2006 election cycle.

To acknowledge your receipt and acceptance of this contract, please countersign and date below and return one copy of this letter to the attention of Carol A. Paquette, Interim Executive Director.

We look forward to working with Rutgers University and the Eagleton Institute on this very important research effort.

Sincerely,

Gracia Hillman, Chair

---

Keith Osterhage
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
May 24, 2005

CONTRACT TO PROVIDE RESEARCH ASSISTANCE TO THE EAC FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOLUNTARY GUIDANCE ON PROVISIONAL VOTING AND VOTER IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES

0.0 Background: Sec. 302(a) of HAVA requires that all States allow the casting of provisional ballots in instances where a voter declares their eligibility to vote but their name does not appear on the official list of eligible voters, or an election official asserts that a voter is not eligible to vote. This section describes several requirements for implementation of provisional voting, but the States have considerable latitude in specifying how to carry out these requirements. The EAC seeks to examine how provisional voting was implemented in the 2004 general election and to prepare guidance for the States on this topic for the 2006 Federal elections.

HAVA Sec. 303(b) mandates that first time voters who register by mail are required to show proof of identity before being allowed to cast a ballot. The law prescribes certain requirements concerning this section, but also leaves considerable discretion to the States for its implementation. The EAC seeks to examine how these voter identification requirements were implemented in the 2004 elections and to prepare guidance on this topic for the 2006 elections.

One of the remedies for a voter not having an acceptable proof of identity is to allow the voter to cast a provisional ballot, either at the polling place or by mail. This linkage between these two HAVA sections provides a rationale for conducting research on these topics in parallel. However, it is anticipated that two separate guidance documents will result.

1.0 Objective: The objective of this contract is for EAC to obtain assistance with the collection, analysis and interpretation of information regarding HAVA provisional voting and voter identification requirements for the purpose of drafting guidance on these topics in time for implementation for the 2006 Federal elections. The anticipated outcome of this activity is the generation of concrete policy recommendations to be issued as voluntary guidance for States.

2.0 Scope: In general the Contractor shall be responsible for all research and analysis activities, including the conduct of public hearings for fact finding and public comment purposes. However, in light of the need to get started on this work, the EAC conducted a public hearing on provisional voting on February 23, 2005.

An initial framework for provisional voting policy has been set by the court decisions rendered on the election procedures utilized in the 2004 election. The 6th Circuit decision, in particular, has drawn some boundaries which must be given
due regard in the course of considering future policy alternatives for provisional voting.

Notice of public meetings and hearings is required to be published in the Federal Register. The Contractor shall be responsible for preparing the notice documents, and the EAC will submit the notices and cover the cost of publication. In addition, draft guidance documents must be published in the Federal Register to obtain public comment prior to their adoption. Again, the Contractor will work with the EAC to prepare the draft documents for publication, which the EAC will submit and pay for the cost of publication. Comments received will be provided to the Contractor for analysis and incorporation into the final guidance documents, as appropriate.

3.0 Specific Tasks

For ease of reference, following task 3.3 the remaining tasks are listed separately under the headings of Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Requirements. It is anticipated that the work on these two topics will be conducted essentially concurrently.

3.1 Update the project work plan, as required. The Contractor shall update and deliver the Project Plan not later than 10 days after contract award. This plan shall describe how the Contractor will accomplish each of the project tasks, including a timeline indicating major milestones. A single document will be prepared to include both provisional voting and voter identification tasks. The updated Project Plan shall be formally briefed to the EAC Project Manager and lead Commissioner.

3.2 Submit monthly progress reports. The Contractor shall submit a monthly progress report within 2 weeks of the end of each month. This report shall provide a brief summary of activities performed and indicate progress against the timeline provided in the Project Plan. Any issues that could adversely affect schedule should be identified for resolution. Budget status shall also be provided.

3.3 Conduct periodic briefings for the EAC. The Contractor shall periodically meet with the EAC Project Manager and the lead Commissioner for this work to discuss research findings and progress. The Project Plan should make allowance for this activity. The number and frequency of briefings will be determined by the Contractor Project Manager and the EAC Project Manager as the work progresses. The Contractor may also be required to periodically brief the full Commission on their work.
Provisional Voting

3.4 Collect and analyze State legislation, administrative procedures, and court cases. An understanding of the disparities and similarities of how provisional voting was implemented around the country will provide a baseline for the consideration of future approaches. Seventeen States never had provisional voting before HAVA was enacted, while many other States did. A State-by-State compendium of the legislation, procedures, and litigation reviewed shall be delivered along with the analysis results.

Topics of particular interest include the following:
- How did States prepare for the onset of the HAVA provisional ballot requirement?
- How did this vary between States that had previously had some form of provisional ballots and those that did not?
- How did litigation affect the implementation?
- How effective was provisional voting in enfranchising qualified voters?
- Did State and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots?
- Did local election officials have a clear understanding of how to implement provisional voting?

3.5 Recommend alternative approaches for future implementation of provisional voting. The Contractor shall conduct a literature review to identify other research results and data available on this topic. The EAC Election Day Survey, for example, contained several questions on provisional voting. The EAC will make these survey data available to the Contractor. Based on their analysis of available research and the results of Task 4.5, the Contractor shall diagnose the problems and challenges of provisional voting implementation and hypothesize alternative approaches.

The Contractor shall assess the efficacy of these alternatives in relation to the following inter-related policy objectives: (1) enabling the maximum number of eligible voters to cast ballots that will be counted; (2) providing procedural simplicity for voters, poll workers, and election officials; (3) minimizing opportunity for voter fraud; and (4) maintaining a reasonable workload for election officials and poll workers. Additional policy considerations may be identified in the course of this research effort. The Contractor shall document and brief these alternatives to the Commission.

3.6 Prepare preliminary draft guidance document. Based on the feedback received from the Commission, the Contractor shall prepare a draft guidance document for review and comment by the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board. EAC will convene a meeting or teleconference of the Boards for the discussion of this document. The Contractor shall provide the document in advance and participate in the meeting to answer questions and
record comments.

3.7 Revise draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register. The Contractor shall revise the guidance document as appropriate to reflect the comments of the EAC, the Board of Advisors and the Standards Board and prepare the draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register by the EAC.

3.8 Arrange one public hearing for receiving public comment on draft guidance. This hearing should be scheduled 30 days after the initial publication date. The Contractor shall select the location in consultation with the EAC. EAC will handle publicity for the meeting.

3.9 Prepare final guidance document for EAC adoption. Review all comments received in response to Federal Register publication and at public hearing and revise guidance document as appropriate. Provide final version to EAC for adoption.

Voter Identification Requirements

3.10 Collect and analyze State legislation, administrative procedures, and court cases. It is assumed that the collection of information for analysis of voter identification requirements will be performed concurrently with the research for Task 4.5. An understanding of the disparities and similarities of how voter identification requirements were implemented around the country will provide a baseline for the consideration of future approaches. A State-by-State compendium of the legislation, procedures, and litigation reviewed shall be delivered along with the analysis results.

3.11 Convene a half day public hearing on the topic of voter identification requirements. This hearing should occur early in the research process as an informational hearing where all points of view on this topic can be aired. The Contractor shall be responsible for all aspects of planning and conducting this hearing in consultation with the EAC. The Contractor shall identify three panels of three to four speakers each. The Contractor shall arrange for speaker attendance to include travel and per diem expenses. The EAC will provide publicity for the hearing. The Contractor shall prepare a document summarizing the proceedings and containing all testimony provided.

3.12 Recommend alternative approaches for future implementation of HAVA voter identification requirements. The Contractor shall conduct a literature review to identify other research results and data available on this topic. Based on their analysis of available research and the results of Task 4.11, the Contractor shall diagnose the problems and challenges of voter identification and hypothesize alternative approaches. The Contractor shall
coordinate with the EAC to identify appropriate policy objectives by which to assess these alternatives. The Contractor shall document and brief these alternatives to the Commission.

3.13 Prepare preliminary draft guidance document. Based on the feedback received from the Commission, the Contractor shall prepare a draft guidance document for review and comment by the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board. EAC will convene a meeting or teleconference of the Boards for the discussion of this document. The Contractor shall provide the document in advance and participate in the Board meeting to answer questions and record comments.

3.14 Revise draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register. The Contractor shall revise the guidance document as appropriate to reflect the comments of the EAC, the Board of Advisors and the Standards Board and prepare the draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register by the EAC.

3.15 Arrange a second public hearing for receiving public comment on the draft guidance. This hearing should be scheduled 30 days after the initial publication date. The Contractor shall select the location in consultation with the EAC. EAC will handle publicity for the hearing.

3.16 Prepare final guidance document for EAC adoption. Review all comments received in response to Federal Register publication and at public hearing and revise guidance document as appropriate. Provide final version to EAC for adoption.

4.0 Contract Type. The contract type will be Time and Materials in the amount of $560,002.00.

5.0 Place of performance. The principal place of performance will be the Contractor's place of business. Meetings and occasional work efforts may be performed at the EAC offices. Some travel will be required.

6.0 Period of Performance. The period of performance is from date of award until December 30, 2005.

7.0 Schedule of Deliverables:

1. Updated project plan – 10 days after contract award
2. Progress reports – monthly
3. Briefings – as required
4. Analysis report on provisional voting, including compendium of legislation, procedures and litigation - TBD
5. Alternatives report on provisional voting – TBD

014854
6. Preliminary draft guidance on provisional voting - TBD
7. Draft guidance on provisional voting for publication - 9/2005
8. Public hearing on draft guidance - 30 days after publication
9. Final guidance on provisional voting for EAC adoption - 10/2005
10. Analysis report on voter identification requirements, including compendium of legislation, procedures and litigation - TBD
11. Public hearing on voter identification requirements - TBD
12. Summary of voter identification requirements hearing - TBD
13. Alternatives report on voter identification requirements - TBD
14. Preliminary draft guidance on voter identification requirements - TBD
15. Draft guidance on voter identification requirements for publication - 11/2005
16. Public hearing on draft guidance - 30 days after publication
17. Final guidance on voter identification requirements to EAC for adoption - 12/2005

8.0 Inspection and Acceptance Criteria. Final inspection and acceptance of all work performed, reports, and other deliverables will be performed at the offices of the EAC. The Contracting Officer’s Representative for this effort will be Karen Lynn-Dyson. She will review and approve all work on behalf of the Commission.

9.0 Invoicing. Invoices may be submitted monthly using Standard Form 1034, Public Voucher for Purchases and Services Other Than Personal. Invoices shall be mailed to the attention of Ms. Diana Scott, Administrative Officer, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington D.C. 20005.

10.0 Accounting and Appropriation Data: Funds in the amount of $560,002.00 are available for this task order.

11.0 General Provisions:

11.1 Proposal Incorporated. The Contractor’s proposal is incorporated by reference into the statement of work.

11.2 Inspection/Acceptance. The Contractor shall only tender for acceptance those items that conform to the requirements of this contract. The EAC reserves the right to inspect and review any products or services that have been tendered for acceptance. The EAC may require correction or re-performance of nonconforming items at no increase in contract price. The EAC must exercise its post-acceptance rights within ten (10) days after the defect was discovered or should have been discovered.

11.3 Contract Terms. Should there be a conflict between the contract clauses included in this document and the “Purchase Order Terms and Conditions” on the back of GSA Form 300, which is used to record contract financial.
data, the contract clauses in this document shall take precedence.

11.4 Changes. Changes in the terms and conditions of this Contract may be made only by written agreement signed by authorized representatives of both parties.

11.5 Disputes. This Contract is subject to the Contract Disputes Act of 1978, as amended (41 U.S.C. 601-613). The Contractor shall proceed diligently with performance of this Contract, pending final resolution of any dispute arising under the Contract.

11.6 Excusable Delays. The Contractor shall be liable for default unless nonperformance is caused by an occurrence beyond the reasonable control of the Contractor and without its fault or negligence such as, acts of God or the public enemy, acts of the Government in either its sovereign or contractual capacity, fires, floods, epidemics, quarantine restrictions, strikes, unusually severe weather, and delays of common carriers. The Contractor shall notify the EAC, in writing, as soon as possible after the beginning of an excusable delay. The Contractor shall explain the basis for the excusable delay, and correct the problem as soon as possible. The Contractor shall notify the EAC, in writing, at the end of the delay.

11.7 Other compliances. The Contractor shall comply with all applicable Federal, State and local laws, executive orders, rules and regulations applicable to its performance under this contract.


11.9 Limitation of Government Liability. The Contractor is not authorized to make expenditures or incur obligations exceeding the total amount allocated to the contract. The Contractor is required to notify the Contracting Officer’s Representative when 75% of funding has been obligated.

11.10 Termination for convenience. The EAC, by written notice, may terminate this contract without fault, in whole or in part, when it is in the best interest of the government. In the event of contract termination for convenience, the rights, duties, and obligations of the parties, including compensation to the Contractor, shall be in accordance with Part 49 of the Federal Acquisition Regulations in effect on the date of this contract.
Gavin asked me about this issue yesterday and I also suggested a meeting/call between all of us to discuss this so there is no confusion about where things are. Obviously tomorrow is out, but does everyone want to have a call on Friday about this? Let me know what times everyone is available and I can reserve the small conference room. Thanks.

Edgardo Cortés
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Ste. 1100
Washington, DC 20005
866-747-1471 toll free
202-566-3126 direct
202-566-3127 fax
ecortes@eac.gov
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
10/25/2006 11:59 AM
To Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc ecortes@eac.gov
Subject Re: Question-Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Report

Tom:

I sent the consolidated draft of the report last week (minus the Nexis and case law charts) to the lawyers (with a cc: to you), along with the following comments:

- As you know, references to DOJ actions/responses have caused some concern at DOJ. But both consultants are adamantly opposed to EAC making substantive changes to their report. Perhaps using footnotes clearly labeled as EAC footnotes would be a method of addressing this issue?
- There are some recommendations regarding DOJ that we (the consultants and I) were told would not be supported by DOJ, and other references to DOJ, none of which have been reviewed by the department. I think we ought to give Craig Donsanto and John Tanner a chance to provide feedback on each of these sections.
- I am a little concerned about the naming of names, particularly in the section that addresses working group concerns. If we publish it as is, it might end up as fodder for some very negative newspaper articles.
- The report currently uses three different voices: third person, first person singular, first person plural. I think this looks really clumsy. If we are not actually making substantive changes, perhaps we could get away with making the presentation consistent in this regard.
- Because the consultants submitted the report in pieces, they did not include proper segueways. I don't know if we should leave it as is, or insert them where needed.
The only comments I've received so far were from Gavin, who said, "I would put forth one point at the outset... if we are creating an EAC report, let create an EAC report. Tova and Job contract employees... I do not see why we can't use all, some or none of their work without footnote or comment."

The series of supporting charts can be found in the shared drawer under T:\RESEARCH IN PROGRESS\VOTING FRAUD-VOTER INTIMIDATION \Report\Consolidated Copy in the subfolders marked Case Charts and Nexis Charts. I continue to work on the formatting of these charts, but at least you and Edgardo can access them. (I would have attached copies to this message, but it would involve too many files.)

We may want to schedule a teleconference on this with the attorneys and Jeannie.

I hope you are feeling better. --- Peggy

---

Hi Peggy;
Sorry I missed you yesterday when you were here and hope you are beginning to feel better.
As you know the Voter Fraud and Intimidation Report is causing quite a stir.
Can you give me some ball park timeframe for how long it may take to wrap up our review and get a report to the Commissioners
Is there anything I can do to assist with getting you some help on this.
I know you have other things on your mind but I need to find a way to wrap this up soon.
Also I believe that there were some charts of some sort that were not included in the report we got from Tova and Job, are they available for Edgardo to find so that I may take a look at this.
Thanks so much and hope things are getting better for you.
Tom

---

Thomas R. Wilkey
Executive Director
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Suite 1100
I think it's a good idea, especially considering the media coverage and controversy. I spoke with Todd Rokita today and he was not happy at all about what he has read and feels the status report was misleading as the working group session held the day after the report was given came to different conclusions.

We also should make mention on Thursday about the 4th anniversary of HAVA, which is this Friday. It could give us an opportunity to talk about the positive things that have happened in election reform since its passage. Much of the talking points our media advisors drafted talk about this.

--- Original Message ----
From: Gracia Hillman
Sent: 10/23/2006 09:13 PM
To: Paul DeGregorio; Thomas Wilkey; Donetta Davidson
Cc: Juliet Hodgkins; Jeannie Layson
Subject: The Fraud "Report"

I am recommending that we use Thursday's meeting, a public forum, to be on the record about this report.

My thought is that Tom should report the matter to us in his report. New Business?? Just stating the facts as they exist, including the nature of the study, how we have handled the numerous requests and inquiries that we have received, etc.

Please let me know what you think about this suggestion. Thanks.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
I am recommending that we use Thursday's meeting, a public forum, to be on the record about this report.

My thought is that Tom should report the matter to us in his report. New Business?? Just stating the facts as they exist, including the nature of the study, how we have handled the numerous requests and inquiries that we have received, etc.

Please let me know what you think about this suggestion. Thanks.

--------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
The letter looks fine to me.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 10/17/2006 10:06 AM
To: Paul DeGregorio; Gracia Hillman; Donetta Davidson
Cc: Thomas Wilkey; Margaret Sims; Karen Lynn-Dyson; Juliet Hodgkins; Gavin Gilmour; Bryan Whitener
Subject: NEED APPROVAL: Brennen Cen. letter

Commissioners,
I have not received input from everyone regarding the attached letter. It is a response to Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center, who requested the staff voter fraud status report and the provisional voting draft report, both of which were presented to the Standards Bd. and the Bd. of Adv. at the May meeting. She also requested the draft voter ID report, which was not released at the May meeting. If possible, I'd like to get your input by the end of the day. The letter would go out under Tom's signature. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
The letter is fine with me.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Jeannie Layson  
Sent: 10/17/2006 10:06 AM  
To: Paul DeGregorio; Gracia Hillman; Donetta Davidson  
Cc: Thomas Wilkey; Margaret Sims; Karen Lynn-Dyson; Juliet Hodgkins; Gavin Gilmour; Bryan Whitener  
Subject: NEED APPROVAL: Brennen Cen. letter  

Commissioners, 
I have not received input from everyone regarding the attached letter. It is a response to Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center, who requested the staff voter fraud status report and the provisional voting draft report, both of which were presented to the Standards Bd. and the Bd. of Adv. at the May meeting. She also requested the draft voter ID report, which was not released at the May meeting. If possible, I'd like to get your input by the end of the day. The letter would go out under Tom's signature. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 202-566-3100  
www.eac.gov
October 17, 2006

Ms. Wendy R. Weiser  
Deputy Director, Democracy Program  
Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law  
161 Avenue of the Americas, 12th Floor  
New York, NY 10013

Dear Ms. Wieser:

Thank you for your request for information regarding U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) research projects on voter fraud and voter intimidation, provisional ballots and voter identification.

The status report on voter fraud and voter intimidation, prepared by EAC staff, and the draft report on provisional voting, prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics and the Moritz College of Law, are enclosed. EAC personnel are in the process of drafting a report about voter identification. The report will be made available upon completion.

Status documents about voter fraud and voter intimidation and provisional voting were presented to the EAC’s Standards Board and Board of Advisors at a public meeting held in May 2006. Neither of these documents were final EAC reports. Per the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), the EAC works with its advisory boards to gather input on activities, including research projects. After discussing the provisional voting research with our advisory boards, they requested further research and clarification and noted that some of information was inaccurate or incomplete. Please see the attached resolutions passed by both entities outlining their concerns. As such, EAC is currently reviewing the draft report on provisional voting to address the concerns of the agency’s advisory boards.

As a small agency of only 23 employees, including four commissioners, it is necessary for EAC to contract with third parties and experts to conduct research. The information provided by third parties is used by staff to develop EAC final policy or reports. No documents, drafts or third party recommendations submitted to EAC constitute official EAC policy or opinion and should not be identified or referred to as such.

Please note that our Standards Board and Advisory Board meetings are open to the public and are publicized on the EAC website at www.eac.gov and posted in the Federal Register.

Thank you for your interest, and let us know if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Tom Wilkey  
Executive Director
Jeannie:

Attached is the email I sent to Tova and Job, and Job's response. (I have not yet heard back from Tova.)
--- Peggy

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 10/13/2006 04:37 PM ---

Peg: 

We saw both the USA Today article and a similar thing was reported on Rush Limbaugh's show naming both of us. I had a talk this morning with folks at the EAC. I told them at this point there needs to be a press release sent out by the Chairman saying just what you stated. This is the only way to rehabilitate the work we did, the Chairman's credibility, and our reputations. I also fear that if this is not done the EAC will begin to receive calls from Congressman and Senators regarding the "report" and its effect on voter ID requirements.

Peg, up to now Tova and I have refused to speak with the press at all out of respect for the EAC and its mission. We both stand by our work and its conclusions. We both also feel that if a statement (as well phrased as you did in this e-mail clarifying the issue) is not forthcoming from the Chairman then I will have to correct this error with the Press. I explained this in my conversation this morning with the EAC.

Tova and I worked hard to produce a correct, accurate and truthful report. I could care less that the results are not what the more conservative members of my Party wanted. Neither one of us was willing to conform results for political expediency. I think its important for me to note that I was very impressed with Tova's members of the Working Group and I can't say enough about Tova's partnership effort in this endeavor. While neither one of us really care about outside opinions, we do care that the Chairman was quoted or misquoted in a way that would disparage our year-long effort and all of the tax payer money that went into it. For this reason, we believe that a press release clarifying the situation is necessary from either the Chairman or from me.

Regards,

Job
Tova and Job:

I am home recuperating, but see that in my absence, a USA Today article has gotten everyone stirred up. The report to which the article refers is only the status report on the voting fraud-voter intimidation research project that was delivered to our Standards Board and Board of Advisors last spring. I provided a copy of this document to both of you, but have attached another copy for your information. This document is subject to public release because it was presented at a public meeting.

Due to internal resource allocation problems, your final report has not yet been reviewed by the Commissioners. It is considered a working document (not subject to public release) until it has completed the review process and the Commissioners have agreed to release it. There has been no attempt by the Commission to hold up the report. I bear responsibility for any delays in moving it along. Please be reassured that we would not release your report without letting you know.

Peggy Sims  
Election Research Specialist  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)  
Fax: 202-566-3127  
email: psims@eac.gov
I told him we would call today

--- Forwarded by Donetta L. Davidson

"Todd Rokita"

06/02/2006 09:38 PM

Donetta--- this is the person to whom the EAC is paying---money to perform dispassionate research on voter fraud? No wonder she has concluded for all of us that voter fraud (in person) really does not exist, except for maybe a few isolated places in the Midwest. If her report sees the light of day, I can almost guaranty problems. The fact that the report may have a co-writer does not solve this problem. She should not even be paid. There is a clear agenda behind her conclusions. I believe the credibility of the EAC is in question with your decision to hire this person and allow her to report on behalf of the EAC on either election fraud or voter intimidation. I would like a response from the Chairman that addresses this article. Thanks

---

Rumble in the Desert

Civil rights groups are challenging Arizona's Prop 200, which endangers voting rights for citizens.

Tova Andrew Wang
June 01, 2006

Article created by The Century Foundation.

Without a lot of fanfare, a very important lawsuit was filed last week by the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights and other groups in Arizona. Finally, two years after the passage of the quite pernicious Prop 200, groups are finally taking serious action to combat it.

Basically an anti-immigrant measure, Prop 200 set out a bunch of restrictions on access to services for immigrants. However, with respect to voting rights, Prop 200 set up a situation blocking the right to vote for many citizens by requiring every person registering to vote to prove citizenship.

As the Lawyer's Committee describes it, Proposition 200 requires that that counties
reject any voter registration application that does not include satisfactory proof of citizenship, such as a copy of the applicant’s birth certificate, passport, a driver’s license or non-operating identification license, but only if issued after October 1, 1996, a tribal identification card or naturalization documents. This even applies to voters who must re-register simply because they moved across county lines.

This measure is at least as damaging as many of the voter identification laws being passed and contemplated across the country. This stops someone from being part of the process before they’ve even gotten to square one. As I have repeatedly discussed with respect to ID laws, many voters are unlikely to have the required documentation and efforts to obtain the documentation will take time and money, therefore amounting to an unconstitutional poll tax.

Ironically, it has proven to be eligible voters who have been caught in the snare of this act. Last year in Maricopa County, home to Phoenix, more than 10,000 people trying to register were rejected for being unable to prove their citizenship. A spokeswoman for the recorder’s office said most are probably U.S. citizens whose married names differ from the ones on their birth certificates or who have lost documentation. In Pima County, home to Tucson, 60 percent of those who tried to register initially could not. The elections chief said that all appeared to be U.S. citizens, but many had moved to Arizona recently and couldn’t get their birth certificates or passports.

Moreover, Prop 200 is based on the idea that noncitizens are coming to the polling place and voting illegally. The premise is false. There is no evidence of any number of immigrants knowingly voting in the past in Arizona, and certainly it would seem unlikely when the last thing immigrants want to do in these times is draw official attention to themselves.

Finally, as the lawsuit persuasively argues, the measure also makes it virtually impossible for groups to conduct voter registration drives in Arizona. How many people go to the supermarket with their birth certificate?

The recent decision in Indiana upholding its draconian ID bill and the intolerance toward immigrants being displayed right now makes me worry about how the Arizona courts will respond. They upheld the Proposition in another context once before. But anyone who cares about the right to vote—for qualified, U.S. citizens—should hope that the law is struck down as the unconstitutional and anti-democratic measure it is.

Tova Andrea Wang is Democracy Fellow at The Century Foundation.

David R. Maxwell
Campaign Assistant
Todd Rokita
Secretary of State Reelection Campaign
47 South Meridian Street, Suite 200
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

[Redacted]

dmaxwell@indgop.org
Commissioners and Tom,

I have attached a draft version of the EAC Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation report. Please have your comments ready no later than Tuesday, Nov. 28, COB, so that I will be prepared to discuss them at our briefing on Wednesday, Nov. 29 at 10:30.

You will note that there are appendixes referenced in the report. These documents are quite lengthy. Thus, I did not attach them to this email. If, however, you want to read the documents, DeAnna has access to them in my absence and can either email them to you or print them for you.

I think that the report is fairly self-explanatory. However, there are two questions that we need to address and that the Commissioners need to comment on:

1. The consultants provided summaries of articles, books, and reports that they read, as well as summaries of the interviews that they conducted. Peggy created two tables summarizing the consultants' summaries of books, article and reports as well as interviews. We need to make a determination of which summaries we want to attach as appendixes. The only issue that I am aware of (and I have a question pending to Peggy about the quality of these summaries) is a significant disagreement over the summaries of interviews with Craig Donsanto and John Tanner of the Dept. of Justice. They disagree with the characterization given by the consultants to what they said in the interview. Obviously, this matter would have to be resolved if we decide to use the consultants' summaries.

2. Tom and I had a conversation with Tova and Job about the fact that we are going to issue a report. Tova was quite insistent about being able to see the report before it is released. I am NOT inclined to give her a copy of the report before it is released. Neither Tova nor Job are still on contract with the EAC. Thus, they are just like any other member of the public. I believe that if we release it to them, then we may have a significant problem withholding the document from others that may ask for it via FOIA request. I believe that the course of action should be to release it to all persons simultaneously.

Happy reading and Happy Thanksgiving!

Voter Fraud & Intimidation Report.doc

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
EAC REPORT ON VOTING FRAUD AND VOTER INTIMIDATION STUDY

INTRODUCTION

Voting fraud and voter intimidation are phrases familiar to many voting-aged Americans. However, they mean different things to different people. Voting fraud and voter intimidation are phrases used to refer to crimes, civil rights violations, and, at times, even the correct application of state or federal laws to the voting process. Past study of these topics has been as varied as its perceived meaning. In an effort to help understand the realities of voting fraud and voter intimidation in our elections, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has begun this, phase one, of a comprehensive study on election crimes. In this phase of its examination, EAC has developed a definition of election crimes and adopted some research methodology on how to assess the existence and enforcement of election crimes in the United States.

PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EAC STUDY

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) calls on the EAC to research and study various issues related to the administration of elections. During Fiscal Year 2006, EAC began projects to research several of the listed topics. These topics for research were chosen in consultation with the EAC Standards Board and Board of Advisors. Voting fraud and voter intimidation are topics that the EAC as well as its advisory boards felt were important to study to help improve the administration of elections for federal office.

EAC began this study with the intention of identifying a common understanding of voting fraud and voter intimidation and devising a plan for a comprehensive study of these issues. This study was not intended to be a comprehensive review of existing voting fraud and voter intimidation actions, laws, or prosecutions. To conduct that type of extensive research, a basic understanding had to first be established regarding what is commonly referred to as voting fraud and voter intimidation. Once that understanding was reached, a definition had to be crafted to refine and in some cases limit the scope of what reasonably can be researched and studied as evidence of voting fraud and voter intimidation. That definition will serve as the basis for recommending a plan for a comprehensive study of the area.

To accomplish these tasks, EAC employed two consultants, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, who worked with EAC staff and interns to conduct the research that forms the basis of this report. The consultants were chosen based upon their experience with the topic and the need to assure a bipartisan representation in this study. The consultants and EAC staff were charged with (1) researching the current state of information on the topic of voting fraud and voter intimidation; (2) developing a uniform definition of voting

---

1 Biographies for Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, the two consultants hired by EAC, are attached as Appendix "1".
fraud and voter intimidation; and (3) proposing recommended strategies for researching this subject.

EAC consultants reviewed existing studies, articles, reports and case law on voting fraud and intimidation and conducted interviews with experts in the field. EAC consultants and staff then presented their initial findings to a working group that provided feedback. The working group participants were:

The Honorable Todd Rokita  
Indiana Secretary of State  
Member, EAC Standards Board and the Executive Board of the Standards Board

Kathy Rogers  
Georgia Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State  
Member, EAC Standards Board

J.R. Perez  
Guadalupe County Elections Administrator, Texas

Barbara Arnwine  
Executive Director, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights under Law  
Leader of Election Protection Coalition

Benjamin L. Ginsberg  
Partner, Patton Boggs LLP  
Counsel to National Republican Campaign Committees and Republican candidates

Robert Bauer  
Chair of the Political Law Practice at the law firm of Perkins Coie, District of Columbia  
National Counsel for Voter Protection, Democratic National Committee

Mark (Thor) Hearne II  
Partner-Member, Lathrop & Gage, St Louis, Missouri  
National Counsel to the American Center for Voting Rights

Barry Weinberg  
Former Deputy Chief and Acting Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice  
Technical Advisor:

Craig Donsanto  
Director, Election Crimes Branch, U.S. Department of Justice

Throughout the process, EAC staff assisted the consultants by providing statutes and cases on this subject as well as supervision on the direction, scope and product of this research.

The consultants drafted a report for EAC that included their summaries of relevant cases, studies and reports on voting fraud and voter intimidation as well as summaries of the interviews that they conducted. The draft report also provided a definition of voting fraud and intimidation and made certain recommendations developed by the consultants or by the working group on how to pursue further study of this subject. This document was vetted and edited by EAC staff to produce this final report.
EXISTING INFORMATION ABOUT FRAUD AND INTIMIDATION

To begin our study of voting fraud and voter intimidation, EAC consultants reviewed the current body of information on voting fraud and voter intimidation. The information available about these issues comes largely from a very limited body of reports, articles, and books. There are volumes of case law and statutes in the various states that also impact our understanding of what actions or inactions are legally considered fraud or intimidation. Last, there is anecdotal information available through media reports and interviews with persons who have administered elections, prosecuted fraud, and studied these problems. All of these resources were used by EAC consultants to provide an introductory look at the available knowledge of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Reports and Studies of Voting fraud and Intimidation

Over the years, there have been a number of studies conducted and reports published about voting fraud and voter intimidation. EAC reviewed many of these studies and reports to develop a base-line understanding of the information that is currently available about voting fraud and voter intimidation. EAC consultants reviewed the following articles, reports and books, summaries of which are available in Appendix “2”:

Articles and Reports


• Chandler Davidson, Tanya Dunlap, Gale Kenny, and Benjamin Wise, "Republican Ballot Security Programs: Vote Protection or Minority Vote Suppression – or Both?" A Report to the Center for Voting Rights & Protection, September, 2004.


• Democratic National Committee, “Democracy at Risk: The November 2004 Election in Ohio,” DNC Services Corporation, 2005

• Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2002."

• Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2003."

• Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2004."


During our review of these documents, we learned a great deal about the type of research that has been conducted in the past concerning voting fraud and voter intimidation. None of the studies or reports was based on a comprehensive, nationwide study, survey or review of all allegations, prosecutions or convictions of state or federal crimes related to voting fraud or voter intimidation in the United States. Most reports focused on a limited number of case studies or instances of alleged voting fraud or voter intimidation. For example, "Shattering the Myth: An Initial Snapshot of Voter Disenfranchisement in the 2004 Elections," a report produced by the People for the American Way, focused exclusively on citizen reports of fraud or intimidation to the Election Protection program during the 2004 Presidential election. Similarly, reports produced annually by the Department of Justice, Public Integrity Division, deal exclusively with crimes reported to and prosecuted by the United States Attorneys and/or the Department of Justice through the Public Integrity Section.

It is also apparent from a review of these articles and books that there is no consensus on the pervasiveness of voting fraud and voter intimidation. Some reports, such as
"Building Confidence in U.S. Elections," suggest that there is little or no evidence of extensive fraud in U.S. elections or of multiple voting. This conflicts directly with other reports, such as the “Preliminary Findings of Joint Task Force Investigating Possible Election Fraud,” produced by the Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee County District Attorney’s Office, FBI and U.S. Attorney’s Office. That report cited evidence of more than 100 individual instances of suspected double-voting, voting in the name of persons who likely did not vote, and/or voting using a name believed to be fake.

Voter intimidation is also a topic of some debate because there is little agreement concerning what constitutes actionable voter intimidation. Some studies and reports cover only intimidation that involves physical or financial threats, while others cover non-criminal intimidation, including legal practices that allegedly cause vote suppression.

One point of agreement is that absentee voting and voter registration by nongovernmental groups create opportunities for fraud. For example, a number of studies cited circumstances in which voter registration drives have falsified voter registration applications or have destroyed voter registration applications of persons affiliated with a certain political party. Others conclude that paying persons per voter registration application creates the opportunity and perhaps the incentive for fraud.

Interviews with Experts

In addition to reviewing prior studies and reports on voting fraud and intimidation, EAC consultants interviewed a number of persons regarding their experiences and research of voting fraud and voter intimidation. Persons interviewed included:

- **Wade Henderson**
  Executive Director,
  Leadership Conference for Civil Rights

- **Wendy Weiser**
  Deputy Director,
  Democracy Program, The Brennan Center

- **William Groth**
  Attorney for the plaintiffs in the Indiana voter identification litigation

- **Lori Minnite**
  Barnard College, Columbia University

- **Neil Bradley**
  ACLU Voting Rights Project

- **Pat Rogers**
  Attorney, New Mexico

- **Nina Perales**
  Counsel,
  Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund

- **Rebecca Vigil-Giron**
  Secretary of State, New Mexico

- **Sarah Ball Johnson**
  Executive Director,
  State Board of Elections, Kentucky

- **Stephen Ansolobehere**
  Massachusetts Institute of Technology

- **Chandler Davidson**
  Rice University
These interviews in large part confirmed the conclusions that were gleaned from the articles, reports and books that were analyzed. For example, the interviewees largely agreed that absentee balloting is subject to the greatest proportion of fraudulent acts, followed by vote buying and voter registration fraud. They similarly pointed to voter registration drives by nongovernmental groups as a source of fraud, particularly when the workers are paid per registration. Many asserted that impersonation of voters is probably the least frequent type of fraud because it is the most likely type of fraud to be discovered, there are stiff penalties associated with this type of fraud, and it is an inefficient method of influencing an election.

Interviewees differed on what they believe constitutes actionable voter intimidation. Law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies tend to look to the criminal definitions of voter intimidation, which generally require some threat of physical or financial harm. On the other hand, voter rights advocates tended to point to activities such as challenger laws,
voter identification laws, polling place locations, and distribution of voting machines as activities that can constitute voter intimidation.

Those interviewed also expressed opinions on the enforcement of voting fraud and voter intimidation laws. States have varying authorities to enforce these laws. In some states, enforcement is left to the county or district attorney, and in others enforcement is managed by the state’s attorney general. Regardless, voting fraud and voter intimidation are difficult to prove and require resources and time that many local law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies do not have. Federal law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies have more time and resources but have limited jurisdiction and can only prosecute election crimes perpetrated in elections with a federal candidate on the ballot or perpetrated by a public official under the color of law. Those interviewed differed on the effectiveness of the current system of enforcement. Some allege that prosecutions are not sufficiently aggressive. Others feel that the current laws are sufficient for prosecuting fraud and intimidation.

A summary of the each of the interviews conducted is attached as Appendix “3”.

Case Law and Statutes

Consultants reviewed more than 40,000 cases that were identified using a series of search terms related to voting fraud and voter intimidation. The majority of these cases came from courts of appeal. This is not surprising, since most cases that are publicly reported come from courts of appeal. Very few cases that are decided at the district court level are reported for public review.

Very few of the identified cases were applicable to this study. Of those that were applicable, no apparent thematic pattern emerged. However, it did seem that the greatest number of cases reported on fraud and intimidation have shifted from past patterns of stealing votes to present problems with voter registration, voter identification, the proper delivery and counting of absentee and overseas ballots, provisional voting, vote buying, and challenges to felon eligibility.

A listing of the cases reviewed in this study is attached as Appendix “4”.

Media Reports

EAC consultants reviewed thousands of media reports concerning a wide variety of potential voting fraud or voter intimidation, including:

- absentee ballot fraud,
- voter registration fraud,
- voter intimidation and suppression,
- deceased voters,
- multiple voting,
- felons voting,
• non-citizens voting,
• vote buying,
• deceptive practices, and
• fraud by election officials.

While these reports showed that there were a large number of allegations of voting fraud and voter intimidation, they provided much less information as to whether the allegations were ever formalized as complaints to law enforcement, whether charges were filed, whether prosecutions ensued, and whether any convictions were made. The media reports were enlightening as to the pervasiveness of complaints of fraud and intimidation throughout the country, the correlation between fraud allegations and the perception that the state was a “battleground” or “swing” state, and the fact that there were reports of almost all types of voting fraud and voter intimidation. However, these reports do not provide much data for analysis as to the number of complaints, charges and prosecutions of voting fraud and intimidation throughout the country.

DEFINITION OF ELECTION CRIMES

From our study of available information on voting fraud and voter intimidation, we have learned that these terms mean many things to many different people. These terms are used casually to refer to anything from vote buying to refusing to register a voter to falsifying voter registration applications. Upon further inspection, however, it is apparent that there is no common understanding or agreement of what constitutes “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation.” Some think of voting fraud and voter intimidation only as criminal acts, while others include actions that may constitute civil wrongs, civil rights violations, and even legal and appropriate activities. To arrive at a common definition and list of activities that can be studied, EAC assessed the appropriateness of the terminology that is currently in use and applied certain factors to limit the scope and reach of what can and will be studied by EAC in the future.

New Terminology

The phrase “voting fraud” is really a misnomer for a concept that is much broader. “Fraud” is a concept that connotes an intentional act of deception, which may constitute either a criminal act or civil tort depending upon the willfulness of the act.

FRAUD, n. 1. A knowing misrepresentation of the truth or concealment of a material fact to induce another to act to his or her detriment. • Fraud is usu. a tort, but in some cases (esp. when the conduct is willful) it may be a crime.


“Voting” is the act of casting votes to decide an issue or contest. Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition, p. 1608. Using these terms to form a definition of “voting fraud,” it means fraudulent or deceptive acts committed to influence the act of voting. Thus, a voter who intentionally impersonates another registered voter and attempts to
vote for that person would be committing "voting fraud." Similarly, a person who knowingly provides false information to a voter about the location of the voter's polling place commits fraud on the voter.

The phrase "voting fraud" does not capture a myriad of other criminal acts that are related to elections which are not related to the act of voting and/or do not involve an act of deception. For example, "voting fraud" does not capture actions or willful inaction in the voter registration process. When an election official willfully and knowingly refuses to register to vote a legally eligible person it is a crime. This is a crime that involves neither the act of voting nor an act of deception.

To further complicate matters, the phrases "voting fraud" and "voter intimidation" are used to refer to actions or inactions that are criminal as well as those that are potentially civil wrongs and even those that are legal. Obviously, criminal acts and civil wrongs are pursued in a very different manner. Criminal acts are prosecuted by the local, state or federal government. Generally, civil wrongs are prosecuted by the individual who believes that they were harmed. In some cases, when civil rights are involved, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice may become involved.

The goal of this study was to develop a common definition of what is generically referred to as "voting fraud" and "voter intimidation" that would serve as the basis for a future, comprehensive study of the existence of these problems. In order to meet that goal, we recognize that the current terminology does not accurately represent the spectrum of activities that we desire to study. Furthermore, we recognize that the resources, both financial and human capital, needed to study allegations and prosecutions of criminal acts, suits involving civil torts, and allegations of potential voter suppression through the use of legal election processes are well beyond the resources available to EAC. As such, EAC has defined "election crimes," a phrase that captures all crimes related to the voter registration and voting processes.

**The Definition of an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study**

Election crimes are intentional acts or willful failures to act, prohibited by state or federal law, that are designed to cause ineligible persons to participate in the election process; eligible persons to be excluded from the election process; ineligible votes to be cast in an election; eligible votes not to be cast or counted; or other interference with or invalidation of election results. Election crimes generally fall into one of four categories: acts of deception, acts of coercion, acts of damage or destruction, and failures or refusals to act.

Election crimes can be committed by voters, candidates, election officials, or any other members of the public who desire to criminally impact the result of an election. However, crimes that are based upon intentional or willful failure to act assume that a duty to act exists. Election officials have affirmative duties to act with regard to elections. By and large, other groups and individuals do not have such duties.
The victim of an election crime can be a voter, a group of voters, an election official, a candidate, or the public in general. Election crimes can occur during any stage of the election process, including but not limited to qualification of candidates; voter registration; campaigning; voting system preparation and programming; voting either early, absentee, or on election day; vote tabulation; recounts; and recalls.

The following are examples of activities that may constitute election crimes. This list is not intended to be exhaustive, but is representative of what states and the federal government consider criminal activity related to elections.

**Acts of Deception**

- Knowingly causing to be mailed or distributed, or knowingly mailing or distributing, literature that includes false information about the voter's precinct or polling place, the date and time of the election or a candidate;
- Possessing an official ballot outside the voting location, unless the person is an election official or other person authorized by law or local ordinance to possess a ballot outside of the polling location;
- Making or knowingly possessing a counterfeit of an official election ballot;
- Signing a name other than his/her own to a petition proposing an initiative, referendum, recall, or nomination of a candidate for office;
- Knowingly signing more than once for the proposition, question, or candidate in one election;
- Signing a petition proposing an initiative or referendum when the signer is not a qualified voter.
- Voting or attempting to vote in the name of another person;
- Voting or attempting to vote more than once during the same election;
- Intentionally making a false affidavit, swearing falsely, or falsely affirming under an oath required by a statute regarding their voting status, including when registering to vote, requesting an absentee ballot or presenting to vote in person;
- Registering to vote without being entitled to register;
- Knowingly making a materially false statement on an application for voter registration or re-registration; and
- Voting or attempting to vote in an election after being disqualified or when the person knows that he/she is not eligible to vote.

**Acts of Coercion**

- Using, threatening to use, or causing to be used force, coercion, violence, restraint, or inflicting, threatening to inflict, or causing to be inflicted damage harm, or loss, upon or against another person to induce or compel that person to vote or refrain from voting or to register or refrain from registering to vote;
- Knowingly paying, offering to pay, or causing to be paid money or other thing of value to a person to vote or refrain from voting for a candidate or for or against an election proposition or question;
o Knowingly soliciting or encouraging a person who is not qualified to vote in an
election;
o Knowingly challenging a person’s right to vote without probable cause or on
fraudulent grounds, or engaging in mass, indiscriminate, and groundless
challenging of voters solely for the purpose of preventing voter from voting or to
delay the process of voting;
o As an employer, attempting by coercion, intimidation, threats to discharge or to
lessen the remuneration of an employee, to influence his/her vote in any election,
or who requires or demands an examination or inspection by himself/herself or
another of an employee’s ballot;
o Soliciting, accepting, or agreeing to accept money or other valuable thing in
exchange for signing or refraining from signing a petition proposing an initiative;
o Inducing or attempting to induce an election official to fail in the official’s duty
by force, threat, intimidation, or offers of reward;
o Directly or through any other person advancing, paying, soliciting, or receiving or
causing to be advanced, paid, solicited, or received, any money or other valuable
consideration to or for the use of any person in order to induce a person not to
become or to withdraw as a candidate for public office; and
o Soliciting, accepting, or agreeing to accept money or other thing of value in
exchange for registering to vote.

Acts of Damage or Destruction

o Destroying completed voter registration applications;
o Removing or destroying any of the supplies or other conveniences placed in the
voting booths or compartments;
o Removing, tearing down, or defacing election materials, instructions or ballots;
o Fraudulently altering or changing the vote of any elector, by which such elector is
prevented from voting as the person intended;
o Knowingly removing, altering, defacing or covering any political sign of any
candidate for public office for a prescribed period prior to and following the
election;
o Intentionally changing, attempting to change, or causing to be changed an official
election document including ballots, tallies, and returns; and
o Intentionally delaying, attempting to delay, or causing to be delayed the sending
of certificate, register, ballots, or other materials whether original or duplicate,
required to be sent by jurisdictional law.

Failure or Refusal to Act

o Intentionally failing to perform an election duty, or knowingly committing an
unauthorized act with the intent to effect the election;
o Knowingly permitting, making, or attempting to make a false count of election
returns;
o Intentionally concealing, withholding, or destroying election returns or attempts
to do so;
Marking a ballot by folding or physically altering the ballot so as to recognize the ballot at a later time;

- Attempting to learn or actually and unlawfully learning how a voter marked a ballot;
- Distributing or attempting to distribute election material knowing it to be fraudulent;
- Knowingly refusing to register a person who is entitled to register under the rules of that jurisdiction;
- Knowingly removing the eligibility status of a voter who is eligible to vote; and
- Knowingly refusing to allow an eligible voter to cast his/her ballot.

**What is not an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study**

There are some actions or inactions that may constitute crimes or civil wrongs that we do not include in our definition of “election crimes.” All criminal or civil violations related to campaign finance contribution limitations, prohibitions, and reporting either at the state or federal level are not “election crimes” for purposes of this study and any future study conducted by EAC. Similarly, criminal acts that are unrelated to elections, voting, or voter registration are not “election crimes,” even when those offenses occur in a polling place, voter registration office, or a candidate’s office or appearance. For example, an assault or battery that results from a fight in a polling place or at a candidate’s office is not an election crime. Similarly, violations of ethical provisions such as the Hatch Act are not “election crimes,” and actions that do not rise to the level of criminal activity, such as a misdemeanor, relative felony or felony, are not “election crimes.”

**RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW TO STUDY ELECTION CRIMES**

As a part of its study, EAC sought recommendations on ways that EAC can research the existence of election crimes. EAC consultants, the working groups and some of the persons interviewed as a part of this study provided the following recommendations.

*Recommendation 1: Conduct More Interviews*

Future activity in this area should include conducting additional interviews. In particular, more election officials from all levels of government, parts of the country, and political parties should be interviewed. It would also be especially beneficial to talk to law enforcement officials, specifically federal District Election Officers (“DEOs”) and local district attorneys, as well as civil and criminal defense attorneys.

*Recommendation 2: Follow Up on Media Research*

The media search conducted for this phase of the research was based on a list of search terms agreed upon by EAC consultants. Thousands of articles were reviewed and hundreds analyzed. Many of the articles contained allegations of fraud or intimidation. Similarly, some of the articles contained information about investigations into such
activities or even charges brought. Additional media research should be conducted to
determine what, if any, resolutions or further activity there was in each case.

Recommendation 3: Follow Up on Allegations Found in Literature Review

Many of the allegations made in the reports and books that were analyzed and
summarized by EAC consultants were not substantiated and were certainly limited by the
date of publication of those pieces. Despite this, such reports and books are frequently
cited by various interested parties as evidence of fraud or intimidation. Further research
should include follow up on the allegations discovered in the literature review.

Recommendation 4: Review Complaints Filed With “MyVote1” Voter Hotline

During the 2004 election and the statewide elections of 2005, the University of
Pennsylvania led a consortium of groups and researchers in conducting the MyVote1
Project. This project involved using a toll-free voter hotline that voters could call for poll
locations, be transferred to a local hotline, or leave a recorded message with a complaint.
In 2004, this resulted in more than 200,000 calls received and more than 56,000 recorded
complaints.

Further research should be conducted using the MyVote1 data with the cooperation of the
project leaders. While perhaps not a fully scientific survey given the self-selection of the
callers, the information regarding 56,000 complaints may provide insight into the
problems voters may have experienced, especially issues regarding intimidation or
suppression.

Recommendation 5: Further Review of Complaints Filed With U.S. Department of
Justice

According to a recent GAO report, the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division of the
Department of Justice has a variety of ways it tracks complaints of voter intimidation.
Attempts should be made to obtain relevant data, including the telephone logs of
complaints and information from the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system.
Further research should also include a review and analysis of the DOJ/OPM observer and
“monitor field reports” from Election Day.

Recommendation 6: Review Reports Filed By District Election Officers

Further research should include a review of the reports that must be filed by every
District Election Officer to the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division of the
Department of Justice. The DEOs play a central role in receiving reports of voting fraud
and investigating and pursuing them. Their reports back to the Department would likely
provide tremendous insight into what actually transpired during the last several elections.
Where necessary, information could be redacted or made confidential.
Recommendation 7: Attend Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium

Further activity in this area should include attending the next Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium. At this conference, prosecutors serving as District Election Officers in the 94 U.S. Attorneys’ Offices obtain annual training on fighting election fraud and voting rights abuses. These conferences are sponsored by the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division and the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division, and feature presentations by Civil Rights officials and senior prosecutors from the Public Integrity Section and the U.S. Attorneys’ Offices. By attending the symposium researchers could learn more about the following: how District Election Officers are trained; how information about previous election and voting issues is presented; and how the Voting Rights Act, the criminal laws governing election fraud and intimidation, the National Voter Registration Act, and the Help America Vote Act are described and explained to participants.

Recommendation 8: Conduct Statistical Research

EAC should measure voting fraud and intimidation using interviews, focus groups, and a survey and statistical analysis of the results of these efforts. The sample should be based on the following factors:

- Ten locations that are geographically and demographically diverse where there have been many reports of fraud and/or intimidation;
- Ten locations (geographically and demographically diverse) that have not had many reports of fraud and/or intimidation;

EAC should also conduct a survey of elections officials, district attorneys, and district election officers. The survey sample should be large in order to be able to get the necessary subsets, and it must include a random set of counties where there have and have not been a large number of allegations.

Recommendation 9: Explore Improvements to Federal Law

Future researchers should review federal law to explore ways to make it easier to impose either civil or criminal penalties for acts of intimidation that do not necessarily involve racial animus and/or a physical or economic threat.

Recommendation 10: Use Observers to Collect Data on Election Day

Use observers to collect data regarding fraud and intimidation at the polls on Election Day. There may be some limitations to the ability to conduct this type of research, including difficulty gaining access to polling places for the purposes of observation, and concerns regarding how the observers themselves may inadvertently or deliberately influence the occurrence of election crimes.
Recommendation 11: Study Absentee Ballot Fraud

Because absentee ballot fraud constitutes a large portion of election crimes, a stand-alone study of absentee ballot fraud should be conducted. Researchers should look at actual cases to see how absentee ballot fraud schemes are conducted in an effort to provide recommendations on more effective measures for preventing fraud when absentee ballots are used.

Recommendation 12: Use Risk Analysis Methodology to Study Fraud

Conduct an analysis of what types of fraud people are most likely to commit. Researchers will use that risk analysis to rank the types of fraud based on the “ease of commission” and the impact of the fraud.

Recommendation 13: Conduct Research Using Database Comparisons

Researchers should compare information on databases to determine whether the voter rolls contain deceased persons and felons. In addition, the voter rolls can then be compared with the list of persons who voted to determine whether a vote was recorded by someone who is deceased or if felons are noted as having voted.

Recommendation 14: Conduct a Study of Deceptive Practices

The working group discussed the increasing use of deceptive practices, such as flyers and phone calls with false and/or intimidating information, to suppress voter participation. A number of groups, such as the Department of Justice, the EAC, and organizations such as the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, keep phone logs regarding complaints of such practices. These logs should be reviewed and analyzed to see how and where such practices are being conducted and what can be done about them.

Recommendation 15: Study Use of HAVA Administrative Complaint Procedure as Vehicle for Measuring Fraud and Intimidation

EAC should study the extent to which states are utilizing the administrative complaint procedure mandated by HAVA. In addition, the EAC should study whether data collected through the administrative complaint procedure can be used as another source of information for measuring fraud and intimidation.

Recommendation 16: Examine the Use of Special Election Courts

Given that many state and local judges are elected, it may be worth exploring whether special election courts should be established to handle fraud and intimidation complaints before, during, and after Election Day. Pennsylvania employs such a system and could investigate how well that system is working.
Accepted Recommendations

There has never been a comprehensive, national study that gathered data regarding all claims, charges, and prosecutions of voting crimes. EAC feels that a comprehensive study is the most important research that it can offer the election community and the public. As such, EAC has adopted all or a part of six of the 16 recommendations made by EAC consultants and the working group.

While several of the other recommendations could be used to obtain more anecdotal information regarding election crimes, EAC believes that what is needed is a comprehensive survey and study of the information available from investigatory agencies, prosecutorial bodies and courts on the number and types of complaints, charges and prosecutions of election crimes. Additional media reviews, additional interviews and the use of observers to collect information from voters on Election Day will only serve to continue the use of anecdotal data to report on election crimes. Hard data on complaints, charges and prosecutions exists and we should gather and use that data, rather than rely on the perceptions of the media or the members of the public as to what might be fraud or intimidation.

Some of the recommendations are beyond the scope of the current study. While election courts may be a reasonable conclusion to reach after we determine the volume and type of election crimes being reported, charged or prosecuted, it is premature to embark on an analysis of that solution without more information. Last, some of the recommendations do not support a comprehensive study of election crimes. While a risk analysis might be appropriate in a smaller scale study, EAC desires to conduct a broader survey to avoid the existing problem of anecdotal and limited scope of information.

In order to further its goal of developing a comprehensive data set regarding election crimes and the laws and procedures used to identify and prosecute them, EAC intends to engage in the following research activities in studying the existence and enforcement of election crimes:

Survey Chief Election Officers Regarding Administrative Complaints

Likely sources of complaints concerning election crimes are the administrative complaint processes that states were required to establish to comply with Section 402 of HAVA. These complaint procedures were required to be in place prior to a state receiving any funds under HAVA. Citizens are permitted to file complaints alleging violations of HAVA Title III provisions under these procedures with the state’s chief election official. Those complaints must be resolved within 60 days. The procedures also allow for alternative dispute resolution of claims. Some states have expanded this process to include complaints of other violations, such as election crimes.

In order to determine how many of these complaints allege the commission of election crimes, EAC will survey the states’ chief election officers regarding complaints that have been filed, investigated, and resolved since January 1, 2004. EAC will use the definition
of election crimes provided above in this report so that data regarding a uniform set of offenses will be collected.

Survey State Election Crime Investigation Units Regarding Complaints Filed and Referred

Several chief state election officials have developed investigation units focused on receiving, investigating, and referring complaints of election crimes. These units were established to bolster the abilities of state and local law enforcement to investigate allegations of election crimes. California, New York and Florida are just three examples of states that have these types of units.

EAC will use a survey instrument to gather information on the numbers and types of complaints that have been received by, investigated, and ultimately referred to local or state law enforcement by election crime investigation units since January 1, 2004. These data will help us understand the pervasiveness of perceived fraud, as well as the number of claims that state election officials felt were meritorious of being referred to local and state law enforcement or prosecutorial agencies for further action.

Survey Law Enforcement and Prosecutorial Agencies Regarding Complaints and Charge of Voting Crimes

While voters, candidates and citizens may call national hotlines or the news media to report allegations of election crimes, it is those complaints that are made to law enforcement that can be investigated and ultimately prosecuted. Thus, it is critical to the study of election crimes to obtain statistics regarding the number and types of complaints that are made to law enforcement, how many of those complaints result in the perpetrator being charged or indicted, and how many of those charges or indictments result in pleas or convictions.

Thus, EAC will survey law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies at the local, state and federal level to determine the number and types of complaints, charges or indictments, and pleas or convictions of election crimes since January 1, 2004. In addition, EAC will seek to obtain an understanding of why some complaints are not charged or indicted and why some charges or indictments are not prosecuted.

Analyze Survey Data in Light of State Laws and Procedures

Once a reliable data set concerning the existence and enforcement of election crimes is assembled, a real analysis of the effectiveness of fraud prevention measures can be conducted. For example, data can be analyzed to determine if criminal activities related to elections are isolated to certain areas or regions of the country. Data collected from the election official surveys can be compared to the data regarding complaints, charges and prosecutions gathered from the respective law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies in each jurisdiction. The effect and/or effectiveness of provisions such as voter identification laws and challenger provisions can be assessed based on hard data from
areas where these laws exist. Last, analyses such as the effectiveness of enforcement can be conducted in light of the resources available to the effort.

CONCLUSION

Election crimes are nothing new to our election process. The pervasiveness of these crimes and the fervor with which they have been enforced has created a great deal of debate among academics, election officials, and voters. Past studies of these issues have been limited in scope and some have been riddled with bias. These are issues that deserve comprehensive and nonpartisan review. EAC, through its clearinghouse role, will collect and analyze data on election crimes throughout the country. These data not only will tell us what types of election crimes are committed and where fraud exists, but also inform us of what factors impact the existence, prevention, and prosecution of election crimes.
Hello everyone,
I need each of you to respond affirmatively or negatively to the FOIA request below. If you have no documents in your possession related to this request, please reply to me with the words "no records." If you have records, please identify them in an e-mail reply and attach them to the e-mail. If the document is not electronic, hand deliver them to me. Also, if you believe any of these related documents should be withheld, please provide a brief memo stating the reason for your position.

I need this information and/or a response by COB December 5, 2006. If you cannot comply by this date, please provide notification and an estimated time when you will provide the information and the reason why you cannot comply by the original deadline. Thanks for your cooperation. See request below:

Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center for Justice has submitted a FOIA request for the voting fraud report prepared by our consultants and the voter ID report, as well as the following information:

"In the event that the EAC denies my renewed request for the voter ID and voting fraud reports or delays another week in providing those materials, we respectfully request copies of (1) all requests for proposals and contracts relating to the voter ID and voting fraud reports; and (2) all written and electronic communications concerning the voter ID and voting fraud reports between the EAC and (a) the Eagleton Institute of Politics, (b) the Moritz College of Law, (c) Tova Wang, (d) Job Serebrov, and (e) any other individuals or entities, including but not limited to outside reviewers."

Please let me know if you would like a copy of the FOIA request.

Jeannie Layson  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 202-566-3100  
www.eac.gov
Attached is a revised version of the Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Draft Report. The changes that Commissioner Hillman suggested have been made and highlighted in yellow. See pages 10-11.

Peggy and I are working on the revision of the Donsanto and Tanner interview summaries and will forward that to you under a separate email.
INTRODUCTION

Voting fraud and voter intimidation are phrases familiar to many voting-aged Americans. However, they mean different things to different people. Voting fraud and voter intimidation are phrases used to refer to crimes, civil rights violations, and, at times, even the lawful application of state or federal laws to the voting process. Past study of these topics has been as varied as its perceived meaning. In an effort to help understand the realities of voting fraud and voter intimidation in our elections, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has begun this, phase one, of a comprehensive study on election crimes. In this phase of its examination, EAC has developed a working definition of election crimes and adopted research methodology on how to assess the existence and enforcement of election crimes in the United States.

PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EAC STUDY

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) calls on the EAC to research and study various issues related to the administration of elections. During Fiscal Year 2006, EAC began projects to research several of the listed topics. These topics for research were chosen in consultation with the EAC Standards Board and Board of Advisors. Voting fraud and voter intimidation are topics that the EAC as well as its advisory boards felt were important to study to help improve the administration of elections for federal office.

EAC began this study with the intention of identifying a common understanding of voting fraud and voter intimidation and devising a plan for a comprehensive study of these issues. The initial study was not intended to be a comprehensive review of existing voting fraud and voter intimidation actions, laws, or prosecutions. To conduct that type of extensive research, a basic understanding had to first be established regarding what is commonly referred to as voting fraud and voter intimidation. Once that understanding was reached, a definition had to be crafted to refine and in some cases limit the scope of what reasonably can be researched and studied as evidence of voting fraud and voter intimidation. That definition will serve as the basis for recommending a plan for a comprehensive study of the area.

To accomplish these tasks, EAC employed two consultants, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang,1 who worked with EAC staff and interns to conduct the research that forms the basis of this report. The consultants were chosen based upon their experience with the topic and the need to assure a bipartisan representation in this study. The consultants and EAC staff were charged with (1) researching the current state of information on the topic of voting fraud and voter intimidation; (2) developing a uniform definition of voting

---

1 Biographies for Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, the two consultants hired by EAC, are attached as Appendix “1”.
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fraud and voter intimidation; and (3) proposing recommended strategies for researching this subject.

EAC consultants reviewed existing studies, articles, reports and case law on voting fraud and intimidation and conducted interviews with experts in the field. EAC consultants and staff then presented their initial findings to a working group that provided feedback. The working group participants were:

**The Honorable Todd Rokita**  
Indiana Secretary of State  
Member, EAC Standards Board and the Executive Board of the Standards Board

**Kathy Rogers**  
Georgia Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State  
Member, EAC Standards Board

**J.R. Perez**  
Guadalupe County Elections Administrator, Texas

**Barbara Arnwine**  
Executive Director, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights under Law  
Leader of Election Protection Coalition

**Benjamin L. Ginsberg**  
Partner, Patton Boggs LLP  
Counsel to National Republican Campaign Committees and Republican candidates

**Robert Bauer**  
Chair of the Political Law Practice at the law firm of Perkins Coie, District of Columbia  
National Counsel for Voter Protection, Democratic National Committee

**Mark (Thor) Hearne II**  
Partner-Member, Lathrop & Gage, St Louis, Missouri  
National Counsel to the American Center for Voting Rights

**Barry Weinberg**  
Former Deputy Chief and Acting Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

*Technical Advisor:*  
**Craig Donsanto**  
Director, Election Crimes Branch, U.S. Department of Justice

Throughout the process, EAC staff assisted the consultants by providing statutes and cases on this subject as well as supervision on the direction, scope and product of this research.

The consultants drafted a report for EAC that included their summaries of relevant cases, studies and reports on voting fraud and voter intimidation as well as summaries of the interviews that they conducted. The draft report also provided a definition of voting fraud and intimidation and made certain recommendations developed by the consultants or by the working group on how to pursue further study of this subject. This document was vetted and edited by EAC staff to produce this final report.
EXISTING INFORMATION ABOUT FRAUD AND INTIMIDATION

To begin our study of voting fraud and voter intimidation, EAC consultants reviewed the current body of information on voting fraud and voter intimidation. The information available about these issues comes largely from a very limited body of reports, articles, and books. There are volumes of case law and statutes in the various states that also impact our understanding of what actions or inactions are legally considered fraud or intimidation. Last, there is anecdotal information available through media reports and interviews with persons who have administered elections, prosecuted fraud, and studied these problems. All of these resources were used by EAC consultants to provide an introductory look at the available knowledge of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Reports and Studies of Voting fraud and Intimidation

Over the years, there have been a number of studies conducted and reports published about voting fraud and voter intimidation. EAC reviewed many of these studies and reports to develop a base-line understanding of the information that is currently available about voting fraud and voter intimidation. EAC consultants reviewed the following articles, reports and books, summaries of which are available in Appendix “2”:

Articles and Reports

• Chandler Davidson, Tanya Dunlap, Gale Kenny, and Benjamin Wise, "Republican Ballot Security Programs: Vote Protection or Minority Vote Suppression – or Both?" A Report to the Center for Voting Rights & Protection, September, 2004.


• Democratic National Committee, “Democracy at Risk: The November 2004 Election in Ohio,” DNC Services Corporation, 2005

• Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2002."

• Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2003."

• Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2004."


During our review of these documents, we learned a great deal about the type of research that has been conducted in the past concerning voting fraud and voter intimidation. None of the studies or reports was based on a comprehensive, nationwide study, survey or review of all allegations, prosecutions or convictions of state or federal crimes related to voting fraud or voter intimidation in the United States. Most reports focused on a limited number of case studies or instances of alleged voting fraud or voter intimidation. For example, "Shattering the Myth: An Initial Snapshot of Voter Disenfranchisement in the 2004 Elections," a report produced by the People for the American Way, focused exclusively on citizen reports of fraud or intimidation to the Election Protection program during the 2004 Presidential election. Similarly, reports produced annually by the Department of Justice, Public Integrity Division, deal exclusively with crimes reported to and prosecuted by the United States Attorneys and/or the Department of Justice through the Public Integrity Section.

It is also apparent from a review of these articles and books that there is no consensus on the pervasiveness of voting fraud and voter intimidation. Some reports, such as
“Building Confidence in U.S. Elections,” suggest that there is little or no evidence of extensive fraud in U.S. elections or of multiple voting. This conflicts directly with other reports, such as the “Preliminary Findings of Joint Task Force Investigating Possible Election Fraud,” produced by the Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee County District Attorney’s Office, FBI and U.S. Attorney’s Office. That report cited evidence of more than 100 individual instances of suspected double-voting, voting in the name of persons who likely did not vote, and/or voting using a name believed to be fake.

Voter intimidation is also a topic of some debate because there is little agreement concerning what constitutes actionable voter intimidation. Some studies and reports cover only intimidation that involves physical or financial threats, while others cover non-criminal intimidation, including legal practices that allegedly cause vote suppression.

One point of agreement is that absentee voting and voter registration by nongovernmental groups create opportunities for fraud. For example, a number of studies cited circumstances in which voter registration drives have falsified voter registration applications or have destroyed voter registration applications of persons affiliated with a certain political party. Others conclude that paying persons per voter registration application creates the opportunity and perhaps the incentive for fraud.

**Interviews with Experts**

In addition to reviewing prior studies and reports on voting fraud and intimidation, EAC consultants interviewed a number of persons regarding their experiences and research of voting fraud and voter intimidation. Persons interviewed included:

**Wade Henderson**  
Executive Director,  
Leadership Conference for Civil Rights

**Wendy Weiser**  
Deputy Director,  
Democracy Program, The Brennan Center

**William Groth**  
Attorney for the plaintiffs in the Indiana voter identification litigation

**Lori Minnite**  
Barnard College, Columbia University

**Neil Bradley**  
ACLU Voting Rights Project

**Pat Rogers**  
Attorney, New Mexico

**Nina Perales**  
Counsel,  
Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund

**Rebecca Vigil-Giron**  
Secretary of State, New Mexico

**Sarah Ball Johnson**  
Executive Director,  
State Board of Elections, Kentucky

**Stephen Ansolobohere**  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

**Chandler Davidson**  
Rice University
These interviews in large part confirmed the conclusions that were gleaned from the articles, reports and books that were analyzed. For example, the interviewees largely agreed that absentee balloting is subject to the greatest proportion of fraudulent acts, followed by vote buying and voter registration fraud. They similarly pointed to voter registration drives by nongovernmental groups as a source of fraud, particularly when the workers are paid per registration. Many asserted that impersonation of voters is probably the least frequent type of fraud because it is the most likely type of fraud to be discovered, there are stiff penalties associated with this type of fraud, and it is an inefficient method of influencing an election.

Interviewees differed on what they believe constitutes actionable voter intimidation. Law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies tend to look to the criminal definitions of voter intimidation, which generally require some threat of physical or financial harm. On the other hand, voter rights advocates tended to point to activities such as challenger laws,
voter identification laws, polling place locations, and distribution of voting machines as activities that can constitute voter intimidation.

Those interviewed also expressed opinions on the enforcement of voting fraud and voter intimidation laws. States have varying authorities to enforce these laws. In some states, enforcement is left to the county or district attorney, and in others enforcement is managed by the state’s attorney general. Regardless, voting fraud and voter intimidation are difficult to prove and require resources and time that many local law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies do not have. Federal law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies have more time and resources but have limited jurisdiction and can only prosecute election crimes perpetrated in elections with a federal candidate on the ballot or perpetrated by a public official under the color of law. Those interviewed differed on the effectiveness of the current system of enforcement. Some allege that prosecutions are not sufficiently aggressive. Others feel that the current laws are sufficient for prosecuting fraud and intimidation.

A summary of the each of the interviews conducted is attached as Appendix “3”.

**Case Law and Statutes**

Consultants reviewed more than 40,000 cases that were identified using a series of search terms related to voting fraud and voter intimidation. The majority of these cases came from courts of appeal. This is not surprising, since most cases that are publicly reported come from courts of appeal. Very few cases that are decided at the district court level are reported for public review.

Very few of the identified cases were applicable to this study. Of those that were applicable, no apparent thematic pattern emerged. However, it did seem that the greatest number of cases reported on fraud and intimidation have shifted from past patterns of stealing votes to present problems with voter registration, voter identification, the proper delivery and counting of absentee and overseas ballots, provisional voting, vote buying, and challenges to felon eligibility.

A listing of the cases reviewed in this study is attached as Appendix “4”.

**Media Reports**

EAC consultants reviewed thousands of media reports concerning a wide variety of potential voting fraud or voter intimidation, including:

- absentee ballot fraud,
- voter registration fraud,
- voter intimidation and suppression,
- deceased voters on voter registration list and/or voting,
- multiple voting,
- felons voting,
non-citizens voting, vote buying, deceptive practices, and fraud by election officials.

While these reports showed that there were a large number of allegations of voting fraud and voter intimidation, they provided much less information as to whether the allegations were ever formalized as complaints to law enforcement, whether charges were filed, whether prosecutions ensued, and whether any convictions were made. The media reports were enlightening as to the pervasiveness of complaints of fraud and intimidation throughout the country, the correlation between fraud allegations and the perception that the state was a "battleground" or "swing" state, and the fact that there were reports of almost all types of voting fraud and voter intimidation. However, these reports do not provide much data for analysis as to the number of complaints, charges and prosecutions of voting fraud and intimidation throughout the country.

DEFINITION OF ELECTION CRIMES

From our study of available information on voting fraud and voter intimidation, we have learned that these terms mean many things to many different people. These terms are used casually to refer to anything from vote buying to refusing to register a voter to falsifying voter registration applications. Upon further inspection, however, it is apparent that there is no common understanding or agreement of what constitutes "voting fraud" and "voter intimidation." Some think of voting fraud and voter intimidation only as criminal acts, while others include actions that may constitute civil wrongs, civil rights violations, and even legal activities. To arrive at a common definition and list of activities that can be studied, EAC assessed the appropriateness of the terminology that is currently in use and applied certain factors to limit the scope and reach of what can and will be studied by EAC in the future. As a result, EAC has adopted the use of the term "election crimes" for its future study.

Current Terminology

The phrase "voting fraud" is really a misnomer for a concept that is much broader. "Fraud" is a concept that connotes an intentional act of deception, which may constitute either a criminal act or civil tort depending upon the willfulness of the act.

**Fraud**, n. 1. A knowing misrepresentation of the truth or concealment of a material fact to induce another to act to his or her detriment. • Fraud is usu[ally] a tort, but in some cases (esp. when the conduct is willful) it may be a crime.


"Voting" is the act of casting votes to decide an issue or contest. Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition, p. 1608. Using these terms to form a definition of "voting fraud," it means fraudulent or deceptive acts committed to influence the act of voting.
Thus, a voter who intentionally impersonates another registered voter and attempts to vote for that person would be committing "voting fraud." Similarly, a person who knowingly provides false information to a voter about the location of the voter's polling place commits fraud on the voter.

The phrase "voting fraud" does not capture a myriad of other criminal acts that are related to elections which are not related to the act of voting and/or do not involve an act of deception. For example, "voting fraud" does not capture actions or willful inaction in the voter registration process. When an election official willfully and knowingly refuses to register to vote a legally eligible person it is a crime. This is a crime that involves neither the act of voting nor an act of deception.

To further complicate matters, the phrases "voting fraud" and "voter intimidation" are used to refer to actions or inactions that are criminal as well as those that are potentially civil wrongs and even those that are legal. Obviously, criminal acts and civil wrongs are pursued in a very different manner. Criminal acts are prosecuted by the local, state or federal government. Generally, civil wrongs are prosecuted by the individual who believes that they were harmed. In some cases, when civil rights are involved, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice may become involved.

New Terminology

The goal of this study was to develop a common definition of what is generically referred to as "voting fraud" and "voter intimidation" that would serve as the basis for a future, comprehensive study of the existence of these problems. Because the current terminology has such a variety of applications and meanings, "voting fraud" and "voter intimidation" can be read to encompass almost any bad act associated with an election. Such broad terminology is not useful in setting the boundaries of a future study. A definition must set parameters for future study by applying limitations on what is included in the concepts to be studied. The current terminology applies no such limitations.

Thus, EAC has adopted the use of the phrase "election crimes" to limit the scope of its future study. This term captures all crimes related to the voter registration and voting processes and excludes civil wrongs and non-election related crimes. EAC adopted this definition because it better represents the spectrum of activities that we are able to and desire to study. In addition, we recognize that the resources, both financial and human capital, needed to study all "voting fraud" and "voter intimidation," including criminal acts, civil actions, as well as allegations of voter suppression through the use of legal election processes are well beyond the resources available to EAC. Finally, by limiting this definition to criminal acts, EAC can focus its study on a set of more readily measurable data. Criminal behavior is readily defined through state and federal statutes and is prosecuted by government agencies. This is not the case with civil matters. Civil actions can be prosecuted by individuals and/or government entities. Furthermore, what constitutes civil action is far less defined, subject to change, and can vary from case to
A more complete discussion of the concept of “election crimes” follows along with a list of excluded actions.

The Definition of an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study

Election crimes are intentional acts or willful failures to act, prohibited by state or federal law, that are designed to cause ineligible persons to participate in the election process; eligible persons to be excluded from the election process; ineligible votes to be cast in an election; eligible votes not to be cast or counted; or other interference with or invalidation of election results. Election crimes generally fall into one of four categories: acts of deception, acts of coercion, acts of damage or destruction, and failures or refusals to act.

Election crimes can be committed by voters, candidates, election officials, or any other members of the public who desire to criminally impact the result of an election. However, crimes that are based upon intentional or willful failure to act assume that a duty to act exists. Election officials have affirmative duties to act with regard to elections. By and large, other groups and individuals do not have such duties.

The victim of an election crime can be a voter, a group of voters, an election official, a candidate, or the public in general. Election crimes can occur during any stage of the election process, including but not limited to qualification of candidates; voter registration; campaigning; voting system preparation and programming; voting either early, absentee, or on election day; vote tabulation; recounts; and recalls.

The following are examples of activities that may constitute election crimes. This list is not intended to be exhaustive, but is representative of what states and the federal government consider criminal activity related to elections.

Acts of Deception

- Knowingly causing to be mailed or distributed, or knowingly mailing or distributing, literature that includes false information about the voter’s precinct or polling place, the date and time of the election or a candidate;
- Possessing an official ballot outside the voting location, unless the person is an election official or other person authorized by law or local ordinance to possess a ballot outside of the polling location;
- Making or knowingly possessing a counterfeit of an official election ballot;
- Signing a name other than his/her own to a petition proposing an initiative, referendum, recall, or nomination of a candidate for office;
- Knowingly signing more than once for the proposition, question, or candidate in one election;
- Signing a petition proposing an initiative or referendum when the signer is not a qualified voter.
- Voting or attempting to vote in the name of another person;
- Voting or attempting to vote more than once during the same election;
o Intentionally making a false affidavit, swearing falsely, or falsely affirming under an oath required by a statute regarding their voting status, including when registering to vote, requesting an absentee ballot or presenting to vote in person;

o Registering to vote without being entitled to register;

o Knowingly making a materially false statement on an application for voter registration or re-registration; and

o Voting or attempting to vote in an election after being disqualified or when the person knows that he/she is not eligible to vote.

Acts of Coercion

o Using, threatening to use, or causing to be used force, coercion, violence, restraint, or inflicting, threatening to inflict, or causing to be inflicted damage, harm, or loss, upon or against another person to induce or compel that person to vote or refrain from voting or to register or refrain from registering to vote;

o Knowingly paying, offering to pay, or causing to be paid money or other thing of value to a person to vote or refrain from voting for a candidate or for or against an election proposition or question;

o Knowingly soliciting or encouraging a person who is not qualified to vote in an election;

o Knowingly challenging a person’s right to vote without probable cause or on fraudulent grounds, or engaging in mass, indiscriminate, and groundless challenging of voters solely for the purpose of preventing voter from voting or to delay the process of voting;

o As an employer, attempting by coercion, intimidation, threats to discharge or to lessen the remuneration of an employee, to influence his/her vote in any election, or who requires or demands an examination or inspection by himself/herself or another of an employee’s ballot;

o Soliciting, accepting, or agreeing to accept money or other valuable thing in exchange for signing or refraining from signing a petition proposing an initiative;

o Inducing or attempting to induce an election official to fail in the official’s duty by force, threat, intimidation, or offers of reward;

o Directly or through any other person advancing, paying, soliciting, or receiving or causing to be advanced, paid, solicited, or received, any money or other valuable consideration to or for the use of any person in order to induce a person not to become or to withdraw as a candidate for public office; and

o Soliciting, accepting, or agreeing to accept money or other thing of value in exchange for registering to vote.

Acts of Damage or Destruction

o Destroying completed voter registration applications;

o Removing or destroying any of the supplies or other conveniences placed in the voting booths or compartments;

o Removing, tearing down, or defacing election materials, instructions or ballots;
o Fraudulently altering or changing the vote of any elector, by which such elector is prevented from voting as the person intended;

o Knowingly removing, altering, defacing or covering any political sign of any candidate for public office for a prescribed period prior to and following the election;

o Intentionally changing, attempting to change, or causing to be changed an official election document including ballots, tallies, and returns; and

o Intentionally delaying, attempting to delay, or causing to be delayed the sending of certificate, register, ballots, or other materials whether original or duplicate, required to be sent by jurisdictional law.

**Failure or Refusal to Act**

o Intentionally failing to perform an election duty, or knowingly committing an unauthorized act with the intent to effect the election;

o Knowingly permitting, making, or attempting to make a false count of election returns;

o Intentionally concealing, withholding, or destroying election returns or attempts to do so;

o Marking a ballot by folding or physically altering the ballot so as to recognize the ballot at a later time;

o Attempting to learn or actually and unlawfully learning how a voter marked a ballot;

o Distributing or attempting to distribute election material knowing it to be fraudulent;

o Knowingly refusing to register a person who is entitled to register under the rules of that jurisdiction;

o Knowingly removing the eligibility status of a voter who is eligible to vote; and

o Knowingly refusing to allow an eligible voter to cast his/her ballot.

**What is not an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study**

There are some actions or inactions that may constitute crimes or civil wrongs that we do not include in our definition of “election crimes.” All criminal or civil violations related to campaign finance contribution limitations, prohibitions, and reporting either at the state or federal level are not “election crimes” for purposes of this study and any future study conducted by EAC. Similarly, criminal acts that are unrelated to elections, voting, or voter registration are not “election crimes,” even when those offenses occur in a polling place, voter registration office, or a candidate’s office or appearance. For example, an assault or battery that results from a fight in a polling place or at a candidate’s office is not an election crime. Last, violations of ethical provisions and the Hatch Act are not “election crimes.” Similarly, civil or other wrongs that do not rise to the level of criminal activity (i.e., a misdemeanor, relative felony or felony) are not “election crimes.”
RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW TO STUDY ELECTION CRIMES

As a part of its study, EAC sought recommendations on ways that EAC can research the existence of election crimes. EAC consultants, the working groups and some of the persons interviewed as a part of this study provided the following recommendations.

**Recommendation 1: Conduct More Interviews**

Future activity in this area should include conducting additional interviews. In particular, more election officials from all levels of government, parts of the country, and political parties should be interviewed. It would also be especially beneficial to talk to law enforcement officials, specifically federal District Election Officers ("DEOs") and local district attorneys, as well as civil and criminal defense attorneys.

**Recommendation 2: Follow Up on Media Research**

The media search conducted for this phase of the research was based on a list of search terms agreed upon by EAC consultants. Thousands of articles were reviewed and hundreds analyzed. Many of the articles contained allegations of fraud or intimidation. Similarly, some of the articles contained information about investigations into such activities or even charges brought. Additional media research should be conducted to determine what, if any, resolutions or further activity there was in each case.

**Recommendation 3: Follow Up on Allegations Found in Literature Review**

Many of the allegations made in the reports and books that were analyzed and summarized by EAC consultants were not substantiated and were certainly limited by the date of publication of those pieces. Despite this, such reports and books are frequently cited by various interested parties as evidence of fraud or intimidation. Further research should include follow up on the allegations discovered in the literature review.

**Recommendation 4: Review Complaints Filed With “MyVote1” Voter Hotline**

During the 2004 election and the statewide elections of 2005, the University of Pennsylvania led a consortium of groups and researchers in conducting the MyVote1 Project. This project involved using a toll-free voter hotline that voters could call for poll locations, be transferred to a local hotline, or leave a recorded message with a complaint. In 2004, this resulted in more than 200,000 calls received and more than 56,000 recorded complaints.

Further research should be conducted using the MyVote1 data with the cooperation of the project leaders. While perhaps not a fully scientific survey given the self-selection of the callers, the information regarding 56,000 complaints may provide insight into the problems voters may have experienced, especially issues regarding intimidation or suppression.
Recommendation 5: Further Review of Complaints Filed With U.S. Department of Justice

According to a recent GAO report, the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice has a variety of ways it tracks complaints of voter intimidation. Attempts should be made to obtain relevant data, including the telephone logs of complaints and information from the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system. Further research should also include a review and analysis of the DOJ/OPM observer and "monitor field reports" from Election Day.

Recommendation 6: Review Reports Filed By District Election Officers

Further research should include a review of the reports that must be filed by every District Election Officer to the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. The DEOs play a central role in receiving reports of voting fraud and investigating and pursuing them. Their reports back to the Department would likely provide tremendous insight into what actually transpired during the last several elections. Where necessary, information could be redacted or made confidential.

Recommendation 7: Attend Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium

Further activity in this area should include attending the next Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium. At this conference, prosecutors serving as District Election Officers in the 94 U.S. Attorneys' Offices obtain annual training on fighting election fraud and voting rights abuses. These conferences are sponsored by the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division and the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division, and feature presentations by Civil Rights officials and senior prosecutors from the Public Integrity Section and the U.S. Attorneys' Offices. By attending the symposium researchers could learn more about the following: how District Election Officers are trained; how information about previous election and voting issues is presented; and how the Voting Rights Act, the criminal laws governing election fraud and intimidation, the National Voter Registration Act, and the Help America Vote Act are described and explained to participants.

Recommendation 8: Conduct Statistical Research

EAC should measure voting fraud and intimidation using interviews, focus groups, and a survey and statistical analysis of the results of these efforts. The sample should be based on the following factors:

- Ten locations that are geographically and demographically diverse where there have been many reports of fraud and/or intimidation;
- Ten locations (geographically and demographically diverse) that have not had many reports of fraud and/or intimidation;
EAC should also conduct a survey of elections officials, district attorneys, and district election officers. The survey sample should be large in order to be able to get the necessary subsets, and it must include a random set of counties where there have and have not been a large number of allegations.

**Recommendation 9: Explore Improvements to Federal Law**

Future researchers should review federal law to explore ways to make it easier to impose either civil or criminal penalties for acts of intimidation that do not necessarily involve racial animus and/or a physical or economic threat.

**Recommendation 10: Use Observers to Collect Data on Election Day**

Use observers to collect data regarding fraud and intimidation at the polls on Election Day. There may be some limitations to the ability to conduct this type of research, including difficulty gaining access to polling places for the purposes of observation, and concerns regarding how the observers themselves may inadvertently or deliberately influence the occurrence of election crimes.

**Recommendation 11: Study Absentee Ballot Fraud**

Because absentee ballot fraud constitutes a large portion of election crimes, a stand-alone study of absentee ballot fraud should be conducted. Researchers should look at actual cases to see how absentee ballot fraud schemes are conducted in an effort to provide recommendations on more effective measures for preventing fraud when absentee ballots are used.

**Recommendation 12: Use Risk Analysis Methodology to Study Fraud**

Conduct an analysis of what types of fraud people are most likely to commit. Researchers will use that risk analysis to rank the types of fraud based on the “ease of commission” and the impact of the fraud.

**Recommendation 13: Conduct Research Using Database Comparisons**

Researchers should compare information on databases to determine whether the voter rolls contain deceased persons and felons. In addition, the voter rolls can then be compared with the list of persons who voted to determine whether a vote was recorded by someone who is deceased or if felons are noted as having voted.

**Recommendation 14: Conduct a Study of Deceptive Practices**

The working group discussed the increasing use of deceptive practices, such as flyers and phone calls with false and/or intimidating information, to suppress voter participation. A number of groups, such as the Department of Justice, the EAC, and organizations such as the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, keep phone logs regarding complaints of such
practices. These logs should be reviewed and analyzed to see how and where such practices are being conducted and what can be done about them.

**Recommendation 15: Study Use of HAVA Administrative Complaint Procedure as Vehicle for Measuring Fraud and Intimidation**

EAC should study the extent to which states are utilizing the administrative complaint procedure mandated by HAVA. In addition, the EAC should study whether data collected through the administrative complaint procedure can be used as another source of information for measuring fraud and intimidation.

**Recommendation 16: Examine the Use of Special Election Courts**

Given that many state and local judges are elected, it may be worth exploring whether special election courts should be established to handle fraud and intimidation complaints before, during, and after Election Day. Pennsylvania employs such a system and could investigate how well that system is working.

**Accepted Recommendations**

There has never been a comprehensive, national study that gathered data regarding all claims, charges, and prosecutions of voting crimes. EAC feels that a comprehensive study is the most important research that it can offer the election community and the public. As such, EAC has adopted all or a part of six of the 16 recommendations made by EAC consultants and the working group.

While several of the other recommendations could be used to obtain more anecdotal information regarding election crimes, EAC believes that what is needed is a comprehensive survey and study of the information available from investigatory agencies, prosecutorial bodies and courts on the number and types of complaints, charges and prosecutions of election crimes. Additional media reviews, additional interviews and the use of observers to collect information from voters on Election Day will only serve to continue the use of anecdotal data to report on election crimes. Hard data on complaints, charges and prosecutions exists and we should gather and use that data, rather than rely on the perceptions of the media or the members of the public as to what might be fraud or intimidation.

Some of the recommendations are beyond the scope of the current study. While election courts may be a reasonable conclusion to reach after we determine the volume and type of election crimes being reported, charged or prosecuted, it is premature to embark on an analysis of that solution without more information. Last, some of the recommendations do not support a comprehensive study of election crimes. While a risk analysis might be appropriate in a smaller scale study, EAC desires to conduct a broader survey to avoid the existing problem of anecdotal and limited scope of information.
In order to further its goal of developing a comprehensive data set regarding election crimes and the laws and procedures used to identify and prosecute them, EAC intends to engage in the following research activities in studying the existence and enforcement of election crimes:

**Survey Chief Election Officers Regarding Administrative Complaints**

Likely sources of complaints concerning election crimes are the administrative complaint processes that states were required to establish to comply with Section 402 of HAVA. These complaint procedures were required to be in place prior to a state receiving any funds under HAVA. Citizens are permitted to file complaints alleging violations of HAVA Title III provisions under these procedures with the state’s chief election official. Those complaints must be resolved within 60 days. The procedures also allow for alternative dispute resolution of claims. Some states have expanded this process to include complaints of other violations, such as election crimes.

In order to determine how many of these complaints allege the commission of election crimes, EAC will survey the states’ chief election officers regarding complaints that have been filed, investigated, and resolved since January 1, 2004. EAC will use the definition of election crimes provided above in this report in its survey so that data regarding a uniform set of offenses will be collected.

**Survey State Election Crime Investigation Units Regarding Complaints Filed and Referred**

Several chief state election officials have developed investigation units focused on receiving, investigating, and referring complaints of election crimes. These units were established to bolster the abilities of state and local law enforcement to investigate allegations of election crimes. California, New York and Florida are just three examples of states that have these types of units.

EAC will use a survey instrument to gather information on the numbers and types of complaints that have been received by, investigated, and ultimately referred to local or state law enforcement by election crime investigation units since January 1, 2004. These data will help us understand the pervasiveness of perceived fraud, as well as the number of claims that state election officials felt were meritorious of being referred to local and state law enforcement or prosecutorial agencies for further action.

**Survey Law Enforcement and Prosecutorial Agencies Regarding Complaints and Charge of Voting Crimes**

While voters, candidates and citizens may call national hotlines or the news media to report allegations of election crimes, it is those complaints that are made to law enforcement that can be investigated and ultimately prosecuted. Thus, it is critical to the study of election crimes to obtain statistics regarding the number and types of complaints that are made to law enforcement, how many of those complaints result in the perpetrator...
being charged or indicted, and how many of those charges or indictments result in pleas or convictions.

Thus, EAC will survey law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies at the local, state and federal level to determine the number and types of complaints, charges or indictments, and pleas or convictions of election crimes since January 1, 2004. In addition, EAC will seek to obtain an understanding of why some complaints are not charged or indicted and why some charges or indictments are not prosecuted.

*Analyze Survey Data in Light of State Laws and Procedures*

Once a reliable data set concerning the existence and enforcement of election crimes is assembled, a real analysis of the effectiveness of fraud prevention measures can be conducted. For example, data can be analyzed to determine if criminal activities related to elections are isolated to certain areas or regions of the country. Data collected from the election official surveys can be compared to the data regarding complaints, charges and prosecutions gathered from the respective law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies in each jurisdiction. The effect and/or effectiveness of provisions such as voter identification laws and challenger provisions can be assessed based on hard data from areas where these laws exist. Last, analyses such as the effectiveness of enforcement can be conducted in light of the resources available to the effort.

**CONCLUSION**

Election crimes are nothing new to our election process. The pervasiveness of these crimes and the fervor with which they have been enforced has created a great deal of debate among academics, election officials, and voters. Past studies of these issues have been limited in scope and some have been riddled with bias. These are issues that deserve comprehensive and nonpartisan review. EAC, through its clearinghouse role, will collect and analyze data on election crimes throughout the country. These data not only will tell us what types of election crimes are committed and where fraud exists, but also inform us of what factors impact the existence, prevention, and prosecution of election crimes.
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EAC REPORT ON VOTING FRAUD AND VOTER INTIMIDATION STUDY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) requires the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to study a host of topics, including “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation.” In 2005, EAC embarked on an initial review of the existing knowledge of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The goal of that study was to develop a working definition of “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation” and to identify research methodology to conduct a comprehensive, nationwide study of these topics.

EAC staff along with two, bipartisan consultants reviewed the existing information available about voting fraud and voter intimidation, including reading articles, books and reports; interviewing subject matter experts; reviewing media reports of fraud and intimidation; and studying reported cases of prosecutions of these types of crimes. It is clear from this review that there is a great deal of debate on the pervasiveness of fraud in elections as well as what constitute the most common acts of fraud or intimidation. There is also no apparent consensus on the meaning of the phrases “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation.” Some think of voting fraud and voter intimidation only as criminal acts, while others include actions that may constitute civil wrongs, civil rights violations, and even legal activities.

In order to facilitate future study of these topics, EAC developed a working definition of “election crimes.” “Election crimes” are intentional acts or willful failures to act, prohibited by state or federal law, that are designed to cause ineligible persons to participate in the election process; eligible persons to be excluded from the election process; ineligible votes to be cast in an election; eligible votes not to be cast or counted; or other interference with or invalidation of election results. Election crimes generally fall into one of four categories: acts of deception, acts of coercion, acts of damage or destruction, and failures or refusals to act.

From EAC’s review of existing information on the issue, it was apparent that there have been a number of studies that touched on various topics and regions of the country concerning voting fraud and intimidation, but that there had never been a comprehensive, nationwide study of these topics. EAC will conduct further research to provide a comprehensive, nationwide look at “election crimes.” Future EAC study of this topic will focus on election-related, criminal activity and will not include acts that are exclusively civil wrongs, campaign finance violations, and violations of ethical provisions. EAC will study these concepts by surveying the states’ chief election officials about complaints they received through their administrative complaint processes, election crime investigation units regarding complaints received and those referred to law enforcement, and law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies regarding complaints received and charges filed.
INTRODUCTION

Voting fraud and voter intimidation are phrases familiar to many voting-aged Americans. However, they mean different things to different people. Voting fraud and voter intimidation are phrases used to refer to crimes, civil rights violations, and, at times, even the lawful application of state or federal laws to the voting process. Past study of these topics has been as varied as its perceived meaning. In an effort to help understand the realities of voting fraud and voter intimidation in our elections, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has begun this, phase one, of a comprehensive study on election crimes. In this phase of its examination, EAC has developed a working definition of election crimes and adopted research methodology on how to assess the existence and enforcement of election crimes in the United States.

PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EAC STUDY

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) calls on the EAC to research and study various issues related to the administration of elections. During Fiscal Year 2006, EAC began projects to research several of the listed topics. These topics for research were chosen in consultation with the EAC Standards Board and Board of Advisors. Voting fraud and voter intimidation are topics that the EAC as well as its advisory boards felt were important to study to help improve the administration of elections for federal office.

EAC began this study with the intention of identifying a common understanding of voting fraud and voter intimidation and devising a plan for a comprehensive study of these issues. The initial study was not intended to be a comprehensive review of existing voting fraud and voter intimidation actions, laws, or prosecutions. To conduct that type of extensive research, a basic understanding had to first be established regarding what is commonly referred to as voting fraud and voter intimidation. Once that understanding was reached, a definition had to be crafted to refine and in some cases limit the scope of what reasonably can be researched and studied as evidence of voting fraud and voter intimidation. That definition will serve as the basis for recommending a plan for a comprehensive study of the area.

To accomplish these tasks, EAC employed two consultants, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, who worked with EAC staff and interns to conduct the research that forms the basis of this report. The consultants were chosen based upon their experience with the topic and the need to assure a bipartisan representation in this study. The consultants and EAC staff were charged with (1) researching the current state of information on the topic of voting fraud and voter intimidation; (2) developing a uniform definition of voting fraud and voter intimidation; and (3) proposing recommended strategies for researching this subject.

1 Biographies for Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, the two consultants hired by EAC, are attached as Appendix “1”.
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EAC consultants reviewed existing studies, articles, reports and case law on voting fraud and intimidation and conducted interviews with experts in the field. EAC consultants and staff then presented their initial findings to a working group that provided feedback. The working group participants were:

**The Honorable Todd Rokita**  
Indiana Secretary of State  
Member, EAC Standards Board and the Executive Board of the Standards Board

**Kathy Rogers**  
Georgia Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State  
Member, EAC Standards Board

**J.R. Perez**  
Guadalupe County Elections Administrator, Texas

**Barbara Arnwine**  
Executive Director, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights under Law  
Leader of Election Protection Coalition

**Benjamin L. Ginsberg**  
Partner, Patton Boggs LLP  
Counsel to National Republican Campaign Committees and Republican candidates

**Robert Bauer**  
Chair of the Political Law Practice at the law firm of Perkins Coie, District of Columbia  
National Counsel for Voter Protection, Democratic National Committee

**Mark (Thor) Hearne II**  
Partner-Member, Lathrop & Gage, St Louis, Missouri  
National Counsel to the American Center for Voting Rights

**Barry Weinberg**  
Former Deputy Chief and Acting Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

*Technical Advisor:*  
**Craig Donsanto**  
Director, Election Crimes Branch, U.S. Department of Justice

Throughout the process, EAC staff assisted the consultants by providing statutes and cases on this subject as well as supervision on the direction, scope and product of this research.

The consultants drafted a report for EAC that included their summaries of relevant cases, studies and reports on voting fraud and voter intimidation as well as summaries of the interviews that they conducted. The draft report also provided a definition of voting fraud and intimidation and made certain recommendations developed by the consultants or by the working group on how to pursue further study of this subject. This document was vetted and edited by EAC staff to produce this final report.
EXISTING INFORMATION ABOUT FRAUD AND INTIMIDATION

To begin our study of voting fraud and voter intimidation, EAC consultants reviewed the current body of information on voting fraud and voter intimidation. The information available about these issues comes largely from a very limited body of reports, articles, and books. There are volumes of case law and statutes in the various states that also impact our understanding of what actions or inactions are legally considered fraud or intimidation. Last, there is anecdotal information available through media reports and interviews with persons who have administered elections, prosecuted fraud, and studied these problems. All of these resources were used by EAC consultants to provide an introductory look at the available knowledge of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Reports and Studies of Voting fraud and Intimidation

Over the years, there have been a number of studies conducted and reports published about voting fraud and voter intimidation. EAC reviewed many of these studies and reports to develop a base-line understanding of the information that is currently available about voting fraud and voter intimidation. EAC consultants reviewed the following articles, reports and books, summaries of which are available in Appendix “2”:

Articles and Reports


- Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2002."

- Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2003."

- Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2004."


During our review of these documents, we learned a great deal about the type of research that has been conducted in the past concerning voting fraud and voter intimidation. None of the studies or reports was based on a comprehensive, nationwide study, survey or review of all allegations, prosecutions or convictions of state or federal crimes related to voting fraud or voter intimidation in the United States. Most reports focused on a limited number of case studies or instances of alleged voting fraud or voter intimidation. For example, “Shattering the Myth: An Initial Snapshot of Voter Disenfranchisement in the 2004 Elections,” a report produced by the People for the American Way, focused exclusively on citizen reports of fraud or intimidation to the Election Protection program during the 2004 Presidential election. Similarly, reports produced annually by the Department of Justice, Public Integrity Division, deal exclusively with crimes reported to and prosecuted by the United States Attorneys and/or the Department of Justice through the Public Integrity Section.

It is also apparent from a review of these articles and books that there is no consensus on the pervasiveness of voting fraud and voter intimidation. Some reports, such as
"Building Confidence in U.S. Elections," suggest that there is little or no evidence of extensive fraud in U.S. elections or of multiple voting. This conflicts directly with other reports, such as the "Preliminary Findings of Joint Task Force Investigating Possible Election Fraud," produced by the Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee County District Attorney's Office, FBI and U.S. Attorney's Office. That report cited evidence of more than 100 individual instances of suspected double-voting, voting in the name of persons who likely did not vote, and/or voting using a name believed to be fake.

Voter intimidation is also a topic of some debate because there is little agreement concerning what constitutes actionable voter intimidation. Some studies and reports cover only intimidation that involves physical or financial threats, while others cover non-criminal intimidation, including legal practices that allegedly cause vote suppression.

One point of agreement is that absentee voting and voter registration by nongovernmental groups create opportunities for fraud. For example, a number of studies cited circumstances in which voter registration drives have falsified voter registration applications or have destroyed voter registration applications of persons affiliated with a certain political party. Others conclude that paying persons per voter registration application creates the opportunity and perhaps the incentive for fraud.

Interviews with Experts

In addition to reviewing prior studies and reports on voting fraud and intimidation, EAC consultants interviewed a number of persons regarding their experiences and research of voting fraud and voter intimidation. Persons interviewed included:

Wade Henderson
Executive Director,
Leadership Conference for Civil Rights

Wendy Weiser
Deputy Director,
Democracy Program, The Brennan Center

William Groth
Attorney for the plaintiffs in the Indiana voter identification litigation

Lori Minnite
Barnard College, Columbia University

Neil Bradley
ACLU Voting Rights Project

Pat Rogers
Attorney, New Mexico

Nina Perales
Counsel,
Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund

Rebecca Vigil-Giron
Secretary of State, New Mexico

Sarah Ball Johnson
Executive Director,
State Board of Elections, Kentucky

Stephen Ansolobohere
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Chandler Davidson
Rice University
These interviews in large part confirmed the conclusions that were gleaned from the articles, reports and books that were analyzed. For example, the interviewees largely agreed that absentee balloting is subject to the greatest proportion of fraudulent acts, followed by vote buying and voter registration fraud. They similarly pointed to voter registration drives by nongovernmental groups as a source of fraud, particularly when the workers are paid per registration. Many asserted that impersonation of voters is probably the least frequent type of fraud because it is the most likely type of fraud to be discovered, there are stiff penalties associated with this type of fraud, and it is an inefficient method of influencing an election.

Interviewees differed on what they believe constitutes actionable voter intimidation. Law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies tend to look to the criminal definitions of voter intimidation, which generally require some threat of physical or financial harm. On the other hand, voter rights advocates tended to point to activities such as challenger laws,
voter identification laws, polling place locations, and distribution of voting machines as activities that can constitute voter intimidation.

Those interviewed also expressed opinions on the enforcement of voting fraud and voter intimidation laws. States have varying authorities to enforce these laws. In some states, enforcement is left to the county or district attorney, and in others enforcement is managed by the state's attorney general. Regardless, voting fraud and voter intimidation are difficult to prove and require resources and time that many local law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies do not have. Federal law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies have more time and resources but have limited jurisdiction and can only prosecute election crimes perpetrated in elections with a federal candidate on the ballot or perpetrated by a public official under the color of law. Those interviewed differed on the effectiveness of the current system of enforcement. Some allege that prosecutions are not sufficiently aggressive. Others feel that the current laws are sufficient for prosecuting fraud and intimidation.

A summary of the each of the interviews conducted is attached as Appendix “3”.

**Case Law and Statutes**

Consultants reviewed more than 40,000 cases that were identified using a series of search terms related to voting fraud and voter intimidation. The majority of these cases came from courts of appeal. This is not surprising, since most cases that are publicly reported come from courts of appeal. Very few cases that are decided at the district court level are reported for public review.

Very few of the identified cases were applicable to this study. Of those that were applicable, no apparent thematic pattern emerged. However, it did seem that the greatest number of cases reported on fraud and intimidation have shifted from past patterns of stealing votes to present problems with voter registration, voter identification, the proper delivery and counting of absentee and overseas ballots, provisional voting, vote buying, and challenges to felon eligibility.

A listing of the cases reviewed in this study is attached as Appendix “4”.

**Media Reports**

EAC consultants reviewed thousands of media reports concerning a wide variety of potential voting fraud or voter intimidation, including:

- absentee ballot fraud,
- voter registration fraud,
- voter intimidation and suppression,
- deceased voters on voter registration list and/or voting,
- multiple voting,
- felons voting,
• non-citizens voting,
• vote buying,
• deceptive practices, and
• fraud by election officials.

While these reports showed that there were a large number of allegations of voting fraud and voter intimidation, they provided much less information as to whether the allegations were ever formalized as complaints to law enforcement, whether charges were filed, whether prosecutions ensued, and whether any convictions were made. The media reports were enlightening as to the pervasiveness of complaints of fraud and intimidation throughout the country, the correlation between fraud allegations and the perception that the state was a “battleground” or “swing” state, and the fact that there were reports of almost all types of voting fraud and voter intimidation. However, these reports do not provide much data for analysis as to the number of complaints, charges and prosecutions of voting fraud and intimidation throughout the country.

DEFINITION OF ELECTION CRIMES

From our study of available information on voting fraud and voter intimidation, we have learned that these terms mean many things to many different people. These terms are used casually to refer to anything from vote buying to refusing to register a voter to falsifying voter registration applications. Upon further inspection, however, it is apparent that there is no common understanding or agreement of what constitutes “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation.” Some think of voting fraud and voter intimidation only as criminal acts, while others include actions that may constitute civil wrongs, civil rights violations, and even legal activities. To arrive at a common definition and list of activities that can be studied, EAC assessed the appropriateness of the terminology that is currently in use and applied certain factors to limit the scope and reach of what can and will be studied by EAC in the future. As a result, EAC has adopted the use of the term “election crimes” for its future study.

Current Terminology

The phrase “voting fraud” is really a misnomer for a concept that is much broader. “Fraud” is a concept that connotes an intentional act of deception, which may constitute either a criminal act or civil tort depending upon the willfulness of the act.

_Fraud_, n. 1. A knowing misrepresentation of the truth or concealment of a material fact to induce another to act to his or her detriment. • Fraud is usu[ally] a tort, but in some cases (esp. when the conduct is willful) it may be a crime.


“Voting” is the act of casting votes to decide an issue or contest. Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition, p. 1608. Using these terms to form a definition of “voting fraud,” it means fraudulent or deceptive acts committed to influence the act of voting.
Thus, a voter who intentionally impersonates another registered voter and attempts to vote for that person would be committing "voting fraud." Similarly, a person who knowingly provides false information to a voter about the location of the voter’s polling place commits fraud on the voter.

The phrase "voting fraud" does not capture a myriad of other criminal acts that are related to elections which are not related to the act of voting and/or do not involve an act of deception. For example, "voting fraud" does not capture actions or willful inaction in the voter registration process. When an election official willfully and knowingly refuses to register to vote a legally eligible person it is a crime. This is a crime that involves neither the act of voting nor an act of deception.

To further complicate matters, the phrases “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation” are used to refer to actions or inactions that are criminal as well as those that are potentially civil wrongs and even those that are legal. Obviously, criminal acts and civil wrongs are pursued in a very different manner. Criminal acts are prosecuted by the local, state or federal government. Generally, civil wrongs are prosecuted by the individual who believes that they were harmed. In some cases, when civil rights are involved, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice may become involved.

New Terminology

The goal of this study was to develop a common definition of what is generically referred to as “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation” that would serve as the basis for a future, comprehensive study of the existence of these problems. Because the current terminology has such a variety of applications and meanings, “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation” can be read to encompass almost any bad act associated with an election. Such broad terminology is not useful in setting the boundaries of a future study. A definition must set parameters for future study by applying limitations on what is included in the concepts to be studied. The current terminology applies no such limitations.

Thus, EAC has adopted the use of the phrase “election crimes” to limit the scope of its future study. This term captures all crimes related to the voter registration and voting processes and excludes civil wrongs and non-election related crimes. EAC adopted this definition because it better represents the spectrum of activities that we are able to and desire to study. In addition, we recognize that the resources, both financial and human capital, needed to study all “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation,” including criminal acts, civil actions, as well as allegations of voter suppression through the use of legal election processes are well beyond the resources available to EAC. Finally, by limiting this definition to criminal acts, EAC can focus its study on a set of more readily measurable data. Criminal behavior is readily defined through state and federal statutes and is prosecuted by government agencies. This is not the case with civil matters. Civil actions can be prosecuted by individuals and/or government entities. Furthermore, what constitutes civil action is far less defined, subject to change, and can vary from case to
A more complete discussion of the concept of "election crimes" follows along with a list of excluded actions:

The Definition of an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study

Election crimes are intentional acts or willful failures to act, prohibited by state or federal law, that are designed to cause ineligible persons to participate in the election process; eligible persons to be excluded from the election process; ineligible votes to be cast in an election; eligible votes not to be cast or counted; or other interference with or invalidation of election results. Election crimes generally fall into one of four categories: acts of deception, acts of coercion, acts of damage or destruction, and failures or refusals to act.

Election crimes can be committed by voters, candidates, election officials, or any other members of the public who desire to criminally impact the result of an election. However, crimes that are based upon intentional or willful failure to act assume that a duty to act exists. Election officials have affirmative duties to act with regard to elections. By and large, other groups and individuals do not have such duties.

The victim of an election crime can be a voter, a group of voters, an election official, a candidate, or the public in general. Election crimes can occur during any stage of the election process, including but not limited to qualification of candidates; voter registration; campaigning; voting system preparation and programming; voting either early, absentee, or on election day; vote tabulation; recounts; and recalls.

The following are examples of activities that may constitute election crimes. This list is not intended to be exhaustive, but is representative of what states and the federal government consider criminal activity related to elections.

**Acts of Deception**

- Knowingly causing to be mailed or distributed, or knowingly mailing or distributing, literature that includes false information about the voter’s precinct or polling place, the date and time of the election or a candidate;
- Possessing an official ballot outside the voting location, unless the person is an election official or other person authorized by law or local ordinance to possess a ballot outside of the polling location;
- Making or knowingly possessing a counterfeit of an official election ballot;
- Signing a name other than his/her own to a petition proposing an initiative, referendum, recall, or nomination of a candidate for office;
- Knowingly signing more than once for the proposition, question, or candidate in one election;
- Signing a petition proposing an initiative or referendum when the signer is not a qualified voter.
- Voting or attempting to vote in the name of another person;
- Voting or attempting to vote more than once during the same election;
Intentionally making a false affidavit, swearing falsely, or falsely affirming under an oath required by a statute regarding their voting status, including when registering to vote, requesting an absentee ballot or presenting to vote in person;

Registering to vote without being entitled to register;

Knowingly making a materially false statement on an application for voter registration or re-registration; and

Voting or attempting to vote in an election after being disqualified or when the person knows that he/she is not eligible to vote.

**Acts of Coercion**

Using, threatening to use, or causing to be used force, coercion, violence, restraint, or inflicting, threatening to inflict, or causing to be inflicted damage harm, or loss, upon or against another person to induce or compel that person to vote or refrain from voting or to register or refrain from registering to vote;

Knowingly paying, offering to pay, or causing to be paid money or other thing of value to a person to vote or refrain from voting for a candidate or for or against an election proposition or question;

Knowingly soliciting or encouraging a person who is not qualified to vote in an election;

Knowingly challenging a person's right to vote without probable cause or on fraudulent grounds, or engaging in mass, indiscriminate, and groundless challenging of voters solely for the purpose of preventing voter from voting or to delay the process of voting;

As an employer, attempting by coercion, intimidation, threats to discharge or to lessen the remuneration of an employee, to influence his/her vote in any election, or who requires or demands an examination or inspection by himself/herself or another of an employee's ballot;

Soliciting, accepting, or agreeing to accept money or other valuable thing in exchange for signing or refraining from signing a petition proposing an initiative;

Inducing or attempting to induce an election official to fail in the official’s duty by force, threat, intimidation, or offers of reward;

Directly or through any other person advancing, paying, soliciting, or receiving or causing to be advanced, paid, solicited, or received, any money or other valuable consideration to or for the use of any person in order to induce a person not to become or to withdraw as a candidate for public office; and

Soliciting, accepting, or agreeing to accept money or other thing of value in exchange for registering to vote.

**Acts of Damage or Destruction**

Destroying completed voter registration applications;

Removing or destroying any of the supplies or other conveniences placed in the voting booths or compartments;

Removing, tearing down, or defacing election materials, instructions or ballots;
Fraudulently altering or changing the vote of any elector, by which such elector is prevented from voting as the person intended;

Knowingly removing, altering, defacing or covering any political sign of any candidate for public office for a prescribed period prior to and following the election;

Intentionally changing, attempting to change, or causing to be changed an official election document including ballots, tallies, and returns; and

Intentionally delaying, attempting to delay, or causing to be delayed the sending of certificate, register, ballots, or other materials whether original or duplicate, required to be sent by jurisdictional law.

**Failure or Refusal to Act**

Intentionally failing to perform an election duty, or knowingly committing an unauthorized act with the intent to effect the election;

Knowingly permitting, making, or attempting to make a false count of election returns;

Intentionally concealing, withholding, or destroying election returns or attempts to do so;

Marking a ballot by folding or physically altering the ballot so as to recognize the ballot at a later time;

Attempting to learn or actually and unlawfully learning how a voter marked a ballot;

Distributing or attempting to distribute election material knowing it to be fraudulent;

Knowingly refusing to register a person who is entitled to register under the rules of that jurisdiction;

Knowingly removing the eligibility status of a voter who is eligible to vote; and

Knowingly refusing to allow an eligible voter to cast his/her ballot.

**What is not an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study**

There are some actions or inactions that may constitute crimes or civil wrongs that we do not include in our definition of “election crimes.” All criminal or civil violations related to campaign finance contribution limitations, prohibitions, and reporting either at the state or federal level are not “election crimes” for purposes of this study and any future study conducted by EAC. Similarly, criminal acts that are unrelated to elections, voting, or voter registration are not “election crimes,” even when those offenses occur in a polling place, voter registration office, or a candidate’s office or appearance. For example, an assault or battery that results from a fight in a polling place or at a candidate’s office is not an election crime. Last, violations of ethical provisions and the Hatch Act are not “election crimes.” Similarly, civil or other wrongs that do not rise to the level of criminal activity (i.e., a misdemeanor, relative felony or felony) are not “election crimes.”
RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW TO STUDY ELECTION CRIMES

As a part of its study, EAC sought recommendations on ways that EAC can research the existence of election crimes. EAC consultants, the working groups and some of the persons interviewed as a part of this study provided the following recommendations.

**Recommendation 1: Conduct More Interviews**

Future activity in this area should include conducting additional interviews. In particular, more election officials from all levels of government, parts of the country, and political parties should be interviewed. It would also be especially beneficial to talk to law enforcement officials, specifically federal District Election Officers ("DEOs") and local district attorneys, as well as civil and criminal defense attorneys.

**Recommendation 2: Follow Up on Media Research**

The media search conducted for this phase of the research was based on a list of search terms agreed upon by EAC consultants. Thousands of articles were reviewed and hundreds analyzed. Many of the articles contained allegations of fraud or intimidation. Similarly, some of the articles contained information about investigations into such activities or even charges brought. Additional media research should be conducted to determine what, if any, resolutions or further activity there was in each case.

**Recommendation 3: Follow Up on Allegations Found in Literature Review**

Many of the allegations made in the reports and books that were analyzed and summarized by EAC consultants were not substantiated and were certainly limited by the date of publication of those pieces. Despite this, such reports and books are frequently cited by various interested parties as evidence of fraud or intimidation. Further research should include follow up on the allegations discovered in the literature review.

**Recommendation 4: Review Complaints Filed With “MyVote1” Voter Hotline**

During the 2004 election and the statewide elections of 2005, the University of Pennsylvania led a consortium of groups and researchers in conducting the MyVote1 Project. This project involved using a toll-free voter hotline that voters could call for poll locations, be transferred to a local hotline, or leave a recorded message with a complaint. In 2004, this resulted in more than 200,000 calls received and more than 56,000 recorded complaints.

Further research should be conducted using the MyVote1 data with the cooperation of the project leaders. While perhaps not a fully scientific survey given the self-selection of the callers, the information regarding 56,000 complaints may provide insight into the problems voters may have experienced, especially issues regarding intimidation or suppression.
Recommendation 5: Further Review of Complaints Filed With U.S. Department of Justice

According to a recent GAO report, the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice has a variety of ways it tracks complaints of voter intimidation. Attempts should be made to obtain relevant data, including the telephone logs of complaints and information from the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system. Further research should also include a review and analysis of the DOJ/OPM observer and “monitor field reports” from Election Day.

Recommendation 6: Review Reports Filed By District Election Officers

Further research should include a review of the reports that must be filed by every District Election Officer to the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. The DEOs play a central role in receiving reports of voting fraud and investigating and pursuing them. Their reports back to the Department would likely provide tremendous insight into what actually transpired during the last several elections. Where necessary, information could be redacted or made confidential.

Recommendation 7: Attend Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium

Further activity in this area should include attending the next Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium. At this conference, prosecutors serving as District Election Officers in the 94 U.S. Attorneys’ Offices obtain annual training on fighting election fraud and voting rights abuses. These conferences are sponsored by the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division and the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division, and feature presentations by Civil Rights officials and senior prosecutors from the Public Integrity Section and the U.S. Attorneys’ Offices. By attending the symposium researchers could learn more about the following: how District Election Officers are trained; how information about previous election and voting issues is presented; and how the Voting Rights Act, the criminal laws governing election fraud and intimidation, the National Voter Registration Act, and the Help America Vote Act are described and explained to participants.

Recommendation 8: Conduct Statistical Research

EAC should measure voting fraud and intimidation using interviews, focus groups, and a survey and statistical analysis of the results of these efforts. The sample should be based on the following factors:

- Ten locations that are geographically and demographically diverse where there have been many reports of fraud and/or intimidation;
- Ten locations (geographically and demographically diverse) that have not had many reports of fraud and/or intimidation;
EAC should also conduct a survey of elections officials, district attorneys, and district election officers. The survey sample should be large in order to be able to get the necessary subsets, and it must include a random set of counties where there have and have not been a large number of allegations.

**Recommendation 9: Explore Improvements to Federal Law**

Future researchers should review federal law to explore ways to make it easier to impose either civil or criminal penalties for acts of intimidation that do not necessarily involve racial animus and/or a physical or economic threat.

**Recommendation 10: Use Observers to Collect Data on Election Day**

Use observers to collect data regarding fraud and intimidation at the polls on Election Day. There may be some limitations to the ability to conduct this type of research, including difficulty gaining access to polling places for the purposes of observation, and concerns regarding how the observers themselves may inadvertently or deliberately influence the occurrence of election crimes.

**Recommendation 11: Study Absentee Ballot Fraud**

Because absentee ballot fraud constitutes a large portion of election crimes, a stand-alone study of absentee ballot fraud should be conducted. Researchers should look at actual cases to see how absentee ballot fraud schemes are conducted in an effort to provide recommendations on more effective measures for preventing fraud when absentee ballots are used.

**Recommendation 12: Use Risk Analysis Methodology to Study Fraud**

Conduct an analysis of what types of fraud people are most likely to commit. Researchers will use that risk analysis to rank the types of fraud based on the “ease of commission” and the impact of the fraud.

**Recommendation 13: Conduct Research Using Database Comparisons**

Researchers should compare information on databases to determine whether the voter rolls contain deceased persons and felons. In addition, the voter rolls can then be compared with the list of persons who voted to determine whether a vote was recorded by someone who is deceased or if felons are noted as having voted.

**Recommendation 14: Conduct a Study of Deceptive Practices**

The working group discussed the increasing use of deceptive practices, such as flyers and phone calls with false and/or intimidating information, to suppress voter participation. A number of groups, such as the Department of Justice, the EAC, and organizations such as the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, keep phone logs regarding complaints of such
practices. These logs should be reviewed and analyzed to see how and where such practices are being conducted and what can be done about them.

**Recommendation 15: Study Use of HAVA Administrative Complaint Procedure as Vehicle for Measuring Fraud and Intimidation**

EAC should study the extent to which states are utilizing the administrative complaint procedure mandated by HAVA. In addition, the EAC should study whether data collected through the administrative complaint procedure can be used as another source of information for measuring fraud and intimidation.

**Recommendation 16: Examine the Use of Special Election Courts**

Given that many state and local judges are elected, it may be worth exploring whether special election courts should be established to handle fraud and intimidation complaints before, during, and after Election Day. Pennsylvania employs such a system and could investigate how well that system is working.

**Accepted Recommendations**

There has never been a comprehensive, national study that gathered data regarding all claims, charges, and prosecutions of voting crimes. EAC feels that a comprehensive study is the most important research that it can offer the election community and the public. As such, EAC has adopted all or a part of six of the 16 recommendations made by EAC consultants and the working group.

While several of the other recommendations could be used to obtain more anecdotal information regarding election crimes, EAC believes that what is needed is a comprehensive survey and study of the information available from investigatory agencies, prosecutorial bodies and courts on the number and types of complaints, charges and prosecutions of election crimes. Additional media reviews, additional interviews and the use of observers to collect information from voters on Election Day will only serve to continue the use of anecdotal data to report on election crimes. Hard data on complaints, charges and prosecutions exists and we should gather and use that data, rather than rely on the perceptions of the media or the members of the public as to what might be fraud or intimidation.

Some of the recommendations are beyond the scope of the current study. While election courts may be a reasonable conclusion to reach after we determine the volume and type of election crimes being reported, charged or prosecuted, it is premature to embark on an analysis of that solution without more information. Last, some of the recommendations do not support a comprehensive study of election crimes. While a risk analysis might be appropriate in a smaller scale study, EAC desires to conduct a broader survey to avoid the existing problem of anecdotal and limited scope of information.
In order to further its goal of developing a comprehensive data set regarding election crimes and the laws and procedures used to identify and prosecute them, EAC intends to engage in the following research activities in studying the existence and enforcement of election crimes:

**Survey Chief Election Officers Regarding Administrative Complaints**

Likely sources of complaints concerning election crimes are the administrative complaint processes that states were required to establish to comply with Section 402 of HAVA. These complaint procedures were required to be in place prior to a state receiving any funds under HAVA. Citizens are permitted to file complaints alleging violations of HAVA Title III provisions under these procedures with the state's chief election official. Those complaints must be resolved within 60 days. The procedures also allow for alternative dispute resolution of claims. Some states have expanded this process to include complaints of other violations, such as election crimes.

In order to determine how many of these complaints allege the commission of election crimes, EAC will survey the states' chief election officers regarding complaints that have been filed, investigated, and resolved since January 1, 2004. EAC will use the definition of election crimes provided above in this report in its survey so that data regarding a uniform set of offenses will be collected.

**Survey State Election Crime Investigation Units Regarding Complaints Filed and Referred**

Several chief state election officials have developed investigation units focused on receiving, investigating, and referring complaints of election crimes. These units were established to bolster the abilities of state and local law enforcement to investigate allegations of election crimes. California, New York and Florida are just three examples of states that have these types of units.

EAC will use a survey instrument to gather information on the numbers and types of complaints that have been received by, investigated, and ultimately referred to local or state law enforcement by election crime investigation units since January 1, 2004. These data will help us understand the pervasiveness of perceived fraud, as well as the number of claims that state election officials felt were meritorious of being referred to local and state law enforcement or prosecutorial agencies for further action.

**Survey Law Enforcement and Prosecutorial Agencies Regarding Complaints and Charge of Voting Crimes**

While voters, candidates and citizens may call national hotlines or the news media to report allegations of election crimes, it is those complaints that are made to law enforcement that can be investigated and ultimately prosecuted. Thus, it is critical to the study of election crimes to obtain statistics regarding the number and types of complaints that are made to law enforcement, how many of those complaints result in the perpetrator
being charged or indicted, and how many of those charges or indictments result in pleas or convictions.

Thus, EAC will survey law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies at the local, state and federal level to determine the number and types of complaints, charges or indictments, and pleas or convictions of election crimes since January 1, 2004. In addition, EAC will seek to obtain an understanding of why some complaints are not charged or indicted and why some charges or indictments are not prosecuted.

**Analyze Survey Data in Light of State Laws and Procedures**

Once a reliable data set concerning the existence and enforcement of election crimes is assembled, a real analysis of the effectiveness of fraud prevention measures can be conducted. For example, data can be analyzed to determine if criminal activities related to elections are isolated to certain areas or regions of the country. Data collected from the election official surveys can be compared to the data regarding complaints, charges and prosecutions gathered from the respective law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies in each jurisdiction. The effect and/or effectiveness of provisions such as voter identification laws and challenger provisions can be assessed based on hard data from areas where these laws exist. Last, analyses such as the effectiveness of enforcement can be conducted in light of the resources available to the effort.

**CONCLUSION**

Election crimes are nothing new to our election process. The pervasiveness of these crimes and the fervor with which they have been enforced has created a great deal of debate among academics, election officials, and voters. Past studies of these issues have been limited in scope and some have been riddled with bias. These are issues that deserve comprehensive and nonpartisan review. EAC, through its clearinghouse role, will collect and analyze data on election crimes throughout the country. These data not only will tell us what types of election crimes are committed and where fraud exists, but also inform us of what factors impact the existence, prevention, and prosecution of election crimes.
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Attached are my suggested edits to the Executive Summary. (I am still reviewing the report and may comment on other sections.)

EAC REPORT ON VOTING FRAUD AND VOTER INTIMIDATION STUDY.doc
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) requires the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to study a host of topics, including “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation.” In 2005, EAC embarked on an initial review of the existing knowledge of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The goal of that study was to develop a working definition of “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation” and to identify research methodology to conduct a comprehensive, nationwide study of these topics.

EAC staff along with two, bipartisan consultants reviewed the existing information available about voting fraud and voter intimidation, including reading articles, books and reports; interviewing subject matter experts; reviewing media reports of fraud and intimidation; and studying reported cases of prosecutions of these types of crimes. It is clear from this review that there is a great deal of debate on the pervasiveness of fraud in elections as well as what constitute the most common acts of fraud or intimidation. There is also no apparent consensus on the meaning of the phrases “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation.” Some think of voting fraud and voter intimidation only as criminal acts, while others include actions that may constitute civil wrongs, civil rights violations, and even legal activities.

In order to facilitate future study of these topics, EAC developed a working definition of “election crimes.” “Election crimes” are intentional acts or willful failures to act, prohibited by state or federal law, that are designed to cause ineligible persons to participate in the election process; eligible persons to be excluded from the election process; ineligible votes to be cast in an election; eligible votes not to be cast or counted; or other interference with or invalidation of election results. Election crimes generally fall into one of four categories: acts of deception, acts of coercion, acts of damage or destruction, and failures or refusals to act.

From EAC’s review of existing information on the issue, it was apparent that there have been a number of studies that touched on various topics and regions of the country concerning voting fraud and intimidation, but that there had never been a comprehensive, nationwide study of these topics. EAC will conduct further research to provide a comprehensive, nationwide look at “election crimes.” Future EAC study of this topic will focus on election-related, criminal activity and will not include acts that are exclusively civil wrongs, campaign finance violations, and violations of ethical provisions. EAC will study these concepts by surveying the states’ chief election officials about complaints they received, election crime investigation units regarding complaints received and those referred to law enforcement, and law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies regarding complaints received, charges filed, and final disposition of each complaint.
I offer edits to two sections of the report, on pages 14 and 19. Please see the attached one pager. I did a copy and paste of the two sections rather than resending back to you the entire report.

What is not an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study.doc
What is not an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study

There are some actions or inactions that may constitute crimes or civil wrongs that we do not include in our definition of "election crimes." All criminal or civil violations related to campaign finance contribution limitations, prohibitions, and reporting either at the state or federal level are not "election crimes" for purposes of this study and any future study conducted by EAC. Similarly, criminal acts that are unrelated to elections, voting, or voter registration are not "election crimes," even when those offenses occur in a polling place, voter registration office, or a candidate’s office or appearance. For example, an assault or battery that results from a fight in a polling place or at a candidate’s office is not an election crime. Last, violations of ethical provisions and the Hatch Act are not "election crimes." Similarly, civil or other wrongs that do not rise to the level of criminal activity (i.e., a misdemeanor, relative felony or felony) are not "election crimes."

Survey Chief Election Officers Regarding Administrative Complaints

Likely sources of complaints concerning election crimes are the administrative complaint processes that states were required to establish to comply with Section 402 of HAVA. These complaint procedures were required to be in place prior to a state receiving any funds under HAVA. Citizens are permitted to file complaints alleging violations of HAVA Title III provisions under these procedures with the state’s chief election official. Those complaints must be resolved within 60 days. The procedures also allow for alternative dispute resolution of claims. Some states have expanded this process to include complaints of other violations, such as election crimes.

In order to determine how many of these complaints allege the commission of election crimes, EAC will survey the states’ chief election officers regarding complaints that have been filed, investigated, and resolved since January 1, 2004. The data collected will also include complaints that have been filed outside of the administrative complaint procedures. EAC will use the definition of election crimes provided above in this report in its survey so that data regarding a uniform set of offenses will be collected.
I assume that you saw Gracia's comments. I accepted them and added one or two words to clarify one point.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV

Julie,
I looked over your changes and they look fine with me. I'll trust your judgement on the final product we receive on Thursday. If any policy or major changes are made by other commissioners, let me know. Thanks.
Paul

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
I am not sure you received this e-mail from Hans (it wasn't clear on the to: list).

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV on 10/18/2005 04:56 PM ---

"Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov"
<Christophert@michigan.gov>
10/18/2005 03:14 PM

Dear Commissioners:

On August 18 I sent you an email raising serious concerns over the awarding of a contract to the Moritz College of Law given its clearly demonstrated pre-existing opinions about provisional balloting and voter identification. Unfortunately, nothing was apparently done about this situation.

I have just learned that a similar situation has occurred. I understand that another research grant has been awarded to Tova Wang for research into "voter fraud and voter intimidation." Ms. Wang has an even more pronounced partisan and one-sided view of these issues than was present in the situation involving Moritz College. She has many posted opinions available on the Internet that make it clear that she will not be able to conduct research in an objective fashion on these issues. Just a few examples illustrate this:

"It is truly shocking how, given all the problems in the voting system and
continued disenfranchisement, the terms of the debate have shifted to that of so-called 'ballot integrity.' It is reminiscent of how conservatives have misappropriated the concept of patriotism and the American flag, and used the power of language and messaging to distort the discussion, by using terms such as 'partial birth abortion' or death tax.'

"This stands in stark contrast to the entire tenor or the Carter-Baker report, which presumes that fraud committed by voters is the biggest problem confronting our election system. There is simply no strong evidence of this, and some of the remedies proposed will take us backwards in the fight to increase voter participation."

"...voters are individually disenfranchised by continued, often race based, voter intimidation and deceptive practices..."

Carter-Baker Report: Some Bad Fixes for the Wrong Problem, 9/19/2005

"The data is also mounting that identification requirements have disproportionately disenfranchising impacts on certain communities...Given all this piling on of negative evidence, both in terms of the efficacy of ID requirements in fulfilling the goal their advocate's claim and their impact on voting rights, it is somewhat mind boggling that so many state officials, as well as other groups working on this issue, are still vigorously pushing for greater expansion of what seems to be a rather useless yet dangerous tool. Shouldn't the burden of proof now shift to the advocates of more voter ID to demonstrate the value of their cause?"

Voter ID and Fraud: Prove It, 7/28/2005

There are numerous more examples of her partisan opinions and attacks and demonstrably false claims against Republicans and election officials in general, such as her baseless charge in another article that "partisan election officials and party leaders usurped the process and manipulated the new federal voting law in ways that disenfranchised voters." Election 2004: A Report Card, 1/1/2005. The idea that she will write an objective report on issues that she has already expressed such strong opinions on ("there is no evidence that such election fraud is a serious problem") is hard to accept. I find it surprising that the EAC would award her a research grant or expect that election officials around the country would accept as valid a report written by an individual who asserts that "[a]t every step of the way, election officials in key states threw up unnecessary barriers to voting." Id. This gratuitous remark is an insult to the many hard-working election officials that we all know through our work who did everything they could during the last election to improve the election process and in large part succeeded.

Whatever procedures the EAC has set up to screen individuals and entities applying for research grants is obviously not working. I have no doubt that I could today, based on reading Ms. Wang's prior opinions, predict exactly what her report will conclude on the issues of voter fraud and voter intimidation. This situation needs to be corrected so that research is not being conducted by partisan individuals with preset opinions and views on issues. As with my prior email, I strongly recommend that the EAC reconsider the awarding of this contract.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice
Hans,

I wish you would have shown us the decency to have spoken to someone at the EAC before you sent this e-mail. Had you done so, you might have discovered that Ms. Wang was paired with Job Serebrov, a conservative attorney who, like you, has served on a local election board (Washington, Co, AK -Fayetteville). He has also worked on voting issues and election law in his practice, including voter fraud. He was counsel to the Arkansas GOP on ballot integrity issues and was the ballot protection specialist for Mike Huckabee in his campaign for Lt. Governor. In addition, Job formed and ran "Arkansans for Fair Elections", a non-partisan group that looked to investigate and prevent voter fraud issues. He headed that group for 8 years. Job served the Republican Party of Arkansas as the Chairman of the Committee for the Revision of the State Constitution.

Thor Hearne called me last week to indicate that Job had called him to be on the working group that Job and Ms. Wang are putting together to look at the voter fraud/voter intimidation issues.

Job was recommended to the EAC for this work by Julie Thompson. His references included two US 8th Circuit judges appointed by GOP presidents: Morris Arnold and Lavenski Smith.

You may recall that the Advisory Board made it clear to the EAC that they thought the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation issues should be studied together. That's why Ms. Wang has been paired with Mr. Serebrov to do this study.

Julie tells me that she had a wide-ranging discussion with you last week but you never brought this issue up. It's too bad, as it may have prevented you from sending an e-mail to so many people that contains only half the story.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
Dear Commissioners:

On August 18 I sent you an email raising serious concerns over the awarding of a contract to the Moritz College of Law given its clearly demonstrated pre-existing opinions about provisional balloting and voter identification. Unfortunately, nothing was apparently done about this situation.

I have just learned that a similar situation has occurred. I understand that another research grant has been awarded to Tova Wang for research into "voter fraud and voter intimidation." Ms. Wang has an even more pronounced partisan and one-sided view of these issues than was present in the situation involving Moritz College. She has many posted opinions available on the Internet that make it clear that she will not be able to conduct research in an objective fashion on these issues. Just a few examples illustrate this:

"It is truly shocking how, given all the problems in the voting system and continued disenfranchisement, the terms of the debate have shifted to that of so-called 'ballot integrity.' It is reminiscent of how conservatives have misappropriated the concept of patriotism and the American flag, and used the power of language and messaging to distort the discussion, by using terms such as 'partial birth abortion' or death tax.'"

"This stands in stark contrast to the entire tenor or the Carter-Baker report, which presumes that fraud committed by voters is the biggest problem confronting our election system. There is simply no strong evidence of this, and some of the remedies proposed will take us backwards in the fight to increase voter participation."

"...voters are individually disenfranchised by continued, often race based, voter intimidation and deceptive practices..."

Carter-Baker Report: Some Bad Fixes for the Wrong Problem, 9/19/2005

"The data is also mounting that identification requirements have disproportionately disenfranchising impacts on certain communities...Given all this piling on of negative evidence, both in terms of the efficacy of ID requirements in fulfilling the goal their advocate's claim and their impact on voting rights, it is somewhat mind boggling that so many state officials, as well as other groups working on this issue, are still vigorously pushing for greater expansion of what seems to be a rather useless yet dangerous tool. Shouldn't the burden of proof now shift to the advocates of more voter ID to demonstrate the value of their cause?"

Voter ID and Fraud: Prove It, 7/28/2005

There are numerous more examples of her partisan opinions and attacks and demonstrably false claims against Republicans and election officials in general, such as her baseless charge in another article that "partisan election officials and party leaders usurped the process and manipulated the new federal voting law in ways that disenfranchised voters."
Election 2004: A Report Card, 1/1/2005. The idea that she will write an objective report on issues that she has already expressed such strong opinions on ("there is no evidence that such election fraud is a serious problem") is hard to accept. I find it surprising that the EAC would award her a research grant or expect that election officials around the country would accept as valid a report written by an individual who asserts that "[a]t every step of the way, election officials in key states threw up unnecessary barriers to voting." Id. This gratuitous remark is an insult to the many hard-working election officials that we all know through our work who did everything they could during the last election to improve the election process and in large part succeeded.

Whatever procedures the EAC has set up to screen individuals and entities applying for research grants is obviously not working. I have no doubt that I could today, based on reading Ms. Wang's prior opinions, predict exactly what her report will conclude on the issues of voter fraud and voter intimidation. This situation needs to be corrected so that research is not being conducted by partisan individuals with preset opinions and views on issues. As with my prior email, I strongly recommend that the EAC reconsider the awarding of this contract.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530

Telephone (202) 305-9750
Facsimile (202) 307-2839
Dear Commissioners:

On August 18 I sent you an email raising serious concerns over the awarding of a contract to the Moritz College of Law given its clearly demonstrated
pre-existing opinions about provisional balloting and voter identification. Unfortunately, nothing was apparently done about this situation.

I have just learned that a similar situation has occurred. I understand that another research grant has been awarded to Tova Wang for research into "voter fraud and voter intimidation." Ms. Wang has an even more pronounced partisan and one-sided view of these issues than was present in the situation involving Moritz College. She has many posted opinions available on the Internet that make it clear that she will not be able to conduct research in an objective fashion on these issues. Just a few examples illustrate this:

"It is truly shocking how, given all the problems in the voting system and continued disenfranchisement, the terms of the debate have shifted to that of so-called 'ballot integrity.' It is reminiscent of how conservatives have misappropriated the concept of patriotism and the American flag, and used the power of language and messaging to distort the discussion, by using terms such as 'partial birth abortion' or death tax.'"

"This stands in stark contrast to the entire tenor or the Carter-Baker report, which presumes that fraud committed by voters is the biggest problem confronting our election system. There is simply no strong evidence of this, and some of the remedies proposed will take us backwards in the fight to increase voter participation."

"...voters are individually disenfranchised by continued, often race based, voter intimidation and deceptive practices..."

Carter-Baker Report: Some Bad Fixes for the Wrong Problem, 9/19/2005

"The data is also mounting that identification requirements have disproportionately disenfranchising impacts on certain communities...Given all this piling on of negative evidence, both in terms of the efficacy of ID requirements in fulfilling the goal their advocate's claim and their impact on voting rights, it is somewhat mind boggling that so many state officials, as well as other groups working on this issue, are still vigorously pushing for greater expansion of what seems to be a rather useless yet dangerous tool. Shouldn't the burden of proof now shift to the advocates of more voter ID to demonstrate the value of their cause?"

Voter ID and Fraud: Prove It, 7/28/2005

There are numerous more examples of her partisan opinions and attacks and demonstrably false claims against Republicans and election officials in general, such as her baseless charge in another article that "partisan election officials and party leaders usurped the process and manipulated the new federal voting law in ways that disenfranchised voters." Election 2004: A Report Card, 1/1/2005. The idea that she will write an objective report on issues that she has already expressed such strong opinions on ("there is no evidence that such election fraud is a serious problem") is hard to accept. I find it surprising that the EAC would award her a research grant or expect that election officials around the country would accept as valid a report written by an individual who asserts that "[a]t every step of the way, election officials in key states threw up unnecessary barriers to voting." Id. This gratuitous remark is an insult to the many hard-working election officials that we all know through our work who did everything they could during the last election to improve the election process and in large part succeeded.

Whatever procedures the EAC has set up to screen individuals and entities applying for research grants is obviously not working. I have no doubt that I could today, based on reading Ms. Wang's prior opinions, predict
exactly what her report will conclude on the issues of voter fraud and voter intimidation. This situation needs to be corrected so that research is not being conducted by partisan individuals with preset opinions and views on issues. As with my prior email, I strongly recommend that the EAC reconsider the awarding of this contract.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530

Telephone (202) 305-9750
Facsimile (202) 307-2839
perhaps if the Board of Advisors were kept better informed, I would not have been put into this position.

-----Original Message-----
From: pdegregorio@eac.gov [mailto:pdegregorio@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2005 5:18 PM
To: von Spakovsky, Hans (CRT)
Subject: Re: Research Grants
Importance: High

Hans,
I wish you would have shown us the decency to have spoken to someone at the EAC before you sent this e-mail. Had you done so, you might have discovered that Ms. Wang was paired with Job Serebrov, a conservative attorney who, like you, has served on a local election board (Washington, Co, AK -Fayetteville). He has also worked on voting issues and election law in his practice, including voter fraud. He was counsel to the Arkansas GOP on ballot integrity issues and was the ballot protection specialist for Mike Huckabee in his campaign for Lt. Governor. In addition, Job formed and ran "Arkansans for Fair Elections", a non-partisan group that looked to investigate and prevent voter fraud issues. He headed that group for 8 years. Job served the Republican Party of Arkansas as the Chairman of the Committee for the Revision of the State Constitution.

Thor Hearne called me last week to indicate that Job had called him to be on the working group that Job and Ms. Wang are putting together to look at the voter fraud/voter intimidation issues.

Job was recommended to the EAC for this work by Julie Thompson. His references included two US 8th Circuit judges appointed by GOP presidents: Morris Arnold and Lavenski Smith.

You may recall that the Advisory Board made it clear to the EAC that they thought the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation issues should be studied together. That's why Ms. Wang has been paired with Mr. Serebrov to do this study.
Julie tells me that she had a wide-ranging discussion with you last week but you never brought this issue up. It's too bad, as it may have prevented you from sending an e-mail to so many people that contains only half the story.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

*Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov* <Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov>
10/18/2005 03:45 PM

To
"gmhillman@eac.gov", "rmartinez@eac.gov", "pdegregorio@eac.gov", "jthompson@eac.gov/twilke", "ddavison@eac.gov"
cc
"christophert@michigan.gov", "christophert@michigan.gov",
"lewisinglescenter.org@lewisinglescenter.org"

Subject
Research Grants

Dear Commissioners:

On August 18 I sent you an email raising serious concerns over the awarding of a contract to the Moritz College of Law given its clearly demonstrated pre-existing opinions about provisional balloting and voter identification. Unfortunately, nothing was apparently done about this situation.

I have just learned that a similar situation has occurred. I understand that another research grant has been awarded to Tova Wang for research into "voter fraud and voter intimidation." Ms. Wang has an even more pronounced partisan and one-sided view of these issues than was present in the situation involving Moritz College. She has many posted opinions available on the Internet that make it clear that she will not be able to conduct research in an objective fashion on these issues. Just a few examples illustrate this:
"It is truly shocking how, given all the problems in the voting system and continued disenfranchisement, the terms of the debate have shifted to that of so-called 'ballot integrity.' It is reminiscent of how conservatives have misappropriated the concept of patriotism and the American flag, and used the power of language and messaging to distort the discussion, by using terms such as 'partial birth abortion' or death tax."

"This stands in stark contrast to the entire tenor or the Carter-Baker report, which presumes that fraud committed by voters is the biggest problem confronting our election system. There is simply no strong evidence of this, and some of the remedies proposed will take us backwards in the fight to increase voter participation."

"...voters are individually disenfranchised by continued, often race based, voter intimidation and deceptive practices...

Carter-Baker Report: Some Bad Fixes for the Wrong Problem, 9/19/2005

"The data is also mounting that identification requirements have disproportionately disenfranchising impacts on certain communities...Given all this piling on of negative evidence, both in terms of the efficacy of ID requirements in fulfilling the goal their advocate's claim and their impact on voting rights, it is somewhat mind boggling that so many state officials, as well as other groups working on this issue, are still vigorously pushing for greater expansion of what seems to be a rather useless yet dangerous tool. Shouldn't the burden of proof now shift to the advocates of more voter ID to demonstrate the value of their cause?"

Voter ID and Fraud: Prove It, 7/28/2005

There are numerous more examples of her partisan opinions and attacks and demonstrably false claims against Republicans and election officials in general, such as her baseless charge in another article that "partisan election officials and party leaders usurped the process and manipulated the new federal voting law in ways that disenfranchised voters." Election 2004: A Report Card, 1/1/2005. The idea that she will write an objective report on issues that she has already expressed such strong opinions on ("there is no evidence that such election fraud is a serious problem") is hard to accept. I find it surprising that the EAC would award her a research grant or expect that election officials around the country would accept as valid a report written by an individual who asserts that "[a]t every step of the way, election officials in key states threw up unnecessary barriers to voting." Id. This gratuitous remark is an insult to the many hard-working election officials that we all know through our work who did everything they could during the last election to improve the election process and in large part succeeded.

Whatever procedures the EAC has set up to screen individuals and entities applying for research grants is obviously not working. I have no doubt that I could today, based on reading Ms. Wang's prior opinions, predict exactly what her report will conclude on the issues of voter fraud and voter intimidation. This situation needs to be corrected so that research is not being conducted by partisan individuals with preset opinions and views on issues. As with my prior email, I strongly recommend that the EAC reconsider the awarding of this contract.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
The letter is fine with me.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----  
From: Jeannie Layson 
Sent: 10/17/2006 10:06 AM 
To: Paul DeGregorio; Gracia Hillman; Donetta Davidson 
Cc: Thomas Wilkey; Margaret Sims; Karen Lynn-Dyson; Juliet Hodgkins; Gavin Gilmour; Bryan Whitener 
Subject: NEED APPROVAL: Brennen Cen. letter 

Commissioners, 
I have not received input from everyone regarding the attached letter. It is a response to Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center, who requested the staff voter fraud status report and the provisional voting draft report, both of which were presented to the Standards Bd. and the Bd. of Adv. at the May meeting. She also requested the draft voter ID report, which was not released at the May meeting. If possible, I'd like to get your input by the end of the day. The letter would go out under Tom's signature. Thank you. 

Jeannie Layson 
U.S. Election Assistance Commission 
1225 New York Ave., NW 
Suite 1100 
Washington, DC 20005 
Phone: 202-566-3100 
www.eac.gov
Subject: Tally Vote - Tova Wang contract

Memo for the record - EAC 05-66.pdf  SOW EAC 05-66 Voting Fraud & Voter Intimidation.pdf
Tally Vote - Vote Fraud & Voter Intimidation 9.16.05.pdf  Tally vote cover - Tova Wang.pdf  Tally Vote Memo - Tova Wang.pdf

Amie J. Sherrill
Special Assistant to Vice Chairman Paul S. DeGregorio
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566 3106
BAR ADMISSION: New York

EDUCATION

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW, New York, N.Y.
J.D., May, 1996

BARNARD COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, New York, N.Y.
B.A. in Political Science, magna cum laude, May, 1991; GPA: 3.8

EXPERIENCE

THE CENTURY FOUNDATION, New York, N.Y.
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow: March, 2001 – Present
Research, write, and publish reports, provide commentary to national and state press, provide expertise to policymakers, give expert testimony and speak before groups around the country on election reform and voting rights, in addition to other civil liberties issues. Currently serve as the Executive Director of The Century Foundation’s Post-2004 Election Reform Working Group, comprised of preeminent election law scholars from across the country. Served as staff person to the National Commission on Federal Election Reform, co-chaired by former Presidents Carter and Ford, of which The Century Foundation was a co-sponsor.

THE KAMBER GROUP, New York, N.Y.
Deputy Director of Public Policy: August, 1998 – March, 2001
Formulated and drafted public policy ideas, provided policy research and analysis, and provided general strategic political consulting services to non-governmental organizations, political campaigns, elected officials and grassroots organizations. Conducted lobbying and public advocacy campaigns.

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC ADVOCATE, Investigation Into Police Misconduct, New York, N.Y.
Deputy Director and Director of Policy: January, 1999 – July, 2000
Conducted all policy analysis and research, including evaluating programs and policies of the NYPD and police departments across the world. Developed policy proposals, conducted briefings, and wrote reports. Helped manage collection of quantitative and qualitative data, expert interviews, hearings, budgeting and fundraising.

Advised on policy, politics, legislation, and public relations for Reverend Jesse Jackson, the Children’s Defense Fund, and the Academy of Political Science.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, New York, N.Y.
Assistant to the Editor-in-Chief, Theodor Meron: September, 1995 - May, 1996
Researched, edited and assisted in writing articles and speeches on current issues in international human rights law.

Legal Intern: June - August, 1995
Researched and wrote immigration court decisions in political asylum, deportation and exclusion cases.

CLINTON FOR PRESIDENT CAMPAIGN, New York, N.Y.
Manhattan Field Director: February - July, 1992
Coordinated all campaign field operations in Manhattan. Negotiated the support of elected officials and political
leaders; conducted outreach to community organizations; mobilized and managed activities of 1000 volunteers.

ACTIVITIES/ASSOCIATIONS

Member, Election Law Committee, Association of the Bar of the City of New York
Member, State Affairs Committee, Citizens Union of New York
Member, Make Votes Count Committee, Citizens Union of New York
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MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Date: November 1, 2005

From: Karen Lynn Dyson

Re: Communication of Award of Contracts EAC 05-66 and EAC 05-67, Personal Services Contracts with Tova Wang and Job Serebrov

In late August and early September 2005 a series of emails and phone calls were exchanged with Job Serebrov and Tova Wang in order to communicate the details of personal services contracts that were awarded to them. The substance of these e-mails and phone calls related to Mr. Serebrov and Ms. Wang’s contracts, described the various services they would perform for EAC related to researching and possibly developing a future project that would study and analyze voting fraud and intimidation. These emails included transmitting a statement of work that would govern their work as well as emails and phone calls to establish a kick-off meeting that would provide information to them so that Mr. Serebrov and Ms. Wang could begin work.

Since that time, Ms. Wang and Mr. Serebrov have engaged in substantial work on this project. This has included developing, outlining and providing to EAC staff, a work plan for the project, meeting and conversing with one another to discuss the focus and work of the project, interviewing prospective persons who would serve on the project’s review panel and presenting this initial list of persons to the EAC to be considered as members of this project review panel who would assess and review the project’s work.
EAC CONTRACT #05-66 Consulting Services to Assist EAC in the Development of a Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

Section 241 of HAVA lists a number of election administration topics on which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to do research. In particular, Section 241(b) (6) and (7) state the two topics of nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal offices; and identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation. The EAC Board of Advisors has recommended that the EAC make research on these topics a high priority.

The EAC seeks to obtain consulting services from an individual who can provide advice drawn from broad professional and technical experience in the area of voter fraud and intimidation. The EAC needs this consultant to conduct a preliminary examination of these topics to determine if a larger research project might be warranted. If so, the consultant would also be tasked to define the scope of the project and prepare a Statement of Work for the EAC to use for a subsequent competitive procurement. To promote a balanced and non-partisan approach to this effort, EAC is contracting with two consultants, who will work jointly to perform the work described below.

Nature of the Appointment

The EAC enters into this contract pursuant to its authority to contract for consultants under 5 U.S.C. §3109 (See 42 U.S.C. §15324(b)). As such this contract is for personal services and creates a limited employment relationship. (See 5 C.F.R. §304). As a result of this unique relationship, and pursuant to this agreement, you are required to follow all Federal laws and regulations as they relate to the release of agency documents and information, travel and conduct. All research, information, documents and any other intellectual property, (including but not limited to policies, procedures, manuals, and other work created at the request or otherwise while laboring for the EAC) shall be owned exclusively by the EAC, including copyright. All such work product shall be turned over to the EAC upon completion of your appointment term or as directed by the EAC. The EAC shall have exclusive rights over this material. You may not release government information or documents without the express permission of the EAC.

Supervision and Management.

The EAC Project Manager for this effort is Margaret Sims, EAC Research Specialist. Ms. Sims will provide taskings, and supervise, review and approve all work and performance.
Period of Appointment, Compensation and Travel.

The period of appointment under this contract is estimated at six months. The appointment shall constitute intermittent appointment (without a regularly scheduled tour of duty) per 5 C.F.R. §340.401(b). The consultant shall not incur overtime. The consultants shall not receive automatic adjustments of pay based upon 5 U.S.C. 5303. The consultants are not eligible for sick and annual leave, nor compensation for work performed on federal holidays. The Consultant is expected to work 450 hours during the estimated six month appointment period. These hours must be distributed evenly over the period so that the Consultant is working approximately, but no more than 20 hours per week. The consultant shall be paid at a rate of $111 per hour. The dates of performance are flexible but shall be based upon the needs of the project and the EAC. The project at issue is sought to be completed within the sixth month period. The period of appointment shall continue until the project, outlined below, is completed.

Consultant’s duty station shall be his/her home or place of business. The consultant has access to and shall supply common office equipment to include telecommunications, internet, a computer, office supplies, facsimile machine and common workplace software (including Microsoft Word and Excel). Other resources will be provided by the EAC as needed and at its discretion.

The Consultant is required to travel on a periodic, as needed basis, throughout the duration of their appointment. All travel must be pre-approved by the EAC per Federal Travel Regulations and EAC policy. The Consultant will be reimbursed, at the Federal government rates, for hotel and ground transportation costs, proper incidental expenses, and per diem while on official, pre-approved EAC travel.

Areas of Responsibility


2. Using the description developed above, perform background research, including both Federal and State administrative and case law review, and a summation of current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics. Deliver a written summary of this research and all source documentation.

3. Work in consultation with other EAC staff and the Commissioners to identify a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The Working Group will be provided with the results of the consultant’s research (discussed in 1 and 2, above) as background information. The consultant will be responsible for developing a discussion agenda and convene the Working Group with the objective of identifying promising avenues for future research by EAC.
4. The consultant shall be responsible for creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and Working Group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future research resulting from this effort.

5. Should the EAC decide to pursue one or more of the recommendations made in the report noted above, the consultant will be responsible for defining the appropriate project scope(s) and preparing Statement(s) of Work sufficient for use in a competitive procurement.

Compensation Procedures

Compensation shall be made for work done by submitting invoices. Invoices shall be submitted on a monthly basis. These invoices shall state the number of labor hours that have been expended. Invoices shall be delivered to Ms. Margaret Sims for review and Ms. Diana Scott, Administrative Officer, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington DC 20005. Compensation for travel shall be submitted by travel voucher consistent with federal travel regulation and EAC requirements.

Termination

This consultant contract can be terminated without cause in advance of the current end date by two weeks' notice in writing by either of the parties.

Estimated Project Timetable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project work plan</td>
<td>10 days after contract award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress reports</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of voting fraud and voter intimidation</td>
<td>October 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of background research and associated source documentation</td>
<td>January 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene working group</td>
<td>February 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary report describing findings and recommendations for future EAC research</td>
<td>March 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement(s) of Work for future research project(s)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Date:

From: Gracia Hillman, Chair
On Behalf of the Commission

Re: Ratification of Personal Services Contract with Tova Wang (EAC Contract No. 05-66; ACT No. E4019697)

The purpose of this memorandum is to document the ratification of the above referenced agreement. Ratification is the process proscribed by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) to approve, by an official with the authority to do so, an agreement that was not binding on an agency because the Government representative who made it lacked authority to enter into the agreement on behalf of the government (unauthorized commitment). (FAR 1.602-3(a)).

Background. Information was brought to the attention of the Commission late in the week of October 10. This information suggested that communication of award for the above referenced agreement may not have been made by an individual with authority to bind the government. As such, the agreement may be viewed as an unauthorized commitment. The above referenced personal services agreement was to assist EAC in researching and developing a Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project. This was needed by the Commission in order to fulfill its research responsibilities under Sections 241(b)(6) and (7) of HAVA.

The Commission has considered Ms. Wang's qualifications and found her to be experienced in matters involving voter fraud and intimidation. (Attachment "1", Resume) In addition, the Commission has agreed to a six-month period of performance, from September 2005 through February 2006. (Attachment "2", Statement of Work). An award was made by full vote of the EAC Commissioners on September 19, 2005 (Attachment "3", Tally Vote Certification and Memorandum). The award was announced by the Commission on the record at a public meeting on September 27, 2005.

Prior to the time that the formal award was made by vote of the Commission, award was communicated by an EAC employee though a series of telephone calls and emails in early September 2005. (Attachment "4", Statement from Karen Lynn Dyson). Work began on the contract following award notification. This was evidenced by a kickoff meeting between EAC employees and the contractor which took place on September 7, 2005. Also, the contractor provided services in meeting with the other contractor engaged to provide similar assistance, developing a work plan for the voter fraud and intimidation project, interviewing and considering members to serve as a review panel for the work of the consultants on this project, and
developing a preliminary list of panelists. (Attachment “4”, Statement of Karen Lynn Dyson). Ultimately, ratification of this agreement will result in the Commission receiving all of the deliverables identified in the contract.

Funding was available in fiscal year 2005 (FY 05) for the services at issue. And, it appears based upon a review of the law that funding this contract from FY05 funds would be proper. These FY 05 funds remain available. The funds were in fact obligated to the agreement, in the amount of $50,000.00 on September 21, 2005. This was done under the belief that a legal obligation had been created. The agreement approved for award by the Commissioners had a total estimated cost of $50,000.00.

Requirements. FAR 1.602-3 (b) and (c) set federal ratification policy and requirements. These sections note:

1. Agencies should take action to prevent the need for ratification actions. Ratification procedures should not be used in a manner that encourages unauthorized commitments being made by government personnel. (FAR 1.602-3(b)(1)).

2. The head of an agency’s contracting activity, unless the authority is designated higher, may ratify an unauthorized agreement. This authority may be delegated with limitations. (FAR 1.602-3(b)(2) & (3)).

3. Agencies should process unauthorized commitments consistent with FAR 1.602-3. Such actions should not be forwarded to the General Accounting Office for resolution unless they are subject to a Contracts Dispute Act Claim or are not otherwise ratifiable under the subsection. (FAR 1.602-3(b)(4)-(5) & (d)).

4. Consistent with FAR 1.602-3(c)(1)–(7), ratification authority may be exercised only when:
   a. Supplies or services have been provided to and accepted by the Government, or the Government otherwise has obtained or will obtain a benefit resulting from performance of the unauthorized commitment;
   b. The ratifying official has the authority to enter into a contractual commitment;
   c. The resulting contract would otherwise have been proper if made by an appropriate contracting officer;
   d. The contracting officer reviewing the unauthorized commitment determines the price to be fair and reasonable;
   e. The contracting officer recommends payment and legal counsel concurs in the recommendation, unless agency procedures expressly do not require such concurrence; and
   f. Funds are available and were available at the time the unauthorized commitment was made.

Analysis. The commitment at issue began as a routine contracting effort. EAC, unlike many government agencies, has the express statutory authorization to enter into personal services contracts under 5 U.S.C. Section 3109. That authority is provided by the Help America Vote Act
Section 204(b). Section 3109 and the regulations promulgated by the Office of Personnel Management concerning personal services contracts allows these contracts only where a specific statute authorizes it and where it meets the terms as specified in the statute and regulation for type of appointment and rate of pay. The agreement with Ms. Wang appoints her in an intermittent capacity and establishes a rate of $111 per hour, a rate which falls within the limits prescribed by 5 CFR Part 304.105.

In reviewing the fiscal law, it appears that the type of the contract is not dispositive as to whether the services provided by that contract are severable and must be funded in the fiscal year in which the services are rendered. While personal services contracts are generally considered severable (and payable in the fiscal year the work is performed), there must be an analysis of the nature of the work performed under the contract. The GAO Red Book, Vol. I sites one case which notes that legal administrative services were considered severable where there was no final report or final product produced from the contractual agreement. Another, case determined that substantive legal services procured from attorney’s was non-severable. Thus, appears to be a distinction made between perennial, clerical work and substantive, project-based work. In the instant case, the consultant is providing project associated services that will result in a final report and final product in the form of a report and an RFP for a future study of voter fraud and voter intimidation.

Issues regarding the agreement’s unauthorized nature arose near the end of the award process. While the contract authority (Commissioners) properly took action to make an award determination, they relied on EAC employees to communicate this fact to the contractor. In doing so, the Commission failed to realize that it is the communication of acceptance and award by the appropriate person that serves to obligate the government. EAC personnel seem to have viewed the Commissioners’ concurrence as granting them the authority to communicate award in a manner that would obligate the agency. The bottom line is that the EAC employee believed her efforts to notify the contractor of award obligated the EAC by accepting the contractor’s proposal. Based upon this, the contractor began performance on the agreement and the EAC has and will receive benefit.

Looking specifically at the requirements for ratification noted in FAR 1.602-3(c) and the facts outlined, above, the Commission finds:

a. Services Accepted or Benefit Received. Services under this agreement have been accepted by the government. Moreover the government has and will obtain needed benefit from the services provided and upon completion of the unauthorized agreement.

b. Contract Authority. The undersigned, as the chair of the EAC, has the authority to contract on behalf of the agency. Furthermore, the Chair’s signature represents the decision of the full Commission to take this ratification action. This is documented by the attached Tally Vote. (Attachment “S”, Tally Vote). EAC’s four Commissioners have the legal authority to contract and otherwise bind the agency per the specific authority of the Help America Vote Act (42 U.S.C. §15325(e)) and, generally, as agency heads (see FAR 1.601).
c. **Contract Otherwise Proper.** This agreement, having previously been initiated, processed, and awarded by full vote of the Commission was proper, but for the unauthorized communication of award made by an individual without authority to bind the agency. As stated previously, EAC is specifically authorized by statute to enter into personal services contracts. HAVA Section 204(b). This agreement falls within the statute and regulations governing personal services contracts. See specifically 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 5 CFR Part 304.

d. **Price Fair and Reasonable.** The rate at which this contractor is providing services is within the amount allowable under 5 CFR Part 304.105. In addition, the contractor works regularly as Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow for The Century Foundation. The rate provided is commensurate with her regular rate for consulting services.

e. **Payment of Funds Recommended.** After consultation with the General Counsel, the Commission recommends payment of funds.

f. **Funds Available.** Consistent with the facts noted above, the Commission finds that funds are available and were available at the time of the unauthorized commitment.

**Prevention.** Unfortunately, there are a number of agreements which have suffered from the same deficiencies as discussed above. FAR 1.602(b)(1) makes it clear that agencies should take steps to prevent the need for ratifications and avoid using the process in a way that would encourage unauthorized commitments. The EAC must determine why these unauthorized commitments occurred and how to prevent them in the future. An initial review of EAC's contract process showed deficiencies in (1) the contracting procedure, (2) training of employees on contracting process and procedure, (3) coordination with the General Counsel’s office, and (4) communication amongst contracting officers and staff that resulted in an unauthorized commitment. No new contracting should occur until issues surrounding the process have been resolved. EAC is in the process of negotiating with another government agency to handle its procurement process, thereby relieving the EAC staff of the responsibility of processing these procurements.

Gracia Hillman  
Chair  
On Behalf of the Commission

I Concur.

Juliet Thompson  
General Counsel
Statement of Work  
Assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

Section 241 of HAVA enumerates a number of periodic studies of election administration issues in which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to engage. In general “On such periodic basis as the Commission may determine, the Commission shall conduct and make available to the public studies regarding the election administration issues described in subsection (b)”

Sections 241(b) (6) and (7) list the following election administration issues:

(6) Nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in election for Federal offices.

(7) Identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation.

Building on this HAVA reference to studies of voting fraud and voter intimidation, the EAC Board of Advisors has indicated that further study of these issues to determine how the EAC might respond to them is a high priority.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) seeks to identify one or more senior-level project consultants to develop various project activities and studies related to voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections.

The consultant(s) must have of have knowledge of voting fraud and voter intimidation along with an understanding of the complexities, nuances and challenges which surround the topics. The EAC is particularly interested in candidates with experience in elections, with public policy and with the law. The consultant(s) must be able to demonstrate an ability to approach the issues of voting fraud and voter intimidation in a balanced, nonpartisan fashion.
Duties

The consultant(s), whose contract would run for the period September-February, 2005, would be responsible for the following.

1. Identifying what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections.

2. Performing background research, including Federal and state-by-state administrative and case law review related to voting fraud and voter intimidation, and a review of current voting fraud and voter intimidation activities taking place with key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations. A written summary of this research, and a copy of any source documentation used, will be presented to EAC.

3. Identifying, in consultation with EAC, and convening a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The working group’s goals and objectives and meeting agendas will be vetted with key EAC staff.

4. Developing a project scope of work and a project work plan related to voting fraud and voter intimidation. The consultants (s) will develop a draft scope of work and project work plan for EAC’s consideration based on research into the topics, the deliberations and findings of the working group, and the consultants’ understanding of EAC’s mission and agency objectives.

5. Authoring a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The report will also include suggestions for specific activities that EAC may undertake to address these topics.

From this initial research and exploration of these topics the consultant (s) may be retained to help oversee follow-on research projects and contracts EAC may pursue on the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Special Considerations

Work for Hire. The services performed under the terms of this agreement are considered “work for hire,” and any intellectual property or deliverables, including but not limited to, research, policies, procedures, manuals, and other works submitted; or which are specified to be delivered; or which are developed or produced and paid for by EAC, shall be owned exclusively by EAC, including copyright. EAC or its assignees have the exclusive right to reproduce all work products from this agreement without further payment to the Contractor.
Terms and Conditions

The period of performance for this consulting contract is six months, with a fixed price ceiling of $50,000 for labor. The consultant(s) is expected to work at least 450 hours in performing this work. The EAC estimates that the most efficient distribution of these hours would be for the consultant to work 20 hours per week. The period of performance and level of effort can be revised in writing by mutual agreement of the EAC and the consultant, as required.

The Consultant is required to travel to the EAC Washington, D.C. offices on a periodic, as needed basis, throughout the duration of the contract. The Consultant will be reimbursed, at the Federal government rates, for hotel and ground transportation costs, other approved incidental expenses, and per diem costs while working on-site at the EAC offices. A fixed price ceiling of $5,000 has been allocated for reimbursement for travel and other allowable expenses.

Invoicing

Invoices may be submitted monthly in equal payments for labor. Expenses claimed for reimbursement shall be itemized with appropriate receipts provided. Invoices shall be delivered to Ms. Diana Scott, Administrative Officer, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington DC 20005.

Deliverables and Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft project work plan (Phase I)</td>
<td>ASAP after award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Reports to Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR)</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A written summary of background research on voting fraud and voter intimidation</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and convening a working group knowledgeable about voting fraud and voter intimidation</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a project scope of work and project work plan (Phase II)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary report describing key findings of this preliminary study of voting fraud and voter intimidation</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TALLY VOTE MATTER

DATE & TIME OF TRANSMITTAL: September 16, 2005, 3:00PM

BALLOT DEADLINE: September 20, 2005, 3:00PM

COMMISSIONERS: HILLMAN, DEGREGORIO, MARTINEZ, DAVIDSON

SUBJECT: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

( ) I approve the recommendation.

( ) I disapprove of the recommendation.

( ) I object to the recommendation.

( ) I am recused from voting.

COMMENTS:

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

DATE: ___________________   SIGNATURE: ___________________

A definite vote is required. All ballots must be signed and dated. Please return ONLY THE BALLOT to DeAnna Smith. Please return the ballot no later than the date and time shown above.

FROM THOMAS R. WILKEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
TALLY VOTE MEMORANDUM

TO: EAC Commissioners Hillman, DeGregorio, Martinez, Davidson

FROM: Thomas Wilkey, EAC Executive Director

DATE: September 16, 2005

RE: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

"On such periodic basis as the Commission may determine, the Commission shall conduct and make available to the public studies regarding the election administration issues described in subsection (b)" Sections 241(b) (6) and (7) list the following election administration issues:

(6) Nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in election for Federal offices.

(7) Identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation.

Building on this HAVA reference to studies of voting fraud and voter intimidation, the EAC Board of Advisors has indicated that further study of these issues, to determine how the EAC might respond to them, is a high priority.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has identified two senior-level project consultants to develop various project activities and studies related to voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections. The consultants, whose contracts would run for the period September-February, 2005, would be responsible for helping the EAC identify what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections.

To accomplish this the consultants will: perform background research, including Federal and state-by-state administrative and case law review related to voting fraud and voter intimidation, along with a review of current voting fraud and voter intimidation activities taking place with key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations; in consultation with EAC, identify and convene, a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation; develop an EAC project scope of work and a project work plan related to voting fraud and voter intimidation and; author a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Recommendation

Attached is the Statement of Work for the voting fraud and voter intimidation project consultants. The consultant contract fees total $110,000 ($55,000 per person). An additional $10,000 is allotted for the voting fraud and intimidation project working group. The total project amount is $120,000.
DATE & TIME OF TRANSMITTAL: September 16, 2005. 3:00PM

BALLOT DEADLINE: September 20, 2005. 3:00PM

COMMISSIONERS: HILLMAN, DEGREGORIO, MARTINEZ, DAVIDSON

SUBJECT: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

( ) I approve the recommendation.

( ) I disapprove of the recommendation.

( ) I object to the recommendation.

( ) I am recused from voting.

COMMENTS: __________________________________________

DATE: 9-16-05  SIGNATURE: [Signature]

A definite vote is required. All ballots must be signed and dated. Please return ONLY THE BALLOT to DeAnna Smith. Please return the ballot no later than the date and time shown above.

FROM THOMAS R. WILKEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

014963
DATE & TIME OF TRANSMITTAL: September 16, 2005, 3:00PM

BALLOT DEADLINE: September 20, 2005, 3:00PM

COMMISSIONERS: HILLMAN, DEGREGORIO, MARTINEZ, DAVIDSON

SUBJECT: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

1) I approve the recommendation.

() I disapprove of the recommendation.

() I object to the recommendation.

() I am recused from voting.

COMMENTS: 

DATE: 9/16/05  SIGNATURE: [Signature]

A definite vote is required. All ballots must be signed and dated. Please return ONLY THE BALLOT to DeAnna Smith. Please return the ballot no later than the date and time shown above.

FROM THOMAS R. WILKEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE & TIME OF TRANSMITTAL: September 16, 2005, 3:00PM

BALLOT DEADLINE: September 20, 2005, 3:00PM

COMMISSIONERS: HILLMAN, DEGREGORIO, MARTINEZ, DAVIDSON

SUBJECT: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

I approve the recommendation.

I disapprove of the recommendation.

I object to the recommendation.

I am recused from voting.

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________________________

DATE: September 16, 2005

A definite vote is required. All ballots must be signed and dated. Please return ONLY THE BALLOT to DeAnna Smith. Please return the ballot no later than the date and time shown above.

FROM THOMAS R. WILKEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
This is to authorize my Special Assistant, Arnie Sherrill, to mark on my behalf the following Tally Votes regarding the awarding of contracts, as approving the staff recommendation for each of the following:

1. RFP #05-04 to the University of Florida Levin College of Law for the development of legal resources clearinghouse
2. RFP #05-07 to the Center for Public Policy and Administration of the University of Utah for the development of best practices on vote count and recount procedures
3. RFP #05-11 to Zimmerman Associates, Inc for the development of records management policies and procedures
4. Sole Source contract to the National Academies of Science for Technical Support for Statewide Registration Database Implementation with Online Forums for Discussion
U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

TALLY VOTE MATTER

DATE & TIME OF TRANSMITTAL: September 16, 2005, 3:00PM

BALLOT DEADLINE: September 20, 2005, 3:00PM

COMMISSIONERS: HILLMAN, DEGREORIO, MARTINEZ, DAVIDSON

SUBJECT: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

I approve the recommendation.

I disapprove of the recommendation.

I object to the recommendation.

I am recused from voting.

COMMENTS: _______________________________________

____________________________________

DATE: 9-19-05  SIGNATURE: ____________________________

A definite vote is required. All ballots must be signed and dated. Please return ONLY THE BALLOT to DeAnna Smith. Please return the ballot no later than the date and time shown above.

FROM THOMAS R. WILKEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

014972
DATE & TIME OF TRANSMITTAL: November 3, 2005, 5:00PM

BALLOT DEADLINE: November 7, 2005, 5:00 PM

COMMISSIONERS: DeGREGORIO, HILLMAN, MARTINEZ, DAVIDSON

SUBJECT: Ratification of Personal Services Contract with Tova Wang (EAC 05-66).

() I approve the recommendation.

() I disapprove the recommendation.

() I object to the recommendation.

() I am recused from voting.

COMMENTS: See the attached memo in support.

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

DATE: ________________ SIGNATURE: ____________________________

A definite vote is required. All ballots must be signed and dated. Please return ONLY THE BALLOT to the Benita Fundersburg. Please return the ballot no later than date and time shown above.

FROM JULIET THOMPSON, GENERAL COUNSEL
MEMORANDUM

TO: Commissioners Hillman, DeGregorio, Martinez and Davidson

FROM: Juliet Thompson

DATE: November 1, 2005

RE: Personal Services Contract with Tova Wang (EAC Contract No. 05-66; ACT No. E4019697)

BACKGROUND:

On or about October 7, 2005, the Chair of the EAC requested that the Office of General Counsel review 19 contracts for procurement of goods and services. As a part of the review, we examined contract file documents and spoke with EAC staff and representatives involved in each stage of the contracting process.

In reviewing the contract with Ms. Tova Wang to provide services in researching and developing a voter fraud and intimidation project for EAC, we determined that the agreement had been entered through a legally permissible process, that a vote was taken by the Commission to award this agreement, that the award was communicated by an EAC staff member to Ms. Wang, work has begun under the agreement, and that EAC has and will receive a benefit from the provision of these services by Ms. Wang. The review revealed that the commitment was made by a person who was not the contracting officer of EAC and who was not authorized to make such commitment. Therefore, this agreement was made by a person who did not have the authority to bind the Commission. Because the contract was otherwise proper and EAC has and will continue to receive benefits from the completion of this contract, the agreement and facts surrounding it fit within the framework for ratification set forth in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR).

Ratification is the process proscribed by the FAR to approve, by an official with the authority to do so, an agreement that was not binding on an agency because the Government representative who made it lacked authority to enter into the agreement on behalf of the government (unauthorized commitment). (FAR 1.602-3(a)).
REQUIREMENTS FOR RATIFICATION:

FAR 1.602-3 (b) and (c) set federal ratification policy and requirements. These sections note:

1. Agencies should take action to prevent the need for ratification actions. Ratification procedures should not be used in a manner that encourages unauthorized commitments being made by government personnel. (FAR 1.602-3(b)(1)).

2. The head of an agency’s contacting activity, unless the authority is designated higher, may ratify an unauthorized agreement. This authority may be delegated with limitations. (FAR 1.602-3(b)(2) & (3)).

3. Agencies should process unauthorized commitments consistent with FAR 1.602-3. Such actions should not be forwarded to the General Accounting Office for resolution unless they are subject to a Contracts Dispute Act Claim or are not otherwise ratifiable under the subsection. (FAR 1.602-3(b)(4)-(5) & (d)).

4. Consistent with FAR 1.602-3(c)(1)–(7), ratification authority may be exercised only when:
   a. Supplies or services have been provided to and accepted by the Government, or the Government otherwise has obtained or will obtain a benefit resulting from performance of the unauthorized commitment;
   b. The ratifying official has the authority to enter into a contractual commitment;
   c. The resulting contract would otherwise have been proper if made by an appropriate contracting officer;
   d. The contracting officer reviewing the unauthorized commitment determines the price to be fair and reasonable;
   e. The contracting officer recommends payment and legal counsel concurs in the recommendation, unless agency procedures expressly do not require such concurrence; and
   f. Funds are available and were available at the time the unauthorized commitment was made.

ANALYSIS:

The commitment at issue began as a routine contracting effort. EAC, unlike many government agencies, has the express statutory authorization to enter into personal services contracts under 5 U.S.C. Section 3109. That authority is provided by the Help America Vote Act Section 204(b). Section 3109 and Office of Personnel Management regulations implementing the statute allow personal services contracts only when a they meet the terms specified in the statute and regulation for type of appointment and rate of pay. The agreement with Mr. Serebrov properly appoints him in an intermittent capacity and establishes a rate of $111 per hour, a rate which falls within the limits prescribed by 5 CFR Part 304.105.

In reviewing the fiscal law, it appears that the type of the contract is not dispositive as to whether the services provided by that contract are severable and must be funded in the fiscal year in
which the services are rendered. While personal services contracts are generally considered severable (and payable in the fiscal year the work is performed), there must be an analysis of the nature of the work performed under the contract. The GAO Red Book, Vol. I sites one case which notes that legal administrative services were considered severable where there was no final report or final product produced from the contractual agreement. Another, case determined that substantive legal services procured from attorney’s was non-severable. Thus, appears to be a distinction made between perennial, clerical work and substantive, project-based work. In the instant case, the consultant is providing project associated services that will result in a final report and final product in the form of a report and an RFP for a future study of voter fraud and voter intimidation.

Issues regarding the agreement’s unauthorized nature arose near the end of the award process. While the contract authority (Commissioners) properly took action to make an award determination, they relied on EAC employees to communicate this fact to the contractor. In doing so, the Commission failed to realize that it is the communication of acceptance and award by the appropriate person that serves to obligate the government. EAC personnel seem to have viewed the Commissioners’ concurrence as granting them the authority to communicate award in a manner that would obligate the agency. The bottom line is that the EAC employee believed her efforts to notify the contractor of award obligated the EAC by accepting the contractor’s proposal. Based upon this, the contractor began performance on the agreement and the EAC has and will receive benefit.

RECOMMENDATION:

(1) Review the contract, contract materials and statements of persons involved in the contracting process;
(2) Ratify the contract by voting affirmatively to take such action;
(3) Authorize the Chair on behalf of the Commission, with concurrence by the General Counsel, to document such ratification through a memorandum for the record to become a permanent part of the contract file on this contract;
(4) Execute the contract and transmit the signed contract to the contractor.
Fyi.
Any recommendations?

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Margaret Sims 
Sent: 11/16/2005 01:12 PM 
To: Gracia Hillman; Paul DeGregorio; Raymundo Martinez; donetta.davidson@sos.state.co.us 
Cc: Sheila Banks; Amie Sherrill; Adam Ambrogi; Elileen Collver; Gavin Gilmour 
Subject: RESPONSE REQUESTED-Working Group for Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Dear Commissioners:

The consultants' contracts for EAC's voting fraud and voter intimidation project require Tova Wang and Job Serebrov to work in consultation with EAC staff and the Commissioners "to identify a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation". The contracts do not specify the number of working group members but, as EAC has to pay for the group's travel and we want the size of the group to be manageable, I recommend that we limit the number to 6 or 8. Please let me know if you think that this limit is too conservative.

Attached for your review and comment are two lists of potential working group members for this project. One list was submitted by Job, the other by Tova. Tova and Job have provided brief summaries of each candidate's relevant experience and have placed asterisks next to the names of the individuals whom they particularly recommend. I can provide more extensive biographies of these individuals, if you need them. If EAC agrees that the recommended working group members are acceptable, an equal number may be selected from each list in order to maintain a balanced perspective.

Absent from the attached lists is the name of a representative from the U.S. Department of Justice's Election Crimes Branch. At this time, I am working through the DOJ bureaucracy to determine to what degree Craig Donsanto will be permitted to participate. If he cannot be named as a working group member, we may still be able to use him as a resource.

Please provide your feedback to me no later than Monday, November 28. I am available to meet with you if you would like to discuss this matter further.

Peggy Sims 
Research Specialist
Possible Working Group Members - Serebrov

I recommend the first four with an *

*Mark (Thor) Hearne II- Counsel to Republican National Committee; National Counsel to American Center for Voting Rights; National election counsel to Bush-Cheney, '04; Testified before U.S. House Administration Committee hearings into conduct of Ohio presidential election; Academic Advisor to Commission on Federal Election Reform (Baker-Carter Commission).

*Todd Rokita- Secretary of State, Indiana; Secretary Rokita strives to reform Indiana’s election practices to ensure Indiana’s elections are as fair, accurate and accessible as possible; Secretary Rokita serves on the nine-member Executive Board of the Election Assistance Commission Standards Board, charged by federal law to address election reform issues.

*Patrick J. Rogers- Partner/Shareholder, Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris and Sisk, P.A., Albuquerque, New Mexico; 1991-2003 General Counsel to the New Mexico Republican Party; Election cases: The Coalition to Expose Ballot Deception, et al v. Judy N. Chavez, et al; Second Judicial District Court of Bernalillo County, New Mexico (2005); represented plaintiffs challenging petition procedures; Miguel Gomez v. Ken Sanchez and Judy Chaves; Second Judicial District Court of Bernalillo County, New Mexico (2005); residency challenge; Moises Griego, et al v. Rebecca Vigil-Giron v. Ralph Nader and Peter Miguel Camejo, Supreme Court for the State of New Mexico (2004); represented Ralph Nader and Peter Camejo, ballot access issues; Larry Larrañaga, et al v. Mary E. Herrera and Rebecca Vigil-Giron, Supreme Court of New Mexico (2004); voter identification and fraudulent registration issues; Decker, et al v. Kunko, et al; District Court of Chaves County, New Mexico (2004); voter identification and fraudulent registration issues; Kunko, et al v. Decker, et al; Supreme Court of New Mexico (2004); voter identification and fraudulent registration issues; In the Matter of the Security of Ballots Cast in Bernalillo County in the 2000 General Election; Second Judicial District Court of Bernalillo County, New Mexico (2000); voting and counting irregularities and fraud.

*David A. Norcross- Partner, Blank Rome LLP, Trenton NJ, Washington D.C; Chairman, New Jersey Republican State Committee, 1977 – 1981; General Counsel, Republican National Committee, 1993 – 1997; General Counsel, International Republican Institute; Counsel, The Center for Democracy; Vice Chairman, Commission on Presidential Debates; Executive Director, New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission

Benjamin L. Ginsberg- Served as national counsel to the Bush-Cheney presidential campaign; He played a central role in the 2000 Florida recount; He also represents the campaigns and leadership PACs of numerous members of the Senate and House, as well as the Republican National Committee, National Republican Senatorial Committee and
National Republican Congressional Committee; His expertise is more in campaign finance.

**Cleta Mitchell** Partner in the Washington, D.C. office of Foley & Lardner LLP; She advises corporations, nonprofit organizations, candidates, campaigns, and individuals on state and federal election and campaign finance law, and compliance issues related to lobbying, ethics and financial disclosure; Ms. Mitchell practices before the Federal Election Commission and similar federal and state enforcement agencies; Her expertise is more in campaign finance law.

**Mark Braden** Of counsel at Baker & Hostetler; He concentrates his work principally on election law and governmental affairs, including work with Congress, the Federal Election Commission, state campaign finance agencies, public integrity issues, political broadcast regulation, contests, recounts, the Voting Rights Act, initiatives, referendums and redistricting; His expertise is mainly outside of the voter fraud area.
To: Peggy Sims  
From: Tova Wang  
Re: Working Group Recommendations  
Date: November 12, 2005

*Wendy R. Weiser, Associate Counsel in the Democracy Program at the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law and an expert in federal and constitutional law, has done a great deal of research, writing, speaking, and litigating on voting rights and election law issues. As part of the Brennan Center’s wide ranging activities in the area of democracy, Ms. Weiser is currently overseeing an analysis and investigation of recent allegations of voter fraud throughout the country.

*Barbara Arnwine is Executive Director of the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, an organization that for four decades has been at the forefront of the legal struggle to secure racial justice and equal access to the electoral process for all voters. Notably, Ms. Arnwine and the organization have led the Election Protection program for the last several years, a nationwide grassroots education and legal effort deploying thousands of volunteers and using a nationally recognized voter hotline to protect voters’ rights on election day.

*Daniel Tokaji, professor and associate director of the Election Law Center at the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University, is one of the nation’s foremost experts in election law and reform and ensuring equality in the voting system. Professor Tokaji frequently writes and speaks on democracy related issues at academic and practitioner conferences, on such issues as voting technology, fraud, registration, and identification requirements, as well as the interplay between the election administration practices and voting rights laws.

Donna Brazile is Chair of the Democratic National Committee's Voting Rights Institute, the Democratic Party's major initiative to promote and protect the right to vote created in response to the irregularities of the 2000 election, and former Campaign Manager for Gore-Lieberman 2000 (the first African American to lead a major presidential campaign.) Brazile is a weekly contributor and political commentator on CNN’s Inside Politics and American Morning, a columnist for Roll Call Newspaper and a contributing writer for Ms. Magazine.

Wade Henderson is the Executive Director of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (LCCR) and Counsel to the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund (LCCREF), an organization at the forefront of defending voting rights for the last fifty years. Prior to his role with the Leadership Conference, Mr. Henderson was the Washington Bureau Director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)

Robert Bauer is the Chair of the Political Law Practice at the law firm of Perkins Coie, National Counsel for Voter Protection, Democratic National Committee, Counsel to the Democratic Senatorial and Congressional Campaign Committees and Co-Author, Report
of Counsel to the Senate Rules and Administration Committee in the Matter of the United States Senate Seat from Louisiana in the 105th Congress of the United States, (March 27, 1997). He is the author of United States Federal Election Law, and one of the foremost attorneys in the country in the area of federal/state campaign finance and election laws.

Laughlin McDonald has been the executive director of the Southern Regional Office of the ACLU since 1972 and as the Director of the ACLU Voting Rights Project, McDonald has played a leading role eradicating discriminatory election practices and protecting the gains in political participation won by racial minorities since passage of the 1965 federal Voting Rights Act. During the past two decades, McDonald has broken new ground by expanding ACLU voting rights cases to include representation of Native Americans in various western states, and written innumerable publications on voting rights issues.

Joseph E. Sandler is a member of the firm of Sandler, Reiff & Young, P.C., in Washington, D.C., concentrating in campaign finance and election law matters, and general counsel to the Democratic National Committee. As an attorney he has handled campaign finance and election law matters for Democratic national and state party organizations, Members of Congress, candidates and campaigns. He served as general co-counsel of the Association of State Democratic Chairs, as general counsel for the Democratic Governors' Association and as counsel to several state Democratic parties.

Cathy Cox is serving her second term as Georgia’s Secretary of State, having first been elected in 1998. In 2002 she earned re-election with over 61 percent of the vote, winning 146 out of 159 counties. Because of Secretary Cox’s efforts Georgia has become a national leader in election reform. Her initiative made Georgia the first state in America to deploy a modern, uniform electronic voting system in every county.
Thanks. I actually sent you an earlier version by mistake. That paragraph. (and a few others) have been improved. You are right about Tova. I'll say the consultants' report is undergoing staff review.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Juliet E. Hodgkins  
Sent: 09/28/2006 08:52 PM  
To: Paul DeGregorio  
Subject: Re: Speech on Fraud intimidation Sept 29 06 Salt Lake City

Paul,

Two comments:

1) There is a sentence on page 2 that doesn't make sense. I have copied the text below. 

. While others consider any form of ineligible voter as fraud.

2) I am pretty sure that we have received the final product from our voter fraud/intimidation contractors. However, that product is pending staff review. So, if Tova is in the audience and she likely will be, she may challenge the statement in the speech that we await their report.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

-----Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV wrote: -----
Commissioners,

Jeannie and I have collaborated on the following draft response to Tova Wang’s letter. Please let me know if you agree or have comments/edits.

[File Attachment: draft response to Tova Wang.doc]

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
December 8, 2006

Ms. Tova Wang
(Address)
(Address)

Dear Ms. Wang:

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission believes that voting fraud and voter intimidation are very important, complex topics that should be studied and reported on fairly and accurately. As a clearinghouse of election administration information, EAC is committed to providing complete and comprehensive information to the election community and the public.

In its December 2006 report on voting fraud and voter intimidation, EAC honored this commitment by providing the readers of its report with the full and complete summaries of every interview conducted as well as every book, article, report or case that was reviewed. It is incumbent upon us to provide them with the best and most complete data and research that we can. Rather than provide only the synopsis of these interviews, EAC provided the readers with the entire summaries created by the consultants so readers could reach their own conclusions about the substance of the interviews.

With regard to the interviews of two of the personnel from the Department of Justice, EAC made clarifying edits. Upon reviewing initial information about their interviews contained in the status report provided to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors and the information provided by the consultants at the working group meeting, those persons interviewed did not agree with certain characterizations of their statements contained in these materials. The Department of Justice is an important prosecutorial agency engaged in enforcing Federal anti-fraud and anti-intimidation laws. Thus, it was important to EAC to assure that the summary of their comments did not lend confusion to an already complex and hotly-debated topic.

Because of the lack of organization and cohesion in the draft provided by the consultants, that document would have led to greater confusion and division regarding the issues of voting fraud and voter intimidation. As such, EAC revised the draft report and provided the entirety of the supporting documentation to the public.

For these reasons, the report on voting fraud and voter intimidation will stand as adopted on December 7, 2006.
I can certainly do that. I was focusing on trying to use her own words against her.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins  
General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3100  
Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV

Julie,

The letter is good, but don't you want to point out that in every report we issue that the research provided by paid consultants/organizations is provided under contract to the EAC, who by law is ultimately responsible for any final report issued to the public. And that such reports always takes into consideration the research provided but the EAC is obligated to consider all factors when making determinations to insure fairness and integrity of the process.

Paul

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Juliet E. Hodgkins

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Juliet E. Hodgkins 
Sent: 12/08/2006 04:38 PM 
To: Paul DeGregorio; Gracia Hillman; Donetta Davidson; Thomas Wilkey 
Cc: Bert Benavides; Sheila Banks; Eileen Collver; Matthew Masterson; Jeannie Layson

Subject: Draft response to Tova Wang

Commissioners,

Jeannie and I have collaborated on the following draft response to Tova Wang's letter. Please let me know if you agree or have comments/edits.

[attachment "draft response to Tova Wang.doc" deleted by Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV]

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins  
General Counsel
I saw that...and feel it's VERY appropriate considering the unprofessional conduct she had shown in dealing with this matter.
Have a great weekend.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Juliet E. Hodgkins

----- Original Message -----

From: Juliet E. Hodgkins
Sent: 12/08/2006 05:37 PM
To: Paul DeGregorio
Subject: Re: Draft response to Tova Wang

I can certainly do that. I was focusing on trying to use her own words against her.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV

Julie,
The letter is good, but don't you want to point out that in every report we issue that the research provided by paid consultants/organizations is provided under contract to the EAC, who by law is ultimately responsible for any final report issued to the public. And that such reports always takes into consideration the research provided but the EAC is obligated to consider all factors when making determinations to insure fairness and integrity of the process.
Paul

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Juliet E. Hodgkins

----- Original Message -----

From: Juliet E. Hodgkins
Sent: 12/08/2006 04:38 PM
To: Paul DeGregorio; Gracia Hillman; Donetta Davidson; Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Bert Benavides; Sheila Banks; Elileen Collver; Matthew Masterson; Jeannie Layson
Subject: Draft response to Tova Wang

Commissioners,

Jeannie and I have collaborated on the following draft response to Tova Wang's letter. Please let me know if you agree or have comments/edits.

[attachment "draft response to Tova Wang.doc" deleted by Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV]

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
commissioners,

See below edits that Gracia has offered to the letter. Let me know if you agree. I would like to send this out today. Also, in response to Gracia’s question below, I believe that since her letter was addressed to the Commissioners that the Commissioners should respond (either collectively or through the Chairman). Please let me know if you agree with the edits. It would be nice to get this out today.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

Julie and Jeannie:

Thank you for the quick turn around on drafting a response to Tova Wang.

I have made substantial edits because I think the first draft offered too much information, which is not germane to Tova’s complaint. Additionally, too much verbiage masks the strength of our good report and seemed to obscure the main points in our response.

I hope you will find the attached helpful.

BTW, who will sign the letter?

Gracia M. Hillman
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-566-3100
Fax: 202-566-1392
www.eac.gov
CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message is from a federal agency. Its contents and all attachments, if any, are intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this email and delete this message from your computer.
December 8, 2006

Ms. Tova Wang
(Address)
(Address)

Dear Ms. Wang:

We are writing in response to your December 7, 2006 memorandum. As you know, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) issued its first report on election crimes last week, based in large part on the work that was done for EAC by Job and you. The report contains the full and complete summaries of every interview conducted as well as every book, article, report or case that was reviewed. Rather than provide the synopsis of these interviews, EAC provided the individual summaries so readers could reach their own conclusions about the substance of the interviews.

Upon reviewing initial information about the Department of Justice interviews contained in the status report that was provided to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors and the information provided at the working group meeting in May 2006, those persons interviewed at the Department of Justice did not agree with certain characterizations of their statements contained in these materials. Therefore, EAC exercised its responsibility to make clarifying edits. The Department of Justice is an important prosecutorial agency engaged in enforcing Federal anti-fraud and anti-intimidation laws. Thus, it was important to EAC to assure that the summary of their comments did not lend confusion to an already complex and hotly-debated topic.

The report on voting fraud and voter intimidation will stand as adopted on December 7, 2006. Again, we thank you for the contributions you made to the EAC’s initial research of these important issues.

Sincerely,
With respect to how the letter to Tova is signed, either way is fine with me.
Julie,

I am ok with the edits Commissioner made to the letter; however, I do think that because of the tone of Tova’s letter, which is likely to be supplied to others (as was their report to us), that we need a paragraph in the letter that makes it clear that the process used in producing this final report was consistent with the process we have used in all the reports and studies we have issued to date. What she needs to know (in writing) is that that while we review the work of our researchers and consultants on a topic closely to draw various conclusions, our staff and the commissioners themselves have input into the final product that becomes the public report issued by a majority vote of the EAC. Since I’ve been on the EAC, we have consistently questioned statistics, statements and conclusions drawn by those doing work for the EAC. We have also drawn upon our collect resources and wisdom to produce the best report possible. I think that was true in this case as it has been with all the other reports we have issued. In the end, it is the EAC—and the commissioners in particular—who are held accountable for what we adopt and release; not our paid consultants or organizations we contract with to do studies.

Paul DeGregorio
Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins

See below edits that Gracia has offered to the letter. Let me know if you agree. I would like to send this out today. Also, in response to Gracia’s question below, I believe that since her letter was addressed to the Commissioners that the Commissioners should respond (either collectively or through the Chairman). Please let me know if you agree with the edits. It would be nice to get this out today.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
Julie and Jeannie:

Thank you for the quick turn around on drafting a response to Tova Wang.

I have made substantial edits because I think the first draft offered too much information, which is not germane to Tova’s complaint. Additionally, too much verbiage masks the strength of our good report and seemed to obscure the main points in our response.

I hope you will find the attached helpful.

BTW, who will sign the letter?

[attachment "Tova Wang, Dec06.doc" deleted by Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV]
I agree with the Chairman's recommended additional language.
Commissioners,

Consistent with the changes requested by both Commissioners DeGregorio and Hillman, I have revised the draft response. Please take one more look at the letter. If possible, it would be nice to get this out today.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV

Julie,

I am ok with the edits Commissioner made to the letter; however, I do think that because of the tone of Tova’s letter, which is likely to be supplied to others (as was their report to us), that we need a paragraph in the letter that makes it clear that the process used in producing this final report was consistent with the process we have used in all the reports and studies we have issued to date. What she needs to know (in writing) is that is that while we review the work of our researchers and consultants on a topic closely to draw various conclusions, our staff and the commissioners themselves have input into the final product that becomes the public report issued by a majority vote of the EAC. Since I’ve been on the EAC, we have consistently questioned statistics, statements and conclusions drawn by those doing work for the EAC. We have also drawn upon our collect resources and wisdom to produce the best report possible. I think that was true in this case as it has been with all the other reports we have issued. In the end, it is the EAC—and the commissioners in particular—who are held accountable for what we adopt and release; not our paid consultants or organizations we contract with to do studies.

Paul DeGregorio
Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV

Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV
12/11/2006 11:40 AM

To "Davidson, Donetta" <ddavidson@eac.gov>, Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV@EAC

Subject Fw: Draft response to Tova Wang

commissioners,

See below edits that Gracia has offered to the letter. Let me know if you agree. I would like to send this out today. Also, in response to Gracia’s question below, I believe that since her letter was addressed to the Commissioners that the Commissioners should respond (either collectively or through the Chairman). Please let me know if you agree with the edits. It would be nice to get this out today.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100


Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV
12/11/2006 11:26 AM

To Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, jlayson@eac.gov
cc

Subject Re: Draft response to Tova Wang

Julie and Jeannie:

Thank you for the quick turn around on drafting a response to Tova Wang.

I have made substantial edits because I think the first draft offered too much information, which is not germane to Tova’s complaint. Additionally, too much verbiage masks the strength of our good report and seemed to obscure the main points in our response.

I hope you will find the attached helpful.

BTW, who will sign the letter?

[attachment "Tova Wang, Dec06.doc" deleted by Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV]
December 11, 2006

Ms. Tova Wang

Via U.S. Mail and Facsimile Transmission
202-483-9430

Ms. Tova Wang

c/o The Century Foundation
1333 H Street NW, 10th Floor
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Ms. Wang:

We are writing in response to your December 7, 2006 memorandum. As you know, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) issued its first report on election crimes last week, based in large part on the work that was done for EAC by Job and you. The report contains the full and complete summaries of every interview conducted as well as every book, article, report or case that was reviewed. Rather than provide the synopsis of these interviews, EAC provided the individual summaries so readers could reach their own conclusions about the substance of the interviews.

As the agency responsible for these final reports, it is incumbent upon EAC to assure that the information contained in the reports is accurate and fairly presented. With each of the reports, best practices documents, quick start guides, and other documents that EAC publishes, EAC makes changes as needed to make certain that our constituents are receiving the best and most complete information. This due diligence process is observed regardless of whether the document was created in-house or was created by consultants or contractors.

Upon reviewing initial information about the Department of Justice interviews contained in the status report that was provided to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors and the information provided at the working group meeting in May 2006, those persons interviewed at the Department of Justice did not agree with certain characterizations of their statements contained in these materials. Therefore, EAC exercised its responsibility to make clarifying edits. The Department of Justice is an important prosecutorial agency engaged in enforcing Federal anti-fraud and anti-intimidation laws. Thus, it was important to EAC to assure that the summary of their comments did not lend confusion to an already complex and hotly-debated topic.

Deleted: 
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The report on voting fraud and voter intimidation will stand as adopted on December 7, 2006. Again, we thank you for the contributions you made to the EAC's initial research of these important issues.

Sincerely,

Paul DeGregorio
Chairman

Donetta Davidson
Commissioner

Gracia Hillman
Commissioner
To twilkey@eac.gov, Bert A. Benavides/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
bcc Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV
Subject Eagleton letter in response to the Chairman

This message has been forwarded.

Tom-

Attached is a letter which I have drafted for you summarizing the Commissioner's discussion on the Eagleton contract and which will respond to John Weingart's letter to the Chairman.

K

Wilkey Eagleton close out letter.doc
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
June 15, 2006

John Weingart:
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers University

Dear John:

During its bi-weekly meeting the four EAC Commissioners met, discussed and reviewed possible next steps with the provisional voting and voter identification studies as well as the Eagleton contract which is scheduled to conclude on June 30, 2006.

The four Commissioners were in agreement that Eagleton’s work on the EAC contract should conclude, as scheduled, by June 30, 2006. In preparation for this conclusion the Commissioners have asked that the comments and suggestions which were noted during the EAC’s recent Board of Advisors and Standards Boards meeting (and were described in your June xxx letter to Chairman DeGregorio) be included in the final report on provisional which Eagleton will deliver to the EAC on or about June 30, 2006. The Commissioners have determined that they will take this final report and, from it, develop guidance and best practice recommendations that will be presented to the Board of Advisors and Standards Boards for further review.

The EAC Commissioners have also reviewed and considered next steps with the voter identification draft report which Eagleton has prepared. While the final disposition of the results and findings of this study, on the part of the EAC, are still unclear, the Commissioners have asked that the final report of this study also be prepared and submitted to the EAC not later than June 30, 2006.

We look forward to receiving these reports. On behalf of the EAC thank you for the considerable time and energy which the Eagleton/Moritz team has devoted to these critical election issues during the last eighteen months.

Sincerely,

Thomas Wilkey
Tom-

Attached is a letter which I have drafted for you summarizing the Commissioner's discussion on the Eagleton contract and which will respond to John Weingart's letter to the Chairman.

K
June 15, 2006

John Weingart:
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers University

Dear John:

During its bi-weekly meeting the four EAC Commissioners met, discussed and reviewed possible next steps with the provisional voting and voter identification studies as well as the Eagleton contract which is scheduled to conclude on June 30, 2006.

The four Commissioners were in agreement that Eagleton’s work on the EAC contract should conclude, as scheduled, by June 30, 2006. In preparation for this conclusion the Commissioners have asked that the comments and suggestions which were noted during the EAC’s recent Board of Advisors and Standards Boards meeting (and were described in your June xxx letter to Chairman DeGregorio) be included in the final report on provisional which Eagleton will deliver to the EAC on or about June 30, 2006. The Commissioners have determined that they will take this final report and, from it, develop guidance and best practice recommendations that will be presented to the Board of Advisors and Standards Boards for further review.

The EAC Commissioners have also reviewed and considered next steps with the voter identification draft report which Eagleton has prepared. While the final disposition of the results and findings of this study, on the part of the EAC, are still unclear, the Commissioners have asked that the final report of this study also be prepared and submitted to the EAC not later than June 30, 2006.

We look forward to receiving these reports. On behalf of the EAC thank you for the considerable time and energy which the Eagleton/Moritz team has devoted to these critical election issues during the last eighteen months.

Sincerely,

Thomas Wilkey
Caroline,

You may have read some news articles regarding a "report" we did not release publicly regarding a study we are conducting on vote fraud/voter intimidation issues. The report in question is a May 17 status report on the study that was given to our Advisory and Standards Boards at a meeting they had in Washington. Someone obviously leaked it to the media and some have now made suggestions that it was not released to keep its contents quiet. We had to give it to the media because it was a public document that we shared with our boards at a public meeting. I have attached a copy of the report and a letter that I sent today to Barbara Arnwine of the Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights that explains what this is all about (she was quite misinformed in the letter she sent to the EAC last Friday). Staff and counsel are now reviewing more information, data and feedback that has come in since the May 17 status report and we are not likely to issue any final report on the initial study on this issue for a month or so.

Paul
October 12, 2006

Ms. Barbara R. Arnwine
Executive Director
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law
1401 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005-2124

RE: October 6, 2006 Letter

Dear Ms. Arnwine:

Your letter of October 6, 2006 requests the release of EAC’s Voter Fraud and Intimidation Report. I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the purpose and status of this study.

In late 2005, EAC hired two consultants for the purpose of assisting EAC with two things: 1) developing a uniform definition of the phrase voter fraud, and 2) making recommendations on how to further study the existence, prosecution, and means of deterring such voter fraud. In May 2006, a status report on this study was given to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors, a group of which you are now a member, during their public meetings. During the same week, a working group convened to react to and provide comment on the progress and potential conclusions that could be reached from the work of the two consultants.

The conversation at the working group meeting was lively on the very points that we were trying to accomplish as a part of this study, namely what is voter fraud and how do we pursue studying it. Many of the proposed conclusions that were suggested by the consultants were challenged by the working group members. As such, the consultants were tasked with reviewing the concerns expressed at the working group meeting, conducting additional research as necessary, and providing a draft report to EAC that took into account the working group’s concerns and issues.

That draft report is currently being vetted by EAC staff. EAC will release a final report from this study after it has conducted a review of the draft provided by the consultants, the working group meeting transcript, and data sources provided by the consultants as a part of their working papers. However, it is important to remember the purpose of this study – finding a uniform definition of voter fraud and making recommendations on how
to study the existence, prosecution and deterrence of voter fraud -- as it will serve as the basis of the EAC report on this study.

Thank you for your letter. Please continue to contact us with any concerns that you may have. You and your colleagues on the Board of Advisors are important to the EAC process. As such, you can be assured that as soon as a final report on the fraud and intimidation study is available, a copy will be provided to all members of the EAC Board of Advisors.

Sincerely,

Paul S. DeGregorio, Chairman
Designated Federal Officer, EAC Board of Advisors
October 6, 2006

Chairman Paul S. DeGregorio
Commissioner Donna L. Davidson
Commissioner Gracia M. Hillman
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100
Washington, DC 20005
FAX: (202) 566-3127

Dear Commissioners,

As a member of the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Board of Advisors and a member of the EAC’s Working Group on Voter Fraud and Voter Intimidation, I write requesting the release of the EAC’s Voter Fraud and Voter Intimidation Report. This report was commissioned over a year ago and has yet to be released. In May, 2006 the Working Group met to discuss the project and was told that the final report would be released shortly thereafter. Five months later, and on the heels of another national election, election officials, policy makers and advocates are without guidance from the EAC on this critical subject. Across the country and at all levels of government, legislative and judicial debates that should be informed by the report’s findings continue. The EAC has had ample time to research and release this critical report. There is no reasonable explanation for this delay.

Please immediately release the Election Assistance Commission’s Voter Fraud and Voter Intimidation report. If immediate release is not possible, please provide me with an explanation of the delay and a detailed time line for the report’s release.

Thank You.

Barbara R. Arnwine
Executive Director
Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law

Cc: Hon. Trent Lott, Chairman, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration
Hon. Christopher J. Dodd, Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration
Hon. Vernon Ehlers, Chairman, Committee on House Administration
Hon. Juanita Millender-McDonald, Ranking Member, Committee on House Administration
INTRODUCTION

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the tasks listed in the statute is the development of:

- nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office [section 241(b)(6)]; and

- ways of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)].

EAC’s Board of Advisors recommended that the agency make research on these matters a high priority.

FOCUS OF CURRENT RESEARCH

In September 2005, the Commission hired two consultants with expertise in this subject matter, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, to:

- develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;

- perform background research (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;

- establish a project working group, in consultation with EAC, composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation;

- provide the description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation and the results of the preliminary research to the working group, and convene the working group to discuss potential avenues for future EAC research on this topic; and

- produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future research, if any;

As of the date of this report, the consultants have drafted a definition of election fraud, reviewed relevant literature and reports, interviewed persons from government and private sectors with subject matter expertise, analyzed news reports of alleged election fraud, reviewed case law, and established a project working group.
DEFINITION OF ELECTION FRAUD

The consultants drafted a definition of election fraud that includes numerous aspects of voting fraud (including voter intimidation, which is considered a subset of voting fraud) and voter registration fraud, but excludes campaign finance violations and election administration mistakes. This draft will be discussed and probably refined by the project working group, which is scheduled to convene on May 18, 2006.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The consultants found many reports and books that describe anecdotes and draw broad conclusions from a large array of incidents. They found little research that is truly systematic or scientific. The most systematic look at fraud appears to be the report written by Lori Minnite, entitled “Securing the Vote: An Analysis of Election Fraud”. The most systematic look at voter intimidation appears to be the report by Laughlin McDonald, entitled “The New Poll Tax”. The consultants found that books written about this subject all seem to have a political bias and a pre-existing agenda that makes them somewhat less valuable.

Moreover, the consultants found that reports and books make allegations but, perhaps by their nature, have little follow up. As a result, it is difficult to know when something has remained in the stage of being an allegation and gone no further, or progressed to the point of being investigated or prosecuted or in any other way proven to be valid by an independent, neutral entity. This is true, for example, with respect to allegations of voter intimidation by civil rights organizations, and, with respect to fraud, John Fund’s frequently cited book, “Stealing Elections”.

Consultants found that researchers agree that measuring something like the incidence of fraud and intimidation in a scientifically legitimate way is extremely difficult from a methodological perspective and would require resources beyond the means of most social and political scientists. As a result, there is much more written on this topic by advocacy groups than social scientists.

Other items of note:

- There is as much evidence, and as much concern, about structural forms of disenfranchisement as about intentional abuse of the system. These include felon disenfranchisement, poor maintenance of databases and identification requirements.

- There is tremendous disagreement about the extent to which polling place fraud, e.g. double voting, intentional felon voting, noncitizen voting, is a serious problem. On balance, more researchers find it to be less of a problem than is commonly described in the political debate; but some reports say it is a major problem, albeit hard to identify.
• There is substantial concern across the board about absentee balloting and the opportunity it presents for fraud.

• Federal law governing election fraud and intimidation is varied and complex and yet may nonetheless be insufficient or subject to too many limitations to be as effective as it might be.

• Deceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004.

• Voter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities, although the American Center for Voting Rights uniquely alleges it is focused on Republicans.

Recommendations

The consultants recommend that subsequent EAC research include a follow up study of allegations made in reports, books and newspaper articles. They also suggest that the research should focus on filling the gap between the lack of reports based on methodical studies by social or political scientists and the numerous, but less scientific, reports published by advocacy groups.

INTERVIEWS

The consultants jointly selected experts from the public and private sector for interviews. The consultants’ analysis of their discussions with these members of the legal, election official, advocacy, and academic communities follows.

Common Themes

• There is virtually universal agreement that absentee ballot fraud is the biggest problem, with vote buying and registration fraud coming in after that. The vote buying often comes in the form of payment for absentee ballots, although not always. Some absentee ballot fraud is part of an organized effort; some is by individuals, who sometimes are not even aware that what they are doing is illegal. Voter registration fraud seems to take the form of people signing up with false names. Registration fraud seems to be most common where people doing the registration were paid by the signature.

• There is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud, or at least much less than is claimed, including voter impersonation, “dead” voters, noncitizen voting and felon voters. Those few who believe it occurs often enough to be a concern say that it is impossible to show the extent to which it happens, but do point to instances in the press of such incidents. Most people believe that false registration forms have not resulted in polling place fraud,
although it may create the perception that vote fraud is possible. Those who believe there is more polling place fraud than reported/investigated/prosecuted believe that registration fraud does lead to fraudulent votes. Jason Torchinsky from the American Center for Voting Rights is the only interviewee who believes that polling place fraud is widespread and among the most significant problems in the system.

- Abuse of challenger laws and abusive challengers seem to be the biggest intimidation/suppression concerns, and many of those interviewed assert that the new identification requirements are the modern version of voter intimidation and suppression. However there is evidence of some continued outright intimidation and suppression, especially in some Native American communities. A number of people also raise the problem of poll workers engaging in harassment of minority voters. Other activities commonly raised were the issue of polling places being moved at the last moment, unequal distribution of voting machines, videotaping of voters at the polls, and targeted misinformation campaigns.

- Several people indicate that, for various reasons, DOJ is bringing fewer voter intimidation and suppression cases now, and has increased its focus on matters such as noncitizen voting, double voting, and felon voting. Interviews with DOJ personnel indicate that the Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, focuses on systemic patterns of malfeasance in this area. While the Election Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, continues to maintain an aggressive pursuit of systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process (including voter suppression), it also has increased prosecutions of individual instances of felon, alien, and double voting.

- The problem of badly kept voter registration lists, with both ineligible voters remaining on the rolls and eligible voters being taken off, remains a common concern. A few people are also troubled by voters being on registration lists in two states. They said that there was no evidence that this had led to double voting, but it opens the door to the possibility. There is great hope that full implementation of the new requirements of HAVA – done well, a major caveat – will reduce this problem dramatically.

**Common Recommendations:**

- Many of those interviewed recommend better poll worker training as the best way to improve the process; a few also recommended longer voting times or voting on days other than election day (such as weekends) but fewer polling places so only the best poll workers would be employed.

- Many interviewed support stronger criminal laws and increased enforcement of existing laws with respect to both fraud and intimidation. Advocates from across the spectrum expressed frustration with the failure of the Department of Justice to pursue complaints.
With respect to DOJ’s Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, John Tanner indicated that fewer cases are being brought because fewer are warranted – it has become increasingly difficult to know when allegations of intimidation and suppression are credible since it depends on one’s definition of intimidation, and because both parties are doing it. Moreover prior enforcement of the laws has now changed the entire landscape – race based problems are rare now. Although challenges based on race and unequal implementation of identification rules would be actionable, Mr. Tanner was unaware of such situations actually occurring and his office has not pursued any such cases.

Craig Donsanto of DOJ’s Election Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, says that while the number of election fraud related complaints have not gone up since 2002, nor has the proportion of legitimate to illegitimate claims of fraud, the number of cases DOJ is investigating and the number of indictments his office is pursuing are both up dramatically. Since 2002, in addition to pursuing systematic election corruption schemes, DOJ has brought more cases against alien voters, felon voters and double voters than ever before. Mr. Donsanto would like more resources so that his agency can do more and would like to have laws that make it easier for the federal government to assume jurisdiction over voter fraud cases.

- A couple of interviewees recommend a new law that would make it easier to criminally prosecute people for intimidation even when there is not racial animus.
- Several advocate expanded monitoring of the polls, including some associated with the Department of Justice.
- Almost everyone hopes that administrators will maximize the potential of statewide voter registration databases to prevent fraud.
- Challenge laws, both with respect to pre-election day challenges and challengers at the polls, need to be revised by all states to ensure they are not used for purposes of wrongful disenfranchisement and harassment.
- Several people advocate passage of Senator Barak Obama’s “deceptive practices” bill.
- There is a split on whether it would be helpful to have nonpartisan election officials – some indicated they thought even if elections officials are elected as non partisan officials, they will carry out their duties in biased ways nonetheless. However, most agree that elections officials pursuing partisan agendas are a problem that must be addressed in some fashion. Suggestions included moving election responsibilities out of the secretary of states’ office; increasing transparency in the process; and enacting conflict of interest rules.
• A few recommend returning to allowing use of absentee ballots “for cause” only if it were politically feasible.

• A few recommend enacting a national identification card, including Pat Rogers, an attorney in New Mexico, and Jason Torchinsky from ACVR, who advocates the proposal in the Carter-Baker Commission Report.

• A couple of interviewees indicated the need for clear standards for the distribution of voting machines.

NEWS ARTICLES

Consultants conducted a Nexis search of related news articles published between January 1, 2001 and January 1, 2006. A systematic, numerical analysis of the data collected during this review is currently being prepared. What follows is an overview of these articles provided by the consultants.

Absentee Ballots

According to press reports, absentee ballots are abused in a variety of ways:

• Campaign workers, candidates and others coerce the voting choices of vulnerable populations, usually elderly voters.

• Workers for groups and individuals have attempted to vote absentee in the names of the deceased.

• Workers for groups, campaign workers and individuals have attempted to forge the names of other voters on absentee ballot requests and absentee ballots and thus vote multiple times.

It is unclear how often actual convictions result from these activities (a handful of articles indicate convictions and guilty pleas), but this is an area in which there have been a substantial number of official investigations and actual charges filed, according to news reports where such information is available. A few of the allegations became part of civil court proceedings contesting the outcome of the election.

While absentee fraud allegations turn up throughout the country, a few states have had several such cases. Especially of note are Indiana, New Jersey, South Dakota, and most particularly, Texas. Interestingly, there were no articles regarding Oregon, where the entire system is vote by mail.
Voter Registration Fraud

According to press reports, the following types of allegations of voter registration fraud are most common:

- Registering in the name of dead people;
- Fake names and other information on voter registration forms;
- Illegitimate addresses used on voter registration forms;
- Voters being tricked into registering for a particular party under false pretenses; and
- Destruction of voter registration forms depending on the party the voter registered with.

There was only one self evident instance of a noncitizen registering to vote. Many of the instances reported included official investigations and charges filed, but few actual convictions, at least from the news reporting. There have been multiple reports of registration fraud in California, Colorado, Florida, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Voter Intimidation and Suppression

This is the area which had the most articles, in part because there were so many allegations of intimidation and suppression during the 2004 election. Most of these remained allegations and no criminal investigation or prosecution ensued. Some of the cases did end up in civil litigation.

This is not to say that these alleged activities were confined to 2004 – there were several allegations made during every year studied. Most notable were the high number of allegations of voter intimidation and harassment reported during the 2003 Philadelphia mayoral race.

A very high number of the articles were about the issue of challenges to voters' registration status and challengers at the polling places. There were many allegations that planned challenge activities were targeted at minority communities. Some of the challenges were concentrated in immigrant communities.

However, the tactics alleged varied greatly. The types of activities discussed also include the following:

- Photographing or videotaping voters coming out of polling places;
- Improper demands for identification;
Poll watchers harassing voters;

Poll workers being hostile to or aggressively challenging voters;

Disproportionate police presence;

Poll watchers wearing clothes with messages that seemed intended to intimidate; and

Insufficient voting machines and unmanageably long lines.

Although the incidents reported on occurred everywhere, not surprisingly, many came from “battleground” states. There were several such reports out of Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

“Dead Voters and Multiple Voting”

There were a high number of articles about people voting in the names of the dead and voting more than once. Many of these articles were marked by allegations of big numbers of people committing these frauds, and relatively few of these allegations turning out to be accurate according to investigations by the newspapers themselves, elections officials, and criminal investigators. Often the problem turned out to be a result of administrative error, poll workers mis-marking voter lists, a flawed registration list and/or errors made in the attempt to match names of voters on the list with the names of the people who voted. In a good number of cases, there were allegations that charges of double voting by political leaders were an effort to scare people away from the voting process.

Nonetheless there were a few cases of people actually being charged and/or convicted for these kinds of activities. Most of the cases involved a person voting both by absentee ballot and in person. A few instances involved people voting both during early voting and on Election Day, which calls into question the proper marking and maintenance of the voting lists. In many instances, the person charged claimed not to have voted twice on purpose. A very small handful of cases involved a voter voting in more than one county and there was one substantiated case involving a person voting in more than one state. Other instances in which such efforts were alleged were disproved by officials.

In the case of voting in the name of a dead person, the problem lay in the voter registration list not being properly maintained, i.e. the person was still on the registration list as eligible to vote, and a person took criminal advantage of that. In total, the San Francisco Chronicle found five such cases in March 2004; the AP cited a newspaper analysis of five such persons in an Indiana primary in May 2004; and a senate committee found two people to have voted in the names of the dead in 2005.
As usual, there were a disproportionate number of such articles coming out of Florida. Notably, there were three articles out of Oregon, which has one hundred percent vote-by-mail.

**Vote Buying**

There were a surprising number of articles about vote buying cases. A few of these instances involved long-time investigations concentrated in three states (Illinois, Kentucky, and West Virginia). There were more official investigations, indictments and convictions/pleas in this area.

**Deceptive Practices**

In 2004 there were numerous reports of intentional disinformation about voting eligibility and the voting process meant to confuse voters about their rights and when and where to vote. Misinformation came in the form of flyers, phone calls, letters, and even people going door to door. Many of the efforts were reportedly targeted at minority communities. A disproportionate number of them came from key battleground states, particularly Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. From the news reports found, only one of these instances was officially investigated, the case in Oregon involving the destruction of completed voter registration applications. There were no reports of prosecutions or any other legal proceeding.

**Non-citizen Voting**

There were surprisingly few articles regarding noncitizen registration and voting – just seven all together, in seven different states across the country. They were also evenly split between allegations of noncitizens registering and noncitizens voting. In one case, charges were filed against ten individuals. In another case, a judge in a civil suit found there was illegal noncitizen voting. Three instances prompted official investigations. Two cases, from this Nexis search, remained just allegations of noncitizen voting.

**Felon Voting**

Although there were only thirteen cases of felon voting, some of them involved large numbers of voters. Most notably, of course, are the cases that came to light in the Washington gubernatorial election contest (see Washington summary) and in Wisconsin (see Wisconsin summary). In several states, the main problem was the large number of ineligible felons that remained on the voting list.

**Election Official Fraud**

In most of the cases in which fraud by elections officials is suspected or alleged, it is difficult to determine whether it is incompetence or a crime. There are several cases of ballots gone missing, ballots unaccounted for and ballots ending up in a worker’s possession. In two cases workers were said to have changed peoples’ votes. The one
instance in which widespread ballot box stuffing by elections workers was alleged was in Washington State. The judge in the civil trial of that election contest did not find that elections workers had committed fraud. Four of the cases are from Texas.

Recommendation

The consultants recommend that subsequent EAC research should include a Nexis search that specifically attempts to follow up on the cases for which no resolution is evident from this particular initial search.

CASE LAW RESEARCH

After reviewing over 40,000 cases from 2000 to the present, the majority of which came from appeals courts, the consultants found comparatively few applicable to this study. Of those that were applicable, the consultants found that no apparent thematic pattern emerges. However, it appears to them that the greatest areas of fraud and intimidation have shifted from past patterns of stealing votes to present problems with voter registration, voter identification, the proper delivery and counting of absentee and overseas ballots, provisional voting, vote buying, and challenges to felon eligibility.

Recommendation

Because so few cases provided a picture of these current problems, consultants suggest that subsequent EAC research include a review of state trial-level decisions.

PROJECT WORKING GROUP

Consultants and EAC worked together to select members for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group that included election officials and representatives of advocacy groups and the legal community who have an interest and expertise in the subject matter. (See Attachment A for a list of members.) The working group is scheduled to convene at EAC offices on May 18, 2006 to consider the results of the preliminary research and to offer ideas for future EAC activities concerning this subject.

FINAL REPORT

After convening the project working group, the consultants will draft a final report summarizing the results of their research and the working group deliberations. This report will include recommendations for future EAC research related to this subject matter. The draft report will be reviewed by EAC and, after obtaining any clarifications or corrections deemed necessary, will be made available to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors for review and comment. Following this, a final report will be prepared.
Attachment A

**Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project Working Group**

**The Honorable Todd Rokita**
Indiana Secretary of State
Member, EAC Standards Board and the Executive Board of the Standards Board

**Kathy Rogers**
Georgia Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State
Member, EAC Standards Board

**J.R. Perez**
Guadalupe County Elections Administrator, TX

**Barbara Arnwine**
Executive Director, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law
Leader of Election Protection Coalition

*(To be represented at May 18, 2006 meeting by Jon M. Greenbaum, Director of the Voting Rights Project for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law)*

**Robert Bauer**
Chair of the Political Law Practice at the law firm of Perkins Coie, DC
National Counsel for Voter Protection, Democratic National Committee

**Benjamin L. Ginsberg**
Partner, Patton Boggs LLP
Counsel to national Republican campaign committees and Republican candidates

**Mark (Thor) Hearne II**
Partner-Member, Lathrop & Gage, St Louis, MO
National Counsel to the American Center for Voting Rights

**Barry Weinberg**
Former Deputy Chief and Acting Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S.
Department of Justice

**EAC Invited Technical Advisor:**

**Craig Donsanto**
Director, Election Crimes Branch, U.S. Department of Justice
He called regarding the voter fraud and intimidation report. He may be reached at (816) 556-2789.

Amie J. Sherrill
Special Assistant to Chairman Paul S. DeGregorio
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566 3106
Mr. Chairman,

Chuck McCutchen of Newhouse News Service wants to interview you tomorrow at 11:30 regarding absentee voting, and your thoughts about whether this presents more opportunities for fraud. He asked for and I sent him the status report on fraud, but he's focused on the absentee voting angle. He knows you were a former elections official and have first hand experience with this issue. The interview would last about 15 min. Newhouse owns about 25 newspapers scattered throughout the nation. Please let me know if you can accomodate him. If so, we are to call him at 202-383-7801.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Attached is a draft letter from Julie to Mr. Reynolds of the Comm. on Civ Rights. It contains the same language as the other letters we have sent. Please let me know if you would like for me to use your e-signature and get it faxed to them this afternoon.

Amie J. Sherrill  
Special Assistant to Chairman Paul S. DeGregorio  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York NW - Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566 3106  

--- Forwarded by Amie J. Sherrill/EAC/GOV on 10/20/2006 04:23 PM ---

DeAnna M. Smith/EAC/GOV  
10/20/2006 04:02 PM  
To Amie J. Sherrill/EAC/GOV@EAC  
cc

Subject Letter to Mr. Reynolds Re: Voter Fraud Report

draft letter to Mr Reynolds.doc

DeAnna M. Smith  
Paralegal Specialist  
Office of the General Counsel  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
202-566-3117 (phone)  
202-566-1392 (fax)  
www.eac.gov
October 20, 2006

Gerald A Reynolds  
Chairman, United States Commission on Civil Rights  
624 9th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20425

RE: October 19, 2006 Letter

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

Your letter of October 19, 2006 requests the release of EAC's Voter Fraud and Intimidation Report. I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the purpose and status of this study.

In late 2005, EAC hired two consultants for the purpose of assisting EAC with two things: 1) developing a uniform definition of the phrase voter fraud, and 2) making recommendations on how to further study the existence, prosecution, and means of deterring such voter fraud. In May 2006, a status report on this study was given to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors during their public meetings. During the same week, a working group convened to react to and provide comment on the progress and potential conclusions that could be reached from the work of the two consultants.

The conversation at the working group meeting was lively on the very points that we were trying to accomplish as a part of this study, namely what is voter fraud and how do we pursue studying it. Many of the proposed conclusions that were suggested by the consultants were challenged by the working group members. As such, the consultants were tasked with reviewing the concerns expressed at the working group meeting, conducting additional research as necessary, and providing a draft report to EAC that took into account the working group's concerns and issues.

That draft report is currently being vetted by EAC staff. EAC will release a final report from this study after it has conducted a review of the draft provided by the consultants. However, it is important to remember the purpose of this study — finding a uniform definition of voter fraud and making recommendations on how to study the existence, prosecution and deterrence of voter fraud -- as it will serve as the basis of the EAC report on this study.

Thank you for your letter. You can be assured that as soon as a final report on the fraud and intimidation study is available, a copy will be made available to the public.

Sincerely,

Paul S. DeGregorio  
Chairman
He called regarding the voter fraud and intimidation report. He may be reached at (816) 556-2789.

Amie J. Sherrill  
Special Assistant to Chairman Paul S. DeGregorio  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York NW - Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566 3106
Dear Mr. Chairman:

The last submission from the Vote Fraud-Voter Intimidation Study consultants is dated August 8. At this time, EAC staff are reviewing all items submitted for the report to the Commission with an eye toward the best way of presenting the information to the Commissioners for their consideration. There has been some delay in this staff review process, for which I take full responsibility.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
No big deal--and no big delay. Don't worry about it.

Paul DeGregorio
Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The last submission from the Vote Fraud-Voter Intimidation Study consultants is dated August 8. At this time, EAC staff are reviewing all items submitted for the report to the Commission with an eye toward the best way of presenting the information to the Commissioners for their consideration. There has been some delay in this staff review process, for which I take full responsibility.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
Commissioners,

I wanted to make sure that you were aware of this request. Information that has previously been distributed to the Board of Advisors and Standards Board or otherwise publicly released will be provided to the requestor. This includes a status report on voter fraud and the information that was distributed to the SB and BOA regarding the provisional voting study.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

All

Richard Wolf of USA Today called and asked for the following. Jeannie and I ask that you consider this carefully and let us know ASAP what to provide.

(1) The status report on voter fraud and consultant update that was presented to the advisory boards in May, 2006.

(2) The status of the required guidance document on provisional voting and voter ID that is referenced in the following passage in today's Electionline Weekly by Doug Chapin.

In addition to the EAC's considerable election management responsibilities (especially in the area of voting equipment certification and testing), the agency has key policy issues to resolve in the immediate to near-term future, including a required guidance document on provisional voting and voter ID (now nearly two years overdue) and continued regulatory oversight over state implementation of "motor voter". This latter issue will almost certainly involve questions about the intersection of state and federal laws on voter registration - questions which divided the Commission when applied to Arizona, and could divide it again as Republicans and Democrats continue their traditional struggle to balance access to the franchise with concerns about the potential for fraud at the polls.

Thanks,
Bryan
Commissioners,

As you requested, I provided Tom and Julie a draft response to USA Today to accompany the docs requested by Richard Wolf. Julie revised it as follows and Tom agrees. Please let me know ASAP if you concur.

Rich,

As we discussed, here are the docs you asked about that were presented at the board meetings in May and links to the meeting agenda. There are two reports: (1) a draft report produced by Eagleton Institute concerning provisional voting; and (2) a status report produced by EAC contractors regarding research being conducted on voter fraud and intimidation. The reports were presented by the contractors to the Standards Board and Board of Advisors for their input. This type of input is required for any guidance issued by EAC and is desired for any product that we provide to the election community and the public. Based on the input that was received from these boards, particularly regarding the questionable information contained in Eagleton's provisional voting report, EAC has not issued the Eagleton draft report as a final EAC document. As for the voter fraud and intimidation status report, it is merely an update on the status of the research conducted by the EAC contractors. A report and recommendations on future actions regarding this topic will be produced after EAC review of the preliminary research.

###
Commissioners-

Attached please find a first draft of a short job description outlining EAC's expectations for a project consultant on voter fraud.

As you are aware, Julie has shared with me the resume of someone with an interest in the position. Ray has indicated that he participates in a legal list-serve group that has recently focused on voter fraud issues. This list-serve is probably a good place to "advertise" the consultant opportunity.

Let me know you thoughts on next steps. I look forward to getting this project up and running.

Regards-

K
Job Description

U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voter Fraud Project Consultant

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) seeks to identify a senior-level project consultant to assist with the oversight and development of a study and possible project examining U.S. election voter fraud.

The consultant must of have a knowledge of voter fraud and an understanding of the complexities, nuances and challenges which surround the topic. The EAC is particularly interested in candidates with experience in elections, with public policy and the law. The consultant must be able to demonstrate an ability to approach the issue of voter fraud in a balanced, nonpartisan fashion.

This consultant, whose contract would run for the period June-November, 2005, would be responsible for conceptualizing a project scope of work around the issue and from that, developing a statement of work for a research project around the topic.

In consultation with EAC staff, EAC Commissioners, and other key EAC stakeholders, the consultant will develop a project plan around voter fraud. The consultant will recommend certain EAC project activities related to voter fraud and will develop a scope of work for an EAC research study on voter fraud. The consultant will oversee and manage various processes related to EAC contracts awarded for work related to voter fraud.

EAC's consultant fees are competitive and are awarded based on the candidates' relevant background and experience.
Subject Project documents for your consideration

Paul-

Enclosed please find my revisions to the job description for the Voter Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project Consultant who would work with us to help us define our work around these issues. Please revise/edit and you see fit.

Also enclosed is a draft Statement of Work for EAC project work related to vote counts and vote recounts. I’m hoping that you will be willing to serve as lead Commissioner on this project, since I believe this is an area you have expressed an interest in and are concerned about.

Let me know your thoughts on these documents and how you would like me to proceed.

Hope the weekend was restful, and look forward to seeing you tomorrow.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Vote Count and Recount SOW.doc voterfraud project manager.doc
Hi-

I've scheduled a meeting with Craig DonSanto for Tuesday, May 17th at 10:00 am in his offices.

We'll be discussing voter fraud and what the EAC might do regarding research on the issue. As you may know, Craig's office is issuing a major report/manual on the topic. He will share the draft of this effort with us at the meeting next week.

As you know, I'm hoping one of our interns will be working on this project for us this summer. In the meantime, I'm hoping at least one of the folks from the EAC legal team can come tho this meeting. BTW, Craig's office is just down the street.

Let me know your availability, and which intern you can assign to this effort.

Thanks

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Job Description
U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voter Fraud and Voter Intimidation
Project Consultant

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) seeks to identify a senior-level project consultant to develop various project activities and studies related to U.S. election voter fraud and voter intimidation.

The consultant must have knowledge of voter fraud and intimidation along with an understanding of the complexities, nuances and challenges which surround the topics. The EAC is particularly interested in candidates with experience in elections, with public policy and the law. The consultant must be able to demonstrate an ability to approach the issues of voter fraud and intimidation in a balanced, nonpartisan fashion.

This consultant, whose contract would run for the period June-November, 2005, would be responsible for:

- Identifying and convening a working group of key individuals and organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voter fraud and intimidation;
- Developing a project scope of work and a project work plan related to voter fraud and intimidation;
- Authoring a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voter fraud and intimidation. The report will also include suggestions for specific activities the EAC may undertake around these topics.

From this initial research and exploration of these topics the consultant may be retained to help oversee research projects and contracts EAC may develop on the topics of voter fraud and intimidation.

EAC’s consultant fees are competitive and are awarded based on the candidate’s relevant background and experience.
Commissioners,

Below is a draft of a press release Eagleton wants to distribute regarding the EAC contract. (It's also attached.) Please let me know if you have edits/changes. Also, take a close look at the language regarding the scope for the voter ID study to make sure it is acceptable.

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL

EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS WINS $560,000 CONTRACT FROM U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Rutgers Institute to Study Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Procedures

NEW BRUNSWICK/PISCATAWAY, N.J. – The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has awarded the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, a $560,000 contract to study provisional voting and voter identification procedures based on experiences from the 2004 election.

Under the national contract, the institute will develop recommendations for EAC to issue as guidance to the states to use in 2006, according to Eagleton Director Ruth B. Mandel, the study’s principal investigator. She added that the Moritz College of Law at Ohio State University, Eagleton’s partner in the contract application, will be responsible for the legal analysis of the competitively bid, seven-month project.

Eagleton already is home to an extensive civic education and political participation program, with several projects aimed at increasing voter turnout, political participation and Americans’ involvement in civic life.

EAC was established by the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002. It is an independent, bipartisan agency and provides federal funds to states to upgrade voting systems and improve election administration. It publishes voluntary guidelines for the states and serves as a national clearinghouse of information regarding election administration.

The Eagleton project team, led by Mandel, includes Ingrid W. Reed, John Weingart and consultant Thomas O’Neill, retired president of the Partnership for New Jersey, who will serve as project director. The project will address key questions related to provisional voting and voter identification in the context of effective election administration, voter access and ballot security.

Questions include:

- Did the states have in place clear and uniform written procedures, guidelines and instructions to govern the casting and counting of provisional ballots?
• Did local procedures reflect the state’s uniform procedures?
• Did all states and election jurisdictions make these procedures available to the public, political parties and candidates before the election?

• To what extent were poll workers appropriately trained on how to administer provisional ballots, including establishing the identity of the potential voter seeking a provisional ballot?

• How were federal funds under the Help America Vote Act used to educate voters about their rights to cast a provisional ballot and where such provisional ballots must be cast to be counted?

• In states where a provisional ballot had to be cast at the voter’s assigned polling place or precinct, was information available to poll workers to allow them to determine the voter’s assigned precinct and polling place?

• Did states have mechanisms in place to inform voters casting provisional ballots whether their vote was counted and whether they are now registered for subsequent elections?

Eagleton will address these questions by examining the nation’s experience with provisional voting and voter identification requirements and practices in 2004 through extensive research including a survey of local election officials across the country. In addition, the work will be informed by scrutiny from a panel of peer reviewers as well as by comments offered at public hearings to be held in conjunction with the project.

At the contract’s conclusion, the team will present a narrative on both topics, indexed databases of major articles on provisional voting and voter identification requirements, summaries of case law on each subject, analyses of provisional voting procedures from around the country and of voter participation and vote fraud under various voter ID requirements, and a report of alternatives to existing practices and procedures.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100

www.eac.gov Eagleton release.doc
June 13, 2005

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL

EDITOR’S NOTE: ATTENTION POLITICAL, ASSIGNMENT EDITORS

EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICSWins $560,000 CONTRACT FROM U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Rutgers Institute to Study Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Procedures

NEW BRUNSWICK/PISCATAWAY, N.J. – The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has awarded the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, a $560,000 contract to study provisional voting and voter identification procedures based on experiences from the 2004 election.

Under the national contract, the institute will develop recommendations for EAC to issue as guidance to the states to use in 2006, according to Eagleton Director Ruth B. Mandel, the study’s principal investigator. She added that the Moritz College of Law at Ohio State University, Eagleton’s partner in the contract application, will be responsible for the legal analysis of the competitively bid, seven-month project.

Eagleton already is home to an extensive civic education and political participation program, with several projects aimed at increasing voter turnout, political participation and Americans’ involvement in civic life.

EAC was established by the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002. It is an independent, bipartisan agency and provides federal funds to states to upgrade voting systems and improve election administration. It publishes voluntary guidelines for the states and serves as a national clearinghouse of information regarding election administration.

The Eagleton project team, led by Mandel, includes Ingrid W. Reed, John Weingart and consultant Thomas O’Neill, retired president of the Partnership for New Jersey, who will serve as project director. The project will address key questions related to provisional voting and voter identification in the context of effective election administration, voter access and ballot security.

-more-
Questions include:

- Did the states have in place clear and uniform written procedures, guidelines and instructions to govern the casting and counting of provisional ballots?

- Did local procedures reflect the state’s uniform procedures?

- Did all states and election jurisdictions make these procedures available to the public, political parties and candidates before the election?

- To what extent were poll workers appropriately trained on how to administer provisional ballots, including establishing the identity of the potential voter seeking a provisional ballot?

- How were federal funds under the Help America Vote Act used to educate voters about their rights to cast a provisional ballot and where such provisional ballots must be cast to be counted?

- In states where a provisional ballot had to be cast at the voter’s assigned polling place or precinct, was information available to poll workers to allow them to determine the voter’s assigned precinct and polling place?

- Did states have mechanisms in place to inform voters casting provisional ballots whether their vote was counted and whether they are now registered for subsequent elections?

Eagleton will address these questions by examining the nation’s experience with provisional voting and voter identification requirements and practices in 2004 through extensive research including a survey of local election officials across the country. In addition, the work will be informed by scrutiny from a panel of peer reviewers as well as by comments offered at public hearings to be held in conjunction with the project.

At the contract’s conclusion, the team will present a narrative on both topics, indexed databases of major articles on provisional voting and voter identification requirements, summaries of case law on each subject, analyses of provisional voting procedures from around the country and of voter participation and vote fraud under various voter ID requirements, and a report of alternatives to existing practices and procedures.
Made essentially the same comment to Jeannie regarding the guidance language in paragraph two. We had no input to the creation of this release, so there is no EAC intent to use this as a trial balloon.

Carol A. Paquette  
Interim Executive Director  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
(202)566-3125  
cpaquette@eac.gov  
Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV

I have some concerns about the press release. In paragraph two, I am not comfortable with the following language in what I believe is paragraph two: Under the national contract, the institute will develop recommendations for EAC to issue as guidance to the states to use in 2006.

It seems to me that EAC will develop the guidance based on Eagleton’s findings.

Also, I do not think the press release should contain the list of questions. Are they/we trying to float a trial balloon and elicit initial reaction at this early stage of the study??

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS WINS $560,000 CONTRACT FROM U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

NEW BRUNSWICK/PISCATAWAY, N.J. – The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has awarded the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, a $560,000 contract to study provisional voting and voter identification procedures based on experiences from the 2004 election.

Under the national contract, the institute will develop recommendations for EAC to issue as guidance to the states to use in 2006, according to Eagleton Director Ruth B. Mandel, the study’s principal investigator. She added that the Moritz College of Law at Ohio State University, Eagleton’s partner in the contract application, will be responsible for the legal analysis of the competitively bid, seven-month project.

Eagleton already is home to an extensive civic education and political participation program, with several projects aimed at increasing voter turnout, political participation and Americans’ involvement in civic life.

EAC was established by the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002. It is an independent, bipartisan agency and provides federal funds to states to upgrade voting systems and improve election administration. It publishes voluntary guidelines for the states and serves as a national clearinghouse of information regarding election administration.

The Eagleton project team, led by Mandel, includes Ingrid W. Reed, John Weingart and consultant Thomas O’Neill, retired president of the Partnership for New Jersey, who will serve as project director. The project will address key questions related to provisional voting and voter identification in the context of effective election administration, voter access and ballot security.

Questions include:

- Did the states have in place clear and uniform written procedures, guidelines and instructions to govern the casting and counting of provisional ballots?
- Did local procedures reflect the state’s uniform procedures?
- Did all states and election jurisdictions make these procedures available to the public, political parties and candidates before the election?
- To what extent were poll workers appropriately trained on how to administer provisional ballots, including establishing the identity of the potential voter seeking a provisional ballot?
- How were federal funds under the Help America Vote Act used to educate voters about
their rights to cast a provisional ballot and where such provisional ballots must be cast to be counted?

- In states where a provisional ballot had to be cast at the voter’s assigned polling place or precinct, was information available to poll workers to allow them to determine the voter’s assigned precinct and polling place?

- Did states have mechanisms in place to inform voters casting provisional ballots whether their vote was counted and whether they are now registered for subsequent elections?

Eagleton will address these questions by examining the nation’s experience with provisional voting and voter identification requirements and practices in 2004 through extensive research including a survey of local election officials across the country. In addition, the work will be informed by scrutiny from a panel of peer reviewers as well as by comments offered at public hearings to be held in conjunction with the project. At the contract’s conclusion, the team will present a narrative on both topics, indexed databases of major articles on provisional voting and voter identification requirements, summaries of case law on each subject, analyses of provisional voting procedures from around the country and of voter participation and vote fraud under various voter ID requirements, and a report of alternatives to existing practices and procedures.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Following is the Eagleton press release including revisions from the chair and Carol. If anyone else has changes or edits, please let me know by tomorrow morning so Eagleton can get this out. Thank you.

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL

EDITOR’S NOTE: ATTENTION POLITICAL, ASSIGNMENT EDITORS

EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS WINS $560,000 CONTRACT FROM U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Rutgers Institute to Study Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Procedures

NEW BRUNSWICK/PISCATAWAY, N.J. – The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has awarded the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, a $560,000 contract to study provisional voting and voter identification procedures based on experiences from the 2004 election.

Under the national contract, the institute will develop recommendations for EAC to consider in the development of its guidance to the states for the 2006 elections, according to Eagleton Director Ruth B. Mandel, the study’s principal investigator. She added that the Moritz College of Law at Ohio State University, Eagleton’s partner in the contract application, will be responsible for the legal analysis of the competitively bid, seven-month project.

Eagleton already is home to an extensive civic education and political participation program, with several projects aimed at increasing voter turnout, political participation and Americans’ involvement in civic life.

EAC was established by the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002. It is an independent, bipartisan agency and provides federal funds to states to upgrade voting systems and improve election administration. It publishes voluntary guidelines for the states and serves as a national clearinghouse of information regarding election administration.

The Eagleton project team, led by Mandel, includes Ingrid W. Reed, John Weingart and consultant Thomas O’Neill, retired president of the Partnership for New Jersey, who will serve as project director. The project will address key questions related to provisional voting and voter identification in the context of effective election administration, voter access and ballot security. Eagleton will examine the nation’s experience with provisional voting and voter identification requirements and practices in 2004 through extensive research including a survey of local...
election officials across the country. In addition, the work will be informed by scrutiny from a panel of peer reviewers as well as by comments offered at public hearings to be held in conjunction with the project.

At the contract's conclusion, the team will present a narrative on both topics, indexed databases of major articles on provisional voting and voter identification requirements, summaries of case law on each subject, analyses of provisional voting procedures from around the country and of voter participation and vote fraud under various voter ID requirements, and a report of potential alternatives to existing practices and procedures.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Commissioners-

Enclosed please find a preliminary list of Peer Review Group members, whom Eagleton is considering for their Peer Review Group. Tom Wilkey will be bringing this item to you for discussion and input at Monday's Commissioner's meeting.

Eagleton envisions this Peer Review Group as the body that will review the draft analysis that it will prepare on provisional voting and on voter identification. The Group would also provide comment on the development of alternative approaches to provisional voting and voter identification which Eagleton will develop for the EAC.

I have included the e-mail from the Eagleton Project Director, Tom O'Neil, so that you could get a feel for his approach/philosophy to assembling the Group.

Regards-

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/23/2005 02:25 PM -----
academia or related fields. We have a conference call with our partners at Moritz planned for tomorrow or Friday to decide a) if former officials should be included in the PRG and b) if so, who they should be. I'll keep you informed of our thinking as it develops.

Tom
PROPOSED MEMBERS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology
rma@hss.caltech.edu
626-395-4422
Alvarez has taught political science at Caltech since 1992. He received his B.A. in political science from Carleton College; his M.A. and Ph.D. from Duke University. Alvarez focuses on the study of electoral politics. He has published many articles on electoral behavior and public opinion. Support for his research has come from the National Science Foundation, The IBM Corporation, the Carnegie Corporation, of New York, and the Knight Foundation. Alvarez edits the Analytical Methods for Social Research book series and is on the editorial boards of a number of academic journals. He is Co-Director of the Caltech-MIT Voting Technology Project.

Deborah Goldberg, Ph.D
Program Director, Democracy Program
Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law
161 Avenue Of The Americas, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10013
212-998-6730
Goldberg supervises the Democracy Program’s litigation, scholarship, and public education. She was the principal author of Writing Reform: A Guide to Drafting State & Local Campaign Finance Laws, and was lead counsel to the intervenor in the Supreme Court case Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Government PAC. She serves on the Steering Committee of a coalition to restore voting rights to persons with past felony convictions. Goldberg is a graduate of Harvard Law School. Before joining the Brennan Center, she was in private practice. She holds a Ph.D. in philosophy and taught ethics at Columbia University.

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu
Kropf has been on the faculty at Missouri since 1999. She received her BA Summa Cum Laude, Phi Beta Kappa from Kansas State University and her PhD in Political Science from American University. Her work concentrates on Research Methods, Urban Politics, American Government, and Political Behavior. Before joining the faculty at Missouri, she was Project Coordinator at the University of Maryland Survey Research Center. She has published recent on undervoting in presidential elections, and on invalidated ballots in the 1996 presidential election, and on the incremental process of election reform in Missouri.

Wade Henderson, Esq.
Executive Director
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
1629 K Street, NW, 10th Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Wade Henderson is the Executive Director of the LCCR and Counsel to the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund (LCCREF), and leads the organizations' work on issues involving nationwide election reform. He is a graduate of Howard University and the Rutgers University School of Law. During its over 50 years of existence, LCCR has worked to redefine civil rights issues in broad and inclusive ways. Today, it includes over 180 national organizations. Previously Henderson served as Washington Bureau Director of the NAACP. He began his career as a legislative counsel of the ACLU.

Kay Maxwell
President
League of Women Voters of the U.S.
1730 M Street NW, Suite 1000
Kay J. Maxwell has been a member of the League since 1976. She attended Smith College and earned a B.A. in International Relations from the University of Pennsylvania. She has conducted civic participation training for women leaders in Bosnia, Israel, the West Bank, Rwanda, Kuwait and Jamaica. She has also served as vice president at the International Executive Service Corps (IESC), an international economic development organization. She is a board member of DC Vote, and the New Voters Project.

Tim Storey
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures
7700 East First Place
Denver, CO 80230
303-364-7700
or
444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-5400

Peter G. Veniero, Esq.
Counsel
Sills, Cummins, Epstein and Gross, PC
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, New Jersey 07102
Tel: 973-643-7000
Verniero chairs the firm’s Appellate Practice Group. He earned his B.A. at Drew University, Phi Beta Kappa, and his J.D. (with honors) at the Duke University School of Law. In 1999, he was appointed a justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, where he served for 7 years before re-entering private practice. Before his appointment to the Supreme Court, he served as New Jersey’s Attorney General, and in that capacity oversaw the state’s election laws. He also served as Chief of Staff and Chief Counsel to Governor Christine Todd Whitman.
Job-

Thanks ever so much for following up. Indeed, the Commissioners have reviewed the issue and have agreed in principle, to an approach that would entail hiring a consultant or consultants to help the EAC study and frame the issues of voter fraud and intimidation.

The idea would be that after a period of time, the consultants, and, perhaps, a working group of the EAC, would make a series of recommendations on next steps for the agency to take regarding voter fraud and intimidation.

Thanks for your patience; I hope to have a definitive answer for you by mid-July at the latest.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Job-

I write to see if you might be available to come to Washington on Monday, August 1 to meet with several EAC staff and Commissioners to discuss the voter fraud/voter intimidation project and your possible work as a consultant on the project.

I'd like to schedule this 1-2 hour meeting for sometime between 1 and 3 in the afternoon.

Might you be available to come to Washington for this?

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Tom-

I will be in touch shortly with possible dates in very late August or early September, when EAC staff might be available to meet with Eagleton to discuss the project's research results and next steps.

In the meantime, I thought it was important to follow up on the issues Vice Chair DeGregorio raised while we were in Pasadena.

To be certain that I have the latest information, could you send to me the final list of the Eagleton/Moritz Peer Review Group and the list of organizations that Eagleton will be contacting for input?

Regards-

Karen

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Thanks for this list, Vice Chair. I've passed it along to Eagleton

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Commissioners-

As mentioned in this morning’s meeting, Eagleton/Moritz project staff are scheduled to come to Washington in early September to brief EAC staff on the project’s progress to date.

Let me know if you would like to attend or if you will send someone in your place.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

--- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 08/15/2005 01:34 PM ---
Dear Commissioners:

At the meeting of the Board of Advisors in Portland, Oregon, our notebooks included an EAC Information Research Update, dated July 18, 2005. The Update indicates that the EAC has awarded a contract to the Eagleton Institute / Moritz College of Law ("Moritz") to conduct research into "Provisional Voting / ID Requirements."

Obviously, the duty of the EAC as outlined in Section 241 to conduct research on election issues is a very important one. That is why it is clearly an absolute necessity that the researchers who are awarded contracts to conduct that research be objective and nonpartisan in their work. It would be inappropriate and potentially very damaging and embarrassing to the EAC (and the Board of Advisors) if this research is conducted by entities that have a preconceived opinion or bias on the issue being researched or are, in fact, advocates on the issue. Any findings or recommendations such biased entities put in their final report would be open to question and could cause great harm.

Unfortunately, hiring the faculty at Moritz to conduct research on provisional balloting and voter identification provisions calls into question whether the research can be conducted in an objective manner and reach conclusions that are not pre-determined by the public and pre-existing views of the researchers. This is crystal clear from an easily-conducted review of the Moritz website.

The Associate Director of the Election Law program at Moritz, Daniel Tokaji, is an outspoken opponent of voter identification requirements and commentator on provisional voting. Here is a brief summary of some of his recent comments, taken from the Moritz website:

It's therefore questionable at best whether an ID requirement is really necessary to combat voting fraud. Supporters of the ID requirement have yet to make a convincing case that existing methods of discouraging and punishing fraud are insufficient. While the anti-fraud benefits of stricter ID laws are dubious, there is evidence that an ID requirement would impose a severe burden on many voters, particularly those of low income....In their present form, the ID bills presently on the table are likely unconstitutional.... (ID and the Right to Vote, April 12, 2005)

"Ohio's election reform is a mixed bag. Establishing a clear rule for provisional ballots is a good idea, but I don't think there's a good reason for refusing to count provisional ballots cast out of precinct, given that a statewide registration database (which should allow for easy verification of eligibility) has to be in place by 2006. It would be much better to move to in-precinct early voting than mail-in absentee voting, but it seems that Ohio doesn't want to spend the money." (Reform Comes to Ohio, May 20, 2005).

*Nevertheless, DOJ seems likely to sign off on this [Arizona's proposition 200
implementing rules], given that they've take the position - quite clearly an erroneous one, in my view - that voters need not even be given a provisional ballot if they lack ID.* (Arizona Voter ID, July 18, 2005).

"It remains to be seen, of course, whether DOJ will rigorously enforce Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, when it comes to practices - like the Georgia ID law - that threaten to result in the denial of minority votes...." (Preclearance, Preclearance, Preclearance, July 20, 2005).

"...I tend to doubt that the preclearance process will prove to be an effective remedy for measures like the Georgia ID law. Even though this law will have a "retrogressive" effect, by serving as a barrier to minority voters' participation...." (The Voting Rights Act, Then and Now, July 31, 2005)

"We should remember that, at the turn of the 20th Century, allegations of "good government" were used by white Democrats in a remarkably successful strategy to suppress the black vote. The result of those very successful efforts was to impose barriers like the literacy test, which excluded African Americans from voting throughout the South for the better part of the century, until after the Voting Rights Act of 1965. If you go back and read some of the documents from the late 1800's and early 1900's, as I've recently been doing, the similarity to the sort of arguments being advanced now in support of photo ID laws is frightening. It is beyond unfortunate to see the same sort of tactics, albeit dressed up in more respectable garb, being employed at the start of the 21st Century." (Vote Suppression, Fraud and Voter ID, August 3, 2005)

In addition to these postings, Dr. Tokaji is acting as an advocate on voter identification issues, having submitted a comment letter to the Department of Justice dated August 18, 2005, along with a number of other professors, urging an objection to a voter identification provision currently before the Department for review under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Obviously, this advocacy is occurring after the EAC awarded this contract and during the pendancy of the research work.

The issue here is not whether Dr. Tokaji's opinions are correct or incorrect, or the appropriateness of his submitting a comment letter to the Department of Justice. The point is the strongly held, pre-existing notions about both provisional balloting and voter identification espoused by the Associate Director of Moritz's election law program and his advocacy on these issues. This raises serious concerns about the propriety of Moritz being provided with federal tax dollars to conduct non-partisan and impartial research into such a sensitive and high profile area of election law. We cannot be certain that data collected and conclusions reached by this research project will not be predetermined to comport with the views of Moritz's officials.

I would strongly recommend that this contract be reconsidered by the EAC. Under these circumstances, any report issued by Moritz will be open to serious questions as to its validity and objectivity.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530
Telephone (202) 305-9750
Facsimile (202) 307-2839
Hans:

I'm currently at the Seattle airport awaiting a return flight to D.C., so I apologize if my response below is somewhat incomplete. I think the issue you raise certainly deserves our full consideration, so I will look forward to additional responses and dialogue from others included in this distribution list.

A couple of quick points in response to your concerns (and I am speaking for myself below, and not for the entire commission):

(1) The RFP that was issued by the EAC pertaining to the research on provisional voting and voter ID requirements was widely advertised (as all our RFP's are). We did so because we wanted to receive a wide range of possible contractors to conduct this important research. This was a competitive RFP process which, if my memory serves me correct, produced a good number of responses from interested entities.

(2) Carol Paquette assembled a review panel (I'm not sure how many persons were involved in the review panel) to score the responses to this RFP...the submission by the Eagleton Institute included, as a part of their proposal, the Moritz School of Law at Ohio State University as a partner in conducting the legal research required for Eagleton to provide a final report (due in October) to the EAC. The review panel scored the Eagleton submission as best, considering a variety of factors.

(3) The lead entity in this project is the Eagleton Institute. While the project manager's name from Eagleton escapes me right now, the lead from Moritz is not Dan Tokagi, but Ned Foley, who directs the election law section (or something to that effect) at Moritz. Certainly it is true that Professor Tokagi is contributing to the work product being assemble by Moritz, which consists primarily of reviewing election and administrative codes from all 50 states to ascertain how each state deals with provisional voting and voter ID requirements.

(4) As is the case with all federal contractors, both Eagleton Institute and Moritz are contractually obligated to produce objective, sound and unbiased research and analysis on this project. While it is certainly prudent to consider the potential bias of any prospective contractor(s), after receiving the recommendation from the review panel and Carol Paquette (at the time, the acting EAC Executive Director), we unanimously agreed among the commissioners that the recommendation was worthy of support. At the time, we were aware, for example, that the Eagleton Institute had been involved last year in some litigation involving provisional ballots. We were also aware, as you point out, of Professor Tokagi's personal views regarding the issue of voter ID and provisional voting. Nevertheless, there was unanimous agreement in supporting the staff (and review panel) recommendation to move forward with the proposal submitted by Eagleton Institute.

(5) Finally, to ensure that the final workproduct from both Eagleton and Moritz is objective and representative of all view points on these important issues, Eagleton proposed early in the process -- and we enthusiastically agreed -- to the formation of a balanced peer review panel which will review the work, on an on-going basis, of Eagleton and Moritz. All EAC commissioners have had an opportunity to provide names to Eagleton to ensure appropriate political balance on this peer review panel and Eagleton has been responsive to our various suggestions.
By way of summary, let me say that I believe we have an obligation to closely scrutinize the conduct of all of our federal contractors. If things come to light that bring into question the objectivity of any of our contractors, I believe the EAC ought to conduct its due diligence and deal with such matters accordingly, including the possibility of contract termination.

I would be happy to conduct such due diligence with regard to this particular contract. However, I must say, with all due respect, that I do not think any breach has occurred, either by Eagleton or Moritz, which would necessitate termination of this contract. I think appropriate checks and balances have been accounted for in this contract, and I believe these checks and balances will ensure an objective and sound final product from Eagleton.

I welcome your continued feedback, Hans.

Kindest regards,

RAY MARTINEZ III
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 566-3100 (W)
(202) 566-3127 (FAX)
www.eac.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message and all attachments, if any, are intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete it from your computer.
In his note regarding the Eagleton contract, Hans has raised some of the same concerns I raised from the beginning of any discussions I had regarding this contract with our staff, and at our first formal meeting with Eagleton. In reviewing their work product from time to time, I continue to have concerns about a lack of balanced input and have repeatedly voiced them with staff and with Eagleton. I did this when the initial peer review group was proposed and again during their presentation at our meeting in Pasadena (the outreach slide in their public presentation showed outreach to seven groups, of which only one could be considered conservative-leaning). Now, as I have just had the opportunity to read their July progress report, it appears that Eagleton seems to be going into a larger analysis of the voter fraud issue than was authorized in the contract. My suspicion is that Dan Tokaji is injecting his views into this to dismiss or diminish the concerns some people may have about voter fraud. I could be wrong, but his previous writings lead me to believe otherwise.

I only found one mention of voter fraud in the contract with Eagleton. It is in Section 3.5 regarding provisional voting, where it discusses "minimizing opportunity for voter fraud." Yet, on page 4 of the July progress report from Eagleton, in describing their work plan for the next month it states: "we will expand upon vote fraud research and examine further the relationship between instances of vote fraud and ensuing election reforms." This clearly seems to be going beyond the mandate we gave them as I thought they were going to be looking at voter fraud relating to provisional voting (as the contract calls for), not voter fraud as it relates to election reforms. While voter fraud was never mentioned in the contract regarding the voter ID issue, page 5 of their July report indicates that their narratives "will include an appraisal of the prevalence and nature of vote fraud." In addition to this, page 6 describes a look into the "relationship between voter ID regime and vote fraud."

Voter fraud is clearly an issue that is perceived differently from the Right and from the Left. I have struggled with determining what a clear definition of voter fraud is myself, and therefore want to obtain various perspectives and good analysis on this issue before I formulate a solid conclusion in my mind. It has been my understanding all along that the whole voter fraud/voter intimidation issue is going to studied by the EAC using a balanced group of consultants—not Eagleton and Moritz, who are likely to focus on just the number of prosecutions of voter fraud, rather than the complaints made or the fact that many election officials are frustrated that some prosecutors don't take their complaints about voter fraud seriously. I am not convinced at this point that we will get a balanced and objective study from Eagleton/Moritz on voter fraud. I am puzzled on why they seem to be expending a significant portion of their time on this and would want to know if we somehow authorized them to do more research into the voter fraud issue.

On page 7 of their July report Eagleton indicates that communications with the EAC on the Peer Review Group "were not clear or timely." I would like to know what this refers to. Also, I may have missed it, but I do not recall seeing the final list of who is serving as the Peer Review group.

The August 15th copy of the July report that I received from Karen did not include the attachment of the financial report of expenses incurred. I would like to see that attachment.

Outside of our NIST work, this contract represents our largest single outside expenditure of our operational funds. Any single expenditure of $500,000+ needs to be closely monitored. I, for one, am not going to sign off on any report that appears to have been written from a biased viewpoint, especially one that doesn’t appear to be interested in hearing from conservative organizations or right-leaning researchers, or seems to minimize any input from them. I've already had questions from congressional staff and others on why we picked Eagleton and Moritz, as they are perceived by some as biased against...
Republicans. I assured the critics that we have insisted all along on an objective study from Eagleton. An unbalanced or biased study from them will not only hurt my credibility, but also that of the EAC. I'm not suggesting that we stop their work, but I do want Tom and Julie to inform them in no uncertain terms that we will not accept a report that does not seriously consider all viewpoints on provisional voting and the voter ID issue, and that any study or interpretations they present to us reflect a diversity of opinions on these subjects. We also need for staff to determine whether their considerable work into the voter fraud area is authorized in the contract. We should not be paying for and receiving work we did not authorize.

The contract clearly calls for "alternative approaches" on voter ID requirements and "alternatives" on provisional voting. I agreed to support this contract to Eagleton because I was assured that we would receive a variety of approaches from their work, and not just those from a liberal perspective.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV  
08/19/2005 12:06 PM

To: Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc "Paul DeGregorio" <pdegregorio@eac.gov>, "Ray Martinez" <rmartinez@eac.gov>, "Karen Lynn-Dyson" <klynn-dyson@eac.gov>, Juliet E.

Subject: Fw: Eagleton

Tom: Please put this on the agenda for discussion when we get together on Friday in Denver.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Paul DeGregorio

In his note regarding the Eagleton contract, Hans has raised some of the same concerns I raised from the beginning of any discussions I had regarding this contract with our staff, and at our first formal meeting with Eagleton. In reviewing their work product from time to time, I continue to have concerns about a lack of balanced input and have repeatedly voiced them with staff and with Eagleton. I did this when the initial peer review group was proposed and again during their presentation at our meeting in Pasadena (the outreach slide in their public presentation showed outreach to seven groups, of which only one could be considered conservative-leaning). Now, as I have just had the opportunity to read their July progress report, it appears that Eagleton seems to be going into a larger analysis of the voter fraud issue than was authorized in the contract. My suspicion is that Dan Tokaji is injecting his views into this to dismiss or diminish the concerns some people may have about voter fraud. I could be wrong, but his previous writings lead me to believe otherwise.

I only found one mention of voter fraud in the contract with Eagleton. It is in Section 3.5 regarding provisional voting, where it discusses "minimizing opportunity for voter fraud." Yet, on page 4 of the July progress report from Eagleton, in describing their work plan for the next month it states: "we will expand upon vote fraud research and examine further the relationship between instances of vote fraud and ensuing election reforms." This clearly seems to be going beyond the mandate we gave them as I thought they were going to be looking at voter fraud relating to provisional voting (as the contract calls for), not voter fraud as it relates to election reforms. While voter fraud was never mentioned in the contract regarding the voter ID issue, page 5 of their July report indicates that their narratives "will include an appraisal of the prevalence and nature of vote fraud." In addition to this, page 6 describes a look into the "relationship between voter ID regime and vote fraud."

Voter fraud is clearly an issue that is perceived differently from the Right and from the Left. I have struggled with determining what a clear definition of voter fraud is myself, and therefore want to obtain various perspectives and good analysis on this issue before I formulate a solid conclusion in my mind. It has been my understanding all along that the whole voter fraud/voter intimidation issue is going to studied by the EAC using a balanced group of consultants—not Eagleton and Moritz, who are likely to focus on just on the number of prosecutions of voter fraud, rather than the complaints made or the fact that many election officials are frustrated that some prosecutors don't take their complaints about voter fraud seriously. I am not convinced at this point that we will get a balanced and objective study from Eagleton/Moritz on voter fraud. I am puzzled on why they seem to be expending a significant portion of their time on this and would want to know if we somehow authorized them to do more research into the voter fraud issue.

On page 7 of their July report Eagleton indicates that communications with the EAC on the Peer Review
Group "were not clear or timely." I would like to know what this refers to. Also, I may have missed it, but I do not recall seeing the final list of who is serving as the Peer Review group.

The August 15th copy of the July report that I received from Karen did not include the attachment of the financial report of expenses incurred. I would like to see that attachment.

Outside of our NIST work, this contract represents our largest single outside expenditure of our operational funds. Any single expenditure of $500,000+ needs to be closely monitored. I, for one, am not going to sign off on any report that appears to have been written from a biased viewpoint, especially one that doesn't appear to be interested in hearing from conservative organizations or right-leaning researchers, or seems to minimize any input from them. I've already had questions from congressional staff and others on why we picked Eagleton and Moritz, as they are perceived by some as biased against Republicans. I assured the critics that we have insisted all along on an objective study from Eagleton. An unbalanced or biased study from them will not only hurt my credibility, but also that of the EAC. I'm not suggesting that we stop their work, but I do want Tom and Julie to inform them in no uncertain terms that we will not accept a report that does not seriously consider all viewpoints on provisional voting and the voter ID issue, and that any study or interpretations they present to us reflect a diversity of opinions on these subjects. We also need for staff to determine whether their considerable work into the voter fraud area is authorized in the contract. We should not be paying for and receiving work we did not authorize.

The contract clearly calls for "alternative approaches" on voter ID requirements and "alternatives" on provisional voting. I agreed to support this contract to Eagleton because I was assured that we would receive a variety of approaches from their work, and not just those from a liberal perspective.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
Paul:

I am directing this email only to the commissioners, because I don't think we should air our disagreements among staff until we have at least had a chance to discuss controversial issues with each other in person. It appears from Gracia's email that we will have a chance to do so next week in Denver.

In the meantime, I feel compelled to respond to your email regarding Eagleton.

(1) As I stated last night in my email to Hans, we have an on-going responsibility to monitor the expenditure of all our federal funds, including to government contractors who are contractually obligated to deliver unbiased research. However, I will remind you that we did not contract with Eagleton merely to provide a compilation of state laws and procedures. Rather, we contracted with Eagleton (and indirectly with Moritz through Eagleton) to provide both research AND analysis of provisional voting and voter ID. Invariably, the analysis portion of their final product will be from a professional (and institutional) perspective, and will NOT represent any one researcher's personal point of view. If it does, then Eagleton and Moritz risk damaging their credibility not just with the EAC, but with other federal government agencies which undoubtedly contract with their respective institutions on other projects. I doubt seriously that either institution would risk such damage and allow one team member to inject bias into the work. Moreover, the peer review group that is (or has) been assembled by Eagleton is designed to cure any lingering concerns about potential institutional or personal bias...Eagleton has been responsive to your feedback on this issue, to the point where they have removed all perspective representatives of the advocacy community on the peer review group (because they felt they could not achieve political "balance" from the advocacy groups). If there is some person (or persons) which you would like to see Eagleton include in the review group, it is my understanding that such inclusion is but a mere phone call away.

(2) You will recall that at our meeting last week, I raised the exact same concern about the Eagleton progress report, and asked for clarification from staff regarding the details of this particular work (i.e., fraud) on the part of Eagleton. I expect staff (or us directly) to ask questions of Eagleton (as we would any contractor) and determine if their work in this area is within the scope of work (and contract) we all agreed to. If it isn't then we re-direct them, just as we have done, for example with Kim Brace and EDS.

(3) Finally, I must express my disappointment, Paul, regarding your comments on Professor Tokagi that you chose to include in your email. While I may disagree with Hans on his particular analysis of the perceived personal bias of this contract, at least his allegations regarding Professor Tokagi's potential bias are grounded in fact (and he recited them as such in his email). You, on the other hand, have chosen to accuse Professor Tokagi of manipulating the work on this project based on your "suspicion." With all due respect, that unfortunate accusation borders, in my view, on a breach of professional decorum and I cannot let it go without response.

We clearly have some political issues that are increasingly being injected into nearly every discussion at the EAC table. I have stated both to you and Gracia individually that I believe this trend in part represents a "maturation" of the EAC and I am not uncomfortable with it. However, if we are going to bring accusations of subjectivity and bias to the table, then I will expect that such a filter will be applied across the board to ALL projects undertaken by the EAC, and that such a filter will be based solidly on fact, and not on innuendo, personal hunches or suspicions.
I send this email, as always, with the highest degree of respect and friendship toward you. And yet, my disappointment is evident in your comments regarding an esteemed and respected member of the legal academic community (and someone whom I regard as a personal friend.)

I look forward to our continued discussion on this matter. And as for the substance of Hans' concern regarding Moritz, I stand by my email which I sent to everyone last night.

Regards,

RAY MARTINEZ III
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 566-3100 (W)
(202) 566-3127 (FAX)
www.eac.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message and all attachments, if any, are intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete it from your computer.
Tom-

Thank you for sharing this list of your Peer Review Group members, to-date. I will share this list with the Commissioners and will be certain to let your know of their feedback, if any.

I will also be back in touch regarding Eagleton’s research around voter fraud and the research project EAC will be undertaking, this fall, around voting fraud and voter intimidation. The EAC is presently in the process of finalizing a work and staff plan for this project and once it is completed, I will be certain to brief you on it.

In the meantime, EAC staff and several of the Commissioners looks forward to meeting with the Eagleton/Moritz team on September 6 at 1:30 PM.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Tom O'Neill"

Karen,

Attached is a report on the status of recruitment of members of the Peer Review Group. We extended 9 invitations. We have four confirmed members, one reluctant turn-down, one who has yet to respond to an initial inquiry, and are awaiting confirmation from 3 others who initially agreed. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Tom O'Neill
STATUS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP RECRUITMENT
(As of August 17, 2005)

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.  YES/CONFIRMED
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology

Guy-Uriel Charles  YES
Associate Professor, School of Law
University of Minnesota
612-626-9154

Brad Clark  NO
Professor of Law
George Washington University School of Law

Pamela Susan Karlan  YES
Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law
Stanford Law School
650-725-4851

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.  YES/CONFIRMED
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu

Daniel H. Lowenstein  YES
Professor of Law
UCLA
310-825-4841

John F. Manning  NO RESPONSE
Professor
Harvard Law School

Tim Storey  YES/CONFIRMED
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures

Peter G. Verniero, Esq.  YES/CONFIRMED
Counsel
Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
(Former NJ Attorney General and Supreme Court Justice)
Commissioner-

I thought you would find of particular interest, the attached short description that one of our consultants who will be working on the voting fraud, voter participation issues, has provided.

I think Job will be a wonderful addition to our group of consultants and will bring a wealth of practical knowledge and political balance to our review of the voting fraud and voter intimidation issue. Job is very, very excited about working on this topic and looks forward to meeting the EAC staff, when we bring them together for a meeting in early September.

Best-

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Summary of Election Activities of Job Serebrov

Background to Election Problems in Arkansas

Ever since Reconstruction, Arkansas has had a history of election problems. The election fraud that gave
rise to the Brooks-Baxter War in Arkansas in the 1870s involved people from both sides of the aisle voting more than once, the dead rising to cast a ballot or two, destroying ballots, creating ballots and making ballot boxes disappear. A strong one-party system perpetuated this tradition into modern times.

In 1995, I met with Arkansas Supreme Court Justice Tom Glaze to discuss voting issues and my efforts to clean up the electoral process. Although supportive, Justice Glaze encouraged me to proceed with caution. Before being elected to the Supreme Court, Justice Glaze had been employed in the 1960s by Gov. Win Rockefeller to clean up ballot fraud throughout Arkansas. He was nearly disbarred in the process by those involved in ballot fraud in a small, rural county.

Shortly after my discussion with Justice Glaze, I discovered how pervasive the election problems were in the state. For instance, ballot boxes were stuffed or disappeared into the night only to return altered. Contrary to state law, county sheriffs running in contested elections maintained custody of the ballot boxes. In one instance, 20 voted ballot boxes were found in the attic of a sheriff's deputy after he died.


In my private practice as an attorney, I represented numerous clients in county election contests throughout Arkansas. I also represented clients in matters before the Federal Election Commission. I have never lost an election case. Finally, I was hired as a consultant to a major nonprofit legal organization to review and summarize the 2002 amendments to federal election laws and apply the new law to 10 scenarios.

Member, Washington County Board of Election Commissioners, Fayetteville, Arkansas (1990-1996)

This board consisted of three commissioners; I was the lone Republican. We were charged with supervising the training of poll workers, evaluating voting systems and then purchasing an optical scan system to be used countywide, preparing and justifying our annual budget before the Washington County Quorum Court, hiring and supervising staff and sitting as an administrative tribunal.

When I first came on the board, Washington County was primarily a one-party county and the Democrats were used to running elections according to tradition rather than the law. I had to battle with the two Democrats on the board to enforce election laws within the county. As I started to force the issue in the courts, the Republican Party gained strength. Four years later and after outlasting eight Democrat commissioners, I was able to work with new Democrat
commissioners who recognized the need to enforce the law. At this point, the commission requested that I draft administrative regulations for the board. These remain in place today.

Founder, President, General Counsel; Arkansans for Fair Elections (1994-1999)

In 1994, Gov. Mike Huckabee (R), then a candidate for lieutenant governor, asked me to serve as his general counsel for ballot fraud protection. Thinking it best to act independently of any candidate, I formed Arkansans for Fair Elections. I served as the organization's president and, later, general counsel. This group launched a statewide educational campaign to train poll watchers to recognize irregular or fraudulent electoral procedures; this included the creation of literature and a video. Our extensive public relations campaign brought media attention to the issue. We also organized a statewide team of citizen poll watchers and attorneys to ensure that the election laws were fairly enforced. We were so successful in the lieutenant governor's race that Arkansans for Fair Elections was asked to continue the effort until 1999 when I moved to Louisiana.

General Counsel - Ballot Fraud Protection Committee, Republican Party of Arkansas (1995-1999)

In late 1995, Asa Hutchinson, chairman of the Republican Party of Arkansas, appointed me as general counsel for the newly formed Ballot Fraud Protection Committee of the state party. I retained this position until 1999. I was responsible for coordinating statewide enforcement efforts and directing a legal team to respond to problematic situations prior to and on election day.

(Through my role with Arkansans for Fair Elections and the Ballot Fraud Protection Committee, I successfully sued or negotiated a settlement in more than two-thirds of the 75 counties in Arkansas over electoral irregularities.)

Legal Consultant to Republican Members of the Arkansas General Assembly (1994-1996)

Republicans in the General Assembly requested that I review and draft suggested changes to Arkansas election law. Based on my personal experience as an election commissioner and as an election attorney, I identified a number of areas of concern and drafted new statutes modeled on the best examples that I could find from other states. My proposal was not passed by the Democrat-controlled General Assembly as a package, however, several of its components were passed into law.
Consultant to the Arkansas Court of Appeals

I drafted five redistricting bills and maps for the constitutionally required redistricting of the Arkansas Court of Appeals. These bills were based on current U.S. Supreme Court precedent regarding gerrymandering. I had to present each bill and give supporting testimony to the commission.

Director of International Development - Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana (2000-2003)

Part of my duties as director was to develop international cooperative projects. The theme of several of these proposals was democratization. In each case, I required review of the national election code of the country involved.

My activities in Namibia led to a request by the director of the Namibian Election Commission, Joram Rukambe and the Speaker of the Namibian National Assembly, Dr. Mose Tjitendero to review and suggest changes to the Namibian election code. This review took three months and resulted in proposed alterations a number of code sections. These suggestions were considered by the Namibian National Assembly and a number were incorporated into the code revisions. Additionally, I drafted legislation for the Speaker to guarantee voting rights to agricultural workers that were being denied by the owners of the farms. This legislation also was passed into law.

During this time, I was qualified as an election expert and placed on an election consultant list by the United Nations, IFES and the Electoral Institute of Southern Africa.

Related Memberships

- Republican Party of Arkansas (1990-1999)
- Benton County, Arkansas, Republican Committee (1996-1999)
- Washington County, Arkansas, Republican Committee (1990-1996)

(When we moved to Louisiana in 1999, the party was in such turmoil that is was difficult to get involved. This past year, I have been prohibited by the Hatch Act from participating in partisan politics. This prohibition ends August 19 when my judicial clerkship ends.)

Related Education

- Graduate certificate in electoral governance, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia (2003)
Yes I believe he will make a great addition to this project and will bring a wealth of experience on dealing with voter fraud. He even makes me look like a raving moderate.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 08/19/2005 04:38 PM
To: Paul DeGregorio
Subject: Fw: Requested Documents

Commissioner-

I thought you would find of particular interest, the attached short description that one of our consultants who will be working on the voting fraud, voter participation issues, has provided.

I think Job will be a wonderful addition to our group of consultants and will bring a wealth of practical knowledge and political balance to our review of the voting fraud and voter intimidation issue. Job is very, very excited about working on this topic and looks forward to meeting the EAC staff, when we bring them together for a meeting in early September.

Best-

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

--- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 08/18/2005 04:32 PM ---

"Job Sebranov"
To: klynndyson@eac.gov
cc
Subject: Re: Requested Documents

Karen:

I enjoyed the discussion too. I really think that this project will be of national importance and can positively affect elections administration while providing an answer to the handling of the vote fraud problem for the future.
Regards,

Job

Summary of Election Activities of Job Serebrov

Background to Election Problems in Arkansas

Ever since Reconstruction, Arkansas has had a history of election problems. The election fraud that gave rise to the Brooks-Baxter War in Arkansas in the 1870s involved people from both sides of the aisle voting more than once, the dead rising to cast a ballot or two, destroying ballots, creating ballots and making ballot boxes disappear. A strong one-party system perpetuated this tradition into modern times.

In 1995, I met with Arkansas Supreme Court Justice Tom Glaze to discuss voting issues and my efforts to clean up the electoral process. Although supportive, Justice Glaze encouraged me to proceed with caution. Before being elected to the Supreme Court, Justice Glaze had been employed in the 1960s by Gov. Win Rockefeller to clean up ballot fraud throughout Arkansas. He was nearly disbarred in the process by those involved in ballot fraud in a small, rural county.

Shortly after my discussion with Justice Glaze, I discovered how pervasive the election problems were in the state. For instance, ballot boxes were stuffed or disappeared into the night only to return altered. Contrary to state law, county sheriffs running in contested elections maintained custody of the ballot boxes. In one instance, 20 voted ballot boxes were found in the attic of a sheriff’s deputy after he died.


In my private practice as an attorney, I represented numerous clients in county election contests throughout Arkansas. I also represented clients in matters before the Federal Election Commission. I have never lost an election case. Finally, I was hired as a consultant to a major nonprofit legal organization to review and summarize the 2002 amendments to federal election laws and apply the new law to 10 scenarios.

Member, Washington County Board of Election Commissioners, Fayetteville, Arkansas (1990-1996)

This board consisted of three commissioners; I was the lone Republican. We were charged with supervising the training of poll workers, evaluating voting systems and then purchasing an optical scan system to be used countywide, preparing and justifying our annual budget.
before the Washington County Quorum Court, hiring and supervising staff and sitting as an administrative tribunal.

When I first came on the board, Washington County was primarily a one-party county and the Democrats were used to running elections according to tradition rather than the law. I had to battle with the two Democrats on the board to enforce election laws within the county. As I started to force the issue in the courts, the Republican Party gained strength. Four years later and after outlasting eight Democrat commissioners, I was able to work with new Democrat commissioners who recognized the need to enforce the law. At this point, the commission requested that I draft administrative regulations for the board. These remain in place today.

Founder, President, General Counsel; Arkansans for Fair Elections (1994-1999)

In 1994, Gov. Mike Huckabee (R), then a candidate for lieutenant governor, asked me to serve as his general counsel for ballot fraud protection. Thinking it best to act independently of any candidate, I formed Arkansans for Fair Elections. I served as the organization's president and, later, general counsel. This group launched a statewide educational campaign to train poll watchers to recognize irregular or fraudulent electoral procedures; this included the creation of literature and a video. Our extensive public relations campaign brought media attention to the issue. We also organized a statewide team of citizen poll watchers and attorneys to ensure that the election laws were fairly enforced. We were so successful in the lieutenant governor's race that Arkansans for Fair Elections was asked to continue the effort until 1999 when I moved to Louisiana.

General Counsel - Ballot Fraud Protection Committee, Republican Party of Arkansas (1995-1999)

In late 1995, Asa Hutchinson, chairman of the Republican Party of Arkansas, appointed me as general counsel for the newly formed Ballot Fraud Protection Committee of the state party. I retained this position until 1999. I was responsible for coordinating statewide enforcement efforts and directing a legal team to respond to problematic situations prior to and on election day.

(Through my role with Arkansans for Fair Elections and the Ballot Fraud Protection Committee, I successfully sued or negotiated a settlement in more than two-thirds of the 75 counties in Arkansas over electoral irregularities.)

Legal Consultant to Republican Members of the Arkansas
General Assembly (1994-1996)

Republicans in the General Assembly requested that I review and draft suggested changes to Arkansas election law. Based on my personal experience as an election commissioner and as an election attorney, I identified a number of areas of concern and drafted new statutes modeled on the best examples that I could find from other states. My proposal was not passed by the Democrat-controlled General Assembly as a package, however, several of its components were passed into law.

Consultant to the Arkansas Court of Appeals

I drafted five redistricting bills and maps for the constitutionally required redistricting of the Arkansas Court of Appeals. These bills were based on current U.S. Supreme Court precedent regarding gerrymandering. I had to present each bill and give supporting testimony to the commission.

Director of International Development - Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana (2000-2003)

Part of my duties as director was to develop international cooperative projects. The theme of several of these proposals was democratization. In each case, I required review of the national election code of the country involved.

My activities in Namibia led to a request by the director of the Namibian Election Commission, Joram Rukambe and the Speaker of the Namibian National Assembly, Dr. Mose Tjitendero to review and suggest changes to the Namibian election code. This review took three months and resulted in proposed alterations a number of code sections. These suggestions were considered by the Namibian National Assembly and a number were incorporated into the code revisions. Additionally, I drafted legislation for the Speaker to guarantee voting rights to agricultural workers that were being denied by the owners of the farms. This legislation also was passed into law.

During this time, I was qualified as an election expert and placed on an election consultant list by the United Nations, IFES and the Electoral Institute of Southern Africa.

Related Memberships

• Republican Party of Arkansas (1990-1999)
• Benton County, Arkansas, Republican Committee (1996-1999)
• Washington County, Arkansas, Republican Committee (1990-1996)
(When we moved to Louisiana in 1999, the party was in such turmoil that it was difficult to get involved. This past year, I have been prohibited by the Hatch Act from participating in partisan politics. This prohibition ends August 19 when my judicial clerkship ends.)

Related Education

• Graduate certificate in electoral governance, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia (2003)
Amie,

I need for you to do research into every identified on this Peer Review Group to identify their politics and/or political leanings. You can go to www.opensecrets.com to determine if they have given to political candidates. Thanks.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdeggregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV on 08/19/2005 10:52 PM -----

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
08/19/2005 03:41 PM
To "Tom O'neill"
cc
Subject Re: Peer Review Group

Tom-

Thank you for sharing this list of your Peer Review Group members, to-date. I will share this list with the Commissioners and will be certain to let your know of their feedback, if any.

I will also be back in touch regarding Eagleton's research around voter fraud and the research project EAC will be undertaking this fall, around voting fraud and voter intimidation. The EAC is presently in the process of finalizing a work and staff plan for this project and once it is completed, I will be certain to brief you on it.

In the meantime, EAC staff and several of the Commissioners looks forward to meeting with the Eagleton/Moritz team on September 6 at 1:30 PM.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Karen,

Attached is a report on the status of recruitment of members of the Peer Review Group. We extended 9 invitations. We have four confirmed members, one reluctant turn-down, one who has yet to respond to an initial inquiry, and are awaiting confirmation from 3 others who initially agreed. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Tom O'Neill

RecruitmentStatus.doc
Karen,

I have reviewed the Eagleton Peer Review Group recruitment list that you recently provided. Based on what I or Amie can determine from the bio’s provided or an Internet search, it appears that at least 4 of the 7 people who have said yes to be on the group seem to have a liberal perspective, or have had a history of working on that side of the political spectrum. I could only identify one as being a Republican, and a moderate one at that (Verniero). Mike Alvarez has conducted a lot of research into election issues and generally seems to do it in a neutral way. I have been unable to obtain a bio or background information on Tim Storey, who is not an academic. The only person that I could identify on their list as being conservative was Brad Clark, who has declined to participate.

Therefore, based on this information regarding the Peer Review Group, I am not satisfied that they will provide Eagleton with the balanced review that I thought they would receive from such a group. I would urge you to ask them to seek the input of more conservative academics so that whatever study we receive from them will have the benefit of a balanced review. I am going to have Amie provide you with the background sheet on Professor Tim O’Rourke of Salisbury University in Maryland, whom they may want to consider for this panel. We have some calls into others who could suggest some conservative academics for this review panel.

Thanks.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
Amie J. Sherrill
Special Assistant to Vice Chairman Paul S. DeGregorio
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566 3106

Nicole Mortellito

From: Nicole Mortellito
Sent: 09/16/2005 03:29 PM
To: Amie Sherrill; Sheila Banks
Subject: Tally Vote voter fraud

Tallyvote Ballot Voter Fraud.doc  Tally vote Memo - voter fraud.doc

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Executive Director - Thomas R. Wilkey
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
202.566.3127 fax
DATE & TIME OF TRANSMITTAL: September 16, 2005, 3:00PM

BALLOT DEADLINE: September 20, 2005, 3:00PM

COMMISSIONERS: HILLMAN, DEGREGORIO, MARTINEZ, DAVIDSON

SUBJECT: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

( ) I approve the recommendation.

( ) I disapprove of the recommendation.

( ) I object to the recommendation.

( ) I am recused from voting.

A definite vote is required. All ballots must be signed and dated. Please return ONLY THE BALLOT to DeAnna Smith. Please return the ballot no later than the date and time shown above.

FROM THOMAS R. WILKEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
TALLY VOTE MEMORANDUM

TO: EAC Commissioners Hillman, DeGregorio, Martinez, Davidson
FROM: Thomas Wilkey, EAC Executive Director
DATE: September 16, 2005
RE: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

"On such periodic basis as the Commission may determine, the Commission shall conduct and make available to the public studies regarding the election administration issues described in subsection (b)" Sections 241(b) (6) and (7) list the following election administration issues:

(6) Nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in election for Federal offices.

(7) Identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation.

Building on this HAVA reference to studies of voting fraud and voter intimidation, the EAC Board of Advisors has indicated that further study of these issues, to determine how the EAC might respond to them, is a high priority.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has identified two senior-level project consultants to develop various project activities and studies related to voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections. The consultants, whose contracts would run for the period September-February, 2005, would be responsible for helping the EAC identify what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections.

To accomplish this the consultants will: perform background research, including Federal and state-by state administrative and case law review related to voting fraud and voter intimidation, along with a review of current voting fraud and voter intimidation activities taking place with key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations; in consultation with EAC, identify and convene, a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation; develop an EAC project scope of work and a project work plan related to voting fraud and voter intimidation and; author a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Recommendation

Attached is the Statement of Work for the voting fraud and voter intimidation project consultants. The consultant contract fees total $110,000 ($55,000 per person). An additional $10,000 is allotted for the voting fraud and intimidation project working group. The total project amount is $120,000.
This is to authorize my Special Assistant, Amie Sherrill, to mark on my behalf the following Tally Votes regarding the awarding of contracts, as approving the staff recommendation for each of the following:

1. RFP #05-04 to the University of Florida Levin College of Law for the development of legal resources clearinghouse
2. RFP #05-07 to the Center for Public Policy and Administration of the University of Utah for the development of best practices on vote count and recount procedures
3. RFP #05-11 to Zimmerman Associates, Inc for the development of records management policies and procedures
4. Sole Source contracts to Job Serebrov and Tova Wang in developing a EAC Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project
5. Sole Source contract to the National Academies of Science for Technical Support for Statewide Registration Database Implementation with Online Forums for Discussion

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdeggregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
Paul; I know I relayed this message to you through Aimee but just double checking to let you know that Eagleton put from FEC Commissioner Brad Smith on the peer review group. We have had a devil of a time getting anyone someone to return are calls from FEMA and have tried several places including the woman you recommended. I am having Donetta call her contact at the White House to see what he can do. We also extended an invitation to them to attend. And finally did you know you are a celebrity now. If you received the Carter/Baker report look under the section on Admistration and there is a picture of a couple of guys from the EAC
Safe Travels
Tom
Commissioners-

Attached please find a copy of the September Eagleton/Moritz progress report.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

--- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 10/16/2005 03:25 PM ----

Dear Ms. Karen Lynn Dyson:

My name is Johanna Dobrich and I have taken over the responsibility of sending the Eagleton Institute of Politics Monthly Progress Reports to you, in place of Lauren Vincelli.

Attached in this email you will find the Eagleton Institute of Politics monthly Progress Report for September 2005. Also attached, is a document called "PRG Summary Comments" which is an attachment to September’s Progress Report.

Please email me at jdobrich@eden.rutgers.edu to confirm that you have received this email. If you prefer I send a hard copy of these documents, in addition to the electronic version, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Johanna Dobrich

ProgressReport_SEPTEMBER2005_EagletonInstitute.doc  PRG Summary Comments 10.17.05.doc
Contract to Provide Research Assistance to The EAC
For the Development of Voluntary Guidance on
Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Procedures

MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT
September 2005

For
UNITED STATES ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100
Washington, DC 20005

September 14, 2005

Prepared by:
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557
INTRODUCTION

This report describes our progress from September 1 through September 30, 2005. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks; progress made; challenges encountered or anticipated; milestones reached; and projections for work to be completed in the coming month.

We focused in September on refining our Provisional Voting research. This refinement was necessary to prepare a strong final analysis paper and develop alternative approaches to Provisional Voting based on the analysis. An important part of this refinement involved reconciling sometimes conflicting data on Provisional Voting from different sources, including the Election Day Study, which finally became available in September. With a clearer understanding of our data, we began the critical work of selecting alternatives to recommend to the EAC as guidance or best practices responsive to both our research and the needs of the Commission.

Three meetings this month helped us accomplish the necessary refinement. We briefed the EAC on our work on September 6, held the first meeting of the Peer Review Group (PRG) on September 21, and gained the benefit of the EAC’s reaction to the September 6 briefing in a conference call on September 30.

The completion of our work on Provisional Voting has been delayed by the time needed to absorb and incorporate the findings of the EAC Election Day Study, to recruit and receive the comments of the PRG, and to receive the Commission’s comments on the September 6 briefing. The schedule called for the release of the Election Day Study last spring, the submission of the Preliminary Guidance Document to the EAC’s advisory boards in mid-September, and a public hearing on the Guidance Document in late October. We now plan to submit to the EAC a final draft of our report, a preliminary guidance document, and draft
best practices before the end of October. And we understand that after review of those materials, the EAC will decide whether to issue a guidance document or recommend best practices. Projecting a late November date for those decisions seems reasonable. If the EAC does decide to issue a Guidance Document on Provisional Voting, the time needed for a review by the advisory boards is likely to delay a public hearing until January.

While we have made a good start on the Voter ID sections of our research, most time and resources this month were dedicated to resolving issues involved in Provisional Voting.

This report is divided into 3 sections: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, and Project Management. Each section references specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract. The Financial Report will be sent separately by the Rutgers Division of Grant and Contract Accounting.

Please direct questions or comments about this report to Tom O'Neill at:
PROVISIONAL VOTING

Tasks 3.4 – 3.9 in our contract relate to Provisional Voting. Work on the first of these must be complete before proceeding to later tasks. Task 3.4 was completed in August, and Task 3.5 is well underway.

Task 3.5: Analysis and Alternative Approaches. Assess the potential, problems, and challenges of Provisional Voting and develop alternative means to achieve the goals of Provisional Voting.

LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS, AND LITIGATION

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation. This information constitutes the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task. It has provided a base of understanding for the analysis of states’ actual experience with Provisional Voting in 2004, for which the Eagleton team has lead responsibility.

Description: The Moritz team has created a 50-state chart to summarize information on Provisional Voting, compiled statutes, case law and administrative procedures regarding Provisional Voting and is near completion with this research.

Progress: We have completed the memorandum outlining Provisional Voting legislative changes since the 2004 election and we are continuing to clarify the laws prior to these changes.

Challenges: The variety in the form and frequency of Provisional Voting legislation from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

Work Plan: The analysis of the information, data, and survey results concerning Provisional Voting was completed in September, on schedule. We are now revising it in response to comments by the Peer Review Group (PRG). We are also revising the alternatives document to reflect the critique of the PRG and the guidance from the EAC in response to the September 6 briefing.

PREPARATION FOR AND EXPERIENCE WITH PROVISIONAL VOTING

The Eagleton team has researched and compiled a narrative of each state’s experience with Provisional Voting in 2004. The report findings from the survey of 400 local election officials are now complete. The survey results have proven to be instrumental in shaping our
understanding of actual practice in administering Provisional Voting, including the steps local officials took to prepare for the election.

**PROVISIONAL VOTING NARRATIVES**

**Description:** To construct the narratives, a researcher examined newspaper accounts, state websites, and reports from third-party organizations to gather information on the experience with Provisional Voting in the 2004 election. To organize the information derived from this examination, we created an information system that catalogues information about the states (i.e. whether a state was new to Provisional Voting, the percentage of provisional votes counted, the method of notifying voters if their vote was counted, etc.) and combined it with Moritz’s collection and analysis of statutes, regulations and litigation.

**Progress:** We completed a state-by-state narrative of developments in Provisional Voting and distributed it to the EAC and the PRG. This work has been helpful in understanding the context of the data collected on provisional voting from the states.

**Challenges:** The primary obstacle to constructing the narratives was difficulty in communicating and obtaining necessary information from various state officials. As a result, the narratives underwent several revisions to incorporate up-to-date and reliable information. Now that so many other analyses, including the Election Day Survey, have been released, we were challenged by different interpretations of the same basic facts. But the reconciliation of interpretation and data collection has been invaluable in establishing rigor in our report.

**Work Plan:** We completed revisions of the narratives incorporating comments from the PRG.

**PROVISIONAL VOTING STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

**Description:** Throughout September the Eagleton research team revised and clarified its statistical analysis, and worked to reconcile the classifications of this analysis (such as states counting only those provisional ballots cast within the proper precinct versus states that counted ballots cast within the proper county) with the classification made in other parts of this study or in other studies (such as the Election Day Study or Electionline reports).

**Progress:** In response to comments from the PRG, we have clarified and sharpened the presentation on the methods used and results achieved in the statistical analysis. We have double checked the classification of variables upon which the study is based and reconciled differences in various areas of the overall study. This effort is nearing completion.

**Challenges:** The difficulties encountered have been a result of communication delays and time constraints. Overall, these are not problems or hindrances, but simply slow down the process.
**Work Plan:** In mid-October we aim to complete a final revision of the statistical analysis and a full reconciliation of all data within the study.

**Survey of County Election Officials**

**Description:** The Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (CPIP) conducted a national survey of county election officials to measure several aspects of Provisional Voting.

**Progress:** The analysis of the survey results and findings report is complete. As a result of the critique by the PRG, the research team is revising and clarifying the descriptions of the survey design and sample selection process to make the research methods more transparent.

**Work Plan:** We used the information from the survey in drafting the analysis and alternatives document required under Task 3.5. We will include necessary clarifications regarding survey design and sample selection in the final analysis and alternatives document.

**Peer Review Group**

Most members of the PRG met by telephone conference on September 21 to comment on all the research described above. Participating in the meeting were Michael Alvarez, Martha Kropf, Dan Lowenstein, Peter Verniero, Brad Smith, and Tim Storey. Timothy O'Rourke contributed his comments separately. The group provided a detailed critique of our approach, methods, and conclusions, and we are now revising each document in response to the comments and suggestions. It praised the quality of the work and the rigor of much of the analysis. A summary of the suggestions from the members of the PRG is attached to this report.

**Challenges and Work Plan**

Making arrangements for review of drafts by the PRG and by the EAC has taken longer than anticipated by the Work Plan. The schedule called for all research and analysis to have been completed and incorporated into a Draft Preliminary Guidance Document by mid September. The review process by the EAC and PRG took longer than contemplated by the Work Plan. And we now understand that the EAC will make a separate decision --that will require additional time-- whether to issue a Guidance Document or recommendations for best practices. It has not, therefore, been possible to schedule a public hearing or arrange for review of our work by the EAC's advisory boards, as called for in the Work Plan. We now aim to complete our reports and recommendations for guidance by the end of October, and to then await a response from the EAC before scheduling submission to the advisory boards or making arrangements for a hearing.
**VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

The contract lists 7 tasks (3.10 – 3.16) related to Voter Identification Requirements. The research on Voter ID requirements is proceeding concurrently with our work on the experience of Provisional Voting, and is becoming the principal focus of our research.

**Task 3.10: Legislation, regulations, and litigation**

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation with regard to Voter Identification Requirements. This collection of material is nearing completion. It will constitute the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task.

**Description:** The Moritz team has compiled statutes on Voter Identification, and will provide a summarized analysis of this research to the project team for review.

**Progress:** The 50 State (plus the District of Columbia) chart has been completed, the voter identification statutes have been collected for all states and D.C., and summaries of the existing voter identification statutes have been written for all states and D.C.

**Challenges:** Identifying the relevant statutes has been challenging because of the different terminology used from state to state to codify voter identification issues, and because many states have scattered election law provisions throughout their codes. This variety from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

**Work Plan:** Analysis of voter identification data will begin now.

**SUPPLEMENTS TO LEGAL ANALYSIS**

To supplement the legal analysis, the Eagleton team is undertaking two research efforts: First, compiling information on the debate over voter ID in the states; and second, estimating the effect on turnout of different voter ID regimes. Tracking the continuing political debate over voter identification reveals that the relatively narrow HAVA requirements for voter identification have apparently sparked in many states a broader concern and a sharp political debate over rigorous identification requirements for all voters. The research follows these developments both to monitor possible secondary effects of HAVA on voter ID, and to provide a rich collection of alternative approaches for consideration.

Individual narratives for the states with significant activity in voter ID will provide a resource for understanding the wide range of experience in the 2004 election. The narratives will include an appraisal of the prevalence and nature of vote fraud, a focus of the concern with increasing the rigor of voter ID requirements. We understand that the EAC has issued a
research contract that will focus on vote fraud and vote suppression. Our research in this area will be limited to developing an understanding of the tradeoffs between ballot security and access to the ballot. We have completed the basic database on voter identification issues has been completed, and the next key step will be drafting the first narratives.

**VOTER ID AND TURNOUT ANALYSIS**

The second supplemental analysis will provide objective information on a contentious feature of the debate over voter ID in the states: the effects of more rigorous voter ID regimes on voter turnout and the relationship between the voter ID regime and vote fraud. As part of this effort, Eagleton is undertaking a statistical analysis to gauge the effect of a state’s voter ID regime on turnout, especially turnout by minority and elderly voters.

**Description:** We have created a database and gathered statistics on the effects of state-level voter identification requirements on voter turnout at the county-level in the 2004 election.

**Progress:** The collection of data for the Voter ID-Turnout analysis is complete. The assembled database contains population demographic data, voter registration data and voter turnout data from all 50 states, 3113 Counties, and the District of Columbia. We have also utilized exit poll data collected on Election Day 2004 as a resource for understanding the demographics of voter turnout.

**Challenges:** The analysis of these data has been postponed until the data reconciliation of Provisional Voting is complete. The main challenge now is an issue of time management. As a result of the extensive revision and data reconciliation efforts aimed at the Provisional Voting section of our work VID has been temporarily placed on hold.

**Work Plan:** The analysis of the impact that voter identification requirements have upon voter turnout should be completed by early November.
PROJECT MANAGEMENT

PEER REVIEW GROUP

Description: A feature of our proposal was the creation of a PRG. It reviews our research and methodology and provides valuable feedback and suggestions for the direction of our work.

Progress: The research team held its first conference call with PRG members on September 19, 2005. The research team will hold a workshop meeting on October 19, 2005 to address the PRG’s comments.

Challenges: To date we still have not heard back from two PRG Members.

Projections: Revisions and clarifications to our reports on Provisional Voting will be resolved by the end of October. We will need to schedule a second conference call to review our research with regard to Voter Identification Requirements in late November. As noted earlier, a summary of the comments we have received from the PRG is attached to this report.

COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Collecting and merging information and data from myriad sources is a demanding requirement of this research. We have developed two principal mechanisms to facilitate the analysis of the material collected or created in the project: an information system and an internal website for easy access to drafts and reports.

INFORMATION SYSTEM

Description: The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law is being merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which will include a compendium of case law and statutes regarding Provisional Voting and voter identification.

Progress: At this point in the research process, many documents are complete after a lengthy process of circulating drafts among team members. We have reorganized our system by separating final drafts from earlier versions of documents, discarding dated files contained in the Information System, and updating the system as a whole.

Projections: The entire project team continues to use the Information System which contains the above referenced research, in working toward the preparation for our final reports to the EAC.

INTRANET
**Description:** All project team members have signed on to the Intranet site. The Intranet facilitates the exchange of information and collaboration among project participants.

**Progress:** Project team members regularly post drafts, completed materials and spreadsheets online for internal review. The intranet has helped team members and serves as an internal website with announcements and important documents readily available to all team members.

**FINANCIAL REPORT**

The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. Financial reporting on grant accounts is limited to actual expenses that have been incurred during the reporting period. Our contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, (732) 932-0165, EXT. 2235.

A detail of expenses incurred from project September 1 - September 30, 2005, will be sent under separate cover to: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer at the EAC.
Peer Review Group
Summary of Comments
To the Eagleton/Moritz Group
Under Contract to Provide Research Assistance to the EAC

October 15, 2005

The Peer Review Group (PRG) met by telephone conference on September 21. Those participating included: Michael Alvarez, John C. Harrison, Martha Kropf, Dan Lowenstein, Peter Verniero, Brad Smith, and Tim Storey. This summary also includes additional written remarks submitted by Martha Kropf and additional remarks from a follow-up phone call with Timothy O’Rourke. We are now addressing all the comments including, in some cases, returning to members of the group to seek further elaboration or clarification.

We encouraged the members of the PRG to comment about any aspect of the project. We furnished them with these materials before the meeting.

1. Survey of local (mainly county) officials conducted in June 2005.
2. State-by-state narrative of developments in provisional voting
3. Statistical Analysis of state provisional voting
4. Memorandum on Provisional Voting Litigation
5. Memorandum on Provisional Ballot Litigation by State
6. July Memorandum on Provisional Ballot Litigation by Issue

We suggested that PRG members rank our draft responses to each of the six key questions posed by the EAC along these lines:
   1- Research supports conclusions well.
   2- Research supports some conclusions. Specific questions are:
   3- Research does not support conclusions. Major problems are:

On the Alternatives paper, we asked PRG members to list up to three items they found questionable in light of the research and their own knowledge of provisional voting and election administration and to give us their thoughts on alternative policies that we had no included.

General Suggestions

1. Make transparently clear the meaning of ‘old’ versus ‘new’ states. It is not enough to categorize the states as such, we need to determine why specific states were considered ‘old’ or ‘new’ (i.e. clarify what conditions were met by old states).
2. Be clear in our report about the data that we were unable to obtain and perhaps speculate on why that data was not available. (For example, do we have the documentation the state election boards gave the localities regarding counting practices? If not, why not? Indicate the states for which it was difficult to obtain data.

3. Prescribe less and describe more (tell what voters/administrators have done, not what they should have done or ought to do).

4. Questioned our assumption about public trust – How do we know that decreases in disputes/challenges signify an increase in public trust? We need to explain this assertion.

Specific Review by Area of Analysis/Document

Response to Statistical Review:

- Challenged our emphasis on the number of provisional ballots counted as a percentage of those cast as an indication of success of Provisional Voting. Suggested alternative relationships to consider (PB v. Turnout, PB v. Registered Voters, and PB v. Voting age Population).

- Wanted the inclusion of variation within states among counties (and geographical considerations).

- The report needs to address the quality and validity of the data used in the analysis.

- On Page 8, cautioned using the estimate of 280,000 disenfranchised voters who would have voted if outside precinct voting was permitted.

Response to Question Four:

- Remove the comments in the footnote (p. 1) that offers an alternative way of analyzing the question relating to the possible increase in voter participation as a result of provisional voting because the margin of error in the Census survey does not support a conclusion at this level of significance.

- Address the alternative explanation for why old states may enfranchise more voters than new states (i.e. Kropf's Failsafe option).

- Include a statistical summary of the relationship between the length of time a state has had PV and the rate at which votes are counted.

Response to Question Five:

- Is it possible to draw any conclusions about the local differences within and among states broken down by county (presumably 20 states worth)?
• Clarify what is meant by “design” and say how many states have/had provisional ballots that are designed differently and look different. Why is design important?

• Page 17 indicates that states with statewide voter databases end up validating fewer PVs. This is important & should be addressed in more detail.

Response to Question Six:

• On the usefulness of instructions, 98% said the instructions were useful. Make it clear that this represents 98% of the officials who got instruction.

• Is the passive voice the best means to communicate this information (for ex. "Second, objectively how well did the process appear to be managed?")

Response to State Narratives:

• When in doubt about whether we have data to support a sentence it is important to be careful about the language we use (say ‘doing XYZ would have revealed’ as opposed to ‘most of what we know about XYZ revealed’…)

• Clarify for the readers what is meant by "provisional vote/total vote". Does that mean provisional votes cast? Counted? Make it clear right at the beginning of every document?

• Footnote states that do not list poll sites or tell people where to vote with the fact that many cities/counties do have a poll finder.

Election Official Survey

• Clarify how we determined who to include in the sample and how we developed the questions in the survey (was a focus group an initial step?) Why were 3,800 election officials deemed eligible to participate (out of how many? 5,000 or so?)

• Clarify old and new states on pg. 2 in National Survey. Comment on how to assess fraud in provisional voting? What is the relationship between PV and turnout?

• Explore more issues about citizenship (18% non-citizen voting in CA)?

• Appendix A says survey was random, but it’s not. How was the data weighted for small, medium and large counties, and for other issues? Clarify this in the report.
• Why doesn’t the total of new and old states equal 50 (25 and 18) and why does the National Survey of Election Officials have different numbers? Is FL an ‘old’ state?

• Are the New England states underrepresented in the survey? If so, why?

• Report should offer more information about the response rate.

. Alternatives Document

• The importance of clarity in state processes for both administrators and voters needs to be better articulated.
  (Better training of poll workers, clarity whether failure to check boxes disqualifies voters, access to better info. at polling locations)

• Cautions the use of definitive statements (such as A-3, perhaps say “This raises the question of…”).

• Have other EAC Guidelines been tested in court yet?

• On page 3: the ‘tracking number’ in # 6 is not feasible. Also, “the information” in # 12 should be changed to “the website and 800 numbers” for clarification.

• Page 6, there were disagreements about # 1 and # 2 of options in Sec. F regarding the installation of a separate body to rule on PV for the integrity process; a motion was made to get rid of them.

• Page 6, Sec. E option # 1 should be eliminated or clarified

• Add to Sec. F a ‘# 5’ requiring states to provide detailed public info. on PV
Dear Commissioners:

On August 18 I sent you an email raising serious concerns over the awarding of a contract to the Moritz College of Law given its clearly demonstrated pre-existing opinions about provisional balloting and voter identification. Unfortunately, nothing was apparently done about this situation.

I have just learned that a similar situation has occurred. I understand that another research grant has been awarded to Tova Wang for research into "voter fraud and voter intimidation." Ms. Wang has an even more pronounced partisan and one-sided view of these issues than was present in the situation involving Moritz College. She has many posted opinions available on the Internet that make it clear that she will not be able to conduct research in an objective fashion on these issues. Just a few examples illustrate this:

"It is truly shocking how, given all the problems in the voting system and continued disenfranchisement, the terms of the debate have shifted to that of so-called 'ballot integrity.' It is reminiscent of how conservatives have misappropriated the concept of patriotism and the American flag, and used the power of language and messaging to distort the discussion, by using terms such as 'partial birth abortion' or death tax."

"This stands in stark contrast to the entire tenor or the Carter-Baker report, which presumes that fraud committed by voters is the biggest problem confronting our election system. There is simply no strong evidence of this, and some of the remedies proposed will take us backwards in the fight to increase voter participation."

"...voters are individually disenfranchised by continued, often race based, voter intimidation and deceptive practices..."

Carter-Baker Report: Some Bad Fixes for the Wrong Problem, 9/19/2005

"The data is also mounting that identification requirements have disproportionately disenfranchising impacts on certain communities...Given all this piling on of negative evidence, both in terms of the efficacy of ID requirements in fulfilling the goal their advocate's claim and their impact on voting rights, it is somewhat mind boggling that so many state officials, as well as other groups working on this issue, are still vigorously pushing for greater expansion of what seems to be a rather useless yet dangerous tool. Shouldn't the burden of proof now shift to the advocates of more voter ID to demonstrate the value of their cause?"

Voter ID and Fraud: Prove It, 7/28/2005

There are numerous more examples of her partisan opinions and attacks and demonstrably false claims against Republicans and election officials in general, such as her baseless charge in another article that
"partisan election officials and party leaders usurped the process and manipulated the new federal voting law in ways that disenfranchised voters." Election 2004: A Report Card, 1/1/2005. The idea that she will write an objective report on issues that she has already expressed such strong opinions on ("there is no evidence that such election fraud is a serious problem") is hard to accept. I find it surprising that the EAC would award her a research grant or expect that election officials around the country would accept as valid a report written by an individual who asserts that "[a]t every step of the way, election officials in key states threw up unnecessary barriers to voting." Id. This gratuitous remark is an insult to the many hard-working election officials that we all know through our work who did everything they could during the last election to improve the election process and in large part succeeded.

Whatever procedures the EAC has set up to screen individuals and entities applying for research grants is obviously not working. I have no doubt that I could today, based on reading Ms. Wang's prior opinions, predict exactly what her report will conclude on the issues of voter fraud and voter intimidation. This situation needs to be corrected so that research is not being conducted by partisan individuals with preset opinions and views on issues. As with my prior email, I strongly recommend that the EAC reconsider the awarding of this contract.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530

Telephone (202) 305-9750
Facsimile (202) 307-2839
Dear Commissioners:

On August 18 I sent you an email raising serious concerns over the awarding of a contract to the Moritz College of Law given its clearly demonstrated pre-existing opinions about provisional balloting and voter identification. Unfortunately, nothing was apparently done about this situation.

I have just learned that a similar situation has occurred. I understand that another research grant has been awarded to Tova Wang for research into "voter fraud and voter intimidation." Ms. Wang has an even more pronounced partisan and one-sided view of these issues than was present in the situation involving Moritz College. She has many posted opinions available on the Internet that make it clear that she will not be able to conduct research in an objective fashion on these issues. Just a few examples illustrate this:

"It is truly shocking how, given all the problems in the voting system and
continued disenfranchisement, the terms of the debate have shifted to that of so-called 'ballot integrity.' It is reminiscent of how conservatives have misappropriated the concept of patriotism and the American flag, and used the power of language and messaging to distort the discussion, by using terms such as 'partial birth abortion' or death tax.'"

"This stands in stark contrast to the entire tenor or the Carter-Baker report, which presumes that fraud committed by voters is the biggest problem confronting our election system. There is simply no strong evidence of this, and some of the remedies proposed will take us backwards in the fight to increase voter participation."

"...voters are individually disenfranchised by continued, often race based, voter intimidation and deceptive practices..."

Carter-Baker Report: Some Bad Fixes for the Wrong Problem, 9/19/2005

"The data is also mounting that identification requirements have disproportionately disenfranchising impacts on certain communities... Given all this piling on of negative evidence, both in terms of the efficacy of ID requirements in fulfilling the goal their advocate's claim and their impact on voting rights, it is somewhat mind boggling that so many state officials, as well as other groups working on this issue, are still vigorously pushing for greater expansion of what seems to be a rather useless yet dangerous tool. Shouldn't the burden of proof now shift to the advocates of more voter ID to demonstrate the value of their cause?"

Voter ID and Fraud: Prove It, 7/28/2005

There are numerous more examples of her partisan opinions and attacks and demonstrably false claims against Republicans and election officials in general, such as her baseless charge in another article that "partisan election officials and party leaders usurped the process and manipulated the new federal voting law in ways that disenfranchised voters." Election 2004: A Report Card, 1/1/2005. The idea that she will write an objective report on issues that she has already expressed such strong opinions on ("there is no evidence that such election fraud is a serious problem") is hard to accept. I find it surprising that the EAC would award her a research grant or expect that election officials around the country would accept as valid a report written by an individual who asserts that "[a]t every step of the way, election officials in key states threw up unnecessary barriers to voting." Id. This gratuitous remark is an insult to the many hard-working election officials that we all know through our work who did everything they could during the last election to improve the election process and in large part succeeded.

Whatever procedures the EAC has set up to screen individuals and entities applying for research grants is obviously not working. I have no doubt that I could today, based on reading Ms. Wang's prior opinions, predict exactly what her report will conclude on the issues of voter fraud and voter intimidation. This situation needs to be corrected so that research is not being conducted by partisan individuals with preset opinions and views on issues. As with my prior email, I strongly recommend that the EAC reconsider the awarding of this contract.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice
Voter Fraud experience

Worked for Mike Hucaby (sp??) in his Lieutenant Gov's race as counsel for ballot fraud protection

Formed and worked for Arkansans for Fair Elections (non-profit -- unofficial effort of the Rep. party) working on voter fraud issues (approximately 8 years). That included organizing a state ballot protection campaign, a video and written materials protection plan, and working on a variety of fraud issues (ballot stuffing, voting system fraud, counting issues), and handling legal issues.

Appointed by Asa Hutchinson to be counsel for ballot issues.

Federal election attorney for Fay (sp) Bozeman in the failed campaign.
Hans,

I wish you would have shown us the decency to have spoken to someone at the EAC before you sent this e-mail. Had you done so, you might have discovered that Ms. Wang was paired with Job Serebrov, a conservative attorney who, like you, has served on a local election board (Washington, Co, AK -Fayetteville). He has also worked on voting issues and election law in his practice, including voter fraud. He was counsel to the Arkansas GOP on ballot integrity issues and was the ballot protection specialist for Mike Huckabee in his campaign for Lt. Governor. In addition, Job formed and ran "Arkansans for Fair Elections", a non-partisan group that looked to investigate and prevent voter fraud issues. He headed that group for 8 years. Job served the Republican Party of Arkansas as the Chairman of the Committee for the Revision of the State Constitution.

Thor Hearne called me last week to indicate that Job had called him to be on the working group that Job and Ms. Wang are putting together to look at the voter fraud/voter intimidation issues.

Job was recommended to the EAC for this work by Julie Thompson. His references included two US 8th Circuit judges appointed by GOP presidents: Morris Arnold and Lavenski Smith.

You may recall that the Advisory Board made it clear to the EAC that they thought the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation issues should be studied together. That's why Ms. Wang has been paired with Mr. Serebrov to do this study.

Julie tells me that she had a wide-ranging discussion with you last week but you never brought this issue up. It's too bad, as it may have prevented you from sending an e-mail to so many people that contains only half the story.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdeggregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
Dear Commissioners:

On August 18 I sent you an email raising serious concerns over the awarding of a contract to the Moritz College of Law given its clearly demonstrated pre-existing opinions about provisional balloting and voter identification. Unfortunately, nothing was apparently done about this situation.

I have just learned that a similar situation has occurred. I understand that another research grant has been awarded to Tova Wang for research into "voter fraud and voter intimidation." Ms. Wang has an even more pronounced partisan and one-sided view of these issues than was present in the situation involving Moritz College. She has many posted opinions available on the Internet that make it clear that she will not be able to conduct research in an objective fashion on these issues. Just a few examples illustrate this:

"It is truly shocking how, given all the problems in the voting system and continued disenfranchisement, the terms of the debate have shifted to that of so-called 'ballot integrity.' It is reminiscent of how conservatives have misappropriated the concept of patriotism and the American flag, and used the power of language and messaging to distort the discussion, by using terms such as 'partial birth abortion' or death tax."

"This stands in stark contrast to the entire tenor of the Carter-Baker report, which presumes that fraud committed by voters is the biggest problem confronting our election system. There is simply no strong evidence of this, and some of the remedies proposed will take us backwards in the fight to increase voter participation."

"...voters are individually disenfranchised by continued, often race based, voter intimidation and deceptive practices..."

Carter-Baker Report: Some Bad Fixes for the Wrong Problem, 9/19/2005

"The data is also mounting that identification requirements have disproportionately disenfranchising impacts on certain communities...Given all this piling on of negative evidence, both in terms of the efficacy of ID requirements in fulfilling the goal their advocate's claim and their impact on voting rights, it is somewhat mind boggling that so many state officials, as well as other groups working on this issue, are still vigorously pushing for greater expansion of what seems to be a rather useless yet dangerous tool. Shouldn't the burden of proof now shift to the advocates of more voter ID to demonstrate the value of their cause?"

Voter ID and Fraud: Prove It, 7/28/2005

There are numerous more examples of her partisan opinions and attacks and demonstrably false claims against Republicans and election officials in general, such as her baseless charge in another article that "partisan election officials and party leaders usurped the process and manipulated the new federal voting law in ways that disenfranchised voters."
Election 2004: A Report Card, 1/1/2005. The idea that she will write an objective report on issues that she has already expressed such strong opinions on ("there is no evidence that such election fraud is a serious problem") is hard to accept. I find it surprising that the EAC would award her a research grant or expect that election officials around the country would accept as valid a report written by an individual who asserts that "[a]t every step of the way, election officials in key states threw up unnecessary barriers to voting." Id. This gratuitous remark is an insult to the many hard-working election officials that we all know through our work who did everything they could during the last election to improve the election process and in large part succeeded.

Whatever procedures the EAC has set up to screen individuals and entities applying for research grants is obviously not working. I have no doubt that I could today, based on reading Ms. Wang's prior opinions, predict exactly what her report will conclude on the issues of voter fraud and voter intimidation. This situation needs to be corrected so that research is not being conducted by partisan individuals with preset opinions and views on issues. As with my prior email, I strongly recommend that the EAC reconsider the awarding of this contract.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530

Telephone (202) 305-9750
Facsimile (202) 307-2839
perhaps if the Board of Advisors were kept better informed, I would not have been put into this position.

-----Original Message-----
From: pdegregorio@eac.gov [mailto:pdegregorio@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2005 5:18 PM
To: von Spakovsky, Hans (CRT)
Subject: Re: Research Grants
Importance: High

Hans,

I wish you would have shown us the decency to have spoken to someone at the EAC before you sent this e-mail. Had you done so, you might have discovered that Ms. Wang was paired with Job Serebrov, a conservative attorney who, like you, has served on a local election board (Washington, Co, AK -Fayetteville). He has also worked on voting issues and election law in his practice, including voter fraud. He was counsel to the Arkansas GOP on ballot integrity issues and was the ballot protection specialist for Mike Huckabee in his campaign for Lt. Governor. In addition, Job formed and ran "Arkansans for Fair Elections", a non-partisan group that looked to investigate and prevent voter fraud issues. He headed that group for 8 years. Job served the Republican Party of Arkansas as the Chairman of the Committee for the Revision of the State Constitution.

Thor Hearne called me last week to indicate that Job had called him to be on the working group that Job and Ms. Wang are putting together to look at the voter fraud/voter intimidation issues.

Job was recommended to the EAC for this work by Julie Thompson. His references included two US 8th Circuit judges appointed by GOP presidents: Morris Arnold and Lavenski Smith.

You may recall that the Advisory Board made it clear to the EAC that they thought the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation issues should be studied together. That's why Ms. Wang has been paired with Mr. Serebrov to do this study.

Julie tells me that she had a wide-ranging discussion with you last week but you never brought this issue up. It's too bad, as it may have prevented you from sending an e-mail to so many people that contains only half the story.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

"Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov" <Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov>
10/18/2005 03:45 PM

To
"'gmhillman@eac.gov'" <gmhillman@eac.gov>, "'rmartinez@eac.gov'
<rmartinez@eac.gov>, "'pdegregorio@eac.gov'" <pdegregorio@eac.gov>,
"'eac.gov'" <jthompson@eac.gov/twilke>, "'ddavison@eac.gov'
<ddavison@eac.gov>
cc
"'christophert@michigan.gov'" <christophert@michigan.gov>,
"'lewis@electioncenter.org'" <lewis@electioncenter.org>,

Subject
Research Grants

Dear Commissioners:

On August 18 I sent you an email raising serious concerns over the awarding of a contract to the Moritz College of Law given its clearly demonstrated pre-existing opinions about provisional balloting and voter identification. Unfortunately, nothing was apparently done about this situation.

I have just learned that a similar situation has occurred. I understand that another research grant has been awarded to Tova Wang for research into "voter fraud and voter intimidation." Ms. Wang has an even more pronounced partisan and one-sided view of these issues than was present in the situation involving Moritz College. She has many posted opinions available on the Internet that make it clear that she will not be able to conduct research in an objective fashion on these issues. Just a few examples illustrate this:

"It is truly shocking how, given all the problems in the voting system and continued disenfranchisement, the terms of the debate have shifted to that of so-called 'ballot integrity.' It is reminiscent of how conservatives have misappropriated the concept of patriotism and the American flag, and used the power of language and messaging to distort the discussion, by using terms such as 'partial birth abortion' or death tax.'"

"This stands in stark contrast to the entire tenor or the Carter-Baker report, which presumes that fraud committed by voters is the biggest problem confronting our election system. There is simply no strong
evidence of this, and some of the remedies proposed will take us backwards in the fight to increase voter participation."

"...voters are individually disenfranchised by continued, often race based, voter intimidation and deceptive practices..."

Carter-Baker Report: Some Bad Fixes for the Wrong Problem, 9/19/2005

"The data is also mounting that identification requirements have disproportionately disenfranchising impacts on certain communities...Given all this piling on of negative evidence, both in terms of the efficacy of ID requirements in fulfilling the goal their advocate's claim and their impact on voting rights, it is somewhat mind boggling that so many state officials, as well as other groups working on this issue, are still vigorously pushing for greater expansion of what seems to be a rather useless yet dangerous tool. Shouldn't the burden of proof now shift to the advocates of more voter ID to demonstrate the value of their cause?"

Voter ID and Fraud: Prove It, 7/28/2005

There are numerous more examples of her partisan opinions and attacks and demonstrably false claims against Republicans and election officials in general, such as her baseless charge in another article that "partisan election officials and party leaders usurped the process and manipulated the new federal voting law in ways that disenfranchised voters." Election 2004: A Report Card, 1/1/2005. The idea that she will write an objective report on issues that she has already expressed such strong opinions on ("there is no evidence that such election fraud is a serious problem") is hard to accept. I find it surprising that the EAC would award her a research grant or expect that election officials around the country would accept as valid a report written by an individual who asserts that "[a]t every step of the way, election officials in key states threw up unnecessary barriers to voting." Id. This gratuitous remark is an insult to the many hard-working election officials that we all know through our work who did everything they could during the last election to improve the election process and in large part succeeded.

Whatever procedures the EAC has set up to screen individuals and entities applying for research grants is obviously not working. I have no doubt that I could today, based on reading Ms. Wang's prior opinions, predict exactly what her report will conclude on the issues of voter fraud and voter intimidation. This situation needs to be corrected so that research is not being conducted by partisan individuals with preset opinions and views on issues. As with my prior email, I strongly recommend that the EAC reconsider the awarding of this contract.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530

Telephone (202) 305-9750
Facsimile (202) 307-2839
perhaps if the Board of Advisors were kept better informed, I would not have been put into this position.

-----Original Message-----
From: pdegregorio@eac.gov [mailto:pdegregorio@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2005 5:18 PM
To: von Spakovsky, Hans (CRT)
Subject: Re: Research Grants
Importance: High

Hans,

I wish you would have shown us the decency to have spoken to someone at the EAC before you sent this e-mail. Had you done so, you might have discovered that Ms. Wang was paired with Job Serebrov, a conservative attorney who, like you, has served on a local election board (Washington, Co, AK -Fayetteville). He has also worked on voting issues and election law in his practice, including voter fraud. He was counsel to the Arkansas GOP on ballot integrity issues and was the ballot protection specialist for Mike Huckabee in his campaign for Lt. Governor. In addition, Job formed and ran "Arkansans for Fair Elections", a non-partisan group that looked to investigate and prevent voter fraud issues. He headed that group for 8 years. Job served the Republican Party of Arkansas as the Chairman of the Committee for the Revision of the State Constitution.

Thor Hearne called me last week to indicate that Job had called him to be on the working group that Job and Ms. Wang are putting together to look at the voter fraud/voter intimidation issues.

Job was recommended to the EAC for this work by Julie Thompson. His references included two US 8th Circuit judges appointed by GOP presidents: Morris Arnold and Lavenski Smith.

You may recall that the Advisory Board made it clear to the EAC that they thought the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation issues should be studied together. That’s why Ms. Wang has been paired with Mr. Serebrov to do this study.
Dear Commissioners:

On August 18 I sent you an email raising serious concerns over the awarding of a contract to the Moritz College of Law given its clearly demonstrated pre-existing opinions about provisional balloting and voter identification. Unfortunately, nothing was apparently done about this situation.

I have just learned that a similar situation has occurred. I understand that another research grant has been awarded to Tova Wang for research into "voter fraud and voter intimidation." Ms. Wang has an even more pronounced partisan and one-sided view of these issues than was present in the situation involving Moritz College. She has many posted opinions available on the Internet that make it clear that she will not be able to conduct research in an objective fashion on these issues. Just a few examples illustrate this:
"It is truly shocking how, given all the problems in the voting system and continued disenfranchisement, the terms of the debate have shifted to that of so-called 'ballot integrity.' It is reminiscent of how conservatives have misappropriated the concept of patriotism and the American flag, and used the power of language and messaging to distort the discussion, by using terms such as 'partial birth abortion' or death tax.'"

"This stands in stark contrast to the entire tenor or the Carter-Baker report, which presumes that fraud committed by voters is the biggest problem confronting our election system. There is simply no strong evidence of this, and some of the remedies proposed will take us backwards in the fight to increase voter participation."

"...voters are individually disenfranchised by continued, often race based, voter intimidation and deceptive practices..." Carter-Baker Report: Some Bad Fixes for the Wrong Problem, 9/19/2005

"The data is also mounting that identification requirements have disproportionately disenfranchising impacts on certain communities...Given all this piling on of negative evidence, both in terms of the efficacy of ID requirements in fulfilling the goal their advocate's claim and their impact on voting rights, it is somewhat mind boggling that so many state officials, as well as other groups working on this issue, are still vigorously pushing for greater expansion of what seems to be a rather useless yet dangerous tool. Shouldn't the burden of proof now shift to the advocates of more voter ID to demonstrate the value of their cause?"

Voter ID and Fraud: Prove It, 7/28/2005

There are numerous more examples of her partisan opinions and attacks and demonstrably false claims against Republicans and election officials in general, such as her baseless charge in another article that "partisan election officials and party leaders usurped the process and manipulated the new federal voting law in ways that disenfranchised voters." Election 2004: A Report Card, 1/1/2005. The idea that she will write an objective report on issues that she has already expressed such strong opinions on ("there is no evidence that such election fraud is a serious problem") is hard to accept. I find it surprising that the EAC would award her a research grant or expect that election officials around the country would accept as valid a report written by an individual who asserts that "[a]t every step of the way, election officials in key states threw up unnecessary barriers to voting." Id. This gratuitous remark is an insult to the many hard-working election officials that we all know through our work who did everything they could during the last election to improve the election process and in large part succeeded.

Whatever procedures the EAC has set up to screen individuals and entities applying for research grants is obviously not working. I have no doubt that I could today, based on reading Ms. Wang's prior opinions, predict exactly what her report will conclude on the issues of voter fraud and voter intimidation. This situation needs to be corrected so that research is not being conducted by partisan individuals with preset opinions and views on issues. As with my prior email, I strongly recommend that the EAC reconsider the awarding of this contract.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530

Telephone (202) 305-9750
Facsimile (202) 307-2839
To Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV

Subject Re: Fw: Research Grants

So, did he "retract" his statement to his colleagues on the Board of Advisors, or have they, at least, been informed that Tova has been teamed with Job?

Also- does Hans know how to say "mea culpa"

:-)

Thanks for passing this on.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

see e-mail traffic below

----- Forwarded by Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV on 10/25/2005 05:07 PM -----

"Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov" To "pdegregorio@eac.gov" <pdegregorio@eac.gov>
cc <Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov>
10/19/2005 09:49 AM Subject RE: Research Grants

perhaps if the Board of Advisors were kept better informed, I would not have been put into this position.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: pdegregorio@eac.gov [mailto:pdegregorio@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2005 5:18 PM
To: von Spakovsky, Hans (CRT)
Subject: Re: Research Grants
Importance: High
Hans,

I wish you would have shown us the decency to have spoken to someone at the EAC before you sent this e-mail. Had you done so, you might have discovered that Ms. Wang was paired with Job Serebrov, a conservative attorney who, like you, has served on a local election board (Washington, Co, AK -Fayetteville). He has also worked on voting issues and election law in his practice, including voter fraud. He was counsel to the Arkansas GOP on ballot integrity issues and was the ballot protection specialist for Mike Huckabee in his campaign for Lt. Governor. In addition, Job formed and ran "Arkansans for Fair Elections", a non-partisan group that looked to investigate and prevent voter fraud issues. He headed that group for 8 years. Job served the Republican Party of Arkansas as the Chairman of the Committee for the Revision of the State Constitution.

Thor Hearne called me last week to indicate that Job had called him to be on the working group that Job and Ms. Wang are putting together to look at the voter fraud/voter intimidation issues.

Job was recommended to the EAC for this work by Julie Thompson. His references included two US 8th Circuit judges appointed by GOP presidents: Morris Arnold and Lavenski Smith.

You may recall that the Advisory Board made it clear to the EAC that they thought the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation issues should be studied together. That's why Ms. Wang has been paired with Mr. Serebrov to do this study.

Julie tells me that she had a wide-ranging discussion with you last week but you never brought this issue up. It's too bad, as it may have prevented you from sending an e-mail to so many people that contains only half the story.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

"Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov" <Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov>
10/18/2005 03:45 PM

To
"'gmhillman@eac.gov'" <gmhillman@eac.gov>, "'rmartinez@eac.gov'" <rmartinez@eac.gov>, "'pdegregorio@eac.gov'" <pdegregorio@eac.gov>, "'eac.gov'" <jthompson@eac.gov/twilke>, "'ddavison@eac.gov'" <ddavison@eac.gov>
Dear Commissioners:

On August 18 I sent you an email raising serious concerns over the awarding of a contract to the Moritz College of Law given its clearly demonstrated pre-existing opinions about provisional balloting and voter identification. Unfortunately, nothing was apparently done about this situation.

I have just learned that a similar situation has occurred. I understand that another research grant has been awarded to Tova Wang for research into "voter fraud and voter intimidation." Ms. Wang has an even more pronounced partisan and one-sided view of these issues than was present in the situation involving Moritz College. She has many posted opinions available on the Internet that make it clear that she will not be able to conduct research in an objective fashion on these issues. Just a few examples illustrate this:

"It is truly shocking how, given all the problems in the voting system and continued disenfranchisement, the terms of the debate have shifted to that of so-called 'ballot integrity.' It is reminiscent of how conservatives have misappropriated the concept of patriotism and the American flag, and used the power of language and messaging to distort the discussion, by using terms such as 'partial birth abortion' or death tax.'"

"This stands in stark contrast to the entire tenor or the Carter-Baker report, which presumes that fraud committed by voters is the biggest problem confronting our election system. There is simply no strong evidence of this, and some of the remedies proposed will take us backwards in the fight to increase voter participation."

"...voters are individually disenfranchised by continued, often race based, voter intimidation and deceptive practices..."

Carter-Baker Report: Some Bad Fixes for the Wrong Problem, 9/19/2005

"The data is also mounting that identification requirements have disproportionately disenfranchising impacts on certain communities...Given all this piling on of negative evidence, both in terms of the efficacy of ID requirements in fulfilling the goal their advocate's claim and their impact on voting rights, it is somewhat mind boggling that so many state officials, as well as other groups working on this issue, are still vigorously pushing for greater expansion of what seems to be a rather useless yet dangerous tool. Shouldn't the burden of proof now shift to the advocates of more voter ID to demonstrate the value of their cause?"

Voter ID and Fraud: Prove It, 7/28/2005
There are numerous more examples of her partisan opinions and attacks and demonstrably false claims against Republicans and election officials in general, such as her baseless charge in another article that "partisan election officials and party leaders usurped the process and manipulated the new federal voting law in ways that disenfranchised voters." Election 2004: A Report Card, 1/1/2005. The idea that she will write an objective report on issues that she has already expressed such strong opinions on ("there is no evidence that such election fraud is a serious problem") is hard to accept. I find it surprising that the EAC would award her a research grant or expect that election officials around the country would accept as valid a report written by an individual who asserts that "[a]t every step of the way, election officials in key states threw up unnecessary barriers to voting." Id. This gratuitous remark is an insult to the many hard-working election officials that we all know through our work who did everything they could during the last election to improve the election process and in large part succeeded.

Whatever procedures the EAC has set up to screen individuals and entities applying for research grants is obviously not working. I have no doubt that I could today, based on reading Ms. Wang's prior opinions, predict exactly what her report will conclude on the issues of voter fraud and voter intimidation. This situation needs to be corrected so that research is not being conducted by partisan individuals with preset opinions and views on issues. As with my prior email, I strongly recommend that the EAC reconsider the awarding of this contract.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530

Telephone (202) 305-9750
Facsimile (202) 307-2839
I took a telephone call this morning from Paul Vinovich. He had attempted to reach Gracia, but since she was not here, he asked Sheila if I was in the office so he spoke to me.

Paul was very upset with comments that Tova Wang had made at yesterday’s AEI’s meeting in which she basically indicated that voter fraud did not exist in the USA. He asked how a person who believes that voter fraud does not exist—or not seem at least willing to listen to both sides—can be hired by the EAC to do a study on voter fraud/voter intimidation. I explained to Paul (as I have now had to explain to many others) that Tova was “balanced” on the study with Job Severbrov. He did not know Job but was well-aware of Tova’s positions and was concerned that her public comments indicate that she will not be fair in looking at this issue. I explained to Paul that we were monitoring the work of our consultants on this study and no report would be issued publicly without the support of at least three commissioners. I sent him some background information on Job. I think this study will need close monitoring.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdeggregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
What Paul V said is NOT at all an accurate statement of what Tova said. I was there. This is very disappointing to read. I may call Mr. V myself.

I watched and heard what was said and by whom. I will be glad to brief you tomorrow morning.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Paul DeGregorio

From: Paul DeGregorio
To: Gracia Hillman; Donetta Davidson; Raymundo Martinez; Juliet Thompson; Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Subject: Call from Paul Vinovich

I took a telephone call this morning from Paul Vinovich. He had attempted to reach Gracia, but since she was not here, he asked Sheila if I was in the office so he spoke to me.

Paul was very upset with comments that Tova Wang had made at yesterday's AEI's meeting in which she basically indicated that voter fraud did not exist in the USA. He asked how a person who believes that voter fraud does not exist—or not seem at least willing to listen to both sides—can be hired by the EAC to do a study on voter fraud/voter intimidation. I explained to Paul (as I have now had to explain to many others) that Tova was "balanced" on the study with Job Severbrov. He did not know Job but was well-aware of Tova's positions and was concerned that her public comments indicate that she will not be fair in looking at this issue. I explained to Paul that we were monitoring the work of our consultants on this study and no report would be issued publicly without the support of at least three commissioners. I sent him some background information on Job. I think this study will need close monitoring.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdeggregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
Commissioners-

I just received a call from Tom O'Neill, Project Manager for the Eagleton/Moritz contract, indicating that the peer review team has not completed their final review of the Voter Identification paper. They are scheduled to have a conference call at 9:00 PM tonight to go over the final review.

I am told I will receive the final Voter Id paper by 9:00 AM, tomorrow morning.

Regards-

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
WHEREAS, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission is conducting studies and research on a wide variety of subjects related to elections.

RESOLVED that the Standards Board recommends—

- The EAC carefully review each study and recommendation of researchers to ensure that findings are based on facts that are clearly defended by quantitative data, rather than suspicions or assumptions;

- The EAC require researchers to study and report on the practicality and expense of implementing each recommendation;

- Election Day survey questions be considered and completed and noticed to states no later than two years before the election in which the data is to be collected.
Curtis:

I was given a copy of the original draft Statement of Work and asked for comments. You will see my response (comments and suggested changes) among the first archived messages on the subject.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

--- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 04/20/2007 08:51 AM -----

Curtis:

I did not draft the Statement of Work or original contracts for this project. I did work with the legal department on the contents of the second set of contracts. The only role I had in selecting the consultants was pretty peripheral. Karen asked me to sit in on a teleconference interview with Job Serebrov to provide her feedback on whether or not I thought he could handle the job.

Karen began as the COR and Project Director but, very early on, the assignment was transferred to me. Virtually all the oversight/management of the project was on my watch.

I'm happy to hear that you are setting up a means for me to submit the materials electronically. For the archived emails, we may have to put the info on disk and give it to you that way.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

Curtis Crider/EAC/GOV
We are just getting started - but we will need copies of all your e-mails, correspondence and notes associated with the projects. We are in the process of setting up an e-mail account so that you can e-mail documents vs printing. As soon as the account is set up I will let you know.

What was your involvement in drafting the contract, vendor selection, oversight/monitoring of the projects

Curtis Crider  
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission  
Phone - (202) 566-3125  
Fax - (202) 566-0957  

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

I haven't heard from you regarding this audit, but I know you that someone from your shop will need to talk with me. Can you give me an idea of when you need me to be available?

Peggy Sims  
Election Research Specialist  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)  
Fax: 202-566-3127  
email: psims@eac.gov
I hope the IG will be able to get to the bottom of this -- and REAL soon -- during his investigation!!

-----Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV wrote: -----

To: Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV, ghillman@eac.gov, Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC
From: Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
Date: 04/19/2007 10:11 AM
cc: Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject: Rep. Serrano

He is quoted in this article as saying the situation surrounding our fraud report could be another Watergate, and wonders if we got our marching orders from the WH. I think we should respond directly to Rep. Serrano regarding his allegation. Say what you will about the way this has been handled, but one thing I'm sure of is that the WH did not edit or was in any way involved in this project. I suggest someone picking up the phone and calling him or his CoS. This is a serious allegation that is starting to really catch on, but now we have a member of Congress saying it.

---

The Fraudulence of Voter Fraud
The Bush administration purged U.S. attorneys for failing to prosecute crimes that didn't occur

By Joel Bleifuss

On April 6, 2006, in Washington, D.C., Karl Rove gave a speech to the Republican National Lawyers Association and issued this dire warning:
We are, in some parts of the country, I'm afraid to say, beginning to look like we have elections like those run in countries where the guys in charge are, you know, colonels in mirrored sunglasses. I mean, it's a real problem, and I appreciate all that you're doing in those hot spots around the country to ensure that the ballot--the integrity of the ballot--is protected, because it's important to our democracy.

When Rove talks about protecting "ballot integrity," that is shorthand for disenfranchising Democratic Party voters. Over the last several years, the Justice Department, with the help of White House operatives, has sought to boost GOP electoral fortunes by orchestrating a national campaign against voter fraud. But the administration overreached on Dec. 7, when President George W. Bush fired eight U.S. attorneys, a political scandal that some say could become this president's Watergate.

When Republicans talk about voter fraud they are referring to illegal voting by individuals, as opposed to vote fraud--systematic attempts to steal an election by an organized group of partisans. This emphasis on voter fraud has convinced eight states to pass laws requiring voters to present
official photo identification in order to cast a ballot--laws that studies have shown suppress Democratic turnout among voters who are poor, black, Latino, Asian-American or disabled.

Understanding that one way to win closely contested elections is to keep Democratic voters away from the polls, the Republican Party has tried to stoke public fears of voter fraud. On Feb. 15, 2005, the U.S. Senate Republican Policy Committee issued a report, "Putting an End to Voter Fraud," which said, "Voter fraud continues to plague our nation's federal elections, diluting and canceling out the lawful votes of the vast majority of Americans." To remedy the situation, the Senate Republicans advised Congress to "require that voters at the polls show photo identification."

But voting experts maintain that voter fraud is not a national problem. In March, Lorraine C. Minnite, a professor of political science at Columbia University, released "The Politics of Voter Fraud," a report she prepared for Project Vote, an advocacy group based in Arkansas. She writes: The claim that voter fraud threatens the integrity of American elections is itself a fraud. It is being used to persuade the public that deceitful and criminal voters are manipulating the electoral system. ... The exaggerated fear of voter fraud has a long history of scuttling efforts to make voting easier and more inclusive, especially for marginalized groups in American society. With renewed partisan vigor, fantasies of fraud are being spun again to undo some of the progress America has made lowering barriers to vote.

This is borne out by a study from the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, which found that in the 2004 election, voters in states that required documentation of identity were 2.7 percent less likely to vote than voters in states where documentation was not required. Specifically, the study, commissioned by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, found that Latinos were 10 percent less likely to vote, Asian-Americans 8.5 percent less likely to vote and blacks 5.7 percent less likely to vote.

What's more, despite GOP claims to the contrary, voter fraud is a very rare occurrence. In 2002 the Justice Department established the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative to ferret out fraudulent voters. On Oct. 4, 2005, Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, with great fanfare, proclaimed, "We've made enforcement of election fraud and corrupting offenses a top priority." Yet according to an April 12 New York Times article, only 120 people have been charged with the crime over the past five years, leading to 86 convictions. Furthermore, the Times noted, federal attorneys say that most of the transgressions have been mistakes by immigrants and felons who simply misunderstood eligibility requirements.

The extent of voter fraud is further complicated by the fact that earlier this year the Election Assistance Commission changed the conclusions of a report it had commissioned. The original report by outside election experts concluded, "There is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud." The commission deleted that sentence and replaced it with, "There is a great deal of debate on the pervasiveness of fraud."

Rep. José Serrano (D.-N.Y.), who chairs the House Appropriations subcommittee that oversees the commission, is disturbed by this apparently politically motivated substitution. He told In These Times:

This possibly could be another Watergate. We have to ask the questions, "Why was this report doctored, and how does this play into the larger picture of voter suppression and intimidation?" By directing public attention to voter fraud you divert attention from the fact that Americans in certain communities are not able to cast their votes properly and that their votes are not being counted. Is this something that this small new agency thought of by themselves or did they get marching
orders from somewhere else, perhaps as far up as the White House?

**Firing prosecutors**

It appears that, under Rove's direction the White House has been planning to use U.S. attorneys to fan national fears of voter fraud. In his speech to the GOP lawyers, Rove listed 11 states that would play a pivotal role in the 2008 elections. Since 2005, Bush has appointed new U.S. attorneys in nine of those states: Florida, Colorado, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, Arkansas and New Mexico.

What's more, the firings of U.S. attorneys in New Mexico, Arkansas and Washington appear directly related to this Republican plan to exploit the issue of voter fraud and suppress Democratic turnout.

In Arkansas, Bush fired a sitting U.S. attorney in order to appoint Rove protégé Tim Griffin. (See "The Talented Mr. Griffin" by Greg Palast on page 31.)

In Washington, fired U.S. Attorney John McKay had refused to prosecute alleged voter fraud in the 2004 Washington governor's race, in which Democrat Chris Gregoire beat Republican Dino Rossi by 129 votes.

On March 6, McKay testified before the Senate that after the election Republicans pressured him to open an investigation. He said his office had examined the allegations of voter fraud and decided there was not enough evidence to pursue a case.

"Had anyone at the Justice Department or the White House ordered me to pursue any matter criminally in the 2004 governor's election, I would have resigned," McKay told the Seattle Times.

"There was no evidence, and I am not going to drag innocent people in front of a grand jury."

In New Mexico, David C. Iglesias was equally suspect in the eyes of the GOP. Recall that in 2000, Gore beat Bush by 377 votes in New Mexico. Consequently, in 2004, Democrat-affiliated groups initiated voter registration campaigns in New Mexico. As a result, two boys, age 13 and 15, received voter cards in the mail. Iglesias responded by setting up a bipartisan task force to investigate. This didn't satisfy attorney Mickey D. Barnett, who represented the 2004 Bush-Cheney campaign in New Mexico. He told Iglesias he should bring federal charges against a canvasser who forged their signatures, which he refused to do.

In a New York Times op-ed, Iglesias wrote:

What the critics, who don't have any experience as prosecutors, have asserted is reprehensible--namely that I should have proceeded without having proof beyond a reasonable doubt. The public has a right to believe that prosecution decisions are made on legal, not political grounds.

**Manufacturing voter fraud**

The issue of fraudulent voters undermining American democracy did not spontaneously erupt. To promote national concern about voter fraud, in March 2005 GOP operatives with ties to the White House established a 501(c)4 organization called the American Center for Voting Rights Legislative Fund (ACVR). The group went public by establishing a Web site, ac4vr.com. (The site has since been taken down for unknown reasons.)

According to its 990 tax forms, ACVR is based in Midlothian, Va., and its executive director is Robin DeJarnette, who is also the founder and executive director of the Virginia Conservative Action PAC. However, according to the registration form for its Internet domain name, the group's address is a mailbox at a UPS Store in Dallas. The chairman of ACVR is Brian Lunde, a former Democratic National Committee official from Texas, who in 2004 was head of Democrats for Bush.
ACVR specializes in issuing studies that purport to document a host of voter fraud cases, like the report titled: "Democrat operatives far more involved in voter intimidation and suppression in 2004 than Republicans."

On March 21, 2005, four days after ACVR went public, Rep. Bob Ney (R-Ohio), then chair of the Committee on House Administration, opened hearings on 2004 election irregularities. One person who testified was ACVR National Counsel Mark "Thor" Hearne II, who described himself as "a longtime advocate of voter rights and an attorney experienced in election law." In the aftermath of the 2000 presidential campaign, Hearne was dispatched to Florida as a Republican observer in Broward County's manual recount, and in 2004 he worked as the national general counsel for Bush/Cheney '04 Inc.

In his testimony, Hearne described ACVR as "committed to defending the rights of voters and working to increase public confidence in the fairness of the outcome of elections." And he submitted to the committee a copy of the ACVR's "Ohio Election Report," of which he was the lead author. That report read in part:

This [Democratic] voter registration effort was not limited to registration of legal voters but, criminal investigations and news reports suggest, that this voter registration effort also involved the registration of thousands of fictional voters such as the now infamous Jive F. Turkey, Sr., Dick Tracy and Mary Poppins. Those individuals registering these fictional voters were reportedly paid not just money to do but were, in at least one instance, paid in crack cocaine.

And in testimony on Dec. 7, 2006, the same day the prosecutors were fired, Hearne told the Election Assistance Commission: "Recent press reports suggest that voter registration fraud remains a significant issue in the recent mid-term elections."

The press contact for ACVR is Jim Dyke, who was the communications director of the Republican National Committee during the 2004 election. In the fall of 2005 he was working in the White House trying to get Harriet Miers on the Supreme Court, before moving on to work in Vice President Dick Cheney's office. Brad Friedman of BradBlog.com reported that according to internet records, Dyke registered the ACVR Internet domain name, ac4vr.com, in December 2004. Those records have since disappeared from public view. (The source of ACVR's funding is also mysterious. According to the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review, "When asked to name any contributors to his nonprofit, Hearne claimed he did not know but said Lunde did. When Lunde was asked, he claimed he did not know but said Hearne did.")

Dyke is a good friend of his fellow Arkansan Tim Griffin, the new U.S. attorney in Arkansas. In 2004, both worked at the Republican National Committee helping Bush get re-elected. Dyke has been a vocal defender of Griffin's appointment as U.S. Attorney. "He has a real passion for the law," Dyke told the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette.

Rounding out the GOP operatives is Pat Rogers, who sits on the board of ACVR. An attorney for the Republican Party in New Mexico, he has been a vocal critic of fired U.S. Attorney Iglesias. According to the Albuquerque Tribune, Rogers is on the short list to replace Iglesias.

Rove's role

Minnite, who did the study on voter fraud, has read through the reports prepared by ACVR and presented by Hearne at various official hearings. She noticed that the claims follow a predictable script. "It all starts to look the same," she says. "There is a pattern in the way the documents that claim to show voter fraud are put together. It is usually a compilation of news reports on allegations. There is no follow up, no research done, no analysis."

"As I delved into it, I was faced with the question: 'Why do people think there is a lot of fraud
"when there isn't any real evidence? I think people are being manipulated by politics, which takes
the form of these reports that are dumped on the public. It is as if you get a big enough pile maybe
you will convince people that the volume of fraud is quite large and that we have a serious
problem."

Wisconsin provides a case in point. At a March 13 press conference, White House Counsel Dan
Bartlett identified Wisconsin as one of the states from which the White House had "received
complaints about U.S. attorneys."

In 2005, U.S. Attorney Steve Biskup, who was appointed by Bush, investigated these allegations
of voter fraud and reported that he found no evidence on which to press charges.

It turns out that early in 2005, Republican officials in Wisconsin prepared a report titled "Fraud in
Wisconsin 2004: A Timeline/Summary." The document, which was found in White House and
Justice Department records released by the House Judiciary Committee, was written by Chris Lato,
the former communications director for the state Republican Party, on orders from Rick Wiley, the
party's executive director. The 30-page report, which covers Aug. 31, 2004 to April 1, 2005,
contains 65 entries detailing voter fraud. The final example is titled: "RPW [Republican Party of

The information contained in this Wisconsin compilation, made its way into a 78-page report
released on July 21, 2005, by ACVR: "Vote Fraud, Intimidation & Suppression in the 2004
Presidential Election." In the introduction, the ACVR's Hearne and Lunde wrote that the report
"documents hundreds of incidents and allegations from around the country. ... [T]housands of
Americans were disenfranchised by illegal votes cast on Election Day 2004 ... [P]aid Democrat
operatives were far more involved in voter intimidation and suppression activities than were their
Republican counterparts. ... [R]equiring government-issued photo ID at the polls ... will help
assure ... that no American is disenfranchised by illegal votes."

And who was behind this trail of misinformation? On April 7, Daniel Bice, a columnist for the
Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, reported that a source familiar with the document told him, "The
report was prepared for Karl Rove. Rick [Wiley] wanted it so he could give it to Karl Rove."

On April 6, 2006, in Washington, at the aforementioned speech to Republican Party attorneys,
Rove began with a joke: "I ran into [ACVR's] Thor Hearne as I was coming in. He was leaving; he
was smart, and he was leaving to go out and enjoy the day." Rove then told the assembled party
lawyers, "We have, as you know, an enormous and growing problem with elections in certain parts
of America today."

Rove should know. He helped grow the problem.
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
04/19/2007 02:50 PM
To Curtis Crider/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC
bcc
Subject Re: Vote Fraud Project Audit

Curtis:

I did not draft the Statement of Work or original contracts for this project. I did work with the legal department on the contents of the second set of contracts. The only role I had in selecting the consultants was pretty peripheral. Karen asked me to sit in on a teleconference interview with Job Serebrov to provide her feedback on whether or not I thought he could handle the job.

Karen began as the COR and Project Director but, very early on, the assignment was transferred to me. Virtually all the oversight/management of the project was on my watch.

I'm happy to hear that you are setting up a means for me to submit the materials electronically. For the archived emails, we may have to put the info on disk and give it to you that way.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

Curtis Crider/EAC/GOV

Curtis Crider/EAC/GOV
04/19/2007 12:57 PM
To Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject audit

We are just getting started - but we will need copies of all your e-mails, correspondence and notes associated with the projects. We are in the process of setting up an e-mail account so that you can e-mail documents vs printing. As soon as the account is set up I will let you know.

What was your involvement in drafting the contract, vendor selection, oversight/monitoring of the projects

Curtis Crider
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission
Phone - (202) 566-3125
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
I haven't heard from you regarding this audit, but I know you that someone from your shop will need to talk with me. Can you give me an idea of when you need me to be available?

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
email: psims@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV on 04/19/2007 10:51 AM -----
Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV
04/19/2007 10:37 AM
To: Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
cc: Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV@EAC, Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC, Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject: Rep. Serrano

I hope the IG will be able to get to the bottom of this -- and REAL soon -- during his investigation!!

-----Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV wrote: -----
To: Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV, ghillman@eac.gov, Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC
From: Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
Date: 04/19/2007 10:11 AM
cc: Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject: Rep. Serrano

He is quoted in this article as saying the situation surrounding our fraud report could be another Watergate, and wonders if we got our marching orders from the WH. I think we should respond directly to Rep. Serrano regarding his allegation. Say what you will about the way this has been handled, but one thing I'm sure of is that the WH did not edit or was in any way involved in this project. I suggest someone picking up the phone and calling him or his CoS. This is a serious allegation that is starting to really catch on, but now we have a member of Congress saying it.
The Fraudulence of Voter Fraud

The Bush administration purged U.S. attorneys for failing to prosecute crimes that didn't occur

By Joel Bleifuss

April 18, 2007

On April 6, 2006, in Washington, D.C., Karl Rove gave a speech to the Republican National Lawyers Association and issued this dire warning:

We are, in some parts of the country, I'm afraid to say, beginning to look like we have elections like those run in countries where the guys in charge are, you know, colonels in mirrored sunglasses. I mean, it's a real problem, and I appreciate all that you're doing in those hot spots around the country to ensure that the ballot--the integrity of the ballot--is protected, because it's important to our democracy.

When Rove talks about protecting "ballot integrity," that is shorthand for disenfranchising Democratic Party voters. Over the last several years, the Justice Department, with the help of White House operatives, has sought to boost GOP electoral fortunes by orchestrating a national campaign against voter fraud. But the administration overreached on Dec. 7, when President George W. Bush fired eight U.S. attorneys, a political scandal that some say could become this president's Watergate.

When Republicans talk about voter fraud they are referring to illegal voting by individuals, as opposed to vote fraud--systematic attempts to steal an election by an organized group of partisans. This emphasis on voter fraud has convinced eight states to pass laws requiring voters to present official photo identification in order to cast a ballot--laws that studies have shown suppress Democratic turnout among voters who are poor, black, Latino, Asian-American or disabled.

Understanding that one way to win closely contested elections is to keep Democratic voters away from the polls, the Republican Party has tried to stoke public fears of voter fraud. On Feb. 15, 2005, the U.S. Senate Republican Policy Committee issued a report, "Putting an End to Voter Fraud," which said, "Voter fraud continues to plague our nation's federal elections, diluting and canceling out the lawful votes of the vast majority of Americans." To remedy the situation, the Senate Republicans advised Congress to "require that voters at the polls show photo identification."

But voting experts maintain that voter fraud is not a national problem. In March, Lorraine C. Minnite, a professor of political science at Columbia University, released "The Politics of Voter Fraud," a report she prepared for Project Vote, an advocacy group based in Arkansas. She writes: The claim that voter fraud threatens the integrity of American elections is itself a fraud. It is being used to persuade the public that deceitful and criminal voters are manipulating the electoral system. ... The exaggerated fear of voter fraud has a long history of scuttling efforts to make voting easier and more inclusive, especially for marginalized groups in American society. With renewed partisan vigor, fantasies of fraud are being spun again to undo some of the progress America has made lowering barriers to vote.

This is borne out by a study from the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, which found that in the 2004 election, voters in states that required documentation of identity were 2.7

015133
percent less likely to vote than voters in states where documentation was not required. Specifically, the study, commissioned by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, found that Latinos were 10 percent less likely to vote, Asian-Americans 8.5 percent less likely to vote and blacks 5.7 percent less likely to vote.

What's more, despite GOP claims to the contrary, voter fraud is a very rare occurrence. In 2002 the Justice Department established the Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative to ferret out fraudulent voters. On Oct. 4, 2005, Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, with great fanfare, proclaimed, "We've made enforcement of election fraud and corrupting offenses a top priority."

Yet according to an April 12 New York Times article, only 120 people have been charged with the crime over the past five years, leading to 86 convictions. Furthermore, the Times noted, federal attorneys say that most of the transgressions have been mistakes by immigrants and felons who simply misunderstood eligibility requirements.

The extent of voter fraud is further complicated by the fact that earlier this year the Election Assistance Commission changed the conclusions of a report it had commissioned. The original report by outside election experts concluded, "There is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud." The commission deleted that sentence and replaced it with, "There is a great deal of debate on the pervasiveness of fraud."

Rep. José Serrano (D.-N.Y.), who chairs the House Appropriations subcommittee that oversees the commission, is disturbed by this apparently politically motivated substitution. He told In These Times:

This possibly could be another Watergate. We have to ask the questions, "Why was this report doctored, and how does this play into the larger picture of voter suppression and intimidation?" By directing public attention to voter fraud you divert attention from the fact that Americans in certain communities are not able to cast their votes properly and that their votes are not being counted. Is this something that this small new agency thought of by themselves or did they get marching orders from somewhere else, perhaps as far up as the White House?

Firing prosecutors

It appears that, under Rove's direction the White House has been planning to use U.S. attorneys to fan national fears of voter fraud. In his speech to the GOP lawyers, Rove listed 11 states that would play a pivotal role in the 2008 elections. Since 2005, Bush has appointed new U.S. attorneys in nine of those states: Florida, Colorado, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, Arkansas and New Mexico.

What's more, the firings of U.S. attorneys in New Mexico, Arkansas and Washington appear directly related to this Republican plan to exploit the issue of voter fraud and suppress Democratic turnout.

In Arkansas, Bush fired a sitting U.S. attorney in order to appoint Rove protégé Tim Griffin. (See "The Talented Mr. Griffin" by Greg Palast on page 31.)

In Washington, fired U.S. Attorney John McKay had refused to prosecute alleged voter fraud in the 2004 Washington governor's race, in which Democrat Chris Gregoire beat Republican Dino Rossi by 129 votes.

On March 6, McKay testified before the Senate that after the election Republicans pressured him to open an investigation. He said his office had examined the allegations of voter fraud and decided there was not enough evidence to pursue a case.

"Had anyone at the Justice Department or the White House ordered me to pursue any matter criminally in the 2004 governor's election, I would have resigned," McKay told the Seattle Times.
In New Mexico, David C. Iglesias was equally suspect in the eyes of the GOP. Recall that in 2000, Gore beat Bush by 377 votes in New Mexico. Consequently, in 2004, Democrat-affiliated groups initiated voter registration campaigns in New Mexico. As a result, two boys, age 13 and 15, received voter cards in the mail. Iglesias responded by setting up a bipartisan task force to investigate. This didn't satisfy attorney Mickey D. Barnett, who represented the 2004 Bush-Cheney campaign in New Mexico. He told Iglesias he should bring federal charges against a canvasser who forged their signatures, which he refused to do.

In a New York Times op-ed, Iglesias wrote:

What the critics, who don't have any experience as prosecutors, have asserted is reprehensible—namely that I should have proceeded without having proof beyond a reasonable doubt. The public has a right to believe that prosecution decisions are made on legal, not political grounds.

Manufacturing voter fraud

The issue of fraudulent voters undermining American democracy did not spontaneously erupt. To promote national concern about voter fraud, in March 2005 GOP operatives with ties to the White House established a 501(c)4 organization called the American Center for Voting Rights Legislative Fund (ACVR). The group went public by establishing a Web site, ac4vr.com. (The site has since been taken down for unknown reasons.)

According to its 990 tax forms, ACVR is based in Midlothian, Va., and its executive director is Robin DeJarnette, who is also the founder and executive director of the Virginia Conservative Action PAC. However, according to the registration form for its Internet domain name, the group's address is a mailbox at a UPS Store in Dallas. The chairman of ACVR is Brian Lunde, a former Democratic National Committee official from Texas, who in 2004 was head of Democrats for Bush.

ACVR specializes in issuing studies that purport to document a host of voter fraud cases, like the report titled: "Democrat operatives far more involved in voter intimidation and suppression in 2004 than Republicans."

On March 21, 2005, four days after ACVR went public, Rep. Bob Ney (R-Ohio), then chair of the Committee on House Administration, opened hearings on 2004 election irregularities. One person who testified was ACVR National Counsel Mark "Thor" Hearne II, who described himself as "a longtime advocate of voter rights and an attorney experienced in election law." In the aftermath of the 2000 presidential campaign, Hearne was dispatched to Florida as a Republican observer in Broward County's manual recount, and in 2004 he worked as the national general counsel for Bush/Cheney '04 Inc.

In his testimony, Hearne described ACVR as "committed to defending the rights of voters and working to increase public confidence in the fairness of the outcome of elections." And he submitted to the committee a copy of the ACVR's "Ohio Election Report," of which he was the lead author. That report read in part:

This [Democratic] voter registration effort was not limited to registration of legal voters but, criminal investigations and news reports suggest, that this voter registration effort also involved the registration of thousands of fictional voters such as the now infamous Jive F. Turkey, Sr., Dick Tracy and Mary Poppins. Those individuals registering these fictional voters were reportedly paid not just money to do but were, in at least one instance, paid in crack cocaine.

And in testimony on Dec. 7, 2006, the same day the prosecutors were fired, Hearne told the
Election Assistance Commission: "Recent press reports suggest that voter registration fraud remains a significant issue in the recent mid-term elections."

The press contact for ACVR is Jim Dyke, who was the communications director of the Republican National Committee during the 2004 election. In the fall of 2005 he was working in the White House trying to get Harriet Miers on the Supreme Court, before moving on to work in Vice President Dick Cheney's office. Brad Friedman of BradBlog.com reported that according to internet records, Dyke registered the ACVR Internet domain name, ac4vr.com, in December 2004. Those records have since disappeared from public view. (The source of ACVR's funding is also mysterious. According to the *Pittsburgh Tribune-Review*, "When asked to name any contributors to his nonprofit, Hearne claimed he did not know but said Lunde did. When Lunde was asked, he claimed he did not know but said Hearne did.")

Dyke is a good friend of his fellow Arkansan Tim Griffin, the new U.S. attorney in Arkansas. In 2004, both worked at the Republican National Committee helping Bush get re-elected. Dyke has been a vocal defender of Griffin's appointment as U.S. Attorney. "He has a real passion for the law," Dyke told the *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*.

Rounding out the GOP operatives is Pat Rogers, who sits on the board of ACVR. An attorney for the Republican Party in New Mexico, he has been a vocal critic of fired U.S. Attorney Iglesias. According to the *Albuquerque Tribune*, Rogers is on the short list to replace Iglesias.

**Rove's role**

Minnite, who did the study on voter fraud, has read through the reports prepared by ACVR and presented by Hearne at various official hearings. She noticed that the claims follow a predictable script. "It all starts to look the same," she says. "There is a pattern in the way the documents that claim to show voter fraud are put together. It is usually a compilation of news reports on allegations. There is no follow up, no research done, no analysis."

"As I delved into it, I was faced with the question: Why do people think there is a lot of fraud when there isn't any real evidence?" I think people are being manipulated by politics, which takes the form of these reports that are dumped on the public. It is as if you get a big enough pile maybe you will convince people that the volume of fraud is quite large and that we have a serious problem."

Wisconsin provides a case in point. At a March 13 press conference, White House Counsel Dan Bartlett identified Wisconsin as one of the states from which the White House had "received complaints about U.S. attorneys."

In 2005, U.S. Attorney Steve Biskup, who was appointed by Bush, investigated these allegations of voter fraud and reported that he found no evidence on which to press charges. It turns out that early in 2005, Republican officials in Wisconsin prepared a report titled "Fraud in Wisconsin 2004: A Timeline/Summary." The document, which was found in White House and Justice Department records released by the House Judiciary Committee, was written by Chris Lato, the former communications director for the state Republican Party, on orders from Rick Wiley, the party's executive director. The 30-page report, which covers Aug. 31, 2004 to April 1, 2005, contains 65 entries detailing voter fraud. The final example is titled: "RPW [Republican Party of Wisconsin] News Release: Evidence of Election Fraud Piles Up."

The information contained in this Wisconsin compilation, made its way into a 78-page report released on July 21, 2005, by ACVR: "Vote Fraud, Intimidation & Suppression in the 2004 Presidential Election." In the introduction, the ACVR's Hearne and Lunde wrote that the report "documents hundreds of incidents and allegations from around the country. … [T]housands of
Americans were disenfranchised by illegal votes cast on Election Day 2004 ... [P]aid Democrat operatives were far more involved in voter intimidation and suppression activities than were their Republican counterparts. ... [R]equiring government-issued photo ID at the polls ... will help assure ... that no American is disenfranchised by illegal votes."

And who was behind this trail of misinformation? On April 7, Daniel Bice, a columnist for the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, reported that a source familiar with the document told him, "The report was prepared for Karl Rove. Rick [Wiley] wanted it so he could give it to Karl Rove."

On April 6, 2006, in Washington, at the aforementioned speech to Republican Party attorneys, Rove began with a joke: "I ran into [AVCR's] Thor Hearne as I was coming in. He was leaving; he was smart, and he was leaving to go out and enjoy the day." Rove then told the assembled party lawyers, "We have, as you know, an enormous and growing problem with elections in certain parts of America today."

Rove should know. He helped grow the problem.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), Request to provide consulting services to the EAC to assist in the development of a Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project. See the attached statement work for a description of the specifics.

LABOR COST: $50,000.00
TRAVEL COST: $ 5,000.00
TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $55,000.00
PURCHASE ORDER TERMS AND CONDITIONS

552.229-70 FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES (APR 1984)
The contract price includes all applicable Federal, State, and local taxes. No adjustment will be made to cover taxes which may subsequently be imposed on this transaction or changes in the rates of currently applicable taxes. However, the Government will, upon the request of the Contractor, furnish evidence appropriate to establish whether from which the Government exempt or which was not included in the contract price.

552.210-79 PACKING LIST (DEC 1989)
(a) A packing list or other suitable shipping document shall accompany each shipment and shall indicate (1) Name and address of consignee; (2) Name and address of consignor; (3) Government order number; (4) Government bill of lading number covering the shipment (if any); and (5) Description of the material shipped, including item number, quantity, number of containers, and packaging number (if any).
(b) When payment will be made by Government commercial credit card, in addition to the information in (a) above, the packing list or shipping document shall include: (1) Cardholder name and telephone number and (2) the term "Credit Card".

52.232-1 PAYMENTS (APR 1984)
The Government shall pay the Contractor, upon the submission of proper invoices or vouchers, the prices stipulated in this contract or any tax on the deliverables accepted by the Government if: (a) The amount due on the deliveries warranted on or before the date which appears on the invoice check or the due date for making invoice payments by the designated Government office shall be the later of the following two events:

2.232-8 DISCOUNTS FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (APR 1989)
(a) Discounts for prompt payment will not be considered in the valuation of offers. However, any offered discount will form a part of the award, and will be deducted if payment is made within the discount period.
(b) In connection with any discount offered for prompt payment, time will be computed from the date of the invoice. For the purpose of computing the discount earned, delivery shall be considered to have been made on the date which appears on the purchase order check or the due date on which an electronic funds transfer was made.

10/07 PAYMENT
Payment clause 52.222-25 is incorporated in this contract by reference. The clause contains information on payment due dates, invoice requirements, constructive acceptance and interest penalties. The Government may require that the Contractor comply with any further requirements set forth in the contract, unless there is a discrepancy between the amount stated in the contract and any invoices submitted.

4.07 PAYMENT
An invoice shall be prepared and submitted to the Government by the Contractor.

4.07.1 Name and address of the Contractor.
4.07.2 Invoice date.
4.07.3 Contract number or other authorization for supplies delivered or services performed (including order number and contract line item number).
4.07.4 Description, quantity, unit of measure, unit price, and extended price of supplies delivered or services performed.
4.07.5 Payment terms (e.g., shipment number and date of shipment, prompt payment discount terms).
4.07.6 Name and address of Contractor official to whom payment is to be sent (must be the same as that in the contract or in a proper notice).
4.07.7 Name and address of Contractor official to whom payments are to be sent (must be the same as that in the contract or in a proper notice).

NOTE: Invoices must include the ACT number (block 4) and shall be submitted in an original only, unless otherwise specified by the Government. The remit to address must correspond to the remittance address in block 2.

52.222-40 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)
Contracts of $2,500 or less (May 1989)

52.222-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)

52.222-42 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRES (APR 1984)

52.222-41 and 52.222-42 apply to service contracts when the amount exceeds $2,500.

NOTE: Invoices must include the ACT number (block 4) and shall be submitted in an original only, unless otherwise specified by the Government. The remit to address must correspond to the remittance address in block 2.

52.222-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)

52.222-41 and 52.222-42 apply to service contracts when the amount exceeds $2,500.

The GSA Form 2166, Service Contract Act of 1965 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (JUN 1988)

This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request the Contracting Officer will make their full text available:

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

52.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)
52.203-3 Gratuities (APR 84)
52.203-6 Compensation - Overtime (JUL 85)
52.203-7 Anti-Kickback Procedures (OCT 88)
52.212-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies:

52.243-1 Disputes - Fixed Price Supply and Service (APR 84)
52.249-1 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Fixed Price) (Short Form) (APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:

52.249-1 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Fixed Price) (Short Form) (APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:

52.249-1 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Fixed Price) (Short Form) (APR 84)

Consulting Services to Assist EAC in the Development of a Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

Section 241 of HAVA lists a number of election administration topics on which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to do research. In particular, Section 241(b) (6) and (7) state the two topics of nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal offices; and identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation. The EAC Board of Advisors has recommended that the EAC make research on these topics a high priority.

The EAC seeks to obtain consulting services from an individual who can provide advice drawn from broad professional and technical experience in the area of voter fraud and intimidation. The EAC needs this consultant to conduct a preliminary examination of these topics to determine if a larger research project might be warranted. If so, the consultant would also be tasked to define the scope of the project and prepare a Statement of Work for the EAC to use for a subsequent competitive procurement. To promote a balanced and non-partisan approach to this effort, EAC is contracting with two consultants, who will work jointly to perform the work described below.

Nature of the Appointment

The EAC enters into this contract pursuant to its authority to contract for consultants under 5 U.S.C. §3109 (See 42 U.S.C. §15324(b)). As such this contract is for personal services and creates a limited employment relationship. (See 5 C.F.R. §304). As a result of this unique relationship, and pursuant to this agreement, you are required to follow all Federal laws and regulations as they relate to the release of agency documents and information, travel and conduct. All research, information, documents and any other intellectual property, (including but not limited to policies, procedures, manuals, and other work created at the request or otherwise while laboring for the EAC) shall be owned exclusively by the EAC, including copyright. All such work product shall be turned over to the EAC upon completion of your appointment term or as directed by the EAC. The EAC shall have exclusive rights over this material. You may not release government information or documents without the express permission of the EAC.

Supervision and Management.

The EAC Project Manager for this effort is Margaret Sims, EAC Research Specialist. Ms. Sims will provide taskings, and supervise, review and approve all work and performance.
Period of Appointment, Compensation and Travel.

The period of appointment under this contract is estimated at six months. The appointment shall constitute intermittent appointment (without a regularly scheduled tour of duty) per 5 C.F.R. §340.401(b). The consultant shall not incur overtime. The consultants shall not receive automatic adjustments of pay based upon 5 U.S.C. 5303. The consultants are not eligible for sick and annual leave, nor compensation for work performed on federal holidays. The Consultant is expected to work 450 hours during the estimated six month appointment period. These hours must be distributed evenly over the period so that the Consultant is working approximately, but no more than 20 hours per week. The consultant shall be paid at a rate of $111 per hour. The dates of performance are flexible but shall be based upon the needs of the project and the EAC. The project at issue is sought to be completed within the sixth month period. The period of appointment shall continue until the project, outlined below, is completed.

Consultant’s duty station shall be his/her home or place of business. The consultant has access to and shall supply common office equipment to include telecommunications, internet, a computer, office supplies, facsimile machine and common workplace software (including Microsoft Word and Excel). Other resources will be provided by the EAC as needed and at its discretion.

The Consultant is required to travel on a periodic, as needed basis, throughout the duration of their appointment. All travel must be pre-approved by the EAC per Federal Travel Regulations and EAC policy. The Consultant will be reimbursed, at the Federal government rates, for hotel and ground transportation costs, proper incidental expenses, and per diem while on official, pre-approved EAC travel.

Areas of Responsibility


2. Using the description developed above, perform background research, including both Federal and State administrative and case law review, and a summation of current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics. Deliver a written summary of this research and all source documentation.

3. Work in consultation with other EAC staff and the Commissioners to identify a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The Working Group will be provided with the results of Tasks 1 and 2 as background information. The consultant will be responsible for developing a discussion agenda and convene the Working Group with the objective of identifying promising avenues for future research by EAC.
4. The consultant shall be responsible for creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and Working Group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future research resulting from this effort.

5. Should the EAC decide to pursue one or more of the recommendations made in the report noted above, the consultant will be responsible for defining the appropriate project scope(s) and preparing Statement(s) of Work sufficient for use in a competitive procurement.

Compensation Procedures

Compensation shall be made for work done by submitting invoices. Invoices shall be submitted on a monthly basis. These invoices shall state the number of labor hours that have been expended. Invoices shall be delivered to Ms. Margaret Sims for review and Ms. Diana Scott, Administrative Officer, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington DC 20005. Compensation for travel shall be submitted by travel voucher consistent with federal travel regulation and EAC requirements.

Termination

This consultant contract can be terminated without cause in advance of the current end date by two weeks' notice in writing by either of the parties.

Estimated Project Timetable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project work plan</td>
<td>10 days after contract award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress reports</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of voting fraud and voter intimidation</td>
<td>October 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of background research and associated source documentation</td>
<td>January 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene working group</td>
<td>February 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary report describing findings and recommendations for future EAC research</td>
<td>March 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement(s) of Work for future research project(s)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 8, 2005

Ms. Tova Wang
201 West 74th Street, Apt. 11F
New York, NY 10023

Dear Ms. Wang:

Enclosed is a signed personal services contract (EAC 05-66) in the amount for the provision of services to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) in researching and developing a plan for a voter fraud and intimidation study. On or about September 1, 2005, an EAC employee communicated to you that EAC agreed to enter this personal services agreement with you. You began work based upon this notice of award. Despite the fact that the agreement was entered and communicated by an unauthorized person, EAC has reviewed the contract and concluded that ratification of this agreement is appropriate. EAC has ratified the agreement made with you on September 1, 2005. EAC has also received your first invoice for the period September 1 through September 30. That invoice will be reviewed and placed in line for payment.

To acknowledge receipt of this contract, please countersign and date below and return one copy of this letter to the attention of Nicole Mortellito.

We appreciate your work on these important efforts.

Sincerely,

Gracia Hillman
Chair

_____________________________________
Tova Wang
Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), request to provide consulting services to the EAC to assist in the development of a Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project. See the attached statement work for a description of the specifics.

LABOR COST: $50,000.00
TRAVEL COST: $5,000.00
TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $55,000.00

15. REQUISITION OFFICE
(Position, symbol and telephone no.)
Election Assistance Commission
C. 1225 New York Ave., NW, #1100, Washington, DC 20005

17. GOVERNMENT B/L NO.

20. SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), request to provide consulting services to the EAC to assist in the development of a Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project. See the attached statement work for a description of the specifics. LABOR COST: $50,000.00 TRAVEL COST: $5,000.00 TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $55,000.00</td>
<td>300-A(1)</td>
<td>55,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

117. GOVERNMENT B/L NO.

23. GRAND TOTAL

GRAND TOTAL

202. TELEPHONE NO.

202-566-3100

258. TELEPHONE NO.

202-566-3100

259. FOR INQUIRIES REGARDING PAYMENT CONTACT:
Diana Scott
Election Assistance Commission

260. NAME OF CONTRACTING/ORDERING OFFICER (Type)
Gracia Hillman
Election Assistance Commission

261. SIGNATURE

The contract price includes all applicable Federal, State, and local taxes. No adjustment will be made to cover taxes which may subsequently be imposed on this transaction or changes in the rates of currently applicable taxes. However, the Government will, upon the request of the Contractor, furnish evidence appropriate to establish exemption from any tax which the Government is exempt and which was not included in the contract price.

PACKING LIST (DEC 1989)

b) When payment will be made by Government commercial credit card, in addition to the information in (a) above, the packing list or shipping document shall include: (1) Cardholder name and telephone number and (2) the term "Credit Card".

2.232-1 PAYMENTS (APR 1984)

The Government shall pay the Contractor, upon the submission of proper invoices or vouchers, the prices stipulated in this contract for supplies delivered or accepted or services rendered and accepted, as deductions of any amount provided hereunder. The contract, payment shall be made on receipt of final invoices and acceptance by the Government; if (a) The amount due on the deliveries warrants it; or (b) The Contractor requests it and the amount due on deliveries is at least $1,000 or 50 percent of the total contract price.

2.232-8 DISCOUNTS FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (APR 1989)

Discounts for prompt payment will not be considered in the valuation of offers. However, any offered discount will form part of a contract award, and will be taken if payment is made within the discount period indicated in the offer by the offeror. As an alternative to offering a prompt payment discount in conjunction with the offer, offerors awarded contracts may include prompt payment discount on individual invoices.

OMIT PAYMENT

Promt Payment clause 52.232-26 is incorporated in this contract by reference. The clause contains information on payment due date, interest, requirements, contract acceptance and interest penalties, and contains acceptance requirements for convenience. All days referred to in the extracts below are end days.

The 30th day after the designated billing office has received a proper invoice from the Contractor. i) The 30th day after Government acceptance of supplies delivered or services performed by the Contractor . . .

4) An invoice shall be prepared and submitted to the designated office specified in the contract. A proper invoice must include items listed in . . . (a) through . . . (vi) . . . Until notice to the contrary is received from the account in the statement of any interest penalty owed the Contractor . . .

Name and address of the Contractor.

Invoices must include the ACT number (block 4) and shall be submitted in an original only, unless otherwise specified, to the billing office designated in block 24 to receive invoices. The "remit to" address must correspond to the remittance address in block 12.

NOTE: The purpose of computing an interest penalty that might be due the Contractor is to ensure that Government acceptance shall be deemed to have occurred constructively on the 10th day after the Contractor accepts the supplies or services in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, unless there is a disagreement over quantity, quality or contractor compliance with a contract provision . . .

52.222-40 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED

Except to the extent that an exception, variation, or tolerance would apply under this contract, were in excess of $2,500, the Contractor and any subcontractors shall pay all employees working on the contract not less than the minimum wage specified under Section 6a. (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended [29 U.S.C. 201-206]. Regulations and interpretations of the Service Contract Act of 1965 are contained in 29 CFR Part 4.

52.222-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)

52.222-42 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRES

52.222-41 and 52.222-42 apply to service contracts when the amount exceeds $2,500.

The GSA Form 2166, Service Contract Act of 1965 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

52.282-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (JUN 1988)

This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request the Contracting Officer will make their full text available:

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

52.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)

52.203-3 Gratuitities [APR 84]

52.203-5 Covenant Against Contingent Fees (APR 84)

52.203-6 Restriciton on Subcontractor Sales to the Government (JUL 85)

52.212-9 Anti-Kickback Procedures (OCT 88)

52.212-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)

52.212-4 Disputes (DEC 91)

52.212-3 Protest / Inspection Requirements (APR 84)

52.222-11 Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases (MAY 92)

52.222-29 Prompt Payment (SEP 92)

52.222-30 Buy American Act - Supplies (JAN 90)

52.222-31 Buy American Act - Supplies (JAN 89)

52.222-32 Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases (MAY 92)

52.222-33 Protest After Award (AUG 89)

52.222-34 Contractor Inspection Requirements (APR 84)

52.222-35 Employment Reports on Special Disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era (JAN 88)(Applies whenever clause 52.222-35 is included.)

52.222-36 Affirmative Action for Handicapped Workers (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $25,000.)

52.222-37 Employment Reports on Special Disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era (JAN 88)(Applies whenever clause 52.222-36 is included.)

52.222-39 Affirmative Action for Disabled Workers (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $2,500.)

52.222-40 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965 - CONTRACTS OF $2,500 OR LESS (MAY 1989)

52.222-42 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRES

52.222-41 and 52.222-42 apply to service contracts when the amount exceeds $2,500.

The GSA Form 2166, Service Contract Act of 1965 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

GSA FORM 300 BACK (REV. 2-93)
Consulting Services to Assist EAC in the Development of a Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

Section 241 of HAVA lists a number of election administration topics on which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to do research. In particular, Section 241(b) (6) and (7) state the two topics of nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal offices; and identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation. The EAC Board of Advisors has recommended that the EAC make research on these topics a high priority.

The EAC seeks to obtain consulting services from an individual who can provide advice drawn from broad professional and technical experience in the area of voter fraud and intimidation. The EAC needs this consultant to conduct a preliminary examination of these topics to determine if a larger research project might be warranted. If so, the consultant would also be tasked to define the scope of the project and prepare a Statement of Work for the EAC to use for a subsequent competitive procurement. To promote a balanced and non-partisan approach to this effort, EAC is contracting with two consultants, who will work jointly to perform the work described below.

Nature of the Appointment

The EAC enters into this contract pursuant to its authority to contract for consultants under 5 U.S.C. §3109 (See 42 U.S.C. §15324(b)). As such this contract is for personal services and creates a limited employment relationship. (See 5 C.F.R. §304). As a result of this unique relationship, and pursuant to this agreement, you are required to follow all Federal laws and regulations as they relate to the release of agency documents and information, travel and conduct. All research, information, documents and any other intellectual property, (including but not limited to policies, procedures, manuals, and other work created at the request or otherwise while laboring for the EAC) shall be owned exclusively by the EAC, including copyright. All such work product shall be turned over to the EAC upon completion of your appointment term or as directed by the EAC. The EAC shall have exclusive rights over this material. You may not release government information or documents without the express permission of the EAC.

Supervision and Management.

The EAC Project Manager for this effort is Margaret Sims, EAC Research Specialist. Ms. Sims will provide taskings, and supervise, review and approve all work and performance.
Period of Appointment, Compensation and Travel.

The period of appointment under this contract is estimated at six months. The appointment shall constitute intermittent appointment (without a regularly scheduled tour of duty) per 5 C.F.R. §340.401(b). The consultant shall not incur overtime. The consultants shall not receive automatic adjustments of pay based upon 5 U.S.C. 5303. The consultants are not eligible for sick and annual leave, nor compensation for work performed on federal holidays. The Consultant is expected to work 450 hours during the estimated six month appointment period. These hours must be distributed evenly over the period so that the Consultant is working approximately, but no more than 20 hours per week. The consultant shall be paid at a rate of $111 per hour. The dates of performance are flexible but shall be based upon the needs of the project and the EAC. The project at issue is sought to be completed within the sixth month period. The period of appointment shall continue until the project, outlined below, is completed.

Consultant’s duty station shall be his/her home or place of business. The consultant has access to and shall supply common office equipment to include telecommunications, internet, a computer, office supplies, facsimile machine and common workplace software (including Microsoft Word and Excel). Other resources will be provided by the EAC as needed and at its discretion.

The Consultant is required to travel on a periodic, as needed basis, throughout the duration of their appointment. All travel must be pre-approved by the EAC per Federal Travel Regulations and EAC policy. The Consultant will be reimbursed, at the Federal government rates, for hotel and ground transportation costs, proper incidental expenses, and per diem while on official, pre-approved EAC travel.

Areas of Responsibility


2. Using the description developed above, perform background research, including both Federal and State administrative and case law review, and a summation of current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics. Deliver a written summary of this research and all source documentation.

3. Work in consultation with other EAC staff and the Commissioners to identify a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The Working Group will be provided with the results of Tasks 1 and 2 as background information. The consultant will be responsible for developing a discussion agenda and convene the Working Group with the objective of identifying promising avenues for future research by EAC.
4. The consultant shall be responsible for creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and Working Group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future research resulting from this effort.

5. Should the EAC decide to pursue one or more of the recommendations made in the report noted above, the consultant will be responsible for defining the appropriate project scope(s) and preparing Statement(s) of Work sufficient for use in a competitive procurement.

Compensation Procedures

Compensation shall be made for work done by submitting invoices. Invoices shall be submitted on a monthly basis. These invoices shall state the number of labor hours that have been expended. Invoices shall be delivered to Ms. Margaret Sims for review and Ms. Diana Scott, Administrative Officer, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington DC 20005. Compensation for travel shall be submitted by travel voucher consistent with federal travel regulation and EAC requirements.

Termination

This consultant contract can be terminated without cause in advance of the current end date by two weeks' notice in writing by either of the parties.

Estimated Project Timetable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project work plan</td>
<td>10 days after contract award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress reports</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of voting fraud and voter intimidation</td>
<td>October 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of background research and associated source documentation</td>
<td>January 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene working group</td>
<td>February 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary report describing findings and recommendations for future EAC research</td>
<td>March 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement(s) of Work for future research project(s)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 8, 2005

Mr. Job Serebrov
2110 South Spring Street
Little Rock, AR 72206

Dear Mr. Serebrov:

Enclosed is a signed personal services contract (EAC 05-67) in the amount for the provision of services to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) in researching and developing a plan for a voter fraud and intimidation study. On or about September 1, 2005, an EAC employee communicated to you that EAC agreed to enter this personal services agreement with you. You began work based upon this notice of award. Despite the fact that the agreement was entered and communicated by an unauthorized person, EAC has reviewed the contract and concluded that ratification of this agreement is appropriate. EAC has ratified the agreement made with you on September 1, 2005. EAC has also received your first invoice for the period September 1 through September 30. That invoice will be reviewed and placed in line for payment.

To acknowledge receipt of this contract, please countersign and date below and return one copy of this letter to the attention of Nicole Mortellito.

We appreciate your work on these important efforts.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gracia Hillman
Chair

_________________________________

Job Serebrov
Commissioners,

Jeannie and I have collaborated on the following draft response to Tova Wang's letter. Please let me know if you agree or have comments/edits.

![Image](draft_response_to_Tova_Wang.doc)

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
December 8, 2006

Ms. Tova Wang  
(Address)  
(Address)

Dear Ms. Wang:

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission believes that voting fraud and voter intimidation are very important, complex topics that should be studied and reported on fairly and accurately. As a clearinghouse of election administration information, EAC is committed to providing complete and comprehensive information to the election community and the public.

In its December 2006 report on voting fraud and voter intimidation, EAC honored this commitment by providing the readers of its report with the full and complete summaries of every interview conducted as well as every book, article, report or case that was reviewed. It is incumbent upon us to provide them with the best and most complete data and research that we can. Rather than provide only the synopsis of these interviews, EAC provided the readers with the entire summaries created by the consultants so readers could reach their own conclusions about the substance of the interviews.

With regard to the interviews of two of the personnel from the Department of Justice, EAC made clarifying edits. Upon reviewing initial information about their interviews contained in the status report provided to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors and the information provided by the consultants at the working group meeting, those persons interviewed did not agree with certain characterizations of their statements contained in these materials. The Department of Justice is an important prosecutorial agency engaged in enforcing Federal anti-fraud and anti-intimidation laws. Thus, it was important to EAC to assure that the summary of their comments did not lend confusion to an already complex and hotly-debated topic.

Because of the lack of organization and cohesion in the draft provided by the consultants, that document would have led to greater confusion and division regarding the issues of voting fraud and voter intimidation. As such, EAC revised the draft report and provided the entirety of the supporting documentation to the public.

For these reasons, the report on voting fraud and voter intimidation will stand as adopted on December 7, 2006.
I can certainly do that. I was focusing on trying to use her own words against her.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins  
General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3100  
Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV

Julie,

The letter is good, but don't you want to point out that in every report we issue that the research provided by paid consultants/organizations is provided under contract to the EAC, who by law is ultimately responsible for any final report issued to the public. And that such reports always takes into consideration the research provided but the EAC is obligated to consider all factors when making determinations to insure fairness and integrity of the process.

Paul

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld  

Juliet E. Hodgkins  
----- Original Message -----  
From: Juliet E. Hodgkins  
Sent: 12/08/2006 04:38 PM  
To: Paul DeGregorio; Gracia Hillman; Donetta Davidson; Thomas Wilkey  
Cc: Bert Benavides; Sheila Banks; Eileen Collver; Matthew Masterson; Jeannie Layson  
Subject: Draft response to Tova Wang

Commissioners,

Jeannie and I have collaborated on the following draft response to Tova Wang's letter. Please let me know if you agree or have comments/edits.

[attachment "draft response to Tova Wang.doc" deleted by Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV]
Commissioners,

Consistent with the changes requested by both Commissioners DeGregorio and Hillman, I have revised the draft response. Please take one more look at the letter. If possible, it would be nice to get this out today.

tova wang response 121106.doc

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV

Julie,

I am ok with the edits Commissioner made to the letter; however, I do think that because of the tone of Tova’s letter, which is likely to be supplied to others (as was their report to us), that we need a paragraph in the letter that makes it clear that the process used in producing this final report was consistent with the process we have used in all the reports and studies we have issued to date. What she needs to know (in writing) is that while we review the work of our researchers and consultants on a topic closely to draw various conclusions, our staff and the commissioners themselves have input into the final product that becomes the public report issued by a majority vote of the EAC. Since I’ve been on the EAC, we have consistently questioned statistics, statements and conclusions drawn by those doing work for the EAC. We have also drawn upon our collective resources and wisdom to produce the best report possible. I think that was true in this case as it has been with all the other reports we have issued. In the end, it is the EAC—or the commissioners in particular—who are held accountable for what we adopt and release; not our paid consultants or organizations we contract with to do studies.

Paul DeGregorio
Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
commissiners,

See below edits that Gracia has offered to the letter. Let me know if you agree. I would like to send this out today. Also, in response to Gracia’s question below, I believe that since her letter was addressed to the Commissioners that the Commissioners should respond (either collectively or through the Chairman). Please let me know if you agree with the edits. It would be nice to get this out today.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100


Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV
12/11/2006 11:26 AM

To: Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, jlayson@eac.gov
cc: Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject: Re: Draft response to Tova Wang

Julie and Jeannie:

Thank you for the quick turn around on drafting a response to Tova Wang.

I have made substantial edits because I think the first draft offered too much information, which is not germane to Tova’s complaint. Additionally, too much verbiage masks the strength of our good report and seemed to obscure the main points in our response.

I hope you will find the attached helpful.

BTW, who will sign the letter?

[attachment "Tova Wang, Dec06.doc" deleted by Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV]
December 11, 2006

Ms. Tova Wang  
c/o The Century Foundation  
1333 H Street NW, 10th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Ms. Wang:

We are writing in response to your December 7, 2006 memorandum. As you know, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) issued its first report on election crimes last week, based in large part on the work that was done for EAC by Job and you. The report contains the full and complete summaries of every interview conducted as well as every book, article, report or case that was reviewed. Rather than provide the synopsis of these interviews, EAC provided the individual summaries so readers could reach their own conclusions about the substance of the interviews.

As the agency responsible for these final reports, it is incumbent upon EAC to assure that the information contained in the reports is accurate and fairly presented. With each of the reports, best practices documents, quick start guides, and other documents that EAC publishes, EAC makes changes as needed to make certain that our constituents are receiving the best and most complete information. This due diligence process is observed regardless of whether the document was created in-house or was created by consultants or contractors.

Upon reviewing initial information about the Department of Justice interviews contained in the status report that was provided to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors and the information provided at the working group meeting in May 2006, those persons interviewed at the Department of Justice did not agree with certain characterizations of their statements contained in these materials. Therefore, EAC exercised its responsibility to make clarifying edits. The Department of Justice is an important prosecutorial agency engaged in enforcing Federal anti-fraud and anti-intimidation laws. Thus, it was important to EAC to assure that the summary of their comments did not lend confusion to an already complex and hotly-debated topic.
The report on voting fraud and voter intimidation will stand as adopted on December 7, 2006. Again, we thank you for the contributions you made to the EAC’s initial research of these important issues.

Sincerely,

Paul DeGregorio  Donetta Davidson  
Chairman  Commissioner

Gracia Hillman  
Commissioner
One option is why don't you have me or someone else who is doing research on voter ID debate them in a forum before the commission. As you know, I already have a study done on this issue and would happy to do it almost as soon as you wanted to set something up. I agree that unless you look at data over time you can't tell anything about the effect of the regulations.

On Apr 10, 2007, at Tuesday, April 10, 3:35 PM, HvonSpakovskya@fec.gov wrote:

John,

have you seen the controversy over the release of a study done under contract for the U.S. Election Assistance Commission on voter ID and turnout? Here is the link to the press release that the EAC put out about the voter ID study: http://www.eac.gov/news_033007.asp.

Basically, the EAC awarded the contract to individuals who had lots of prior writings indicating their opposition to any voter ID requirements. When they did the study, it apparently didn't come out showing what they wanted it to show, so they recast the numbers to come to the conclusion they wanted. The methodology they used is completely flawed, the most obvious problem being that they only looked at one election year and then compared the turnout in different states, completely failing to take into account the fact that different states have different turnout rates as a matter of historical and cultural trends. Comparing a state in the West that traditionally has very high turnout to a state in the South like Georgia that traditionally has much lower turnout to prove that Georgia's voter ID law must lower turnout is problematic when you don't look at or review longer term turnout trends in each state, particularly before and after an ID requirement is implemented.
The point of my sending you this is that I think this study would be a great opportunity for you to do what you are very good at - analyzing the methodology used by the authors and pointing out its flaws. Apparently, there was a peer review conducted by some academics for the EAC who orally told the EAC that study was flawed.

This study is now being trumpeted as proof that voter ID hurts turnout, and if it is a flawed study, someone with your kind of reputation needs to point that out. If you are interested in doing this, Caroline Hunter, one of the new commissioners at the EAC, would be happy to provide you with whatever information you might need.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Commissioner
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20463
Tel. (202) 694-1011
Fax (202) 219-8493

=
Peer Review Group

A draft of this report and the statistical analysis in its appendix were critiqued by a Peer Review Group. The comments of its members improved the quality of our work. While the Group as a whole and the comments of its members individually contributed generously to the research effort, any errors of fact or weaknesses in inference are the responsibility of the Eagleton-Moritz research team. The members of the Peer Review Group do not necessarily share the views reflected in our recommendations.

R. Michael Alvarez  
Professor of Political Science  
California Institute of Technology

John C. Harrison  
Massee Professor of Law  
University of Virginia School of Law

Martha E. Kropf  
Assistant Professor Political Science  
University of Missouri-Kansas City

Daniel H. Lowenstein  
Professor of Law, School of Law  
University of California at Los Angeles

Timothy G. O'Rourke  
Dean, Fulton School of Liberal Arts  
Salisbury University

Bradley Smith  
Professor of Law  
Capital University Law School

Tim Storey  
Program Principal  
National Conference of State Legislatures

Peter G. Verniero  
former Attorney General, State of New Jersey  
Counsel, Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
Looks fine to me. Of course, she is probably referring to our decision not to release the consultants' draft final report. --- Peggy

Hello all,
A columnist from the WaPo has asked for info about both the voter ID and the fraud and intimidation reports. This was prompted by the accusation that the president was concerned that the fired prosecutors were not aggressively pursuing voter fraud cases. She had heard that we were refusing to release this information, so I am trying to demonstrate otherwise, as well as show that we have discussed these projects numerous times in public meetings. Please take a look at my draft email to her and let me know if you have any suggestions. She needs to hear back from me by 4 p.m. Thanks for your help with this.

Ms. Cocco,
Per your questions, go here to view the testimony regarding voter ID from our Feb. 2 public meeting. As I mentioned, at this meeting EAC Chair Donetta Davidson requested that staff review the initial research provided by Eagleton and produce a final report, which would include recommendations for further study on this subject. Currently, staff is working to finalize the voter ID report.

Regarding the voter fraud and intimidation research, at a May 2006 public meeting of our Standards Board and Board of Advisors, the EAC project manager for this research presented a staff update on the project. Go here to view the agenda, page 3. The document you referred to was the update the project manager gave at this public meeting, and it has been made available to anyone who asked for it. The final culmination of this project can be found here, and links to the attachments provided by the consultants are available by going to page 24 of this report. The commissioners adopted this report at a public meeting in...

As a small agency of 23 employees, including the four commissioners, it is necessary for the agency to contract with consultants to gather the initial data for these projects. After EAC receives the initial data, the agency reviews the data for accuracy and then releases a final report.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
John-

At the present, I envision my role will merely be to provide a chronology of the project and to provide a context to what has happened with the project and the reports, thus far.

All of the Commissioners will have read your final June 28, 2006 report on Voter Identification and will be addressing their questions to the material contained in that 32 page report and the appendices.

When, or if, I get additional information on the substance of the meeting I'll be certain to pass that information along.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen - I understand you will be a panelist on the Eagleton/Moritz Voter ID study along with Tom O'Neill and Tim Vercellotti at next Thursday's EAC meeting. Could you let us know what you will be covering so we prepare comments that will not be redundant.

Thanks. I hope your new year is off to a good start.

John

--

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290.
Commissioners & Tom,

After checking all of your schedules, it appears that Wednesday, Nov. 29 in the morning is available for everyone. Let's set 10:30 as the time. I will reserve the small conference room. Will anyone other than Donetta be calling in?

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Hello everyone,

I need each of you to respond affirmatively or negatively to the FOIA request below. If you have no documents in your possession related to this request, please reply to me with the words "no records."

If you have records, please identify them in an email reply and attach them to the email. If the document is not electronic, hand deliver them to me. Also, if you believe any of these related documents should be withheld, please provide a brief memo stating the reason for your position.

I need this information and/or a response by COB December 5, 2006. If you cannot comply by this date, please provide notification and an estimated time when you will provide the information and the reason why you cannot comply by the original deadline. Thanks for your cooperation. See request below:

Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center for Justice has submitted a FOIA request for the voting fraud report prepared by our consultants and the voter ID report, as well as the following information:

"In the event that the EAC denies my renewed request for the voter ID and voting fraud reports or delays another week in providing those materials, we respectfully request copies of (1) all requests for proposals and contracts relating to the voter ID and voting fraud reports; and (2) all written and electronic communications concerning the voter ID and voting fraud reports between the EAC and (a) the Eagleton Institute of Politics, (b) the Moritz College of Law, (c) Tova Wang, (d) Job Serebrov, and (e) any other individuals or entities, including but not limited to outside reviewers."

Please let me know if you would like a copy of the FOIA request.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV To EAC Personnel cc bcc

Subject FOIA Request
by the way, i forwarded the commissioner's staff meeting materials to Trudie's aol account so you can print them out.

----- Original Message -----
From: Donetta L. Davidson
Sent: 10/17/2006 03:54 PM
To: Jeannie Layson
Subject: Re: NEED APPROVAL: Brennen Cen. letter

Jeannie. My appointments are at 9 20 - 12 00 - 2 00. I could call him tomorrow at 9 DC time or about 6 DC time. Let me know if that works.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Commissioners,
I have not received input from everyone regarding the attached letter. It is a response to Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center, who requested the staff voter fraud status report and the provisional voting draft report, both of which were presented to the Standards Bd. and the Bd. of Adv. at the May meeting. She also requested the draft voter ID report, which was not released at the May meeting. If possible, I'd like to get your input by the end of the day. The letter would go out under Tom's signature. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Donetta--- this is the person to whom the EAC is paying taxpayer money to perform dispassionate research on voter fraud? No wonder she has concluded for all of us that voter fraud (in person) really does not exist, except for maybe a few isolated places in the Midwest. If her report sees the light of day, I can almost guaranty problems. The fact that the report may have a co-writer does not solve this problem. She should not even be paid. There is a clear agenda behind her conclusions. I believe the credibility of the EAC is in question with your decision to hire this person and allow her to report on behalf of the EAC on either election fraud or voter intimidation. I would like a response from the Chairman that addresses this article. Thanks

Rumble in the Desert

Civil rights groups are challenging Arizona’s Prop 200, which endangers voting rights for citizens.

Tova Andrew Wang
June 01, 2006

Article created by The Century Foundation.

Without a lot of fanfare, a very important lawsuit was filed last week by the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights and other groups in Arizona. Finally, two years after the passage of the quite pernicious Prop 200, groups are finally taking serious action to combat it.

Basically an anti-immigrant measure, Prop 200 set out a bunch of restrictions on access to services for immigrants. However, with respect to voting rights, Prop 200 set up a situation blocking the right to vote for many citizens by requiring every person registering to vote to prove citizenship.

As the Lawyer’s Committee describes it, Proposition 200 requires that that counties reject any voter registration application that does not include satisfactory proof of citizenship, such as a copy of the applicant’s birth certificate, passport, a driver’s license or non-operating identification license, but only if issued after October 1, 1996, a tribal identification card or naturalization documents. This even applies to voters who must re-register simply because they moved across county lines.

This measure is at least as damaging as many of the voter identification laws being passed and contemplated across the country. This stops someone from being part of the
process before they've even gotten to square one. As I have repeatedly discussed with respect to ID laws, many voters are unlikely to have the required documentation and efforts to obtain the documentation will take time and money, therefore amounting to an unconstitutional poll tax.

Ironically, it has proven to be eligible voters who have been caught in the snare of this act. Last year in Maricopa County, home to Phoenix, more than 10,000 people trying to register were rejected for being unable to prove their citizenship. A spokeswoman for the recorder's office said most are probably U.S. citizens whose married names differ from the ones on their birth certificates or who have lost documentation. In Pima County, home to Tucson, 60 percent of those who tried to register initially could not. The elections chief said that all appeared to be U.S. citizens, but many had moved to Arizona recently and couldn't get their birth certificates or passports.

Moreover, Prop 200 is based on the idea that noncitizens are coming to the polling place and voting illegally. The premise is false. There is no evidence of any number of immigrants knowingly voting in the past in Arizona, and certainly it would seem unlikely when the last thing immigrants want to do in these times is draw official attention to themselves.

Finally, as the lawsuit persuasively argues, the measure also makes it virtually impossible for groups to conduct voter registration drives in Arizona. How many people go to the supermarket with their birth certificate?

The recent decision in Indiana upholding its draconian ID bill and the intolerance toward immigrants being displayed right now makes me worry about how the Arizona courts will respond. They upheld the Proposition in another context once before. But anyone who cares about the right to vote—for qualified, U.S. citizens—should hope that the law is struck down as the unconstitutional and anti-democratic measure it is.

Tova Andrea Wang is Democracy Fellow at The Century Foundation.

David R. Maxwell
Campaign Assistant
Todd Rokita
Secretary of State Reelection Campaign
47 South Meridian Street, Suite 200
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
Direct: (317) 964 - 5027
Commissioners:

Today we had the following media inquiries:

(1) Leslie Robinson, a reporter for the news blog, ColoradoConfidential.com inquired about the rules and regulations that EAC board members must adhere to. She said that one of the EAC members from Colorado, Dan Kopelman, has recently been cited by the Secretary of State for his business of selling voter lists and consulting partisan candidates. She asked if these infractions cause Kopelman to withdraw from the EAC board. We explained that, according to SEC. 213 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA), there are two EAC Standards Board representatives from each state, one is a state official, one is a local official, and that both individuals represent their state on the Board. We said that the state representatives are selected by the Chief State election official from each state. We said that, with respect to Colorado, Mr. Kopelman was selected to serve on the Board by Colorado Secretary of State Michael Coffman. We suggested Ms. Robinson contact their office for questions regarding the appointment of state representatives from Colorado.

(2) Rose Marie Berger, Associate Editor of Sojourners/Call to Renewal, asked for the document on voter fraud authored by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov. We replied that our Inspector General is currently reviewing the circumstances surrounding this research and noted page two of the following memo from the chair. We said that when that process is complete we'll be glad to discuss it further. 04/16/07 - EAC Requests Review of Voter ID, Vote Fraud & Voter Intimidation Research Projects

####
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Commissioners:

Today we had the following media inquiries:

(1) Meg Cox, a freelance journalist in Chicago is working on an article about voter fraud and voter ID laws. She asked the following two questions:

1) Is the EAC still sending its "Elections Crimes" report to journalists who request the report on voter fraud and intimidation authored by Wang and Serebrov?

2) If the answer to #1 is yes, is the EAC still sending the "Election Crimes" report in these cases without comment—i.e., without indicating that it is not the Wang/Serebrov report?

We forwarded her questions to Curtis and replied to Ms. Cox that the chair has asked our Inspector General to review the circumstances surrounding this research project, as well as research done about voter ID. We said he has requested that EAC not comment on either one of these projects while his review is ongoing. We referred her to the following link: here, and said we'd be glad to make sure she receives the IG's review when it is completed.

(2) Jenna Portnoy of the Doylestown Intelligencia in Bucks Co., PA called again to ask about EAC's progress in determining the status of Pennsylvania's 102 funds. She wants to know the amount of money, if any, that they will have to return. We said that EAC is still reviewing the certifications submitted by the states and we hope to have this process completed as soon as possible. We said we are also evaluating all the reports submitted by the states regarding their 101 and 251 funds expenditures.
Commissioners:

Today Meg Cox, a freelance journalist in Chicago, sent us the same two questions she sent us last Friday (see below). She had not been satisfied with our response. She is working on an article about voter fraud and voter ID laws. She said she is concerned that journalists are receiving a substitute report from EAC and not the real thing. We replied that we directed her to the one and only report adopted by EAC -- Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study -- We noted that it contains clear language about the role of the consultants, identifies them by name and that their bios are included in the EAC report as Appendix D here. We said we would notify her when the IG has completed his review of this subject. We also noted the following contents of the report:

- Page one: "EAC staff along with two, bipartisan consultants reviewed the existing information available about voting fraud and voter intimidation, including reading articles, books and reports; interviewing subject matter experts; reviewing media reports of fraud and intimidation; and studying reported cases of prosecutions of these types of crimes.

- Page three: To accomplish these tasks, EAC employed two consultants, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, who worked with EAC staff and interns to conduct the research that forms the basis of this report.

- Page four: The consultants drafted a report for EAC that included their summaries of relevant cases, studies and reports on voting fraud and voter intimidation as well as summaries of the interviews that they conducted. The draft report also provided a definition of voting fraud and intimidation and made certain recommendations developed by the consultants or by the working group on how to pursue further study of this subject. This document was vetted and edited by EAC staff to produce this final report.

###

BACKGROUND: Last Friday’s Q&A.

Meg Cox, a freelance journalist in Chicago is working on an article about voter fraud and voter ID laws. She asked the following two questions:

1) Is the EAC still sending its "Elections Crimes" report to journalists who request the report on voter fraud and intimidation authored by Wang and Serebrov?
2) If the answer to #1 is yes, is the EAC still sending the "Election Crimes" report in these cases without comment--in other words, without indicating that it is not the Wang/Serebrov report?

We forwarded her questions to Curtis and replied to Ms. Cox that the chair has asked our Inspector General to review the circumstances surrounding this research project, as well as research done about voter ID. We said he has requested that EAC not comment on either one of these projects while his review is ongoing. We referred her to the following link: here, and said we'd be glad to make sure she receives the IG's review when it is completed.
Commissioners and Tom,

There are several questions in the Feinstein and Durbin letter that I need your assistance responding to. Particularly, I need your responses as to question 1 for both the Voter ID study (page 4 -- numbered at the top) and Voting Fraud and Intimidation (page 5 -- numbered at the top). While these two questions actually say the same exact thing, I believe that the question under Voter ID was intended to refer to the Voter ID study and not the Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Study. In addition, please look at questions 5 and 9 under Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation. Each of these questions require information and documents that you may have. Last, if you have any input on the response to Question 10 under Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation, please let me know.

I am currently working on the response and anticipate working on it tomorrow and Friday. I would appreciate any information that you may have.

[PDF attachment: Feinstein and Durbin letter.pdf]

Juliet T. Hodgkins  
General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3100
United States Senate  
WASHINGTON, DC 20510  

April 12, 2007

The Honorable Donetta Davidson  
Chairman  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Commissioner Davidson:

We are writing to seek a response to very troubling news reports that included allegations that the Commission may have altered or delayed release of two taxpayer-funded studies of election issues for political purposes.

While the Commission is within its rights to decide what guidance it issues to election officials, it is critical that its actions are not perceived as politically motivated and it is imperative that you provide full documentation about the Commission's proceedings on these matters.

On Wednesday, the New York Times reported that a bipartisan team of election law experts hired by the Commission to research voter fraud in federal elections found that there was little such fraud around the nation, but the Commission revised the report to say that the pervasiveness of voter fraud was still open to debate.

On Monday, Roll Call reported that the Commission two weeks ago rejected the findings of a report, prepared as part of a $560,000 contract with Rutgers University's Eagleton Institute and Ohio State University's Moritz College of Law. That report found that voter identification laws may reduce election turnout, especially by minorities.
It is imperative that the Commission's actions and deliberations are unbiased, free from political influence and transparent. While the Commission does not have to agree with the experts who perform its research, it should make the research available unfettered and unfiltered.

Attached are a series of questions, we would like the Commission to address. We look forward to your timely response.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

Dianne Feinstein
Chairman
Committee on Rules and Administration

Richard J. Durbin
Chairman
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government
Committee on Appropriations
We request information and documentation from the Commission that answer the following questions:

COMMISSION'S OVERSIGHT ON EAGLETON CONTRACT TO PERFORM A STUDY ON VOTER IDENTIFICATION

1. Did the Commissioners or Commission senior staff receive any outside communication or pressure to change or not release the entire draft report or portions of the draft language on the voter fraud report? If so, who made those requests?

2. Would you please provide a copy of the approved Request For Proposals, as well as any contract modifications that were agreed to between the Commission and Eagleton Institute and subcontractors?

3. Can you provide the names and qualifications of Election Assistance Commission staff that worked on the Eagleton Institute project?

4. Please indicate how many project meetings occurred during the term of the Eagleton contract, including in-person meetings, conference calls regarding the status of the report, and any meeting where Commissioners were present for at least part of the meeting. Please provide copies of any minutes from those meetings.

5. Please identify the names and affiliations of members of the Peer Review group or groups that examined the Eagleton Institute drafts. Please also indicate the dates upon which any such review of the Eagleton research was conducted, and the specific concerns or complaints that were raised by members of the Peer Review group as to either the analysis or statistical methodology, if any. Please provide copies of any minutes from those meetings.

6. If certain members of the Peer Review groups had concerns with the data or methodology of the Eagleton study, was that information communicated to Eagleton, and were any changes made to the study based on Peer Review group concerns with methodology or data?

7. Who were the individuals (and what were their academic qualifications) that advised the Commission that the data, methodology, or the results of the Eagleton Contract were so flawed that the Commission should reject the report? At what point did the Commission receive input from those individuals?
8. The Commission previewed its research on the Eagleton Institute's study on Provisional Voting at its May 2006 Advisory Board meetings—why was the Voter Identification Draft Study not discussed at that time? What is the status of the Provisional Voting report?

9. In rejecting the Eagleton report, the Commission indicated concerns that there was only one year's worth of data. Given that this was the first year that Commission had studied the results, isn't "one year" what was originally contemplated in the Eagleton contract? Isn't the reason for having a major research institute conduct this study is so they can draw initial assessments from that data—even though that data can be augmented in future years? Because of the rejected report, will the Commission start anew for research in the 2008 elections?

10. What was the final, total cost of the Eagleton contract, and what was produced or released by that Commission as a result of that contract?

COMMISSION'S OVERSIGHT OVER VOTER FRAUD/INTIMIDATION STUDY

1. Did the Commissioners or Commission senior staff receive any outside communication or pressure to change or not release the entire draft report or portions of the draft language on the voter fraud report? If so, who made those requests?

2. Given the bipartisan nature of the Working Group that guided the Voter Fraud/Intimidation report, and the bipartisan nature of the contracted experts who uniformly support the results of this report, what concerns lead the Commission to determine the report should not be released?

3. If there were points in the report that the Commission objected to, were there attempts to work with the contractors to deal with specific concerns? If there were such attempts, please describe them.
4. Who drafted the Commission summary (released in December, 2006) of the Voter Fraud/Intimidation report, and what were their credentials and involvement in the original research process? Were there instructions or guidance given from Commissioners or senior staff as to what portions of the research should be emphasized? Who at the Commission reviewed the summarized report? Since the contracted experts are referred to in the Commission’s released report, were the contractors allowed a chance to review or edit that Commission’s final report that was released in December, 2006?

5. Please provide copies of any electronic or written communications between Commission employees that relate to the editing of the Voter Fraud/Intimidation report.

6. Please explain what Mr. Job Serebrov was referring to in his email referenced in the New York Times article of April 11, 2007. Please provide any documents in the Commission’s possession where employees or contracted experts discussed pressure, political sensitivities, or the failure of the Commission to adopt the Voter Fraud/Intimidation report from March 1, 2006 to present.

7. While we realize that the Commission voted to release its summary report in December 2006, was there a public vote taken to reject the Draft Voter Fraud/Intimidation report? Such a monumental decision to reject the contract experts’ work is a policy decision, and one that should be done in public. When was the decision made to reject the original report, and what notice was provided to the public that the Commission would reject that report?

8. Prior to the Draft Voter Fraud/Intimidation report’s release, had other organizations requested a copy of that original report? Please include copies of your responses to those organizations, if any.

9. Had any States requested that the Commission or staff provide guidance related to voter identification requirements in the Help America Vote Act, or identification requirements generally? Please provide those requests, and any responses from the Commission.

10. Please indicate what steps the Commission is taking to ensure that political considerations do not impact the agency’s research and that decisions are handled in a public and transparent manner.
Hello everyone,
The chair wanted to distribute the attached memo from the IG, which contains guidance about how we proceed during the review of the voter ID and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research projects. She will continue to keep staff informed as this review moves forward, and she thanks everyone for their continued cooperation and hard work.

IG Memo to Chair on Review of Studies (4-27-07).pdf

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Memorandum

To: Donetta Davidson  
Chair, U.S. Elections Commission  

From: Curtis Crider  
Inspector General  


In your letter of April 23, 2007, you requested my comments concerning several activities that the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) was considering to undertake pending our review of the Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Study and on related questions. My responses to your proposed activities and questions follow:

1. The EAC would like to prepare a summary of the differences between the draft report prepared by the consultants and the final report adopted by the EAC.

   Answer: We believe that such a summary will be helpful to our investigation. Please provide us with a copy of the summary of differences upon its completion.

2. Would there be any prohibition against the Director of Communications speaking with EAC employees, consultants or working group members when questions arise from members of the press or under the Freedom of Information Act?

   Answer: We are not aware of any prohibition. However, we suggest that EAC not comment or limit its comments on this matter because of the ongoing investigation. Any FOIA requests should be promptly responded to stating that the matter is under investigation. Once the investigation is completed, appropriate information should be made available to the FOIA requester.

3. Would there be any prohibition against EAC briefing members of the EAC Standards Board and the EAC Board of Advisors.

   Answer: We are not aware of any prohibition. Our preference, however, would be that EAC allow the investigation to be completed before conducting any briefings.

4. Would there be any prohibition against gathering information related to this project in order to respond to inquiries that have been made by members of Congress?
Answer: We are not aware of any prohibition. As previously stated, our preference is that there are no public comments while the investigation is in process or that comments be limited. However, we appreciate the sensitivity of Congressional requests, EAC must decide how best to proceed in this matter. We ask that you share any proposed responses with us prior to their release and that you provide us with a copy of final responses and any attachments.

5. Would there be any prohibition against responding to an inquiry that the Commission has received from an attorney engaged by one of the consultants?

Answer: It is the EAC's decision whether to respond to the attorney for the consultant. We prefer that the consultants not be released from the confidentiality clause of their contracts until the OIG has completed its investigations.

We understand that EAC will want to respond to criticism of its handling of the Voter Fraud and Intimidation Study, and that management must ultimately decide how best to proceed. Our preference would be that you attempt to defer commenting until we have finished our investigation.

I appreciate you raising these matters to me before acting. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this memorandum.
All:

The Office of Inspector General has initiated an evaluation of the contracting process used by the EAC for the voter fraud and voter intimidation projects. In order for us to complete our evaluation, we need copies of all e-mails or other documents that you have regarding either project. Electronic documents can be sent to an e-mail account that we have set up—eaccon@eac.gov. If you have any hard copy documents, please let me know.

If you do not have any documents or e-mails, please send me an e-mail to that effect.

Thank you,

Curtis Crider
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission
Phone - (202) 566-3125
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.
Commissioners:

We just accessed the following article that appears today in Congressional Quarterly's CQ WEEKLY.

[wr20070423-17election-cht.pdf]

Election Board Facing Votes of No Confidence

CQ WEEKLY - IN FOCUS
Congressional Quarterly
April 23, 2007 - Page 1164
By David Nather, CQ Staff

After the turmoil over the 2000 presidential election, Congress created a bipartisan commission that was supposed to do nice, non-controversial things: hand out some federal grants, do some studies, certify voting machines, promote voting practices that seem to work well.

Instead, the Election Assistance Commission is now surrounded by controversy and tough questions. And the same lawmakers who could barely be bothered to pay attention to its creation four years ago are putting it under the microscope now.

Democrats were enraged by the commission's handling of a report on voter fraud – the panel ordered up the report (which found little evidence of fraud), sat on the document for several months, then released a rewritten version that concluded "there is a great deal of debate" about how much voter fraud takes place. Republicans have contended that voter fraud is a big problem and benefits Democrats.

A second commission report on voter identification laws found that the laws can reduce turnout, particularly among Hispanics. The panel delayed releasing that report for months, then made it public even while refusing to endorse its conclusions.

Voting rights groups have criticized the commission's handling of the reports, and two powerful Democratic senators – Dianne Feinstein of California, who chairs the Rules and Administration Committee, and Majority Whip Richard J. Durbin of Illinois, who chairs the Appropriations subcommittee that funds the commission – have asked the panel to answer a barrage of questions. More than anything, they want to know whether the commission received "any outside communication or pressure" to delay or change the reports.

The controversy has put a harsh spotlight on the commission in recent weeks, but it's hardly the only case where the panel's actions have gotten it into trouble. Last year, the commission angered Arizona's secretary of state when it refused to grant the state permission to require voters to provide proof of citizenship when they registered by mail using federal forms. Secretary of State Jan Brewer, a
Republican, called the decision "inexcusably wrong" because Arizona's voters called for the requirement in Proposition 200 and because the Department of Justice had approved it.

On top of it all, secretaries of state have been suspicious of the commission all along, fearing that it would turn into yet another federal regulatory agency. The National Association of Secretaries of State called for the commission to be abolished after the 2006 election, since its three-year authorization expired at the end of fiscal 2005. New Hampshire Secretary of State William Gardner, a Democrat, urged the group to take that position because, he said, "I could see what could potentially be coming. . . . I remember when the Federal Election Commission was basically a clearinghouse as well."

These are a lot of pressures for a four-member commission with a staff of 19 and an operating budget of just over $11 million, which got so little attention from Congress that it took a year before its first four members won Senate confirmation. The commission also has strict limits on what it can do under the 2002 election overhaul law that created it. Among other things, it's not supposed to be a regulatory agency — though it does have some authority under the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, the "motor voter" law that was at issue in the Arizona dispute.

'We Took On Too Much'

Donetta L. Davidson, the Republican who in January became the commission's third chairman, says she takes seriously the questions about the reports on voter fraud and voter identification. The commission has referred the issue to its own inspector general, asking him to take a hard look at the panel's contracting procedures for outside research projects. "We want to be as transparent as possible," Davidson said.

But Davidson, who was previously Colorado's secretary of state, says the biggest problem was that the commission may have been trying to move too many reports with a small staff that mostly works with outside contractors rather than producing its own research. "I think that was our biggest mistake — being too aggressive," she said. "We just took on too much."

That explanation won't quiet the criticism. House Majority Leader Steny H. Hoyer, a Maryland Democrat and one of the authors of the 2002 law, is concerned that the commission "may have mishandled taxpayer-financed reports" and has called for hearings, said spokeswoman Stacey Farnen Bernards. Feinstein's committee already has an oversight hearing tentatively scheduled for June.

Voting rights groups are highly suspicious of the commission's actions, though there is no evidence the administration interfered with the reports. Jonah Goldman, director of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, said it "just seems a little too convenient that there's no political motive" given that the administration reportedly fired some U.S. attorneys because they were not aggressive in prosecuting alleged voter fraud.

And even those who don't subscribe to a political conspiracy find fault with the commission's handling of the reports. "I think they're just trying to avoid controversy, and trying to avoid controversy is not what we need right now," said Richard L. Hasen, an election-law expert at Loyola Law School in Los Angeles. "With all the problems we're having with elections in this country, we need bold leadership, and they're not providing it."

Congressional Alarm Bells

Davidson insists that the commission doesn't shy away from controversial subjects. "That's our job," she said. Indeed, the law spells out a list of reports the commission is supposed to produce, and they touch on nearly every hot-button election issue imaginable: ballot designs, voter registration methods, recount procedures, the handling of misinformation about election times and locations, and even proposals to make Election Day a holiday.

Much of the commission's other work is advice and testing of voting systems. In 2005, it published
guidelines that dealt with security issues, paper audit trails, and accommodations for voters with disabilities. And last year, it started testing and certifying voting systems in preparation for the 2008 election.

Still, the way the voter fraud and identification reports were handled and the possibility that the Justice Department influenced the reports have alarmed some members of Congress.

That issue won't be settled until the hearings have been held and the inspector general's office has issued its report. But the back story of one incident with the voter fraud report – in which two Justice officials secured changes to the summaries of their interviews for the report – suggests the department was more than a bystander in the voter fraud study.

In the appendix, which summarizes all of the expert interviews conducted for the fraud report, two Justice officials' interviews are included: Craig Donsanto, director of the Election Crimes Branch of the Public Integrity Section, and John Tanner, chief of the Civil Rights Division's Voting Section. In both cases, a footnote declares that "this interviewee did not agree with the consultants' interpretation of his interview comments" and that the commission made "clarifying edits." No such note accompanies any of the other expert interviews.

Donsanto got to see the summary of his interview because he was a technical adviser to the working group. He thought the summary erroneously implied that his unit didn't pursue systematic fraud schemes anymore, only individual cases like voting by felons and non-citizens. He worried that civil rights groups would think their constituencies were being singled out. Peggy Sims, an election research specialist at the commission who managed the project, agreed and had it changed.

Tanner took issue with the suggestion that he had said the Department of Justice wasn't pursuing voter-suppression cases anymore, and provided examples of cases where it was doing just that. His remarks were corrected.

Sims said that neither Donsanto nor Tanner got to weigh in on the entire report before it was released.

Such controversies are inevitable given that some lawmakers are worried about political influence on the commission and others are concerned it might grow too powerful. Elections are emotional, and even a bipartisan panel will have disagreements. When the four commissioners tried to revisit the Arizona decision, for instance, they deadlocked on party lines, something that also happens periodically to the bipartisan Federal Election Commission.

But the commission can go a long way, voting rights groups say, simply by operating with more transparency and establishing more written procedures for making decisions. "It is a relatively young agency," said Wendy R. Weiser of the Brennan Center for Justice at the New York University School of Law. "But they've been around long enough that this is no longer acceptable."

Davidson said more transparency and better procedures are her goals as well. "Definitely I hear what Congress is saying," she said. "We're a bipartisan commission, and we want to do the right thing." Now, in a year when lawmakers say they're trying to improve oversight, it's up to Congress to decide whether it is interested enough in its own creation to help the commissioners do the right thing.

Who's Who on the Commission

The Election Assistance Commission was created in 2002 to help states comply with federal rules and to set standards and distribute grants for voting equipment. Its members, two from each party, are nominated by the president and confirmed by the Senate to four-year terms that are renewable once.

Donetta L. Davidson (Republican) was appointed in 2005 and is the current chairwoman. She had been Colorado's Secretary of State for six years and before that state elections director and a county clerk in suburban Denver. Her term expires in December.

Gracia M. Hillman (Democrat) is a longtime figure in the voting rights movement and a former executive director of the League of Women Voters. She was president of a Washington consulting company when appointed in 2003. Her term expired in 2005, but she is serving until a replacement is named.

Caroline C. Hunter (Republican) was deputy director of the White House Office of Public Liaison when President Bush appointed her in 2003. She is a former attorney for the Republican National Committee and ombudsman for the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services. Her term expires in February 2011.

Rosemary E. Rodriguez (Democrat) was finishing her third year on the Denver City Council when she was appointed in 2007 to replace Ray Martinez, who resigned. She had previously been Denver's city clerk and director of boards and commissions for the mayor. Her term expires in December.
1. I spoke with St. Louis editorial board members Christine Bertelson and Kevin Korrigan regarding an editorial that ran today, asserting that we'd worked on the vote fraud/voter intimidation study for five years, and that the administration/White House edited the report. I told them both of these assertions were false, and I requested a correction. I gave them the details about how this project was conceived and managed. I explained that the vote fraud and voter intimidation project began in Sept. 2004. As I said, the statement that this project had been five years in the making is incorrect -- that predates the creation of the EAC. Commissioners were appointed in Dec. 2003, and the agency's first year of operations was 2004 with a $1.2 million operating budget. I said the assertion that the administration edited the document was false, and said that at no point in the process did the administration play any role. I also pointed out that the chair requested the IG to fully review the matter. They are going to run a correction. The editorial follows.

Snipe hunting in Jeff City

Tuesday, Apr. 17 2007

The Missouri Legislature's dogged efforts to crack down on voter fraud call to mind the hallowed tradition of the snipe hunt.

In a snipe hunt, gullible kids are taken out to the woods, handed sticks and gunny sacks and told to track down the elusive snipe. Meanwhile, their pals, who know a snipe is a bird of marsh and shore generally found nowhere near the woods, yuck it up.

Voter fraud is about as rare as snipe in most parts of the country, including Missouri. As evidence of that we have the testimony of (a) a five-year study by the federal Election Assistance Commission; (b) a report from the Missouri Secretary of State showing nobody in the state tried to vote with a fake I.D. in 2006; (c) Department of Justice statistics showing only 86 people were convicted of voter fraud-related crimes in the last five years, many of them on trivial errors; and (d) a federal judge's ruling last week that the justice department had failed to demonstrate that voter fraud had occurred in Missouri last year.

Undaunted by these facts, Republicans in the Legislature lurk about like Elmer Fudd with their gunny sacks and sticks, promoting bills to require voters to present photo identification before they're allowed to cast a ballot. They passed such a bill last year, but the courts threw it out as unfair to those who couldn't afford the cost and hassle involved in getting a photo I.D. card.
This year's versions of the photo I.D. bills would allow voters without photo I.D. to cast "provisional ballots," which may or may not get counted. So, despite the fact that a photo I.D. requirement would disenfranchise many voters in the cause of solving a problem that doesn't exist, the Missouri House could pass such a bill this week.

Evidence continues to mount that the hunt master for the national voter I.D. snipe hunt is none other than Karl Rove, President George W. Bush's deputy chief of staff and political guru. As The New York Times suggested Sunday, "The more we learn about the White House purge of United States attorneys, the more a single thread runs through it: the Bush administration's campaign to transform the minor problem of voter fraud into a supposed national scourge."

Not only did the administration suggest that some of the eight fired prosecutors had been insufficiently aggressive in pursuing voter fraud cases, it changed the wording of the Election Assistance Commission's findings on the voter fraud issue. What originally read, "there is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud" became "there is a great deal of debate on the pervasiveness of fraud."

Moreover, the release of the commission's report was delayed for nine months, during which period eight states, including Missouri, dealt with voter I.D. laws. Since the 3 percent to 4 percent of the electorate who don't have photo I.D.s tend to be poor, disabled or elderly voters, suppressing their vote would tend to help Republican candidates.

Investigators looking for evidence of fraud need look no further than the e-mail messages emanating from Mr. Rove's offices. Alas, thousands, perhaps millions, of those messages are now "missing." Perhaps Attorney General Alberto Gonzales will shed some light on the problem when his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee is rescheduled. In the meantime, Missouri lawmakers should put down the sticks and gunny sacks and back slowly out of the woods before their constituents realize they've been snookered, too.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Commissioners:

Jeannie issued the following media inquiries log for today:

(1) I asked Rick Hasen of Election Law Blog to please post info about our Spanish language glossary of election terms, and he did.

(2) Eliza Carney, National Journal columnist, interviewed the chair today about the recent challenges EAC has encountered. She asked about CIBER, and the chair explained the interim process, the way we modeled our interim process after NVLAP. Eliza wanted to know what EAC was doing to address some of the criticism, and the chair talked about the bipartisan subcommittees and her request to the IG. She said Rep. Hinchey told her the only reason we released the voter ID report was because he asked for it at a hearing. The chair pointed out that in Feb. she asked staff to bring the commission recommendations for wrapping it up w/in 30 days. She asked the chair about the voter fraud report, and the chair said staff reviewed it for accuracy, as we have a responsibility to do. I sent her background info on the history of certification and the voluntary nature of the guidelines and our certification program. She also asked for info about our budgets, and our employee cap, which I sent to her.

(3) David Nather of Congressional Quarterly interviewed the chair about how the agency is standing up against all of the recent criticism. She talked about the bipartisan subcommittees and the IG review request. She said if the IG identifies things that need to be changed, we'll change them. He had emails b/w Peggy and Craig Donsanto about discrepancies with his interview. Peggy talked with the reporter about the issue. She explained that she sat in on the interview, and that she agreed with Craig that they had gotten something wrong -- they stated that DOJ had moved from focusing on fraud conspiracies to individual cases. Peg and Craig agreed that what he'd said was that DOJ used to only focus on conspires, now they also focus on individual cases too. Peg said Craig learned of the inaccurate portrayal during his role as the technical advisor to the working group. She said none of the people interviewed were given the opportunity to review the summaries. Craig found out about his through the working group, and Tanner learned about his interview summary after the boards were briefed on the project in May. He asked me if we were finished with the following research projects: -- ballot designs, voter registration methods, recount procedures, misinformation about election times and locations, and proposals to make election day a holiday. I told him all of that research is underway. HAVA-mandated research that's been completed includes Election Crimes (vote fraud), the 2004 Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act Survey, and the 2003-2004 National Voter Registration Act Survey. We've also released the 2004 Election Day Survey. And we've issued a series of quick management start guides to election officials throughout the nation, addressing voting system security, introducing a new voting system, ballot preparation, and poll workers. Yesterday, the commission adopted the Spanish language glossary of election terms, the first project released under EAC's Language Accessibility Program, which consists of working groups comprised of local election officials, national advocacy groups and research and public policy organizations to advise the commission on how to best meet language accessibility requirements. Next we will translate the glossary in five Asian languages. We also are working on a Legal Resources Clearinghouse, which will be a web-based database containing statutes, regulations, rules, and fed. and state court decisions related to election administration. It will provide the public and election officials a central location to conduct election administration research. I pointed out to him that we have already met two of the biggest HAVA mandates -- VVSG and the certification program. He asked for the ages of all the commissioners, and I gave it him.

015190
(4) Philip Burrowes of Congressional Quarterly asked for photos of all commissioners and their length of terms which we provided. He also asked for the names of the members of Congress who made recommendations to the White House regarding appointments. We provided the text of HAVA regarding recommendations and said he would need to ask the White House for names.

(5) Marc Songini of Computer World had the following questions, and my responses follow.

A. Is the EAC doing enough to strengthen voluntary voting system guidelines and voting system certification? EAC, the National Institute of Science and Technology (NIST), and the Technical Guidelines Development Committee (TGDC) have already completed an initial update of the 2002 standards. First, it is important to note that these guidelines are voluntary, and it is up to states whether to adopt them. The 2005 guidelines update and augment the 2002 voting system standards, as required by HAVA, to address advancements in election practices and computer technologies. After December of this year, voting systems will no longer be tested against the 2002 standards. The major changes from 2002 to 2005 fall in the areas of accessibility and usability. The changes made to these sections include a usability section which was not in the 2002 standards and increase the number of accessibility requirements from 29 to 120 and increase language accessibility requirements. The 2005 guidelines also created greater security requirements based on the new technology used in the voting machines, increasing standards in the areas of data transmission and voter verification. The 2005 guidelines also include a section on conformance testing that was not in the previous standards and included more requirements regarding wireless components. It also provides an overview of the requirements for Independent Verification systems, including requirements for a voter verified paper audit trail for states that require this feature for their voting systems. The VWSG includes the requirement that all voting system vendors submit software to a national repository, which will allow local election officials to make sure the voting system software they purchase is the same software that was certified. In addition, NIST and the TGDC are working on the next iteration of guidelines as we speak, and have said they expect to provide their recommendations to EAC by this summer. You may also want to contact Jan Kosko at NIST. Her number is 301-975-2767.

B. Regarding EAC resources, please see our operating budgets below. Note that the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) receives a pass through in our budget, so that amount is not part of EAC's operating budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Pass Through for NIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>$1.2 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>$13.8 million</td>
<td>($2.8 million of which was a pass through for NIST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>$14 million</td>
<td>($2.8 million of which was a pass through for NIST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>$16.2 million</td>
<td>($4.95 million of which was a pass through for NIST)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Regarding your inquiry about what EAC is doing to strengthen the certification program, the most important issue is that it is now a role the federal government has assumed for the very first time. In the past, this was done by the National Association of State Election Directors (NASED) on a volunteer basis. NASED is not a federal agency, and it did not receive any federal funds in its efforts. EAC made the decision not to grandfather any systems certified by NASED. So any system seeking an EAC certification must be tested end to end. Under EAC's program, which is laid out in our Testing and Certification Program Manual, the federal government will not only operate a more rigorous testing and certification process, it will also have a Quality Monitoring Program in place. For the first time manufacturers will be held accountable through not only this program, but also under the decertification process, which would be the ultimate sanction against a manufacturer. If a system is decertified, the manufacturer may not represent the system as being certified, may not label the system as certified, and the system will be removed from the EAC's list of certified voting systems. Election officials will be notified about the decertification. The Quality Monitoring Program will allow election officials to report anomalies. EAC will visit facilities for quality control purposes, and we will perform site reviews per states' requests. In addition, this program will be transparent. Information about the process and the manufacturers and test labs that participate will be posted on the agency's website. Go here for the list of documents and information we will provide. In addition to holding the manufacturers accountable, any federal employees involved with this program will have their financial holdings reviewed for potential conflicts of interest.

###
Hello everyone,
I wanted to notify you that Chair Davidson, in agreement with the other three commissioners, has requested that our IG -- Curtis Crider -- conduct a review of our contracting procedures surrounding the voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation research projects. Very shortly, I will distribute her request along with a press release to the media and to all our stakeholders. However, she wanted to make sure the staff was fully informed about this action before we make this news public.

The chair's request, the press release and all of the materials referenced in her request will be available on the home page under Announcements very shortly. Please direct anyone with questions about this action to the website. And let me know if you have questions about any of this information or if I can be of assistance answering questions from the public about this issue.

The chair wants to convey to everyone how much she appreciates your hard work, and that she is confident in our ability to work with Curtis to resolve this issue. Tom would like staff to join him at 3:30 today in the large conf. room upstairs to answer any questions you have.
EAC Requests Review of Voter ID, Vote Fraud and Voter Intimidation Research Projects

For Immediate Release	 Contact: Jeannie Layson
April 16, 2007	 Bryan Whitener
(202) 566-3100

WASHINGTON – U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Chair Donetta Davidson today issued a formal request to the commission’s inspector general to conduct a review of the commission’s contracting procedures, including a review of two recent projects focusing on voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation. The chair’s memo to the inspector general is attached.

“The actions taken by the commission regarding these research projects have been challenged, and the commissioners and I agree that it is appropriate and necessary to ask the inspector general to review this matter,” said EAC Chair Davidson.

Chair Davidson has requested that the inspector general specifically review the circumstances surrounding the issuance and management of the voter identification research project and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research project.

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary E. Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

###
April 16, 2007

MEMORANDUM

To: EAC Inspector General Curtis Crider
Fr: EAC Chair Donetta Davidson
Cc: Commissioners Rodriguez, Hillman and Hunter, Tom Wilkey, and Julie Hodgkins
RE: EAC requests review of contracting procedures

On Friday, April 13, each of my three colleagues -- Rosemary Rodriguez, Gracia Hillman, and Caroline Hunter -- agreed with my recommendation that we issue the following formal request to the Commission’s Office of Inspector General to review the circumstances surrounding two recent EAC research projects -- vote fraud and voter intimidation and voter identification.

Background
The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) is an independent, bipartisan Commission created by the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002.

EAC develops guidance to meet HAVA requirements, adopts voluntary voting system guidelines, accredits voting system test laboratories, certifies voting systems and audits the use of HAVA funds. HAVA also directs EAC to maintain the national mail voter registration form developed in accordance with the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) of 1993.

The Commission serves as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. It is under the Commission’s clearinghouse role that research projects are conducted with the goal of providing information that will lead to improvements in election administration, as well as inform the public about how, where and when we vote.

The voter identification research was conducted by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics (“Contractor”). The contract, awarded in May 2005, required the Contractor to perform a review and legal analysis of state legislation, administrative procedures and court cases, and to perform a literature review on other research and data available on the topic of voter identification requirements. Further, the Contractor was asked to analyze the problems and challenges of voter identification, to hypothesize alternative approaches and to recommend various policies that could be applied to these approaches. Last month, the commission voted
unanimously not to adopt the report, citing concerns with its methodology, but voted to release all of the data provided by the Contractor.

The vote fraud and voter intimidation research was conducted by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov ("Consultants"). The contracts, awarded in September 2005, issued to these Consultants tasked them with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the Consultants were responsible for "creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and Working Group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort."

Review Request
The actions taken by the Commission regarding both the voter identification and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research projects have been challenged. Specifically, Members of Congress, the media, and the public have suggested that political motivations may have been part of the Commission's decision making process regarding these two projects. Also, the Commission has been criticized for the amount of taxpayer dollars that were spent on these two projects, as well as how efficiently these projects were managed.

The Commission takes these allegations very seriously, and we request that you fully review the following issues and provide the Commission and the Congress with a report of your findings as soon as possible. The Commission stands ready to assist you in these efforts and will provide whatever information, including memos, emails and other documents you will need. Cooperating with your review will be the staff's top priority.

1. Current Commission policy regarding awarding and managing research contracts.
2. Issuance and management of the vote fraud and voter intimidation contract.
3. Circumstances surrounding the receipt of information from Consultants regarding the vote fraud and voter intimidation project.
4. Circumstances surrounding staff efforts to write a final report for Commission consideration.
5. Identification of staff members who assisted in the editing and collaboration of the final vote fraud and voter intimidation report for Commission consideration.
6. Staff and/or Commissioner collaboration with political entities or other federal agencies regarding the vote fraud and voter intimidation project.
8. Issuance and management of the voter identification contract.
9. Circumstances surrounding the receipt of information from Contractor regarding the voter identification report.
10. Identification of staff members who assisted in the editing, collaboration, and recommendation to the Commission regarding final adoption of the voter identification report.
11. Staff and/or Commissioner collaboration with political entities or other federal agencies regarding the voter identification project.
12. Circumstances surrounding Commission deliberation whether to adopt a final voter identification report.

For your information, I have attached statements and related correspondence from Members of Congress, and a statement issued by the Commission regarding the criticism.

It is our hope that your findings will instruct us how to move forward in a more efficient, effective and transparent manner. The Commission takes its mandates under HAVA very seriously, and this small Commission has an enormous amount of work to conduct, including testing and certifying voting equipment, providing guidance and assistance to election officials, and auditing the proper use of the $3.1 billion that was distributed under HAVA.

We look forward to your findings so that we may take the actions necessary to improve the way we conceive research projects, manage research contracts, and make decisions regarding the final release of data provided to the Commission from a third party.
United States Senate  
WASHINGTON, DC 20510  

April 12, 2007

The Honorable Donetta Davidson  
Chairman  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Commissioner Davidson:

We are writing to seek a response to very troubling news reports that included allegations that the Commission may have altered or delayed release of two taxpayer-funded studies of election issues for political purposes.

While the Commission is within its rights to decide what guidance it issues to election officials, it is critical that its actions are not perceived as politically motivated and it is imperative that you provide full documentation about the Commission's proceedings on these matters.

On Wednesday, the New York Times reported that a bipartisan team of election law experts hired by the Commission to research voter fraud in federal elections found that there was little such fraud around the nation, but the Commission revised the report to say that the pervasiveness of voter fraud was still open to debate.

On Monday, Roll Call reported that the Commission two weeks ago rejected the findings of a report, prepared as part of a $560,000 contract with Rutgers University's Eagleton Institute and Ohio State University's Moritz College of Law. That report found that voter identification laws may reduce election turnout, especially by minorities.
It is imperative that the Commission's actions and deliberations are unbiased, free from political influence and transparent. While the Commission does not have to agree with the experts who perform its research, it should make the research available unfettered and unfiltered.

Attached are a series of questions, we would like the Commission to address. We look forward to your timely response.

Sincerely,

Dianne Feinstein
Chairman
Committee on Rules and Administration

Richard J. Durbin
Chairman
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government
Committee on Appropriations
We request information and documentation from the Commission that answer the following questions:

**COMMISSION'S OVERSIGHT ON EAGLETON CONTRACT TO PERFORM A STUDY ON VOTER IDENTIFICATION**

1. Did the Commissioners or Commission senior staff receive any outside communication or pressure to change or not release the entire draft report or portions of the draft language on the voter fraud report? If so, who made those requests?

2. Would you please provide a copy of the approved Request For Proposals, as well as any contract modifications that were agreed to between the Commission and Eagleton Institute and subcontractors?

3. Can you provide the names and qualifications of Election Assistance Commission staff that worked on the Eagleton Institute project?

4. Please indicate how many project meetings occurred during the term of the Eagleton contract, including in-person meetings, conference calls regarding the status of the report, and any meeting where Commissioners were present for at least part of the meeting. Please provide copies of any minutes from those meetings.

5. Please identify the names and affiliations of members of the Peer Review group or groups that examined the Eagleton Institute drafts. Please also indicate the dates upon which any such review of the Eagleton research was conducted, and the specific concerns or complaints that were raised by members of the Peer Review group as to either the analysis or statistical methodology, if any. Please provide copies of any minutes from those meetings.

6. If certain members of the Peer Review groups had concerns with the data or methodology of the Eagleton study, was that information communicated to Eagleton, and were any changes made to the study based on Peer Review group concerns with methodology or data?

7. Who were the individuals (and what were their academic qualifications) that advised the Commission that the data, methodology, or the results of the Bagleton Contract were so flawed that the Commission should reject the report? At what point did the Commission receive input from those individuals?
8. The Commission previewed its research on the Eagleton Institute's study on Provisional Voting at its May 2006 Advisory Board meetings—why was the Voter Identification Draft Study not discussed at that time? What is the status of the Provisional Voting report?

9. In rejecting the Eagleton report, the Commission indicated concerns that there was only one year's worth of data. Given that this was the first year that Commission had studied the results, isn't "one year" what was originally contemplated in the Eagleton contract? Isn't the reason for having a major research institute conduct this study is so they can draw initial assessments from that data—even though that data can be augmented in future years? Because of the rejected report, will the Commission start anew for research in the 2008 elections?

10. What was the final, total cost of the Eagleton contract, and what was produced or released by that Commission as a result of that contract?

COMMISSION'S OVERSIGHT OVER VOTER FRAUD/INTIMIDATION STUDY

1. Did the Commissioners or Commission senior staff receive any outside communication or pressure to change or not release the entire draft report or portions of the draft language on the voter fraud report? If so, who made those requests?

2. Given the bipartisan nature of the Working Group that guided the Voter Fraud/Intimidation report, and the bipartisan nature of the contracted experts who uniformly support the results of this report, what concerns lead the Commission to determine the report should not be released?

3. If there were points in the report that the Commission objected to, were there attempts to work with the contractors to deal with specific concerns? If there were such attempts, please describe them.
4. Who drafted the Commission summary (released in December, 2006) of the Voter Fraud/Intimidation report, and what were their credentials and involvement in the original research process? Were there instructions or guidance given from Commissioners or senior staff as to what portions of the research should be emphasized? Who at the Commission reviewed the summarized report? Since the contracted experts are referred to in the Commission's released report, were the contractors allowed a chance to review or edit that Commission's final report that was released in December, 2006?

5. Please provide copies of any electronic or written communications between Commission employees that relate to the editing of the Voter Fraud/Intimidation report.

6. Please explain what Mr. Job Serebrov was referring to in his email referenced in the New York Times article of April 11, 2007. Please provide any documents in the Commission's possession where employees or contracted experts discussed pressure, political sensitivities, or the failure of the Commission to adopt the Voter Fraud/Intimidation report from March 1, 2006 to present.

7. While we realize that the Commission voted to release its summary report in December 2006, was there a public vote taken to reject the Draft Voter Fraud/Intimidation report? Such a monumental decision to reject the contract experts' work is a policy decision, and one that should be done in public. When was the decision made to reject the original report, and what notice was provided to the public that the Commission would reject that report?

8. Prior to the Draft Voter Fraud/Intimidation report's release, had other organizations requested a copy of that original report? Please include copies of your responses to those organizations, if any.

9. Had any States requested that the Commission or staff provide guidance related to voter identification requirements in the Help America Vote Act, or identification requirements generally? Please provide those requests, and any responses from the Commission.

10. Please indicate what steps the Commission is taking to ensure that political considerations do not impact the agency's research and that decisions are handled in a public and transparent manner.
April 12, 2007

Chairwoman Donetta Davidson  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Chairwoman Davidson:

As Chairwoman of the Committee on House Administration Subcommittee on Elections, which has oversight over the Election Assistance Commission, I was alarmed at what appears to be an emerging pattern by the EAC to hold off on publicly releasing reports as well as modifying reports that are released. Two recent instances have brought to light the increased politicalization of the EAC and this lack of transparency.

First, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government released a draft version of an EAC report on voter fraud and intimidation that shows significant changes were made to the findings of outside experts before the final report was released. The EAC released report “Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study” does not accurately reflect the research in the original report “Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation.”

Second, in addition to this report on voter fraud and intimidation, the EAC recently released a report by The Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University on voter identification. Again, the EAC did not endorse the report, citing methodological concerns, and only released it after pressure from Congress.

The EAC is charged with conducting nonpartisan research and to advise policy makers. How are we to rely on advice if instead of full and accurate reporting, we are provided an inaccurate modified version which negates clear evidence to the contrary in the original research? I am outraged that the election process is being threatened by a lack of transparency and limited discussion.

In order to preempt any further problems with the release of reports from the EAC, I request all versions of the Absentee Ballot report and the Military and Overseas report, as well as any other overdue reports, including supporting documents and research, be provided to my office by close of business Monday, April 16, 2007. These reports are overdue and I want to ensure that the delay is no way related to what appears to be an ongoing problem of politicalization of the EAC.

Sincerely,

Zoe Lofgren
Member of Congress
For Immediate Release

April 11, 2007

Hinchey, Serrano Urge Non-Partisanship,
Greater Transparency at Election Assistance Commission

Washington, DC - Today, Congressmen Maurice Hinchey (NY-22) and José E. Serrano (NY-16) urged the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to act with greater transparency and without partisanship. The comments from the congressmen came as the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government released a draft version of an EAC report on voter fraud and intimidation that shows significant changes were made to the findings of outside experts before the final report was released.

"The EAC has an obligation to be forthright with the American people and operate transparently and in a non-partisan manner," said Congressman Hinchey, who requested the draft report from EAC Commissioner Donetta L. Davidson during a subcommittee hearing last month. "The draft report was commissioned with taxpayer dollars upon a mandate from Congress so that we could learn more about voter fraud and intimidation. The need for this report is even more clear when we see the way in which the Bush administration is carrying out the electoral process and how this system is sliding towards corruption. In hiding a draft report from the public that is significantly different from the final version, the EAC has created a lot more questions than it has answered while stunting debate on the issue. In order for our democracy to function properly it is essential that our elections are free of any corruption and that includes ensuring that the EAC does not work to benefit one political party over the other. To achieve that goal we must have all the facts and opinions on the table, not just some of them. The EAC must never limit discussion and debate."

"The EAC is charged with helping to ensure our elections are trustworthy and administered fairly," said Congressman Serrano, who is Chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee that oversees the EAC budget. "I'm concerned if changes were made to the report on voter fraud because of partisan bias rather than impartial analysis. When you read the draft report side-by-side with the final version, it is clear that important conclusions of the experts who wrote the draft report were excluded from the final product. Among the excluded information is an analysis that undermines the notion that voter fraud is rampant.

"I am concerned that the EAC did not publicly release the taxpayer-funded draft report, and I worry that political considerations may have played a role. We cannot have a politicized EAC, or one that yields to outside pressure. Our democracy, and the American people's faith in it, is far more important than any short-term political advantage."

The draft report was written by outside experts under contract with the EAC. The final report was entitled "Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study" and was issued on December 7, 2006.

The EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by the 2002 Help America Vote Act in order to disburse funds to the states for the purchase of new voting systems, certify voting technologies, develop guidelines and serve as an information resource for election administration.
SERRANO, HINCHEY URGE NON-PARTISANSHIP, GREATER TRANSPARENCY AT ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Washington, DC – April 11, 2007 – Today, Congressmen Maurice Hinchey (NY-22) and José E. Serrano (NY-16) urged the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to act with greater transparency and without partisanship. The comments from the congressmen came as the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government released a draft version of an EAC report on voter fraud and intimidation that shows significant changes were made to the findings of outside experts before the final report was released.

“The EAC has an obligation to be forthright with the American people and operate transparently and in a non-partisan manner,” said Congressman Hinchey, who requested the draft report from EAC Commissioner Donetta L. Davidson during a subcommittee hearing last month. “The draft report was commissioned with taxpayer dollars upon a mandate from Congress so that we could learn more about voter fraud and intimidation. The need for this report is even more clear when we see the way in which the Bush administration is carrying out the electoral process and how this system is sliding towards corruption. In hiding a draft report from the public that is significantly different from the final version, the EAC has created a lot more questions than it is has answered while stunting debate on the issue. In order for our democracy to function properly it is essential that our elections are free of any corruption and that includes ensuring that the EAC does not work to benefit one political party over the other. To achieve that goal we must have all the facts and opinions on the table, not just some of them. The EAC must never limit discussion and debate.”

“The EAC is charged with helping to ensure our elections are trustworthy and administered fairly,” said Congressman Serrano, who is Chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee that oversees the EAC budget. “I’m concerned if changes were made to the report on voter fraud because of partisan bias rather than impartial analysis. When you read the draft report side-by-side with the final version, it is clear that important conclusions of the experts who wrote the draft report were excluded from the final product. Among the excluded information is an analysis that undermines the notion that voter fraud is rampant.

“I am concerned that the EAC did not publicly release the taxpayer-funded draft report, and I worry that political considerations may have played a role. We cannot have a politicized EAC, or one that yields to outside pressure. Our democracy, and the American people’s faith in it, is far more important than any short-term political advantage.”


4/13/2007
The draft report was written by outside experts under contract with the EAC. The final report was entitled "Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study" and was issued on December 7, 2006.

The EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by the 2002 Help America Vote Act in order to disburse funds to the states for the purchase of new voting systems, certify voting technologies, develop guidelines and serve as an information resource for election administration.

###

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASHINGTON OFFICE</th>
<th>BRONX OFFICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2227 Rayburn House Office Building</td>
<td>788 Southern Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20515-3216</td>
<td>Bronx, New York 10455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(202) 225-4361</td>
<td>(718) 620-0084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: (202) 225-6001</td>
<td>Fax: (718) 620-0658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Email: jserrano@mail.house.gov
Commissioners,

Attached is a draft letter to respond to Congresswoman Lofgren's letter regarding the voting fraud and voter intimidation and voter identification studies as well as requesting information regarding our studies on Free Absentee Ballot Postage and Military and Overseas Voting (Internet Voting). I have not attached the appendixes as I have those in hard copy and will be assembling them in the morning into the appendixes. Congresswoman Lofgren has asked for this information by COB Monday. As such, I would appreciate your comments as early as possible tomorrow, but no later than 2:00 p.m. -- so that I can consolidate the comments and get the information to the Congresswoman's office by her deadline.

Thanks in advance for your quick review of this letter. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Juliet T. Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
April 13, 2007

Congresswoman Zoe Lofgren, Chair  
House Administration Committee  
Subcommittee on Elections  
102 Cannon House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

RE: EAC Research Efforts

Dear Congresswoman Lofgren:

Thank you for your letter of April 12, 2007 and the opportunity to provide valuable information about the research efforts being undertaken by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission. Your letter referenced four studies that have been or are being conducted by EAC through contracts and contracted employees. I will address each in turn, below.

**Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Study**

The first study about which you inquired is the voting fraud and voter intimidation study. This study was conducted by contract employees of the EAC for the EAC. In the fall of 2005, EAC hired two contract employees to conduct an initial review of the existing information available about voting fraud and voter intimidation. From that review, the employees were asked to provide two things: (1) a definition of voting fraud and voter intimidation that could be used in a future and comprehensive study of these topics; and (2) a series of recommendations on how such a future, comprehensive study could be conducted. In July 2006, EAC received a body of research including summaries of the articles, books, interviews, and media reports that were reviewed by the contract employees. In addition, they provided a draft report for EAC's review and consideration.

EAC, as a Federal agency, is the policy and decision making body. Consultants, contractors and employees do not make policy for EAC. Their recommendations were only one part of a deliberative process that precedes any agency decision. The Freedom of Information Act, a Federal statute governing the release of documents to the public, creates an exemption to protect pre-decisional, draft documents.

The report requested by House Appropriations Committee is a draft, representing one phase of the deliberative process—before the document was vetted by staff, approved by the Executive Director and reviewed and approved by the Commissioners (the relevant policy makers). Ultimately, the draft document was created by contract employees in order to aid the EAC's Commissioners in their decisions regarding voting fraud and voter
intimidation. The contract employees had no personal interest in their submissions and had no agency decision-making authority. Each was tasked with simply providing pre-decisional research and information to the EAC. Their efforts were limited to creating a truthful, comprehensive, and unbiased draft report. Only when the report is finalized and is adopted by EAC does it constitute an EAC decision or a policy determination.

In keeping with this concept, EAC reviews and vets all draft products or recommendations delivered by its consultants, contractors and employees. It would be irresponsible for EAC to accept the product of contracted employees and publish that information without exercising due diligence in vetting the product of the employees’ work and the veracity of the information used to produce that product. EAC conducted this review of the draft voting fraud and intimidation report provided by the contracted employees. EAC found that the draft report failed to provide a definition of the terms as required, contained conclusions that were not sought under the terms of the contract or were not supported by the underlying research, and contained allegations that showed bias. EAC also found that the research provided by the contracted employees was a good body of data concerning the existing knowledge of voting fraud and intimidation. EAC staff developed a subsequent draft report to correct the problems mentioned above, to address the questions that this study sought to answer, and to address inconsistencies between the contracted employees’ draft report and the research that was provided. The staff report included all of the contracted employees’ and working group’s recommendations. The staff report was adopted by EAC on December 7, 2007 during its public meeting and became the final and decisional report of the Commission on this issue. The final report as well as all of the underlying research conducted by the contracted employees are available on EAC’s Web site, www.eac.gov.

Voter Identification Study

The second study about which you inquired was a study conducted by Rutgers University in conjunction with Moritz College of Law. Rutgers and Moritz served as contractors to EAC and produced this draft document pursuant to the provisions of the contract governing that relationship. A draft report was created by Rutgers University in conjunction with the Moritz College of Law (Ohio State University) to “…provide research assistance to the EAC for the development of voluntary guidance on provisional voting and voter identification procedures.” The stated objective of the contract was to:

…obtain assistance with the collection, analysis and interpretation of information regarding HAVA provisional voting and voter identification requirements for the purpose of drafting guidance on these topics... The anticipated outcome of this activity is the generation of concrete policy recommendations to be issued as voluntary guidance for States.

As with the voter fraud and intimidation study mentioned above, the contractors were provided guidance, information, and were directed by EAC personnel. The final product they delivered (draft report sought) was identified as “a guidance document for EAC
adoption." Clearly, as noted by the contract, the issuance of Federal guidance to states is a matter of government policy and limited to official EAC action.

EAC reviewed and vetted of the draft document provided by Eagleton. Review of that document revealed data and analysis that caused EAC concern. The study only focused on one federal election. An analysis using averaged county-level turnout data from the U.S. Census showed no statistically significant correlations. A second analysis using a data set based upon the Current Population Survey (which was self-reported and showed a significantly higher turnout rate than other conventional data) was conducted that produced some evidence of correlation between voter identification requirements and turnout. The initial categorization of voter identification requirements included classifications that, actually, require no identification documentation, such as “state your name.” The research methodology and the statistical analysis used by the Contractor were questioned by an EAC review group comprised of social scientists and statisticians. The Contractor and the EAC agree that the report raises more questions than provides answers and both agree the study should have covered more than one federal election.4

On March 30, 2007, EAC decided not to adopt Eagleton’s study and not to issue an EAC report based upon this study. The Commission did release all of the material provided by Eagleton at that time. In addition, EAC voted to engage in a longer-term, more systematic review of voter identification requirements. Additional study on the topic will include more than one Federal election cycle, additional environmental and political factors that effect voter participation and the numerous changes in state laws and regulations related to voter identification requirements that have occurred since 2004.

EAC will undertake the following activities:

- Conduct an ongoing state-by-state review, reporting and tracking of voter identification requirements. This will include tracking states’ requirements which require a voter to state his or her name, to sign his or her name, to match his or her signature to a signature on file, to provide photo or non-photo identification or to swear an affidavit affirming his or her identify.

- Establish a baseline of information that will include factors that may affect or influence Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) voter participation, including various voter identification requirements, the competitiveness of a race and certain environmental or political factors. EAC will use some of the information collected by Eagleton as well as additional data from the states to develop this baseline.

- In 2007, convene a working group of advocates, academics, research methodologists and election officials to discuss EAC’s next study of voter identification. Topics to be discussed include methodology, specific issues to be covered in the study and timelines for completing an EAC study on voter identification.
• Study how voter identification provisions that have been in place for two or more Federal elections have impacted voter turnout, voter registration figures, and fraud. Included in this study will be an examination of the relationship between voter turnout and other factors such as race and gender. Study the effects of voter identification provisions, or the lack thereof, on early, absentee and vote-by-mail voting.

• Publish a series of best practice case studies which detail a particular state’s or jurisdiction’s experiences with educating poll workers and voters about various voter identification requirements. Included in the case studies will be detail on the policies and practices used to educate and inform poll workers and voters.

Free Absentee Ballot Postage Study

Pursuant to Section 246 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA), EAC was directed to study and produce a report on the feasibility and advisability of a program that would provide absentee ballots that could be returned by the voter postage-free. HAVA directed that this report be delivered one year after the passage of HAVA, that is not later than October 29, 2003.

EAC was not able to complete this study within the original deadline set forth in HAVA, but EAC currently has a pending research project to provide information for a report on this subject. On the deadline set forth in HAVA, EAC Commissioners had not yet been appointed and confirmed to fill their positions and to form the agency that is now EAC. After the formation of EAC in December 2003, Congress provided an appropriation for FY 2004 in the amount of $1.2 million dollars, which did not include sufficient funding for research activities. EAC received operational funding including some funding for research in its FY 2005 budget. Thus, in FY 2005, EAC developed an issued a request for proposals for a research contract to study this issue. No responsible bidders responded to the request for proposals and the request was ultimately withdrawn by the Commission due to the failure to receive any responsible bids.

Because this research report was required by HAVA and the deadline for the completion of the project had passed, EAC issued a subsequent request for proposals in FY 2006. EAC received proposals and awarded a contract for the study of this issue. The statement of work for that project has been attached as Appendix “1” to this letter for your review and convenience. As you will see, the statement of work sets forth several requirements for the contractor, including conducting a survey of registered voters to gather information from them regarding their voting behavior and whether the implementation of a national program for free absentee ballot postage would change that behavior. The contractor was further asked to conduct a series of focus groups comprised of potential beneficiaries of free or reduced absentee ballot postage.

The EAC and its contractors are subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) and thus all information collection instruments must be published prior to issuance to obtain public...
Congresswoman Zoe Lofgren, Chair
House Administration Subcommittee on Elections
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comment regarding the questions asked, the necessity of the collection, and the burden that will be imposed on respondents. EAC published the survey instrument to be used as a part of this study in the Federal Register on November 14, 2006. See Federal Register, Vol. 71, No. 219, Page 66321. A copy of the Federal Register notice and request for comments is attached as Appendix “2” to this letter. In keeping with the PRA, a notice for comments to be provided to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) was published in the Federal Register on January 23, 2007. See Federal Register, Vol. 72, No. 14, Page 2875. A copy of that notice is attached as Appendix “3” to this letter. In addition for your convenience a copy of the actual survey instrument has been attached as Appendix “4” to this letter.

In keeping with the statement of work, the contractor has also developed discussion guides for the focus groups that it has planned involving senior citizens, disabled voters, and low income voters. These guides have been attached as Appendix “5” to this letter. This research project requires coordination with the United States Postal Service (USPS) as implementation of such a program would undoubtedly have a significant impact on that agency. Through that participation, USPS has suggested that additional focus groups be added to the original work plan for this study. The contractor communicated that request to EAC and the proposal for additional working groups has been attached as Appendix “6” to this letter. EAC believes that these additional focus groups would be helpful for this research project and is working with the contracting officer on this contract to determine whether the contract can be amended to add these additional focus groups.

You will note from the attached work plan that this project has a current project completion date of November 1, 2007. See Attachment “7”, Work Plan. Progress reports updating progress on the work plan are also attached as Appendix “7” to this letter. However, additional focus groups would require additional time to complete the proposed, expanded statement of work. See Attachment “6”, Proposal for Adding Focus Groups to the Free/Reduced Postage for Absentee Ballots Research Project. Progress reports updating progress on the work plan are also attached as Appendix “7” to this letter.

Military and Overseas Voting Study

Section 245 of HAVA directs EAC to study the risks and benefits of using the Internet to conduct voting. The only area in which this type of electronic technology has been used at all to administer voting is for military and overseas citizens. As such, EAC has focused on using that experience as instructive for the possibility of Internet voting on a larger scale.

This study was directed to be completed within 20 months of the passage of HAVA, or no later than June 30, 2004. EAC was unable to complete this study by the original deadline, but currently has a pending research project to provide information regarding the use of electronic means for voting in military and overseas citizen voting.
Much like the Free Absentee Ballot Postage Study, the majority of time allotted in the original deadline for research passed prior to the existence of EAC and during the time of its initial budget which did not allow for research spending. In FY 2005, EAC approached the Technical Guidelines Development Committee (TGDC), the Federal advisory committee that researches and proposes voting system standards to EAC, to provide guidelines on security, core requirements and usability requirements for the use of the Internet in voting. The TGDC declined to include these as a part of their recommendations for voting system guidelines. TGDC considered the possibility of using the Internet for voting too risky and further believed that any voting system, Internet-based or not, must conform to the standards established by EAC based upon their research and recommendation.

Following this setback, EAC opted to seek a contractor to provide research in this area. We first conferred with the Federal Voting Assistance Program of the Department of Defense that several years ago worked on a substantial project aimed at establishing Internet voting for military members. In those conversations, we learned that there are many obstacles at the state and local level to implementing Internet-based voting. Based on this information, EAC determined that the best course of action was to find out what the current state of readiness and willingness is among state and local election jurisdictions to implement Internet-based voting. We can only develop standards for an appropriate system if we know what needs that system will have to serve and what obstacles it will have to overcome. A request for proposals was issued in FY 2006 and a contract was awarded.

A copy of the statement of work for this study has been attached as Appendix “8” to this letter. As you will see, that statement tasks the contractor with conducting case studies of election jurisdictions with experience in this area, conducting a survey of military and overseas voters, and a conducting a conference on Internet voting. The contractor has developed an outline for their case studies. This outline has been attached as Appendix “9” to this letter. In addition, the contractor has developed and distributed a survey instrument in keeping with the emergency provisions of the PRA. A copy of that survey instrument is attached as Appendix “10” to this letter. The conference is planned for August 2007 in New Orleans. The progress reports from the contract showing their progress on completing tasks as set forth in the statement of work are attached as Appendix “11” to this letter.

Thank you for your requests and your interest in election administration. I trust that the information that we have provided will give you a complete picture of the status of the pending research projects about which you inquired as well as valuable information concerning EAC’s previous research projects regarding voting fraud and voter intimidation and voter identification. However, if you have further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Sincerely,

Donetta Davidson
Chair
Donetta L.
Davidson/EAC/GOV
04/13/2007 12:36 PM

To: Elieen L. Kuala/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc

Subject: Re: FOIA Request

---

Thanks

---

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Elieen L. Kuala

---- Original Message ----

From: Elieen L. Kuala
Sent: 04/12/2007 02:18 PM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson
Subject: Re: FOIA Request

I did a search through your emails with their names and I didn't find any. I don't have any either. However, I will check and see if we have any mailed correspondence hard copies.

Elle L.K. Kuala
Special Assistant to the Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
office: (202) 566-2256
donette davidson@eac.gov

Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV

Donetta L.
Davidson/EAC/GOV
04/12/2007 01:33 PM

To: Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV@EAC, Gracie Hillman/EAC/GOV@EAC, Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC, Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC, Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC, Sheila A. Banks/EAC/GOV@EAC, Elieen L. Kuala/EAC/GOV@EAC, Bert A. Benavides/EAC/GOV@EAC, Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC, Bryan Whitener/EAC/GOV@EAC, "stephanie wolson" -

cc

Subject: Re: FOIA Request

Elle, I don't think I have any emails from Job or Tova, but to be on the safe side would you double check

---

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Jeannie Layson
Today I will circulate a formal FOIA request to all of you. Please note that this request is from a journalist. The information I circulate will include a copy of the original request, which was made by the DC bureau of McClatchy Newspapers. An abbreviated version of the request follows:

"Copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Election Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for EAC."

Some of you have provided similar information in the past, but I will need another complete submission that includes any related files that may have been generated since your last submission.

Please anticipate a formal request to be distributed to everyone today, and take note that the deadline to provide this information is April 30. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Donetta L.
Davidson/EAC/GOV
04/14/2007 12:35 PM

To Elieen L. Kuala/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
bcc

Subject Re: FOIA Request

Thanks

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Elieen L. Kuala
----- Original Message ----- 

From: Elieen L. Kuala
Sent: 04/13/2007 02:00 PM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson
Subject: Re: FOIA Request

I checked all of our paper records and found nothing so I submitted our FOIA response to Jeannie.

Elle L.K. Kuala
Special Assistant to the Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
office: (202) 566-2256
fax: (202) 566-1392

Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV

Donetta L.
Davidson/EAC/GOV
04/13/2007 12:36 PM

To Elieen L. Kuala/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc

Subject Re: FOIA Request

Thanks

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Elieen L. Kuala
----- Original Message ----- 

From: Elieen L. Kuala
Sent: 04/12/2007 02:18 PM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson
Subject: Re: FOIA Request

I did a search through your emails with their names and I didn't find any. I don't have any either. However, I will check and see if we have any mailed correspondence hard copies.

Elle L.K. Kuala
Elle, I don't think I have any emails from Job or Tova, but to be on the safe side would you double check

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 04/12/2007 08:38 AM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Rosemary Rodriguez; Thomas Wilkey; Juliet Hodgkins; Karen Lynn-Dyson; Margaret Sims; Sheila Banks; Elieen Kuala; Bert Benavides; Gavin Gilmour; Bryan Whitener;

Subject: FOIA Request

Today I will circulate a formal FOIA request to all of you. Please note that this request is from a journalist. The information I circulate will include a copy of the original request, which was made by the DC bureau of McClatchy Newspapers. An abbreviated version of the request follows:

"Copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Election Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for EAC."

Some of you have provided similar information in the past, but I will need another complete submission that includes any related files that may have been generated since your last submission.

Please anticipate a formal request to be distributed to everyone today, and take note that the deadline to provide this information is April 30. Thank you.
Thanks

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Elieen Kuala

----- Original Message -----  

From: Elieen L. Kuala 
Sent: 04/14/2007 09:58 PM EDT 
To: Donetta Davidson 
Subject: Re: FOIA Request

Also I got your message and I will get to work on that tomorrow. I will email Tom and we can talk about what you want to write to Curtis.
Elle Collver
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 566-2256
www.eac.gov

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Donetta L. Davidson

----- Original Message -----  

From: Donetta L. Davidson 
Sent: 04/14/2007 12:35 PM EDT 
To: Elieen Kuala 
Subject: Re: FOIA Request

Thanks

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Elieen Kuala

----- Original Message -----  

From: Elieen L. Kuala 
Sent: 04/13/2007 02:00 PM EDT 
To: Donetta Davidson 
Subject: Re: FOIA Request

I checked all of our paper records and found nothing so I submitted our FOIA response to Jeannie.

Elle L.K. Kuala
Special Assistant to the Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Thanks

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Elieen L. Kuala

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Elieen L. Kuala
Sent: 04/12/2007 02:18 PM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson
Subject: Re: FOIA Request

I did a search through your emails with their names and I didn't find any. I don't have any either. However, I will check and see if we have any mailed correspondence hard copies.

Elle L.K. Kuala
Special Assistant to the Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
office: (202) 566-2256
fax: (202) 566-1392
Elle, I don't think I have any emails from Job or Tova, but to be on the safe side would you double check

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Jeannie Layson
----- Original Message -----

From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 04/12/2007 08:38 AM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Rosemary Rodriguez; Thomas Wilkey; Juliet Hodgkins; Karen Lynn-Dyson; Margaret Sims; Sheila Banks; Elleen Kuala; Bert Benavides; Gavin Gilmour; Bryan Whitener;

Subject: FOIA Request

Today I will circulate a formal FOIA request to all of you. Please note that this request is from a journalist. The information I circulate will include a copy of the original request, which was made by the DC bureau of McClatchy Newspapers. An abbreviated version of the request follows:

"Copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Election Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for EAC."

Some of you have provided similar information in the past, but I will need another complete submission that includes any related files that may have been generated since your last submission.

Please anticipate a formal request to be distributed to everyone today, and take note that the deadline to provide this information is April 30. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

To Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV@EAC

04/13/2007 11:57 AM

cc Bert A. Benavides/EAC/GOV@EAC, Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC, Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV@EAC, Eileen L. Kuala/EAC/GOV@EAC, Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC, Stephanie Woson/EAC/GOV@EAC

Subject Re: FOR YOUR REVIEW: Draft letter to BdstJ

Subject This message has been forwarded.

Jeannie:

I noticed the following factual errors in the draft letter, which we may want to correct:

- The consultants were asked to do 4 things (not 2): (1) provide a definition of voting fraud and voter intimidation that could be used in a future and comprehensive study of these topics; (2) perform background research (including Federal and State administrative and case law review) and identify current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding voting fraud and voter intimidation; (3) establish and convene a project working group, in consultation with EAC, composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation to review the definition of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation and the results of the background research, and to make recommendations on future EAC research on the topic; and (4) report to EAC on the preliminary research effort, working group deliberations, and recommendations for future research.
- The project working group met and offered its feedback and recommendations just before the 2006 meetings of the Standards and Advisory Boards, but after the May 2006 status report had been prepared. EAC staff orally updated the boards on the results of this meeting.

--- Peggy

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

Commissioners,

We attempted to capture your edits in this version. Please let me know if this is what you had in mind. Also, take note that there is still pending decision regarding the release of the draft, which is why the related sentence is highlighted. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100

015222
April 13, 2007

EAC Board of Advisors
EAC Standards Board

RE: EAC Election Crimes Study

Dear Members of the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors:

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission has recently come under fire for not releasing a draft report from EAC’s Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation project that was submitted by two contracted employees, Tova Wang and Job Serebrov. That draft report, which is attached to this letter, is a compilation of summaries of the work that they conducted. We thought it was important to explain the circumstances surrounding this project.

In 2005, the EAC Board of Advisors helped EAC prioritize its research efforts. As a result, EAC developed a research agenda that included studying voting fraud and voter intimidation. In the fall of 2005, EAC hired the two contract employees to conduct an initial review of the information available about voting fraud and voter intimidation. The employees were asked to provide two things: (1) a definition of voting fraud and voter intimidation that could be used in a future and comprehensive study of these topics; and (2) a series of recommendations on how such a future, comprehensive study could be conducted.

In May 2006, a status report regarding this study was presented at both public meetings of the Standards Board and Board of Advisors. Each group provided feedback on the progress of the study and the direction that it should take. Following those meetings, the employees convened a working group that likewise provided feedback on the study. In July 2006, EAC received a body of research including summaries of the articles, books, interviews, and media reports that were reviewed by the contract employees. In addition, they provided a draft report for EAC’s review and consideration. EAC adopted a final report on voting fraud and voter intimidation, Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study, in December 2006.

After the release of EAC’s final report there was some debate about whether EAC should release the draft version provided by our contracted employees. The Board of Advisors considered, but did not pass, a resolution urging the release of that document. Recently, EAC testified before a Congressional committee that requested the draft report. A copy was provided to the committee, and the committee released the draft report this week.

There has been much discussion surrounding EAC’s review process of the material provided by the contract employees, and how much was included in the final report. After receiving the information from the consultants, EAC conducted due diligence to make sure the information was accurate, as both boards encouraged us to do regarding this project as well as all research we receive from third parties. During our review, we
closely examined any claims regarding existing voter fraud and intimidation or the lack thereof. Due to the small scope of the project, we wanted to be very sure any claims could be fully supported by data.

The consultants interviewed 24 people with experience in these issues. As you will see in the consultants’ draft, they reached conclusions in their summaries that were based solely on these interviews, not on the entire body of work they collected. While individual accounts are certainly useful and instruct us on what issues to examine in moving forward, we did not feel these interviews provided the kind of extensive data upon which to draw these conclusions.

We understand that the topics of voter fraud and voter intimidation are hotly debated and sometimes divisive. We assure you that the process we took to review all of the materials and adopt a final report was not motivated by partisan politics, but by a responsibility and desire to issue data and findings that EAC could stand firmly behind and defend.

To avoid even the appearance of partisan influence in future research endeavors, EAC has established a bipartisan commission panel to oversee all research. We will also review our contracting policy and internal procedures to make sure consultants provide data that can be fully supported and substantiated. We will also take a hard look at our internal review process to determine if we can make further improvements as well as identify ways to expedite the process in which we complete these projects.

We take input from our advisory boards, Congress, and the public very seriously, and we pledge to you that we will continue to provide you with accurate, complete, and supported research, whether that research is conducted by consultants or by EAC staff.

Thank you for your service and for your continued commitment to the election process. We know that you in the election community rely on us to supply you with reliable information and we will strive to provide you with the very best information available on election administration issues.

We have attached a copy of EAC’s statement on this issue, as well as a statement issued by Congressmen Maurice Hinchey and José Serrano. If you have any questions regarding this study or on any other matter, please don’t hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Donetta Davidson, Chair
Gracia Hillman, Commissioner
Caroline Hunter, Commissioner
Rosemary Rodriguez, Commissioner
Elle,

would you fax this to donetta?

Juliet T. Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

Julie. Could you fax the Zoe lett to 3037415861. Thanks

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Juliet E. Hodgkins 
Sent: 04/12/2007 06:19 PM EDT 
To: Donetta Davidson 
Subject: First cut at letter to Zoe Lofgren 

Donetta, 

I have attached a draft of a letter that we might use to respond to the request from Zoe Lofgren. I wanted to get it to you for you to start reviewing. It is rather lengthy. It also assumes that we are not going to release the fraud and intimidation report (a matter which came under some debate this afternoon). If that decision changes, I will have to alter the letter. You will also note that there are a number of blanks in the document, which I will fill in as soon as I have the information from Karen.
April 13, 2007

Congresswoman Zoe Lofgren, Chair
House Administration Committee
Subcommittee on Elections
102 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

RE: EAC Research Efforts

Dear Congresswoman Lofgren:

Thank you for your letter of April 12, 2007 and the opportunity to provide valuable information about the research efforts being undertaken by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission. Your letter referenced four studies that have been or are being conducted by EAC through contracts and contracted employees. I will address each in turn, below.

Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Study

The first study about which you inquired is the voting fraud and voter intimidation study. This study was conducted by contract employees of the EAC for the EAC. In the fall of 2005, EAC hired two contract employees to conduct an initial review of the existing information available about voting fraud and voter intimidation. From that review, the employees were asked to provide two things: (1) a definition of voting fraud and voter intimidation that could be used in a future and comprehensive study of these topics; and (2) a series of recommendations on how such a future, comprehensive study could be conducted. In July 2006, EAC received a body of research including summaries of the articles, books, interviews, and media reports that were reviewed by the contract employees. In addition, they provided a draft report for EAC’s review and consideration.

EAC, as a Federal agency, is the policy and decision making body. Consultants, contractors and employees do not make policy for EAC. Their recommendations are only one part of a deliberative process that precedes any agency decision. The Freedom of Information Act, a Federal statute governing the release of documents to the public, creates an exemption to protect pre-decisional, draft documents.

As you may know, the deliberative process privilege protects intra-agency documents that are (1) pre-decisional in nature and (2) part of the deliberative process. In other words, the documents must be part of a process that recommends or presents opinions on a policy matter or governmental decision before that matter is finally decided. It is a well settled matter of law that the work of contract employees and
contractors ("consultants") constitute intra-agency documents. This is true even where the consultants are deemed to be independent contractors and are not subject to the degree of control that agency employment entails. The courts have made this determination after recognizing that agencies have a special need for the opinions and recommendations of temporary consultants. Ultimately, deliberative documents are exempt from release (1) to encourage open and frank discussions on policy matters between agency subordinates and superiors, (2) to protect against premature disclosure of proposed policies and (3) to protect against public confusion that might result from disclosure of rationales that were not in fact the ultimate basis for agency action.

The report requested by House Appropriations Committee is a draft, representing one phase of the deliberative process—before the document was vetted by staff, approved by the Executive Director and reviewed and approved by the Commissioners (the relevant policy makers). Ultimately, the draft document was created by contract employees in order to aid the EAC's Commissioners in their decisions regarding voting fraud and voter intimidation. The contract employees had no personal interest in their submissions and had no agency decision-making authority. Each was tasked with simply providing pre-decisional research and information to the EAC. Their efforts were limited to creating a truthful, comprehensive, and unbiased draft report. Only when the report is finalized and is adopted by EAC does it constitute an EAC decision or a policy determination.

The determination of this document as predecisional is born out in the facts surrounding the project at issue, including the contract documents that gave rise to research and writing of this draft report. First, the voter fraud and intimidation study that was requested is a draft of a final document that has already been released after being vetted by staff and approved by the EAC Commissioners. It is available in its final form on EAC's Web site, www.eac.gov. The draft document at issue was created by two contract employees hired pursuant to 5 U.S.C. §3109 (see 42 U.S.C. §15324(b)). Individuals hired under this authority enter into an employment relationship with the EAC. The contract employees were supervised by an EAC program director who participated directly in the project. For example, the supervisor approved, facilitated, scheduled and participated in interviews conducted for the project. Further, the contract employees were provided research materials and other support from EAC law clerks and staff. As stated by their contracts, these consultants were hired so that the EAC could “…obtain consulting services from an individual who can provide advice drawn from broad professional and technical experience in the area of voter fraud and intimidation.”

2 Klamath, at 10.
3 Hoover, 611 F.2d at 1138.
4 NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 41 U.S. at 151.
Moreover, the contracts clearly forbid the consultants from releasing the draft they created consistent with the privilege covering the draft report. The contract states:

All research, information, documents and any other intellectual property (including but not limited to policies, procedures, manuals, and other work created at the request or otherwise while laboring for the EAC) shall be owned exclusively by the EAC, including copyright. All such work product shall be turned over to the EAC upon completion of your appointment term or as directed by the EAC. The EAC shall have exclusive rights over this material. You may not release government information or documents without the express written permission of the EAC.

Finally, the purpose or subject of the draft report at issue was to make an EAC determination on how voter fraud should be studied by the agency. This was to be done by (1) assessing the nature and quality of the information that presently exists on the subject matter, (2) defining the terms and scope of EAC study as proposed by HAVA, (3) determining what is to be studied and (4) determining how it is to be studied. In addition, the Consultants were asked to develop a definition of the phrases “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation.”

In keeping with this concept, EAC reviews and vets all draft products or recommendations delivered by its consultants, contractors and employees. It would be irresponsible for EAC to accept the product of contracted employees and publish that information without exercising due diligence in vetting the product of the employees' work and the veracity of the information used to produce that product. EAC conducted this review of the draft voter fraud and intimidation report provided by the contracted employees. EAC found that the draft report failed to provide a definition of the terms as required, contained conclusions that were not sought under the terms of the contract or were not supported by the underlying research, and contained allegations that showed bias. EAC also found that the research provided by the contracted employees was a good body of data concerning the existing knowledge of voting fraud and intimidation. EAC staff developed a subsequent draft report to correct the problems mentioned above, to address the questions that this study sought to answer, and to address inconsistencies between the contracted employees' draft report and the research that was provided. The staff report included all of the contracted employees’ and working group’s recommendations. The staff report was adopted by EAC on December 7, 2007 during its public meeting and became the final and decisional report of the Commission on this issue. The final report as well as all of the underlying research conducted by the contracted employees are available on EAC’s Web site, www.eac.gov.

EAC understands and appreciates that a request from a Congressional committee is exempt from the provisions of FOIA, and as such, EAC provided the draft document despite the fact that the deliberative process exemption clearly applies to its contents.
Voter Identification Study

The second study about which you inquired was a study conducted by Rutgers University in conjunction with Moritz College of Law. Rutgers and Moritz served as contractors to EAC and produced this draft document pursuant to the provisions of the contract governing that relationship. A draft report was created by Rutgers University in conjunction with the Moritz College of Law (Ohio State University) to “…provide research assistance to the EAC for the development of voluntary guidance on provisional voting and voter identification procedures.” The stated objective of the contract was to:

...obtain assistance with the collection, analysis and interpretation of information regarding HAVA provisional voting and voter identification requirements for the purpose of drafting guidance on these topics... The anticipated outcome of this activity is the generation of concrete policy recommendations to be issued as voluntary guidance for States.

As with the voter fraud and intimidation study mentioned above, the contractors were provided guidance, information, and were directed by EAC personnel. The final product they delivered (draft report sought) was identified as “a guidance document for EAC adoption.” Clearly, as noted by the contract, the issuance of Federal guidance to states is a matter of government policy and limited to official EAC action.

EAC reviewed and vetted of the draft document provided by Eagleton. Review of that document revealed data and analysis that caused EAC concern. The study only focused on one federal election. An analysis using averaged county-level turnout data from the U.S. Census showed no statistically significant correlations. A second analysis using a data set based upon the Current Population Survey (which was self-reported and showed a significantly higher turnout rate than other conventional data) was conducted that produced some evidence of correlation between voter identification requirements and turnout. The initial categorization of voter identification requirements included classifications that, actually, require no identification documentation, such as “state your name.” The research methodology and the statistical analysis used by the Contractor were questioned by an EAC review group comprised of social scientists and statisticians. The Contractor and the EAC agree that the report raises more questions than provides answers and both agree the study should have covered more than one federal election.4

On March 30, 2007, EAC decided not to adopt Eagleton’s study and not to issue an EAC report based upon this study. The Commission did release all of the material provided by Eagleton at that time. In addition, EAC voted to engage in a longer-term, more systematic review of voter identification requirements. Additional study on the topic will include more than one Federal election cycle, additional environmental and political factors that effect voter participation and the numerous changes in state laws and regulations related to voter identification requirements that have occurred since 2004.

EAC will undertake the following activities:
• Conduct an ongoing state-by-state review, reporting and tracking of voter identification requirements. This will include tracking states’ requirements which require a voter to state his or her name, to sign his or her name, to match his or her signature to a signature on file, to provide photo or non-photo identification or to swear an affidavit affirming his or her identity.

• Establish a baseline of information that will include factors that may affect or influence Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) voter participation, including various voter identification requirements, the competitiveness of a race and certain environmental or political factors. EAC will use some of the information collected by Eagleton as well as additional data from the states to develop this baseline.

• In 2007, convene a working group of advocates, academics, research methodologists and election officials to discuss EAC’s next study of voter identification. Topics to be discussed include methodology, specific issues to be covered in the study and timelines for completing an EAC study on voter identification.

• Study how voter identification provisions that have been in place for two or more Federal elections have impacted voter turnout, voter registration figures, and fraud. Included in this study will be an examination of the relationship between voter turnout and other factors such as race and gender. Study the effects of voter identification provisions, or the lack thereof, on early, absentee and vote-by-mail voting.

• Publish a series of best practice case studies which detail a particular state’s or jurisdiction’s experiences with educating poll workers and voters about various voter identification requirements. Included in the case studies will be detail on the policies and practices used to educate and inform poll workers and voters.

**Free Absentee Ballot Postage Study**

Pursuant to Section 246 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA), EAC was directed to study and produce a report on the feasibility and advisability of a program that would provide absentee ballots that could be returned by the voter postage-free. HAVA directed that this report be delivered one year after the passage of HAVA, that is not later than October 29, 2003. On that date, EAC Commissioners had not yet been appointed and confirmed to fill their positions and to form the agency that is now EAC.

After the formation of EAC in December 2003, Congress provided an appropriation for FY 2004 in the amount of $1.2 million dollars, which did not include sufficient funding for research activities. EAC received operational funding including some funding for research in its FY 2005 budget. Thus, in FY 2005, EAC developed an issued a request for proposals for a research contract to study this issue. No responsible bidders responded to the request for proposals. As such, EAC issued a subsequent request for
proposals in FY 2006. EAC received proposals and awarded a contract for the study of this issue. The work plan for this study shows that EAC expects to receive a final product from the contractor around _______________. Documents related to this study including _______________ are attached as Appendix “1” to this letter.

**Military and Overseas Voting Study**

Section 245 of HAVA directs EAC to study the risks and benefits of using the Internet to conduct voting. The only area in which this type of technology has been used at all to administer elections is for military and overseas citizens. As such, EAC has focused on using that experience as instructive for the possibility of Internet voting on a larger scale.

This study was directed to be completed within 20 months of the passage of HAVA, or no later than June 30, 2004. Again, the majority of this period for research passed prior to the existence of EAC and during the time of its initial budget which did not allow for research spending. In FY 2005, EAC approached the Technical Guidelines Development Committee (TGDC), the Federal advisory committee that researches and proposes voting system standards to EAC, to provide guidelines on security, core requirements and usability requirements for the use of the Internet in voting. The TGDC declined to include these as a part of their recommendations for voting system guidelines. TGDC considered the possibility of using the Internet for voting too risky and further believed that any voting system, Internet-based or not, must conform to the standards established by EAC based upon their research and recommendation.

Following this set back, EAC opted to seek a contractor to provide research in this area. We first conferred with the Federal Voting Assistance Program of the Department of Defense that several years ago worked on a substantial project aimed at establishing Internet voting for military members. In those conversations, we learned that there are many obstacles at the state and local level to implementing Internet-based voting. Based on this information, EAC determined that the best course of action was to find out what the current state of readiness and willingness is amongst state and local election jurisdictions to implement Internet-based voting. We can only develop standards for an appropriate system if we know what needs that system will have to serve and what obstacles it will have to overcome. A request for proposals was issued in FY 2006 and a contract was awarded. The work plan for that contract shows that a product from the contractor should be available to EAC around _______________. Documents related to ongoing work on this study including _______________ are attached as Appendix “2” to this letter.

Thank you for your requests and your interest in election administration. If you have further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
Today I will circulate a formal FOIA request to all of you. Please note that this request is from a journalist. The information I circulate will include a copy of the original request, which was made by the DC bureau of McClatchy Newspapers. An abbreviated version of the request follows:

"Copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Election Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for EAC."

Some of you have provided similar information in the past, but I will need another complete submission that includes any related files that may have been generated since your last submission. Please anticipate a formal request to be distributed to everyone today, and take note that the deadline to provide this information is April 30. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
I do not have anything. Thanks.

Rosemary E. Rodriguez
Commissioner
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-566-3104
Facsimile: 202-566-3127
www.eac.gov
rrodriguez@eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

To Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV, ghillman@eac.gov, Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC, jthompson@eac.gov, klynndyson@eac.gov, psims@eac.gov, sbanks@eac.gov, Elieen L. Kuala/EAC/GOV@EAC, Bert A. Benavides/EAC/GOV@EAC, Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV, bwhitener@eac.gov.

Subject FOIA Request

Today I will circulate a formal FOIA request to all of you. Please note that this request is from a journalist. The information I circulate will include a copy of the original request, which was made by the DC bureau of McClatchy Newspapers. An abbreviated version of the request follows:

"Copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Election Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for EAC."

Some of you have provided similar information in the past, but I will need another complete submission that includes any related files that may have been generated since your last submission.

Please anticipate a formal request to be distributed to everyone today, and take note that the deadline to provide this information is April 30. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Elle, I don't think I have any emails from Job or Tova, but to be on the safe side would you double check

--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Jeannie Layson
----- Original Message ----- 

From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 04/12/2007 08:38 AM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Rosemary Rodriguez; Thomas Wilkey; Juliet Hodgkins; Karen Lynn-Dyson; Margaret Sims; Sheila Banks; Elileen Kuala; Bert Benavides; Gavin Gilmour; Bryan Whitener;

Subject: FOIA Request

Today I will circulate a formal FOIA request to all of you. Please note that this request is from a journalist. The information I circulate will include a copy of the original request, which was made by the DC bureau of McClatchy Newspapers. An abbreviated version of the request follows:

"Copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Election Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for EAC."

Some of you have provided similar information in the past, but I will need another complete submission that includes any related files that may have been generated since your last submission.

Please anticipate a formal request to be distributed to everyone today, and take note that the deadline to provide this information is April 30. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Commissioners:

Today we had the following media inquiries:

(1) Commissioner Hillman was interviewed by Allison Keyes of NPR about the fraud report. Commissioner Hillman explained the scope of the contract and that we asked the contractors to do two things: define voter fraud and intimidation and provide recommendations for future study on these topics. The commissioner pointed out that we did not ask them for conclusions. The reporter asked if it was true that EAC was trying to suppress information about voter intimidation among minorities. The commissioner said she had worked all her life to prevent minorities from being intimidated at the polls, and that she was very anxious to embark upon a more expansive study on this very topic. The commissioner said the agency was transparent, and talked about our public meetings and the transcripts and testimony that were available to the public through our website.

NOTE: The interview will be aired repeatedly this evening on the five minute newscast at the top and bottom of the hour. To listen, tune into WAMU 88.5 FM American University Radio or Listen Live.

(2) Laura Strickler of CBS News wanted to know how much we spent on the fraud report and the voter ID report. We told her the fraud and intimidation research contract was for $147,106, and the voter ID and provisional voting research contract was $560,002. We explained that voter ID was only part of the contract. It also tasked Eagleton to provide information about provisional voting practices. In Oct. 2006, the Commission issued provisional voting best practices.

(3) Rich Wolfe of USA Today is working on a story on what states will have to do if Rush Holt's bill is enacted. He asked for details on what states and vendors are currently facing in order to transition from the 2002 to the 2005 voting system guidelines which we provided. Brian Hancock also spoke with him on background about the testing and certification program. Mr. Wolf wanted to know more details regarding the differences in the VSS 2002 and the VVSG 2005. Brian explained that the most significant changes related to accessibility and usability. His real concern was what practical effect the VVSG would have on elections 2008. We noted that more than the VVSG, the changes brought about by the EAC implementation of our Testing and Certification Program might have just as big an impact. We noted that we would not be grandfathering any NASED systems, and that if State law required EAC certification, the manufacturers would need to bring their voting systems through the EAC program for full testing. We also explained the implementation date of December 2005 and that as of that date, no systems could apply for testing to the 2002 VSS. We also made sure that Mr. Wolf understood that the EAC program was voluntary and that participation in the EAC certification program would be driven ultimately by the statues, regulations or procedures in each of the States.

(4) Paul DeGregorio called to let us know he was interviewed by Adam Stichko of the St. Louis Post Dispatch about the fraud report. The reporter wanted to know if the reaction was a major setback for the agency. Paul said no, and that as EAC noted in its statement, it was going to improve its internal operations. He pointed out that sometimes EAC makes tough decisions that both sides of the aisle might not agree upon. But regardless, he said the agency has a responsibility to conduct due diligence, and make the tough decisions. He talked about what we have accomplished and the assistance we provide -- best practices, quick starts, VVSG and certification program.

(5) Meg Cox a freelance writer in Chicago asked what prompted EAC's Statement Regarding Research &
Contracting Policies and whether something new happened in Congress to prompt the statement. We said that the statement contains the information.

(6) Ross Tuttle of Los Angeles was in town today and is working on a documentary series titled "The Freedom Files" which includes an episode on voting rights. He asked for EAC's statement in response to the NYT article on the release of the report. We sent him today's statement.

(7) Kat Zambon of electionline.org asked if other states have a similar partnership arrangement that the Secretary of State in Georgia has with Kennesaw State University to provide technical support for the state's voting machines, as well as outreach, education, ballot design, training and consultation. We said this is the only one that we are aware of.

(8) John Gideon of Voters Unite and Brad Blog had the following questions, and Jeannie's responses follow:

A. How does the EAC see their position as a "clearinghouse" of information as required by HAVA? We follow the mandates of HAVA regarding our responsibilities to conduct studies about election administration issues. The results of those studies make up the "clearinghouse." B. What responsibility does the EAC have with regard to warning states about what may be security vulnerabilities in specific voting systems? The EAC certification program will collect anomaly reports (go here to view the form), which we will then investigate and share with election officials and the public. C. Chairwoman Davidson has said that the EAC's middle name is "Assistance". How does ignoring potential security issues fit into that theme? As I mentioned above, monitoring anomalies is part of our certification program. As we've discussed before, the system you are referring to was not certified by EAC. If the manufacturer of this system wants an EAC certification for this system, it would have to successfully complete our certification process and adhere to all of its rules. EAC did not grandfather any systems already in use (meaning that we did not automatically issue certifications or transfer NASED qualifications to existing systems), including the one you referenced. Mr. Gideon replied that he was amazed that instead of answering the questions I conflated the certification of voting systems with a security vulnerability that is in existence across the country. He asserted this issue had nothing to do with the EAC certification program. I replied that the very fact that we have set up a system to track voting system anomalies is evidence that we think monitoring performance is very important. Again, as we have discussed many times, we did not certify this voting system. If it successfully completes EAC's certification program in the future, then it would be subject to our rules and conditions, and if a problem occurs we would notify the election community and the public.

###
http://electionlawblog.org/archives/008228.html

Indiana Secretary of State Rokita, the EAC Controversy, and the Incidence of Voter Fraud

At a recent AEI-Brookings Election reform project event, I tangled a bit with Indiana Sec. of State Todd Rokita, including over the question whether the National Association of Secretaries of State will continue to take its unfortunate position that the EAC should be disbanded. Sec. Rokita has also been a strong supporter of voter identification laws, and his state's law has been subject to challenge in the Crawford case (see some of my analysis of the cert. possibilities for this case).

I did not realize until now (or perhaps I forgot) that Sec. Rokita was a member of the EAC's working group on vote fraud issues (see page 4 of pdf).

In the draft Seberov/Wang report leaked to the NY Times, Sec. of State Rokita is quoted as making some troubling remarks about conducting research into possible voter fraud, a key empirical question not only for the constitutional issue in Crawford but for election administration more generally. On page 28 of the report, Sec. Rokita is quoted as saying both that he believes the EAC should be in business of designing its own methodology for figuring out the incidence of voter fraud (rather than relying on existing assessments of the amount of fraud) and that the EAC should be "very careful" not the make the "wrong selection in the eyes of some group" of a political scientist to conduct such a study.
In my view, there's no way that the EAC can design a sound methodology for a new study of voter fraud without the help of well-trained political scientists (or other social scientists well trained in appropriate research methods). It cannot subject the selection of such a political scientist to some kind of litmus test that excludes a good political scientist whose choice offends some interest group. This is part of the EAC's new pathology generally: it is afraid to release any data that might offend some group or take a side. (Under pressure, the EAC has now released that Eagleton/Moritz study on voter id and turnout that it has disowned).

In the end, I get the sense that no amount of evidence from the most eminent political scientist would convince Sec. Rokita that voter fraud at the polling place is not a major problem. From the report: "Mr. Rokita stated that, 'We're not sure that fraud at the polling place doesn't exist. We can't conclude that.'"

With the apparent demise of the American Center for Voting Rights (whose Thor Hearne was also in the EAC working group), Mr. Rokita appears to be fighting this battle alone on the EAC.

A more general lesson from the EAC controversy: There has been much writing in recent years by Chris Elmendorf, Heather Gerken, and myself on the use of election reform commissions and other devices to get changes in election administration rules. I fear that we will be studying the EAC's failures for many years to understand how not to engage in meaningful election administration reform.

--

Rick Hasen
William H. Hannon Distinguished Professor of Law
Loyola Law School
919 Albany Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-1211
(213) 736-1466
(213) 380-3769 - fax
rick.hasen@lls.edu
http://www.lls.edu/academics/faculty/hasen.html
http://electionlawblog.org

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
chunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

015242
Hello everyone,

I'm sure you have read the article in today's NYT about the voter fraud report this agency issued. Today, Congressmen Hinchey and Serrano have issued the following statement. Very shortly, EAC will post and distribute the attached statement to articulate our role and approach to conducting research and the steps we will take to improve our process. Please let me know if you have any questions about this, as I am sure we will all receive phone calls today about this issue. You may also direct people with questions to the statement that will be on the website. I will keep everyone informed as this situation evolves.

For Immediate Release

April 11, 2007

Hinchey, Serrano Urge Non-Partisanship, Greater Transparency at Election Assistance Commission

Washington, DC - Today, Congressmen Maurice Hinchey (NY-22) and José E Serrano (NY-16) urged the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to act with greater transparency and without partisanship. The comments from the congressmen came as the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government released a draft version of an EAC report on voter fraud and intimidation that shows significant changes were made to the findings of outside experts before the final report was released.

"The EAC has an obligation to be forthright with the American people and operate transparently and in a non-partisan manner," said Congressman Hinchey, who requested the draft report from EAC Commissioner Donetta L. Davidson during subcommittee hearing last month. "The draft report was commissioned with taxpayer dollars upon a mandate from Congress so that we could learn more about voter fraud and intimidation. The need for this report is even more clear when we see the way in which the Bush administration is carrying out the electoral process and how this system is sliding towards corruption. In hiding a draft report from the public that is significantly different from the final version, the EAC has created a lot more questions than it has answered while stunting debate on the issue. In order for our democracy to function properly it is essential that our elections are free of any corruption and that includes ensuring
that the EAC does not work to benefit one political party over the other. To achieve that goal we must have all the facts and opinions on the table, not just some of them. The EAC must never limit discussion and debate."

"The EAC is charged with helping to ensure our elections are trustworthy and administered fairly," said Congressman Serrano, who is Chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee that oversees the EAC budget. "I’m concerned if changes were made to the report on voter fraud because of partisan bias rather than impartial analysis. When you read the draft report side-by-side with the final version, it is clear that important conclusions of the experts who wrote the draft report were excluded from the final product. Among the excluded information an analysis that undermines the notion that voter fraud is rampant.

"I am concerned that the EAC did not publicly release the taxpayer-funded draft report, and I worry that political considerations may have played a role. We cannot have a politicized EAC, or one that yields to outside pressure. Our democracy, and the American people’s faith in it, is far more important than a short-term political advantage."

The draft report was written by outside experts under contract with the EAC. The final report was entitled “Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study” and was issued on December 7, 2006.

The EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by the 2002 Help America Vote Act in order to disburse funds to the states for the purchase of voting systems, certify voting technologies, develop guidelines and serve as an information resource for election administration.
WASHINGTON — The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) directs the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to serve as a national clearinghouse and resource by, among other things, conducting studies with the goal of improving the administration of federal elections. To fulfill this mandate, the EAC has entered into contracts with a variety of persons and entities. Reports adopted by the EAC, a bipartisan federal entity, are likely to be cited as authoritative in public discourse. Prior to the EAC's adopting a report submitted by a contractor, the EAC has the responsibility to ensure its accuracy and to verify that conclusions are supported by the underlying research.

The Commission takes input and constructive criticism from Congress and the public very seriously. We will take a hard look at the way we do business. Specifically, we will examine both the manner in which we have awarded contracts and our decision-making process regarding the release of research and reports. The EAC takes its mandates very seriously, and we will continue to move forward in a bipartisan way to improve the way America votes.

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

###
Commissioners,

As you know, the NYT will run an article tomorrow about EAC, and I think the focus will be on our recent stumbles, and it will speculate about what kind of role you've been assuming. I think it will portray us as under fire and struggling to regain our footing due to mismanagement and a late start. Also, tomorrow Hinchey and Serrano will release the draft fraud report along with a press release. I'd like to release and post the following statement as soon as their press release hits the street. Please let me know if you agree with this statement. Press log follows.

"EAC's policy is to thoroughly review any information submitted by contractors. That review involves due diligence to ensure that every report EAC adopts and issues is based on accurate information. We have a responsibility to take the time to get things right, and to make sure we can stand behind and each and every report we issue.

"However, we take input from Congress and the public very seriously, and we will take a hard look at the way we do business. If changes need to be made to increase transparency or speed up our review process, we will make those changes. EAC takes its responsibilities very seriously, and we will continue to move forward in a bipartisan way to improve the way America votes."

1. Ian Urbina of the NYT interviewed commissioners Davidson and Hillman about the fraud report. Both told him that EAC has a responsibility to make sure information we release is accurate, and that means conducting due diligence. The chair pointed out that we now have bi-partisan subcommittees to review research, budget issues and certification. She pointed out that we have a responsibility to take the time to get things right. Comm. Hillman answered his questions about specific passages, and explained why we made changes and how some of the comparisons he was making wasn't germane. Ray Martinez called and wanted us to know that he was also interviewed by Ian, and Ray told him he has always thought the agency should make final contractor reports available to the public. My responses to additional questions he posed follow:

A. In the draft on page 7, sec. bullet, it says "there is widespread but not unanimous." In the final, page one, it says "It is clear from the review that there is a great deal of debate on the pervasiveness of fraud in elections as well as what constitute the most common acts of fraud or intimidation." Reason for the change from draft to final language -- The statement in the draft report is based on the interviews only, not on the entire body of research that was conducted. The latter statement in the final report is based upon the entire body of research, including the articles, books and cases which constitute the appendices. Also, the sentence from the draft is in the section that describes the interviews. The sentence in the final version is in the executive summary, which focuses on the entire project, not just the interviews.

B. In the draft on page 7 it says there is "evidence of some intimidation." In the final, page 7, it says "voter intimidation is also a topic of some debate because there is little agreement concerning what constitutes actionable voter intimidation." Reason for the change from draft to final language -- After reviewing all of the data provided by the consultants, EAC determined that there is little agreement as to what constitutes "voter intimidation." There is a difference between actionable intimidation (criminal) and civil issues and activities that are legal in both the criminal and civil context. No one is debating that there is some evidence of intimidation. The question is how intimidation is defined (criminal, civil, both, neither).

C. In the draft on page 7, second bullet, it says "most people believe that false registration forms have not resulted in fraud." This sentence wasn't supported by the entire body of research. Regarding the sentence in the final report: "For example, the interviewees largely agreed that absentee balloting is subject to the
greatest proportion of fraudulent acts, following by voting buying and voter registration fraud." This language was taken from the first bullet on page seven of the draft report, which begins "There is virtually universal agreement that absentee ballot fraud is the biggest problem..."

D. In the draft, the consultants offered conclusions up front. In the final version, these conclusions either ended up in the appendices or elsewhere in the document. Why? EAC organized the content of the document in the manner that seemed most suitable. For instance, all of the recommendations (consultants' and working group's) are grouped together. We added language that reflected the commission's decision to adopt six of the recommendations.

E. Was this voted on in public? Was it unanimous? Three commissioners -- Paul DeGregorio, Gracia Hillman, and Donetta Davidson unanimously approved the final report at a public meeting on Dec. 7, 2006. Go here for details.

F. Who managed this project? Initially, the project was managed by EAC Dir. of Research Karen Lynn-Dyson, but early on the project was shifted to EAC Election Research Specialist Margaret Sims.

G. When did the work begin and when was it concluded? The consultants began work in Sept. 2005. They delivered sections of the draft document in phases (all dates are 2006). Interview conclusions were delivered to EAC in April; future suggestions in June; everything else (except next item) delivered in July; and literature review arrived in August.

H. What are the political affiliations of Karen and Margaret? Who appointed them? I don't know Karen's or Margaret's political affiliation. They are not political appointees -- they are federal employees, not appointed by the commission but hired by the executive director.

I. What about Julie Thompkins? Julie was appointed by the commission. Go here to read the press release about her appointment. The last person she worked for was a Republican, but Julie's appointment to the EAC was not on a partisan basis. She was appointed by a unanimous vote of the full (four commissioners) commission.

J. Explain the circumstances surrounding the only commission vote that wasn't unanimous. HAVA gave EAC the mandate under the National Voter Registration Act (previously held by FEC) to develop a federal voter registration form that must be accepted and used by states covered under the Act. As part of that mandate, EAC routinely updates the state instructions on the form. Instructions provide information about voting rules and laws in the states.

Arizona requested a change to the federal form's state instructions reflecting Prop. 200. Staff routinely reviews and approves state requests regarding changes to the instructions. In this case, the executive director denied Arizona's request. Paul DeGregorio (R), who was EAC chair at the time, put the matter to a vote, proposing that the Commission accommodate Arizona's proof of citizenship procedure by amending the state specific portion of the federal voter registration form. The vote failed along party lines, 2 - 2. HAVA requires any measure to be carried by at least three votes. Therefore, the measure failed.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
1. I confirmed for Matt Murray of Roll Call that Comm. Hunter is a Republican and that she came to EAC in March. He asked for our FY budget figures, which I sent to him. He asked if it was true that we bungled the certification of voting systems in reference to the CIBER situation. I said that it had nothing to do with certifying voting systems, and explained the entire interim process and the reason we had to implement after NIST told us they wouldn't get labs accredited until late 2006 and NASED's termination of its program. I said we announced this program and our decision to invite the three labs to apply at a public meeting in 2005, and that we've had several public meetings about the interim program, as well as sending updates to our stakeholders. He asked me how I would characterize the criticism surrounding CIBER, and I said the feedback we received was that we should have been more proactive in reminding people that CIBER had not received interim certification, that it was still pending. I emphasized that we have not certified any voting systems, so it would be incorrect to state that we had "bungled" that process. He asked if we released the Eagleton data after Hinchey urged us to, and I said yes, but told him that the chair announced that we would complete this project w/in 30 days at a public meeting in Feb. in which Eagleton testified and answered questions about their methodology. I also gave him the following quote: We have a responsibility to take the time to get things right. However, we understand the criticism and we are taking a hard look at our internal processes. We will identify what changes need to be made, and we will make them. We take comments from Congress very seriously, and we appreciate their input and their willingness to give us what we need to get the job done.

2. The chair was interviewed by Pam Zubeck of the Gazette (CO) about what she's seeing regarding voting by mail. The chair talked about the trends in the NW, and how it was important to make sure states have accurate and up to date lists. She noted that the introduction of statewide databases will be especially helpful to those states. The reporter asked if CO sends out ballots to inactive voters, and the chair said yes, and told her it is a federal requirement that voters must be notified before they are removed from voter rolls.

3. Freelance journalist Meg Cox, who is writing an article for Op-Ed News, had the following questions, and my responses follow: a) You said that the Wang/Serebrov report has not been released because it was predecisional. Was the Moritz/Eagleton report released because it was not predecisional? The Moritz/Eagleton report was a predecisional document. The commissioners took an action not to adopt a final report based upon the Moritz/Eagleton report, but to release all the predecisional information (the draft report).

b) I understood you to say that the December EAC report includes all of the Wang/Serebrov recommendations but not all of the Wang/Serebrov findings. Is that correct? The report does include all of their recommendations, as well as the research they reviewed, which includes books and articles and court cases. The contract with the consultants did not ask them to produce findings. It was an initial effort to identify what relevant information is available, define voter fraud and voter intimidation, and make recommendations to EAC regarding future study.

c) I understood you to say that EAC staff added results of their own research to the December EAC report. Is that correct? Yes, EAC conducted additional research to further clarify the definitions of "voter fraud" and "voter intimidation." On page 13, you will see the results of the EAC research, which resulted in defining the scope of future study and new terminology for these topics -- election crimes. EAC staff reviewed the report for accuracy, for grammar and added language that reflected the commission's decision to adopt the final version based upon the initial research provided by the consultants. New language was also added to communicate the commission's decision adopt six of the 16 recommendations put forth by the consultants.

d) If I'm correct on questions 2 and 3, would it be accurate to say that readers of the December report
cannot tell how much of that report does and does not reflect the original Wang/Serebrov findings? Again, the contract with the consultants did not ask them to produce findings, nor was that the scope of the contract. It was an initial effort that tasked them to identify what relevant information is available, define voter fraud and voter intimidation, and make recommendations to EAC regarding future study. The research (Appendix D, 197 pages; and Appendix B, 57 pages) and all of their recommendations are included in the final report.

e) I called earlier today requesting the Wang/Serebrov report, and you sent me the December EAC report. I am concerned that if I had not already been researching this closely, I would have thought that you'd sent me the Wang/Serebrov report and would have reported incorrectly that you had. Does the EAC have any comment on this manner of responding to press inquiries? (I contacted you to request the report after I read in the Statesman Journal of Salem, Oregon, an article by Marie Cocco that says: "The bipartisan commission didn't widely release the consultants' review, but makes it available on request." Did the EAC indeed give Ms. Cocco a copy of the "consultants' review"? Or has she misunderstood you in the way I'm concerned about?) I sent you a link to the "EAC report" because it is what was adopted by the commission based upon the research conducted by the consultants. The final report clearly states how it was compiled, includes bios for both of the consultants, their research and summaries of their interviews. Regarding Ms. Cocco, I explained the entire process to her. I provided the staff update on the project which was presented at a public meeting in May 2006 and the final report, which is posted on the EAC website. Regarding "this manner of responding to press inquiries," I have forwarded your comments to my supervisor so he can review my performance regarding the handling of your inquiry.

f) I understood you to say that the EAC did not release the Wang/Serebrov report in its original form because the EAC has to do due diligence and its staff is small. Do I understand you correctly? As a small agency of 23 employees, including the four commissioners, it is necessary for the agency to contract with consultants to gather the initial data for research projects. After EAC receives the initial data, the agency reviews the data for accuracy. What form of due diligence does the EAC's staff routinely conduct on research that is contracted out to experts before that research is released? You mentioned "vetting" the research. What does that vetting entail? It depends on the project, but in every case, the agency has a responsibility to make sure the information it receives from any contractor is accurate. In this case, EAC staff read every article cited by the consultants and reviewed the contents of every interview they conducted. Appendix C contains the interview summaries, and the changes EAC made are clearly footnoted. Regarding other research projects, if it is information directly related to a mandate within the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), staff will make sure that the information is consistent with the law. If the research focuses on election laws throughout the country, we make sure the laws are cited correctly and that state legislatures haven't changed or amended these laws since the research was conducted. (As you probably know, there have been many new election laws introduced at the state level since 2004.) Throughout the process, we review for grammar as well as make sure the document flows and is arranged logically -- the basic tenets of editing.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
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Washington, DC 20005
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www.eac.gov

015249
Commissioners,

Ian Urbina of the NYT is working on a story about our fraud report. He has the original, and he's asking questions about how we arrived at the final version, as well as wanted to confirm that there were intense discussion among the commissioners about whether to release everything.

Madam Chair--I need to know if you can speak with him in the next 30 min. If not, I need to know which commish would be available to speak with Ian. We are under seige, and I think it's very important to have a commish perspective/input in this piece.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Commissioners:

For the second time in a month, Dan Seligson of Electionline.org requested the same document on voter fraud that was requested of EAC by the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services. Again, we said that the document that was requested by the subcommittee is considered predecisional under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), but that of course we provided it to the subcommittee because they are exempt from FOIA. We noted however, that the EAC adopted a final report on election crimes at our Dec. 7, 2006 public meeting. We said that the final report was based on the research provided by the consultants and additional information gathered by EAC staff and that it is available on our website here. We said that the report includes all of the data reviewed by the consultants. (links on page 24.) and that it also includes all of the recommendations for further study that the consultants put forth. We said that ultimately, the commission adopted four of those recommendations and provided the press release link here. We said that as a small agency, EAC often works with contractors, consultants and experts to gather data and conduct research. After the commission receives the initial data or information, staff then works to incorporate this information into a final EAC report.

###
Elle,

I need a more complete TGDC roster, including their titles and affiliations. Please see last year's annual report, page 45. Again, I need a complete list of those who served in Fiscal Year 2006, which covers Oct. 1, 2005 through Sept. 30, 2006. Anyone who was not serving as of Sept. 30, I will list them as former members. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov

Here is a list of the cities Commissioner Davidson has visited on official business for FY06:

San Francisco, CA
Portland, OR
Albuquerque, NM
Hot Springs, VA
Bismark, ND
Cleveland, OH
Seattle, WA
Austin, TX
Denver, CO
Gaithersberg, MD
Caper, WY
Columbia, SC
Santa Fe, NM
San Diego, CA
Eugene, OR
Chicago, IL
Hartford, CT
Providence, RI
Carson, CA
St. Louis, MO

Roster of TGDC members who served during FY06:
Elle L.K. Collver
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
office: (202) 566-2256
Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

To Eileen L. Collver/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc bwhitener@eac.gov
Subject Need info from you for annual report

Elle,
Per Bryan’s earlier emails, I need several things from you ASAP for the Annual Report, which covers everything from Oct. 1, 2005 to Sept. 30, 2006. 1) A list of cities the commissioner visited during that time period; 2) The TGDC roster as of Oct. 1, 2005. I also need a list of members who resigned during that time period so I can note their service, even though they won’t be listed on the roster. In addition, please make sure her bio on the website is current, as that is what will be in the annual report.

Also, my records indicate that I did not receive a response from you regarding my FOIA request. Please note that it specifically asks for a response from everyone, even if the response is “no records.” I’m assuming you have checked with the commissioner to see if she has any responsive records. Original request is below. Please let me know if you have any questions or need clarification about any of this.

Thank you.

Hello everyone,
I need each of you to respond affirmatively or negatively to the FOIA request below. If you have no documents in your possession related to this request, please reply to me with the words “no records.” If you have records, please identify them in an e-mail reply and attach them to the e-mail. If the document is not electronic, hand deliver them to me. Also, if you believe any of these related documents should be withheld, please provide a brief memo stating the reason for your position.

015253
I need this information and/or a response by COB December 5, 2006. If you cannot comply by this date, please provide notification and an estimated time when you will provide the information and the reason why you cannot comply by the original deadline. Thanks for your cooperation. See request below:

Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center for Justice has submitted a FOIA request for the voting fraud report prepared by our consultants and the voter ID report, as well as the following information:

"In the event that the EAC denies my renewed request for the voter ID and voting fraud reports or delays another week in providing those materials, we respectfully request copies of (1) all requests for proposals and contracts relating to the voter ID and voting fraud reports; and (2) all written and electronic communications concerning the voter ID and voting fraud reports between the EAC and (a) the Eagleton Institute of Politics, (b) the Moritz College of Law, (c) Tova Wang, (d) Job Serebrov, and (e) any other individuals or entities, including but not limited to outside reviewers."

Please let me know if you would like a copy of the FOIA request.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov

015254
I have made arrangements for a conference call for tomorrow's briefing. There are four lines available. That would be sufficient for Tom, Donetta, and me (if necessary). In addition, there is one additional line in the event someone else needs to call in. If there will be more than the callers identified above (Tom, Donetta, and me) please let me know.

Here is the call in number and pass code:

The call will be open from 10:30 to 12:00 (just in case we run over the one hour scheduled meeting).

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC  20005
(202) 566-3100
Elle,

Per Bryan's earlier emails, I need several things from you ASAP for the Annual Report, which covers everything from Oct. 1, 2005 to Sept. 30, 2006. 1) A list of cities the commissioner visited during that time period; 2) The TGDC roster as of Oct. 1, 2005. I also need a list of members who resigned during that time period so I can note their service, even though they won't be listed on the roster. In addition, please make sure her bio on the website is current, as that is what will be in the annual report.

Also, my records indicate that I did not receive a response from you regarding my FOIA request. Please note that it specifically asks for a response from everyone, even if the response is "no records." I'm assuming you have checked with the commissioner to see if she has any responsive records. Original request is below. Please let me know if you have any questions or need clarification about any of this.

Thank you.

Hello everyone,

I need each of you to respond affirmatively or negatively to the FOIA request below. If you have no documents in your possession related to this request, please reply to me with the words "no records." If you have records, please identify them in an e-mail reply and attach them to the e-mail. If the document is not electronic, hand deliver them to me. Also, if you believe any of these related documents should be withheld, please provide a brief memo stating the reason for your position.

I need this information and/or a response by COB December 5, 2006. If you cannot comply by this date, please provide notification and an estimated time when you will provide the information and the reason why you cannot comply by the original deadline. Thanks for your cooperation. See request below:

Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center for Justice has submitted a FOIA request for the voting fraud report prepared by our consultants and the voter ID report, as well as the following information:

"In the event that the EAC denies my renewed request for the voter ID and voting fraud reports or delays another week in providing those materials, we respectfully request copies of (1) all requests for proposals and contracts relating to the voter ID and voting fraud reports; and (2) all written and electronic communications concerning the voter ID and voting fraud reports between the EAC and (a) the Eagleton Institute of Politics, (b) the Moritz College of Law, (c) Tova Wang, (d) Job Serebrov, and (e) any other individuals or entities, including but not limited to outside reviewers."

Please let me know if you would like a copy of the FOIA request.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
That also applies to the Eagleton contract, which is voter ID. Also, please check with the commissioner to make sure she doesn't have any responsive records.

Jeannie Layson  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 202-566-3100  
www.eac.gov  
Elieen L. Collver/EAC/GOV

Elieen L. Collver/EAC/GOV  
12/12/2006 09:23 AM  
To jlayson@eac.gov@EAC  
cc  
Subject Re: FOIA Request

Jeannie, 

I don't have any written correspondence regarding the Voter Fraud issue/Tova or Job correspondence. 

I did have a few phone calls that came in from one of the members of the working group. But that's it as far as correspondence. 

Elle  

Elle L.K Coliver  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Office: (202) 566-3256  
www.eac.gov  
Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
Hello everyone,
I need each of you to respond affirmatively or negatively to the FOIA request below. If you have no documents in your possession related to this request, please reply to me with the words "no records." If you have records, please identify them in an e-mail reply and attach them to the e-mail. If the document is not electronic, hand deliver them to me. Also, if you believe any of these related documents should be withheld, please provide a brief memo stating the reason for your position.

I need this information and/or a response by COB December 5, 2006. If you cannot comply by this date, please provide notification and an estimated time when you will provide the information and the reason why you cannot comply by the original deadline. Thanks for your cooperation. See request below:

Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center for Justice has submitted a FOIA request for the voting fraud report prepared by our consultants and the voter ID report, as well as the following information:

"In the event that the EAC denies my renewed request for the voter ID and voting fraud reports or delays another week in providing those materials, we respectfully request copies of (1) all requests for proposals and contracts relating to the voter ID and voting fraud reports; and (2) all written and electronic communications concerning the voter ID and voting fraud reports between the EAC and (a) the Eagleton Institute of Politics, (b) the Moritz College of Law, (c) Tova Wang, (d) Job Serebrov, and (e) any other individuals or entities, including but not limited to outside reviewers."

Please let me know if you would like a copy of the FOIA request.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
I need to set a meeting with the Commissioners some time during the week of Nov 27 to discuss their comments/issues on the draft voter fraud/voter intimidation report. Please let me know when they are available either in person or by phone. My only limitations at this point are Wednesday, 12:00 -2:00 and Friday, 9:00 -10:00.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Hello everyone,
I need each of you to respond affirmatively or negatively to the FOIA request below. If you have no documents in your possession related to this request, please reply to me with the words "no records." If you have records, please identify them in an e-mail reply and attach them to the e-mail. If the document is not electronic, hand deliver them to me. Also, if you believe any of these related documents should be withheld, please provide a brief memo stating the reason for your position.

I need this information and/or a response by COB December 5, 2006. If you cannot comply by this date, please provide notification and an estimated time when you will provide the information and the reason why you cannot comply by the original deadline. Thanks for your cooperation. See request below:

Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center for Justice has submitted a FOIA request for the voting fraud report prepared by our consultants and the voter ID report, as well as the following information:

"In the event that the EAC denies my renewed request for the voter ID and voting fraud reports or delays another week in providing those materials, we respectfully request copies of (1) all requests for proposals and contracts relating to the voter ID and voting fraud reports; and (2) all written and electronic communications concerning the voter ID and voting fraud reports between the EAC and (a) the Eagleton Institute of Politics, (b) the Moritz College of Law, (c) Tova Wang, (d) Job Serebrov, and (e) any other individuals or entities, including but not limited to outside reviewers."

Please let me know if you would like a copy of the FOIA request.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
We asked them to do two things: 1) define voter fraud and voter intimidation; and 2) provide recommendations for future study.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Hello everyone,
I'm sure you have read the article in today's NYT about the voter fraud report this agency issued. Today, Congressmen Hinchey and Serrano have issued the following statement. Very shortly, EAC will post and distribute the attached statement to articulate our role and approach to conducting research and the steps we will take to improve our process. Please let me know if you have any questions about this, as I am sure we will all receive phone calls today about this issue. You may also direct people with questions to the statement that will be on the website. I will keep everyone informed as this situation evolves.
some of them. The EAC must never limit discussion and debate.”

"The EAC is charged with helping to ensure our elections are trustworthy and administered fairly,” said Congressman Serrano, who is Chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee that oversees the EAC budget. “I’m concerned if changes were made to the report on voter fraud because of partisan bias rather than impartial analysis. When you read the draft report side-by-side with the final version, it is clear that important conclusions of the experts who wrote the draft report were excluded from the final product. Among the excluded information is an analysis that undermines the notion that voter fraud is rampant.

“I am concerned that the EAC did not publicly release the taxpayer-funded draft report, and I worry that political considerations may have played a role. We cannot have a politicized EAC, or one that yields to outside pressure. Our democracy, and the American people’s faith in it, is far more important than a short-term political advantage.”

The draft report was written by outside experts under contract with the EAC. The final report was entitled “Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study” and was issued on December 7, 2006.

The EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by the 2002 Help America Vote Act in order to disburse funds to the states for the purchase of voting systems, certify voting technologies, develop guidelines and serve as an information resource for election administration.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
WASHINGTON – The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) directs the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to serve as a national clearinghouse and resource by, among other things, conducting studies with the goal of improving the administration of federal elections. To fulfill this mandate, the EAC has entered into contracts with a variety of persons and entities. Reports adopted by the EAC, a bipartisan federal entity, are likely to be cited as authoritative in public discourse. Prior to the EAC's adopting a report submitted by a contractor, the EAC has the responsibility to ensure its accuracy and to verify that conclusions are supported by the underlying research.

The Commission takes input and constructive criticism from Congress and the public very seriously. We will take a hard look at the way we do business. Specifically, we will examine both the manner in which we have awarded contracts and our decision-making process regarding the release of research and reports. The EAC takes its mandates very seriously, and we will continue to move forward in a bipartisan way to improve the way America votes.

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

###
Commissioners:

Today we had the following media inquiries:

(1) Commissioner Hillman was interviewed by Allison Keyes of NPR about the fraud report. Commissioner Hillman explained the scope of the contract and that we asked the contractors to do two things: define voter fraud and intimidation and provide recommendations for future study on these topics. The commissioner pointed out that we did not ask them for conclusions. The reporter asked if it was true that EAC was trying to suppress information about voter intimidation among minorities. The commissioner said she had worked all her life to prevent minorities from being intimidated at the polls, and that she was very anxious to embark upon a more expansive study on this very topic. The commissioner said the agency was transparent, and talked about our public meetings and the transcripts and testimony that were available to the public through our website.

NOTE: The interview will be aired repeatedly this evening on the five minute newscast at the top and bottom of the hour. To listen, tune into WAMU 88.5 FM American University Radio or Listen Live.

(2) Laura Strickler of CBS News wanted to know how much we spent on the fraud report and the voter ID report. We told her the fraud and intimidation research contract was for $147,106, and the voter ID and provisional voting research contract was $560,002. We explained that voter ID was only part of the contract. It also tasked Eagleton to provide information about provisional voting practices. In Oct. 2006, the Commission issued provisional voting best practices.

(3) Rich Wolfe of USA Today is working on a story on what states will have to do if Rush Holt's bill is enacted. He asked for details on what states and vendors are currently facing in order to transition from the 2002 to the 2005 voting system guidelines which we provided. Brian Hancock also spoke with him on background about the testing and certification program. Mr. Wolf wanted to know more details regarding the differences in the VSS 2002 and the VVSG 2005. Brian explained that the most significant changes related to accessibility and usability. His real concern was what practical effect the VVSG would have on elections 2008. We noted that more than the VVSG, the changes brought about by the EAC implementation of our Testing and Certification Program might have just as big an impact. We noted that we would not be grandfathering any NASED systems, and that if State law required EAC certification, the manufacturers would need to bring their voting systems through the EAC program for full testing. We also explained the implementation date of December 2005 and that as of that date, no systems could apply for testing to the 2002 VSS. We also made sure that Mr. Wolf understood that the EAC program was voluntary and that participation in the EAC certification program would be driven ultimately by the statutes, regulations or procedures in each of the States.

(4) Paul DeGregorio called to let us know he was interviewed by Adam Stichko of the St. Louis Post Dispatch about the fraud report. The reporter wanted to know if the reaction was a major setback for the agency. Paul said no, and that as EAC noted in its statement, it was going to improve its internal operations. He pointed out that sometimes EAC makes tough decisions that both sides of the aisle might not agree upon. But regardless, he said the agency has a responsibility to conduct due diligence, and make the tough decisions. He talked about what we have accomplished and the assistance we provide -- best practices, quick starts, VVSG and certification program.

(5) Meg Cox a freelance writer in Chicago asked what prompted EAC's Statement Regarding Research &
Contracting Policies and whether something new happened in Congress to prompt the statement. We said that the statement contains the information.

(6) Ross Tuttle of Los Angeles was in town today and is working on a documentary series titled "The Freedom Files" which includes an episode on voting rights. He asked for EAC's statement in response to the NYT article on the release of the report. We sent him today's statement.

(7) Kat Zambon of electionline.org asked if other states have a similar partnership arrangement that the Secretary of State in Georgia has with Kennesaw State University to provide technical support for the state's voting machines, as well as outreach, education, ballot design, training and consultation. We said this is the only one that we are aware of.

(8) John Gideon of Voters Unite and Brad Blog had the following questions, and Jeannie's responses follow:

A. How does the EAC see their position as a "clearinghouse" of information as required by HAVA? We follow the mandates of HAVA regarding our responsibilities to conduct studies about election administration issues. The results of those studies make up the "clearinghouse."  
B. What responsibility does the EAC have with regard to warning states about what may be security vulnerabilities in specific voting systems? The EAC certification program will collect anomaly reports (go here to view the form), which we will then investigate and share with election officials and the public.  
C. Chairwoman Davidson has said that the EAC's middle name is "Assistance". How does ignoring potential security issues fit into that theme? As I mentioned above, monitoring anomalies is part of our certification program. As we've discussed before, the system you are referring to was not certified by EAC. If the manufacturer of this system wants an EAC certification for this system, it would have to successfully complete our certification process and adhere to all of its rules. EAC did not grandfather any systems already in use (meaning that we did not automatically issue certifications or transfer NASED qualifications to existing systems), including the one you referenced. Mr. Gideon replied that he was amazed that instead of answering the questions I conflated the certification of voting systems with a security vulnerability that is in existence across the country. He asserted this issue had nothing to do with the EAC certification program. I replied that the very fact that we have set up a system to track voting system anomalies is evidence that we think monitoring performance is very important. Again, as we have discussed many times, we did not certify this voting system. If it successfully completes EAC's certification program in the future, then it would be subject to our rules and conditions, and if a problem occurs we would notify the election community and the public.

###
Please see the front page of today's NYTimes--scant evidence of voter fraud

Juliet E. Hodgkins

----- Original Message -----  
From: Juliet E. Hodgkins  
Sent: 04/12/2007 07:31 AM EDT  
To: Caroline Hunter; Gracia Hillman; Donetta Davidson; Rosemary Rodriguez  
Cc: Sheila Banks; Elieen Kuala; "Stephanie Wilson"; "Fabre, Stacie"; Thomas Wilkey; Gavin Gilmour; Jeannie Layson  
Subject: Re: Draft letter to board of advisors and standards board  

From the variety of comments it is not clear to me that there is a common understanding on how to proceed and what we should say -- or at least I am not comfortable that I understand how you all want this letter to read. So, I would suggest we spend a bit more time on the theme this morning so that I can efficiently and accurately edit the letter so that we can get it out timely today.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Caroline C. Hunter

----- Original Message -----  
From: Caroline C. Hunter  
Sent: 04/12/2007 07:27 AM EDT  
To: Gracia Hillman; Juliet Hodgkins; Donetta Davidson; Rosemary Rodriguez  
Cc: Sheila Banks; Elieen Kuala; "Stephanie Wilson"; "Fabre, Stacie"; Thomas Wilkey; Gavin Gilmour; Jeannie Layson  
Subject: Re: Draft letter to board of advisors and standards board  

Keeping it narrow to the current controversy is ok with me, but I think we cannot assume people know how the recent events unfolded, ie Cong released, NYT wrote, etc.

Gracia Hillman

----- Original Message -----  
From: Gracia Hillman  
Sent: 04/12/2007 07:22 AM EDT  
To: Caroline Hunter; Juliet Hodgkins; Donetta Davidson; Rosemary Rodriguez  
Cc: Sheila Banks; Elieen Kuala; "Stephanie Wilson"; "Fabre, Stacie"; Thomas Wilkey; Gavin Gilmour; Jeannie Layson  
Subject: Re: Draft letter to board of advisors and standards board  

It appears there will be a substantive rewrite so I will save my edits for that version.

However, my original suggestion was to communicate with the boards about the current controversy, not just research in general. Otherwise it looks like we are sidestepping the problem at hand, which is why we are writing to the boards in the first place.
Today I will circulate a formal FOIA request to all of you. Please note that this request is from a journalist. The information I circulate will include a copy of the original request, which was made by the DC bureau of McClatchy Newspapers. An abbreviated version of the request follows:

"Copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Election Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for EAC."

Some of you have provided similar information in the past, but I will need another complete submission that includes any related files that may have been generated since your last submission.

Please anticipate a formal request to be distributed to everyone today, and take note that the deadline to provide this information is April 30. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
1. I confirmed for Matt Murray of Roll Call that Comm. Hunter is a Republican and that she came to EAC in March. He asked for our FY budget figures, which I sent to him. He asked if it was true that we bungled the certification of voting systems in reference to the CIBER situation. I said that it had nothing to do with certifying voting systems, and explained the entire interim process and the reason we had to implement after NIST told us they wouldn't get labs accredited until late 2006 and NASED's termination of its program. I said we announced this program and our decision to invite the three labs to apply at a public meeting in 2005, and that we've had several public meetings about the interim program, as well as sending updates to our stakeholders. He asked me how I would characterize the criticism surrounding CIBER, and I said the feedback we received was that we should have been more proactive in reminding people that CIBER had not received interim certification, that it was still pending. I emphasized that we have not certified any voting systems, so it would be incorrect to state that we had "bungled" that process. He asked if we released the Eagleton data after Hinchey urged us to, and I said yes, but told him that the chair announced that we would complete this project within 30 days at a public meeting in Feb. in which Eagleton testified and answered questions about their methodology. I also gave him the following quote: We have a responsibility to take the time to get things right. However, we understand the criticism and we are taking a hard look at our internal processes. We will identify what changes need to be made, and we will make them. We take comments from Congress very seriously, and we appreciate their input and their willingness to give us what we need to get the job done.

2. The chair was interviewed by Pam Zubeck of the Gazette (CO) about what she's seeing regarding voting by mail. The chair talked about the trends in the NW, and how it was important to make sure states have accurate and up to date lists. She noted that the introduction of statewide databases will be especially helpful to those states. The reporter asked if CO sends out ballots to inactive voters, and the chair said yes, and told her it is a federal requirement that voters must be notified before they are removed from voter rolls.

3. Freelance journalist Meg Cox, who is writing an article for Op-Ed News, had the following questions, and my responses follow: a) You said that the Wang/Serebrov report has not been released because it was predecisional. Was the Moritz/Eagleton report released because it was not predecisional? The Moritz/Eagleton report was a predecisional document. The commissioners took an action not to adopt a final report based upon the Moritz/Eagleton report, but to release all the predecisional information (the draft report).

b) I understood you to say that the December EAC report includes all of the Wang/Serebrov recommendations but not all of the Wang/Serebrov findings. Is that correct? The report does include all of their recommendations, as well as the research they reviewed, which includes books and articles and court cases. The contract with the consultants did not ask them to produce findings. It was an initial effort to identify what relevant information is available, define voter fraud and voter intimidation, and make recommendations to EAC regarding future study.

c) I understood you to say that EAC staff added results of their own research to the December EAC report. Is that correct? Yes, EAC conducted additional research to further clarify the definitions of "voter fraud" and "voter intimidation." On page 13, you will see the results of the EAC research, which resulted in defining the scope of future study and new terminology for these topics -- election crimes. EAC staff reviewed the report for accuracy, for grammar and added language that reflected the commission's decision to adopt the final version based upon the initial research provided by the consultants. New language was also added to communicate the commission's decision adopt six of the 16 recommendations put forth by the consultants.

d) If I'm correct on questions 2 and 3, would it be accurate to say that readers of the December report
cannot tell how much of that report does and does not reflect the original Wang/Serebrov findings? Again, the contract with the consultants did not ask them to produce findings, nor was that the scope of the contract. It was an initial effort that tasked them to identify what relevant information is available, define voter fraud and voter intimidation, and make recommendations to EAC regarding future study. The research (Appendix D, 197 pages; and Appendix B, 57 pages) and all of their recommendations are included in the final report.

e) I called earlier today requesting the Wang/Serebrov report, and you sent me the December EAC report. I am concerned that if I had not already been researching this closely, I would have thought that you'd sent me the Wang/Serebrov report and would have reported incorrectly that you had. Does the EAC have any comment on this manner of responding to press inquiries? (I contacted you to request the report after I read in the Statesman Journal of Salem, Oregon, an article by Marie Cocco that says: "The bipartisan commission didn't widely release the consultants' review, but makes it available on request." Did the EAC indeed give Ms. Cocco a copy of the "consultants' review"? Or has she misunderstood you in the way I'm concerned about?) I sent you a link to the "EAC report" because it is what was adopted by the commission based upon the research conducted by the consultants. The final report clearly states how it was compiled, includes bios for both of the consultants, their research and summaries of their interviews. Regarding Ms. Cocco, I explained the entire process to her. I provided the staff update on the project which was presented at a public meeting in May 2006 and the final report, which is posted on the EAC website. Regarding "this manner of responding to press inquiries," I have forwarded your comments to my supervisor so he can review my performance regarding the handling of your inquiry.

f) I understood you to say that the EAC did not release the Wang/Serebrov report in its original form because the EAC has to do due diligence and its staff is small. Do I understand you correctly? As a small agency of 23 employees, including the four commissioners, it is necessary for the agency to contract with consultants to gather the initial data for research projects. After EAC receives the initial data, the agency reviews the data for accuracy. What form of due diligence does the EAC's staff routinely conduct on research that is contracted out to experts before that research is released? You mentioned "vetting" the research. What does that vetting entail? It depends on the project, but in every case, the agency has a responsibility to make sure the information it receives from any contractor is accurate. In this case, EAC staff read every article cited by the consultants and reviewed the contents of every interview they conducted. Appendix C contains the interview summaries, and the changes EAC made are clearly footnoted. Regarding other research projects, if it is information directly related to a mandate within the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), staff will make sure that the information is consistent with the law. If the research focuses on election laws throughout the country, we make sure the laws are cited correctly and that state legislatures haven’t changed or amended these laws since the research was conducted. (As you probably know, there have been many new election laws introduced at the state level since 2004.) Throughout the process, we review for grammar as well as make sure the document flows and is arranged logically -- the basic tenets of editing.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
1. Matthew Murray of Roll Call interviewed Commissioner Hunter about the voter ID report. He asked her why the commission declined to adopt it, and she explained that we thought it was important to look at more than one year and that the commission had questions about the methodology -- two analyses produced two conclusions and the state comparisons (reading from the commission statement). She said it was the EAC's responsibility to conduct due diligence and make sure the data was accurate. He asked why it took so long to reach a decision, and that some groups were saying we purposely did not act before the Nov. elections. The commissioner explained that we were reviewing the data and during that time several independent experts also reviewed the information. He wanted to know if Eagleton discussed their methodology with us, and the commissioner said yes. He asked how much it cost, the commissioner told him $560,000, and explained that the contract also included research on provisional voting which resulted in a set of best practices. He asked how EAC will prevent this kind of thing from happening in the future, and the commissioner said we are going to take a much more thorough approach, including making sure the methodology is approved by everyone before the process begins and that we will be constantly updated as the research progresses. He asked if the research didn't produce what we thought it would, and she said the issue was that we had concerns about the methodology. She pointed out that the commission voted to make it public so people could examine it and come to their own conclusions. He asked if we had refused to release this in the past, and I explained that while we were reviewing the information it was a pre-decisional document, but that along with the commission's decision not to adopt the report, they took action to make it public. I pointed out to him that this was an unanimous decision reached by two dems and two reps, and that they also unanimously decided to make it public. I told him we had public meetings about this project, in which the consultants were asked questions about the methodology.
Yes please and thanks!

Jeannie Layson

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 04/04/2007 05:00 PM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson; Caroline Hunter; Rosemary Rodriguez; Gracia Hillman
Cc: Thomas Wilkey; Karen Lynn-Dyson; Juliet Hodgkins
Subject: Roll Call Interview Request for Tomorrow

Commissioners,

Matt Murray of Roll Call wants to interview one of you tomorrow via phone (he's available all day) about the voter ID report. Commissioner Rodriguez - as the vice chair, you would be up, but since you're out tomorrow, do you want Commissioner Hunter to do the interview? The reporter has the following questions:

1. What fiscal year money did we use to pay for the study? A: Fiscal Year 2005
2. What was the EAC's budget during that fiscal year? A: $13.8 million

We should assume that his angle is that this was a waste of money -- what does EAC have to show for two years of work and $560,000 out of a budget of $13.8 million? He also mentioned that the interest groups are not pleased that we delayed releasing this information, and they are not happy we did not adopt a report. I recommend that we stick with the talking points I circulated last week, which are attached.

The bottom line is that we did receive value from this contract, which included provisional voting research, which culminated in a set of best practices. And yes, the commission decided that the voter ID data provided more questions than answers, and that's why it voted to conduct a much more expansive look at this important topic. However, it also made all of the information available to the public.

Remember, many voter ID laws have changed since 2004, and that also has instructed us how to move forward.

EAC should stand firm on its decision, talk about our next steps to conduct a more extensive study, and stress that we released everything to the public.

Please let me know if you agree with this approach.

[attachment "VoterIDtalkingpts.doc" deleted by Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV]

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
Hinchey Statement on U.S. Election Assistance Commission's

Release of Report on Voter Identification Issues

Washington, DC - Congressman Maurice Hinchey (D-NY) today released the following report in response to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission's (EAC) release of a report on voter identification issues that was submitted to them by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics, and Ohio State University's Moritz College of Law. Hinchey directly requested the release of the report when EAC Chairwoman Donetta Davidson appeared earlier this month before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services, of which the congressman is a member. Davidson told Hinchey at the hearing that she would provide the subcommittee with the report that is being released to the public today. Hinchey also requested the release of a separate report on voter fraud and intimidation. The Help America Vote Act (HAVA) requires the EAC to conduct and make available to the public studies regarding certain voting issues.

"I am very pleased that following Chairwoman Davidson's appearances before Congress the EAC decided to do the right thing and make public the Eagleton Institute of Politics study on voter identification issues. I hope that this decision signals a new day of transparency and sets a precedent for all future and previous studies and reports submitted to the EAC.

"When Chairwoman Davidson came before our subcommittee a few weeks ago, I also requested that the EAC make public another report about voter fraud and voter intimidation submitted to them by two outside consultants. It is my hope they will release this report to the public as well. The EAC has the responsibility to keep the public informed on any findings it has with regards to voter fraud, intimidation, and any other electoral issues.

"As we work to increase voter turnout and make our democracy function more effectively, it is imperative that potential voters are assured that they will be able to cast their votes fairly and in an environment free of intimidation. To achieve that goal, the EAC must be open with the information it receives in order to help identify voting problems and make recommendations on fixing them."

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
I do not have anything. Thanks.

Rosemary E. Rodriguez
Commissioner
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-566-3104
Facsimile: 202-566-3127
www.eac.gov
rrodriguez@eac.gov

Today I will circulate a formal FOIA request to all of you. Please note that this request is from a journalist. The information I circulate will include a copy of the original request, which was made by the DC bureau of McClatchy Newspapers. An abbreviated version of the request follows:

"Copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Election Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for EAC."

Some of you have provided similar information in the past, but I will need another complete submission that includes any related files that may have been generated since your last submission.

Please anticipate a formal request to be distributed to everyone today, and take note that the deadline to provide this information is April 30. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
I did a search through your emails with their names and I didn’t find any. I don’t have any either. However, I will check and see if we have any mailed correspondence hard copies.

Elle L.K. Kuala  
Special Assistant to the Chair  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
office: (202) 566-2256  
fax: (202) 566-1392

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----  
From: Jeannie Layson  
Sent: 04/12/2007 08:38 AM EDT  
To: Donetta Davidson; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Rosemary Rodriguez; Thomas Wilkey; Juliet Hodgkins; Karen Lynn-Dyson; Margaret Sims; Sheila Banks; Elle L. Kuala; Bert Benavides; Gavin Gilmour; Bryan Whitener;  
Subject: FOIA Request

Today I will circulate a formal FOIA request to all of you. Please note that this request is from a journalist. The information I circulate will include a copy of the original request, which was made by the DC bureau of
McClatchy Newspapers. An abbreviated version of the request follows:

"Copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Election Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for EAC."

Some of you have provided similar information in the past, but I will need another complete submission that includes any related files that may have been generated since your last submission.

Please anticipate a formal request to be distributed to everyone today, and take note that the deadline to provide this information is April 30. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
I checked all of our paper records and found nothing so I submitted our FOIA response to Jeannie.

Elle L.K. Kuala
Special Assistant to the Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
office: (202) 566-2256
fax: (202) 566-1392

Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV

Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV
04/13/2007 12:36 PM
To Elle L.K. Kuala/EAC/GOV
Subject Re: FOIA Request

Thanks

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Eileen L. Kuala

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Eileen L. Kuala
Sent: 04/12/2007 02:18 PM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson
Subject: Re: FOIA Request

I did a search through your emails with their names and I didn't find any. I don't have any either. However, I will check and see if we have any mailed correspondence hard copies.

Elle L.K. Kuala
Special Assistant to the Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
office: (202) 566-2256
fax: (202) 566-1392
Elle, I don't think I have any emails from Job or Tova, but to be on the safe side would you double check

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Jeannie Layson

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 04/12/2007 08:38 AM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Rosemary Rodriguez; Thomas Wilkey; Juliet Hodgkins; Karen Lynn-Dyson; Margaret Sims; Sheila Banks; Elileen Kuala; Bert Benavides; Gavin Gilmour; Bryan Whitener;

Subject: FOIA Request

Today I will circulate a formal FOIA request to all of you. Please note that this request is from a journalist. The information I circulate will include a copy of the original request, which was made by the DC bureau of McClatchy Newspapers. An abbreviated version of the request follows:

"Copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Election Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for EAC."

Some of you have provided similar information in the past, but I will need another complete submission that includes any related files that may have been generated since your last submission.

Please anticipate a formal request to be distributed to everyone today, and take note that the deadline to provide this information is April 30. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Also I got your message and I will get to work on that tomorrow. I will email Tom and we can talk about what you want to write to Curtis.
Elle Collver
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 566-2256
www.eac.gov

I checked all of our paper records and found nothing so I submitted our FOIA response to Jeannie.

Elle L.K. Kuala
Special Assistant to the Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
office: (202) 566-2256
fax: (202) 566-1392

Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV
Thanks

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Elileen L. Kuala

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Elileen L. Kuala
Sent: 04/12/2007 02:18 PM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson
Subject: Re: FOIA Request

I did a search through your emails with their names and I didn't find any. I don't have any either. However, I will check and see if we have any mailed correspondence hard copies.

Elle L.K. Kuala
Special Assistant to the Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
office: (202) 566-2256
fax: (202) 566-1392

Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV

Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV 04/12/2007 01:33 PM

To: Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV@EAC, Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV@EAC, Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC, Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC, Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC, Sheila A. Banks/EAC/GOV@EAC, Elileen L. Kuala/EAC/GOV@EAC, Bert A. Benavides/EAC/GOV@EAC, Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC, Bryan Whitener/EAC/GOV@EAC, “stephanie wolson”

cc

Subject: Re: FOIA Request

Elle, I don't think I have any emails from Job or Tova, but to be on the safe side would you double check

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Jeannie Layson

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 04/12/2007 08:38 AM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Rosemary Rodriguez; Thomas Wilkey; Juliet Hodgkins; Karen Lynn-Dyson; Margaret Sims; Sheila Banks; Elieen Kuala; Bert Benavides; Gavin Gilmour; Bryan Whitener;

Subject: FOIA Request

Today I will circulate a formal FOIA request to all of you. Please note that this request is from a journalist. The information I circulate will include a copy of the original request, which was made by the DC bureau of McClatchy Newspapers. An abbreviated version of the request follows:

"Copies of all emails between Job Serebrov and Election Assistance Commission staff or members and all emails between Tova Wang and commission staff or members pertaining to a voter fraud study the two were contracted to perform for EAC."

Some of you have provided similar information in the past, but I will need another complete submission that includes any related files that may have been generated since your last submission.

Please anticipate a formal request to be distributed to everyone today, and take note that the deadline to provide this information is April 30. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Commissioners,

The chair has asked me to provide you with the memo she just submitted to Curtis Crider, requesting a review of our contracting procedures surrounding the voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation research projects. She has asked me to write a press release about this decision, which I will send to you shortly. She requests that we incorporate the commission's request into the letter to the advisory boards and to Congresswoman Lofgren. She also requests that we respond to Sen. Feinstein's letter, letting her know that we are working to comply with her request, but we wanted to alert her to the action we've taken.

I am going to circulate this to the staff so everyone will be aware of this action. Please let me know if you have any questions, and I will have a press release for your review shortly. Attached to the press release will be this memo, letters from Members of Congress regarding this issue, and the recent statements from Congressmen Hinchey and Serrano.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
April 16, 2007

MEMORANDUM

To: EAC Inspector General Curtis Crider
Fr: EAC Chair Donetta Davidson
Cc: Commissioners Rodriguez, Hillman and Hunter, Tom Wilkey, and Julie Hodgkins
RE: EAC requests review of contracting procedures

On Friday, April 13, each of my three colleagues — Rosemary Rodriguez, Gracia Hillman, and Caroline Hunter -- agreed with my recommendation that we issue the following formal request to the Commission’s Office of Inspector General to review the circumstances surrounding two recent EAC research projects — vote fraud and voter intimidation and voter identification.

Background
The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) is an independent, bipartisan Commission created by the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002.

EAC develops guidance to meet HAVA requirements, adopts voluntary voting system guidelines, accredits voting system test laboratories, certifies voting systems and audits the use of HAVA funds. HAVA also directs EAC to maintain the national mail voter registration form developed in accordance with the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) of 1993.

The Commission serves as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. It is under the Commission’s clearinghouse role that research projects are conducted with the goal of providing information that will lead to improvements in election administration, as well as inform the public about how, where and when we vote.

The voter identification research was conducted by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics (“Contractor”). The contract, awarded in May 2005, required the Contractor to perform a review and legal analysis of state legislation, administrative procedures and court cases, and to perform a literature review on other research and data available on the topic of voter identification requirements. Further, the Contractor was asked to analyze the problems and challenges of voter identification, to hypothesize alternative approaches and to recommend various policies that could be applied to these approaches. Last month, the commission voted
unanimously not to adopt the report, citing concerns with its methodology, but voted to release all of the data provided by the Contractor.

The vote fraud and voter intimidation research was conducted by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov (“Consultants”). The contracts, awarded in September 2005, issued to these Consultants tasked them with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the Consultants were responsible for “creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and Working Group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort.”

Review Request
The actions taken by the Commission regarding both the voter identification and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research projects have been challenged. Specifically, Members of Congress, the media, and the public have suggested that political motivations may have been part of the Commission’s decision making process regarding these two projects. Also, the Commission has been criticized for the amount of taxpayer dollars that were spent on these two projects, as well as how efficiently these projects were managed.

The Commission takes these allegations very seriously, and we request that you fully review the following issues and provide the Commission and the Congress with a report of your findings as soon as possible. The Commission stands ready to assist you in these efforts and will provide whatever information, including memos, emails and other documents you will need. Cooperating with your review will be the staff’s top priority.

1. Current Commission policy regarding awarding and managing research contracts.
2. Issuance and management of the vote fraud and voter intimidation contract.
3. Circumstances surrounding the receipt of information from Consultants regarding the vote fraud and voter intimidation project.
4. Circumstances surrounding staff efforts to write a final report for Commission consideration.
5. Identification of staff members who assisted in the editing and collaboration of the final vote fraud and voter intimidation report for Commission consideration.
6. Staff and/or Commissioner collaboration with political entities or other federal agencies regarding the vote fraud and voter intimidation project.
8. Issuance and management of the voter identification contract.
9. Circumstances surrounding the receipt of information from Contractor regarding the voter identification report.
10. Identification of staff members who assisted in the editing, collaboration, and recommendation to the Commission regarding final adoption of the voter identification report.
11. Staff and/or Commissioner collaboration with political entities or other federal agencies regarding the voter identification project.
12. Circumstances surrounding Commission deliberation whether to adopt a final voter identification report.

For your information, I have attached statements and related correspondence from Members of Congress, and a statement issued by the Commission regarding the criticism.

It is our hope that your findings will instruct us how to move forward in a more efficient, effective and transparent manner. The Commission takes its mandates under HAVA very seriously, and this small Commission has an enormous amount of work to conduct, including testing and certifying voting equipment, providing guidance and assistance to election officials, and auditing the proper use of the $3.1 billion that was distributed under HAVA.

We look forward to your findings so that we may take the actions necessary to improve the way we conceive research projects, manage research contracts, and make decisions regarding the final release of data provided to the Commission from a third party.
It's in there... first sentence in the fourth paragraph: "Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions."

Please let me know if that is sufficient.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV

Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV
04/16/2007 11:28 AM
To Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV@EAC, ghillman@eac.gov,
Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E.
Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R.
Subject Re: IG Press Release

Could we pls add a sentence about why we did not adopt the fraud report - ie- had conclusions that were not supported by the underlying research.

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
chunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

04/16/2007 11:13 AM
To Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV, ghillman@eac.gov, Caroline
C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E.
Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC, Juliet E.
Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject  IG Press Release

Commissioners,
Per the chair's request, I have drafted the following press release to communicate the commission's decision to ask the IG to review our contract procedures. Please let me know if this is okay with all of you. I would like this to go out ASAP, so if you could get back to me with any comments before noon, I would appreciate it. Sorry for the short turnaround, but I think circumstances demand that this get out immediately. Thank you.

After you give me the okay on the press release, I will send everything to staff before releasing it.

EAC IGRequest 04-16-07.doc

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
EAC Requests Review of Voter ID, Vote Fraud and Voter Intimidation Research Projects

For Immediate Release
April 16, 2007

WASHINGTON — U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Chair Donetta Davidson today issued a formal request to the commission's inspector general to conduct a review of the commission's contracting procedures, including a review of two recent projects focusing on voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation. The chair's memo to the inspector general is attached.

"The actions taken by the commission regarding these research projects have been challenged, and the commissioners and I agree that it is appropriate and necessary to ask the inspector general to review this matter," said EAC Chair Davidson.

Chair Davidson has requested that the inspector general specifically review the circumstances surrounding the issuance and management of the voter identification research project and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research project.

Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions. The commission declined to adopt the report, but released all of the data to the public. The report and the research, conducted by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics, are available at www.eac.gov.

At a public meeting in December 2006, the commission adopted Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Further Study, available at www.eac.gov. This report was the culmination of research conducted by lava Wang and Jon Serebrov, who were tasked with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the consultants were responsible for “creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and working group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort.”

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

###

015289
I was referring to the fraud study and why we did not release the contractor’s report

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
chunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
04/16/2007 11:33 AM
To Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV@EAC, ghiliman@eac.gov, Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject Re: IG Press Release

It's in there... first sentence in the fourth paragraph: "Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions."

Please let me know if that is sufficient.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV

Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV
04/16/2007 11:28 AM
To Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV@EAC, ghiliman@eac.gov, Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject Re: IG Press Release

0152390
Could we pls add a sentence about why we did not adopt the fraud report - ie- had conclusions that were not supported by the underlying research.

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
chunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

To Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV, ghillman@eac.gov, Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC, Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject IG Press Release

Commissioners,
Per the chair's request, I have drafted the following press release to communicate the commission's decision to ask the IG to review our contract procedures. Please let me know if this is okay with all of you. I would like this to go out ASAP, so if you could get back to me with any comments before noon, I would appreciate it. Sorry for the short turnaround, but I think circumstances demand that this get out immediately. Thank you.

After you give me the okay on the press release, I will send everything to staff before releasing it.

EAC IGRequest 04-16-07.doc

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
EAC Requests Review of Voter ID, Vote Fraud and Voter Intimidation Research Projects

For Immediate Release
April 16, 2007

WASHINGTON – U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Chair Donetta Davidson today issued a formal request to the commission’s inspector general to conduct a review of the commission’s contracting procedures, including a review of two recent projects focusing on voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation. The chair’s memo to the inspector general is attached.

“The actions taken by the commission regarding these research projects have been challenged, and the commissioners and I agree that it is appropriate and necessary to ask the inspector general to review this matter,” said EAC Chair Davidson.

Chair Davidson has requested that the inspector general specifically review the circumstances surrounding the issuance and management of the voter identification research project and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research project.

Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions. The commission declined to adopt the report, but released all of the data to the public. The report and the research, conducted by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics, are available at www.eac.gov.

At a public meeting in December 2006, the commission adopted Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Further Study, available at www.eac.gov. This report was the culmination of research conducted by Taya Wang and Jon Serebrov, who were tasked with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the consultants were responsible for “creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and working group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort.”

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

###
Sorry bout that... is this sentence acceptable to everyone? It's the last sentence in the fifth paragraph. Revised press release is attached.

"EAC staff reviewed the consultants' material, and found inconsistencies in their conclusions and the data they submitted. The material in the final report was motivated by a responsibility, especially as a federal agency, to issue findings only when they are supported by data that can enable EAC to firmly defend its conclusions."

I was referring to the fraud study and why we did not release the contractor's report.
It's in there... first sentence in the fourth paragraph: "Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions."

Please let me know if that is sufficient.

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
chunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Could we pls add a sentence about why we did not adopt the fraud report - ie- had conclusions that were not supported by the underlying research.

To Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV@EAC, ghillman@eac.gov, Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject Re: IG Press Release
Commissioners,
Per the chair's request, I have drafted the following press release to communicate the commission's decision to ask the IG to review our contract procedures. Please let me know if this is okay with all of you. I would like this to go out ASAP, so if you could get back to me with any comments before noon, I would appreciate it. Sorry for the short turnaround, but I think circumstances demand that this get out immediately. Thank you.

After you give me the okay on the press release, I will send everything to staff before releasing it.

EAC IGRequest 04-16-07.doc

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
EAC Requests Review of Voter ID, Vote Fraud and Voter Intimidation Research Projects

For Immediate Release
April 16, 2007

WASHINGTON – U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Chair Donetta Davidson today issued a formal request to the commission’s inspector general to conduct a review of the commission’s contracting procedures, including a review of two recent projects focusing on voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation. The chair’s memo to the inspector general is attached.

“The actions taken by the commission regarding these research projects have been challenged, and the commissioners and I agree that it is appropriate and necessary to ask the inspector general to review this matter,” said EAC Chair Davidson.

Chair Davidson has requested that the inspector general specifically review the circumstances surrounding the issuance and management of the voter identification research project and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research project.

Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions. The commission declined to adopt the report, but released all of the data to the public. The report and the research, conducted by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics, are available at www.eac.gov.

At a public meeting in December 2006, the commission adopted Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Further Study, available at www.eac.gov. This report was the culmination of research conducted by Tova Wang and Job Sterb, who were tasked with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the consultants were responsible for “creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and working group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort.” EAC staff reviewed the consultants’ material, and found inconsistencies in their conclusions and the data they submitted. The material in the final report was motivated by a responsibility, especially as a federal agency, to issue findings only when they are supported by data that can enable EAC to firmly defend its conclusions.

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

# # #
Since it's Donetta's statement, I think she should her consent is important. I don't see a need to defend our actions in this release but simply to announce that we have asked the IG to take a look.

Rosemary E. Rodriguez
Commissioner
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-566-3104
Facsimile: 202-566-3127
www.eac.gov
rrodriguez@eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
04/16/2007 12:01 PM
To Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV@EAC, ghillman@eac.gov, Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject Re: IG Press Release

Sorry bout that... is this sentence acceptable to everyone? It's the last sentence in the fifth paragraph. Revised press release is attached.

"EAC staff reviewed the consultants' material, and found inconsistencies in their conclusions and the data they submitted. The material in the final report was motivated by a responsibility, especially as a federal agency, to issue findings only when they are supported by data that can enable EAC to firmly defend its conclusions."

EAC IGRequest 04-16-07FINAL.doc Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV
I was referring to the fraud study and why we did not release the contractor's report

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
chunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

To Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV@EAC, ghillman@eac.gov,
    Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E.
    Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R.
    Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject Re: IG Press Release

It's in there... first sentence in the fourth paragraph: "Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions."

Please let me know if that is sufficient.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV
Could we pls add a sentence about why we did not adopt the fraud report - ie- had conclusions that were not supported by the underlying research.

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
chunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

04/16/2007 11:13 AM

Commissioners,
Per the chair’s request, I have drafted the following press release to communicate the commission’s decision to ask the IG to review our contract procedures. Please let me know if this is okay with all of you. I would like this to go out ASAP, so if you could get back to me with any comments before noon, I would appreciate it. Sorry for the short turnaround, but I think circumstances demand that this get out immediately. Thank you.

After you give me the okay on the press release, I will send everything to staff before releasing it.

EAC IG Request 04-16-07.doc

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
WASHINGTON – U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Chair Donetta Davidson today issued a formal request to the commission’s inspector general to conduct a review of the commission’s contracting procedures, including a review of two recent projects focusing on voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation. The chair’s memo to the inspector general is attached.

“The actions taken by the commission regarding these research projects have been challenged, and the commissioners and I agree that it is appropriate and necessary to ask the inspector general to review this matter,” said EAC Chair Davidson.

Chair Davidson has requested that the inspector general specifically review the circumstances surrounding the issuance and management of the voter identification research project and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research project.

Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions. The commission declined to adopt the report, but released all the data to the public. The report and the research, conducted by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics, are available at www.eac.gov.

At a public meeting in December 2006, the commission adopted Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Further Study, available at www.eac.gov. This report was the culmination of research conducted by Yvonne Wang and Job Sterbrov, who were tasked with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the consultants were responsible for “creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and working group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort.” EAC staff reviewed the consultants’ material, and found inconsistencies in their conclusions and the data they submitted. The material in the final report was motivated by a responsibility, especially as a federal agency, to issue findings only when they are supported by data that can enable EAC to firmly defend its conclusions.

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

###
Hello everyone,
I wanted to notify you that Chair Davidson, in agreement with the other three commissioners, has requested that our IG -- Curtis Crider -- conduct a review of our contracting procedures surrounding the voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation research projects. Very shortly, I will distribute her request along with a press release to the media and to all our stakeholders. However, she wanted to make sure the staff was fully informed about this action before we make this news public.

The chair's request, the press release and all of the materials referenced in her request will be available on the home page under Announcements very shortly. Please direct anyone with questions about this action to the website. And let me know if you have questions about any of this information or if I can be of assistance answering questions from the public about this issue.

The chair wants to convey to everyone how much she appreciates your hard work, and that she is confident in our ability to work with Curtis to resolve this issue. Tom would like staff to join him at 3:30 today in the large conf. room upstairs to answer any questions you have.
EAC Requests Review of Voter ID, Vote Fraud and Voter Intimidation Research Projects

For Immediate Release

April 16, 2007

WASHINGTON – U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Chair Donetta Davidson today issued a formal request to the commission’s inspector general to conduct a review of the commission’s contracting procedures, including a review of two recent projects focusing on voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation. The chair’s memo to the inspector general is attached.

“The actions taken by the commission regarding these research projects have been challenged, and the commissioners and I agree that it is appropriate and necessary to ask the inspector general to review this matter,” said EAC Chair Davidson.

Chair Davidson has requested that the inspector general specifically review the circumstances surrounding the issuance and management of the voter identification research project and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research project.

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary E. Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

###
April 16, 2007

MEMORANDUM

To: EAC Inspector General Curtis Crider
Fr: EAC Chair Donetta Davidson
Cc: Commissioners Rodriguez, Hillman and Hunter, Tom Wilkey, and Julie Hodgkins
RE: EAC requests review of contracting procedures

On Friday, April 13, each of my three colleagues – Rosemary Rodriguez, Gracia Hillman, and Caroline Hunter -- agreed with my recommendation that we issue the following formal request to the Commission’s Office of Inspector General to review the circumstances surrounding two recent EAC research projects – vote fraud and voter intimidation and voter identification.

Background
The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) is an independent, bipartisan Commission created by the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002.

EAC develops guidance to meet HAVA requirements, adopts voluntary voting system guidelines, accredits voting system test laboratories, certifies voting systems and audits the use of HAVA funds. HAVA also directs EAC to maintain the national mail voter registration form developed in accordance with the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) of 1993.

The Commission serves as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. It is under the Commission’s clearinghouse role that research projects are conducted with the goal of providing information that will lead to improvements in election administration, as well as inform the public about how, where and when we vote.

The voter identification research was conducted by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics (“Contractor”). The contract, awarded in May 2005, required the Contractor to perform a review and legal analysis of state legislation, administrative procedures and court cases, and to perform a literature review on other research and data available on the topic of voter identification requirements. Further, the Contractor was asked to analyze the problems and challenges of voter identification, to hypothesize alternative approaches and to recommend various policies that could be applied to these approaches. Last month, the commission voted
unanimously not to adopt the report, citing concerns with its methodology, but voted to release all of the data provided by the Contractor.

The vote fraud and voter intimidation research was conducted by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov ("Consultants"). The contracts, awarded in September 2005, issued to these Consultants tasked them with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the Consultants were responsible for "creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and Working Group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort."

**Review Request**

The actions taken by the Commission regarding both the voter identification and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research projects have been challenged. Specifically, Members of Congress, the media, and the public have suggested that political motivations may have been part of the Commission's decision making process regarding these two projects. Also, the Commission has been criticized for the amount of taxpayer dollars that were spent on these two projects, as well as how efficiently these projects were managed.

The Commission takes these allegations very seriously, and we request that you fully review the following issues and provide the Commission and the Congress with a report of your findings as soon as possible. The Commission stands ready to assist you in these efforts and will provide whatever information, including memos, emails and other documents you will need. Cooperating with your review will be the staff's top priority.

1. Current Commission policy regarding awarding and managing research contracts.
2. Issuance and management of the vote fraud and voter intimidation contract.
3. Circumstances surrounding the receipt of information from Consultants regarding the vote fraud and voter intimidation project.
4. Circumstances surrounding staff efforts to write a final report for Commission consideration.
5. Identification of staff members who assisted in the editing and collaboration of the final vote fraud and voter intimidation report for Commission consideration.
6. Staff and/or Commissioner collaboration with political entities or other federal agencies regarding the vote fraud and voter intimidation project.
7. Circumstances surrounding Commission discussion and deliberation of final adoption of *Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendation for Further Study*.
8. Issuance and management of the voter identification contract.
9. Circumstances surrounding the receipt of information from Contractor regarding the voter identification report.
10. Identification of staff members who assisted in the editing, collaboration, and recommendation to the Commission regarding final adoption of the voter identification report.
11. Staff and/or Commissioner collaboration with political entities or other federal agencies regarding the voter identification project.
12. Circumstances surrounding Commission deliberation whether to adopt a final voter identification report.

For your information, I have attached statements and related correspondence from Members of Congress, and a statement issued by the Commission regarding the criticism.

It is our hope that your findings will instruct us how to move forward in a more efficient, effective and transparent manner. The Commission takes its mandates under HAVA very seriously, and this small Commission has an enormous amount of work to conduct, including testing and certifying voting equipment, providing guidance and assistance to election officials, and auditing the proper use of the $3.1 billion that was distributed under HAVA.

We look forward to your findings so that we may take the actions necessary to improve the way we conceive research projects, manage research contracts, and make decisions regarding the final release of data provided to the Commission from a third party.
The Honorable Donetta Davidson  
Chairman  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  

Dear Commissioner Davidson:

We are writing to seek a response to very troubling news reports that included allegations that the Commission may have altered or delayed release of two taxpayer-funded studies of election issues for political purposes.

While the Commission is within its rights to decide what guidance it issues to election officials, it is critical that its actions are not perceived as politically motivated and it is imperative that you provide full documentation about the Commission’s proceedings on these matters.

On Wednesday, the New York Times reported that a bipartisan team of election law experts hired by the Commission to research voter fraud in federal elections found that there was little such fraud around the nation, but the Commission revised the report to say that the pervasiveness of voter fraud was still open to debate.

On Monday, Roll Call reported that the Commission two weeks ago rejected the findings of a report, prepared as part of a $560,000 contract with Rutgers University’s Eagleton Institute and Ohio State University’s Moritz College of Law. That report found that voter identification laws may reduce election turnout, especially by minorities.
It is imperative that the Commission’s actions and deliberations are unbiased, free from political influence and transparent. While the Commission does not have to agree with the experts who perform its research, it should make the research available unfettered and unfiltered.

Attached are a series of questions, we would like the Commission to address. We look forward to your timely response.

Sincerely,

Dianne Feinstein
Chairman
Committee on Rules and Administration

Richard J. Durbin
Chairman
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government
Committee on Appropriations
We request information and documentation from the Commission that answer the following questions:

**COMMISSION'S OVERSIGHT ON EAGLETON CONTRACT TO PERFORM A STUDY ON VOTER IDENTIFICATION**

1. Did the Commissioners or Commission senior staff receive any outside communication or pressure to change or not release the entire draft report or portions of the draft language on the voter fraud report? If so, who made those requests?

2. Would you please provide a copy of the approved Request For Proposals, as well as any contract modifications that were agreed to between the Commission and Eagleton Institute and subcontractors?

3. Can you provide the names and qualifications of Election Assistance Commission staff that worked on the Eagleton Institute project?

4. Please indicate how many project meetings occurred during the term of the Eagleton contract, including in-person meetings, conference calls regarding the status of the report, and any meeting where Commissioners were present for at least part of the meeting. Please provide copies of any minutes from those meetings.

5. Please identify the names and affiliations of members of the Peer Review group or groups that examined the Eagleton Institute drafts. Please also indicate the dates upon which any such review of the Eagleton research was conducted, and the specific concerns or complaints that were raised by members of the Peer Review group as to either the analysis or statistical methodology, if any. Please provide copies of any minutes from those meetings.

6. If certain members of the Peer Review groups had concerns with the data or methodology of the Eagleton study, was that information communicated to Eagleton, and were any changes made to the study based on Peer Review group concerns with methodology or data?

7. Who were the individuals (and what were their academic qualifications) that advised the Commission that the data, methodology, or the results of the Eagleton Contract were so flawed that the Commission should reject the report? At what point did the Commission receive input from those individuals?
8. The Commission previewed its research on the Eagleton Institute's study on Provisional Voting at its May 2006 Advisory Board meetings—why was the Voter Identification Draft Study not discussed at that time? What is the status of the Provisional Voting report?

9. In rejecting the Eagleton report, the Commission indicated concerns that there was only one year’s worth of data. Given that this was the first year that Commission had studied the results, isn’t “one year” what was originally contemplated in the Eagleton contract? Isn’t the reason for having a major research institute conduct this study is so they can draw initial assessments from that data—even though that data can be augmented in future years? Because of the rejected report, will the Commission start anew for research in the 2008 elections?

10. What was the final, total cost of the Eagleton contract, and what was produced or released by that Commission as a result of that contract?

COMMISSION’S OVERSIGHT OVER VOTER FRAUD/INTIMIDATION STUDY

1. Did the Commissioners or Commission senior staff receive any outside communication or pressure to change or not release the entire draft report or portions of the draft language on the voter fraud report? If so, who made those requests?

2. Given the bipartisan nature of the Working Group that guided the Voter Fraud/Intimidation report, and the bipartisan nature of the contracted experts who uniformly support the results of this report, what concerns lead the Commission to determine the report should not be released?

3. If there were points in the report that the Commission objected to, were there attempts to work with the contractors to deal with specific concerns? If there were such attempts, please describe them.
4. Who drafted the Commission summary (released in December, 2006) of the Voter Fraud/Intimidation report, and what were their credentials and involvement in the original research process? Were there instructions or guidance given from Commissioners or senior staff as to what portions of the research should be emphasized? Who at the Commission reviewed the summarized report? Since the contracted experts are referred to in the Commission’s released report, were the contractors allowed a chance to review or edit that Commission’s final report that was released in December, 2006?

5. Please provide copies of any electronic or written communications between Commission employees that relate to the editing of the Voter Fraud/Intimidation report.

6. Please explain what Mr. Job Serebrov was referring to in his email referenced in the New York Times article of April 11, 2007. Please provide any documents in the Commission’s possession where employees or contracted experts discussed pressure, political sensitivities, or the failure of the Commission to adopt the Voter Fraud/Intimidation report from March 1, 2006 to present.

7. While we realize that the Commission voted to release its summary report in December 2006, was there a public vote taken to reject the Draft Voter Fraud/Intimidation report? Such a monumental decision to reject the contract experts’ work is a policy decision, and one that should be done in public. When was the decision made to reject the original report, and what notice was provided to the public that the Commission would reject that report?

8. Prior to the Draft Voter Fraud/Intimidation report’s release, had other organizations requested a copy of that original report? Please include copies of your responses to those organizations, if any.

9. Had any States requested that the Commission or staff provide guidance related to voter identification requirements in the Help America Vote Act, or identification requirements generally? Please provide those requests, and any responses from the Commission.

10. Please indicate what steps the Commission is taking to ensure that political considerations do not impact the agency’s research and that decisions are handled in a public and transparent manner.
April 12, 2007

Chairwoman Donetta Davidson
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Chairwoman Davidson:

As Chairwoman of the Committee on House Administration Subcommittee on Elections, which has oversight over the Election Assistance Commission, I was alarmed at what appears to be an emerging pattern by the EAC to hold off on publicly releasing reports as well as modifying reports that are released. Two recent instances have brought to light the increased politicalization of the EAC and this lack of transparency.

First, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government released a draft version of an EAC report on voter fraud and intimidation that shows significant changes were made to the findings of outside experts before the final report was released. The EAC released report “Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study” does not accurately reflect the research in the original report “Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation.”

Second, in addition to this report on voter fraud and intimidation, the EAC recently released a report by The Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University on voter identification. Again, the EAC did not endorse the report, citing methodological concerns, and only released it after pressure from Congress.

The EAC is charged with conducting nonpartisan research and to advise policy makers. How are we to rely on advice if instead of full and accurate reporting, we are provided an inaccurate modified version which negates clear evidence to the contrary in the original research? I am outraged that the election process is being threatened by a lack of transparency and limited discussion.

In order to preempt any further problems with the release of reports from the EAC, I request all versions of the Absentee Ballot report and the Military and Overseas report, as well as any other overdue reports, including supporting documents and research, be provided to my office by close of business Monday, April 16, 2007. These reports are overdue and I want to ensure that the delay is no way related to what appears to be an ongoing problem of politicization of the EAC.

Sincerely,

Zoe Lofgren
Member of Congress
For Immediate Release

April 11, 2007

**Hinchey, Serrano Urge Non-Partisanship, Greater Transparency at Election Assistance Commission**

**Washington, DC** - Today, Congressmen Maurice Hinchey (NY-22) and José E. Serrano (NY-16) urged the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to act with greater transparency and without partisanship. The comments from the congressmen came as the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government released a draft version of an EAC report on voter fraud and intimidation that shows significant changes were made to the findings of outside experts before the final report was released.

"The EAC has an obligation to be forthright with the American people and operate transparently and in a non-partisan manner," said Congressman Hinchey, who requested the draft report from EAC Commissioner Donetta L. Davidson during a subcommittee hearing last month. "The draft report was commissioned with taxpayer dollars upon a mandate from Congress so that we could learn more about voter fraud and intimidation. The need for this report is even more clear when we see the way in which the Bush administration is carrying out the electoral process and how this system is sliding towards corruption. In hiding a draft report from the public that is significantly different from the final version, the EAC has created a lot more questions than it has answered while stunting debate on the issue. In order for our democracy to function properly it is essential that our elections are free of any corruption and that includes ensuring that the EAC does not work to benefit one political party over the other. To achieve that goal we must have all the facts and opinions on the table, not just some of them. The EAC must never limit discussion and debate."

"The EAC is charged with helping to ensure our elections are trustworthy and administered fairly," said Congressman Serrano, who is Chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee that oversees the EAC budget. "I'm concerned if changes were made to the report on voter fraud because of partisan bias rather than impartial analysis. When you read the draft report side-by-side with the final version, it is clear that important conclusions of the experts who wrote the draft report were excluded from the final product. Among the excluded information is an analysis that undermines the notion that voter fraud is rampant."

"I am concerned that the EAC did not publicly release the taxpayer-funded draft report, and I worry that political considerations may have played a role. We cannot have a politicized EAC, or one that yields to outside pressure. Our democracy, and the American people's faith in it, is far more important than any short-term political advantage."

The draft report was written by outside experts under contract with the EAC. The final report was entitled "Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study" and was issued on December 7, 2006.

The EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by the 2002 Help America Vote Act in order to disburse funds to the states for the purchase of new voting systems, certify voting technologies, develop guidelines and serve as an information resource for election administration.
SERRANO, HINCHEY URGE NON-PARTISANSHIP, GREATER TRANSPARENCY AT ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Washington, DC – April 11, 2007 – Today, Congressmen Maurice Hinchey (NY-22) and José E. Serrano (NY-16) urged the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to act with greater transparency and without partisanship. The comments from the congressmen came as the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government released a draft version of an EAC report on voter fraud and intimidation that shows significant changes were made to the findings of outside experts before the final report was released.

"The EAC has an obligation to be forthright with the American people and operate transparently and in a non-partisan manner," said Congressman Hinchey, who requested the draft report from EAC Commissioner Donetta L. Davidson during a subcommittee hearing last month. "The draft report was commissioned with taxpayer dollars upon a mandate from Congress so that we could learn more about voter fraud and intimidation. The need for this report is even more clear when we see the way in which the Bush administration is carrying out the electoral process and how this system is sliding towards corruption. In hiding a draft report from the public that is significantly different from the final version, the EAC has created a lot more questions than it has answered while stunting debate on the issue. In order for our democracy to function properly it is essential that our elections are free of any corruption and that includes ensuring that the EAC does not work to benefit one political party over the other. To achieve that goal we must have all the facts and opinions on the table, not just some of them. The EAC must never limit discussion and debate."

"The EAC is charged with helping to ensure our elections are trustworthy and administered fairly," said Congressman Serrano, who is Chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee that oversees the EAC budget. "I'm concerned if changes were made to the report on voter fraud because of partisan bias rather than impartial analysis. When you read the draft report side-by-side with the final version, it is clear that important conclusions of the experts who wrote the draft report were excluded from the final product. Among the excluded information is an analysis that undermines the notion that voter fraud is rampant."

"I am concerned that the EAC did not publicly release the taxpayer-funded draft report, and I worry that political considerations may have played a role. We cannot have a politicized EAC, or one that yields to outside pressure. Our democracy, and the American people's faith in it, is far more important than any short-term political advantage."
The draft report was written by outside experts under contract with the EAC. The final report was entitled "Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study" and was issued on December 7, 2006.

The EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by the 2002 Help America Vote Act in order to disburse funds to the states for the purchase of new voting systems, certify voting technologies, develop guidelines and serve as an information resource for election administration.

###

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASHINGTON OFFICE</th>
<th>BRONX OFFICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2227 Rayburn House Office Building 20515-3216</td>
<td>788 Southern Blvd. Bronx, New York 10455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Bronx, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(202) 225-4361</td>
<td>(718) 620-0084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: (202) 225-6001</td>
<td>Fax: (718) 620-0658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Email: jserrano@mail.house.gov
WASHINGTON – The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) directs the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to serve as a national clearinghouse and resource by, among other things, conducting studies with the goal of improving the administration of federal elections. To fulfill this mandate, the EAC has entered into contracts with a variety of persons and entities. Reports adopted by the EAC, a bipartisan federal entity, are likely to be cited as authoritative in public discourse. Prior to the EAC's adopting a report submitted by a contractor, the EAC has the responsibility to ensure its accuracy and to verify that conclusions are supported by the underlying research.

The Commission takes input and constructive criticism from Congress and the public very seriously. We will take a hard look at the way we do business. Specifically, we will examine both the manner in which we have awarded contracts and our decision-making process regarding the release of research and reports. The EAC takes its mandates very seriously, and we will continue to move forward in a bipartisan way to improve the way America votes.

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

###
1. I spoke with St. Louis editorial board members Christine Bertelson and Kevin Korrigan regarding an editorial that ran today, asserting that we'd worked on the vote fraud/voter intimidation study for five years, and that the administration/White House edited the report. I told them both of these assertions were false, and I requested a correction. I gave them the details about how this project was conceived and managed. I explained that the vote fraud and voter intimidation project began in Sept. 2004. As I said, the statement that this project had been five years in the making is incorrect -- that predates the creation of the EAC. Commissioners were appointed in Dec. 2003, and the agency's first year of operations was 2004 with a $1.2 million operating budget. I said the assertion that the administration edited the document was false, and said that at no point in the process did the administration play any role. I also pointed out that the chair requested the IG to fully review the matter. They are going to run a correction. The editorial follows.

**Snipe hunting in Jeff City**

*Tuesday, Apr. 17 2007*

The Missouri Legislature's dogged efforts to crack down on voter fraud call to mind the hallowed tradition of the snipe hunt.

In a snipe hunt, gullible kids are taken out to the woods, handed sticks and gunny sacks and told to track down the elusive snipe. Meanwhile, their pals, who know a snipe is a bird of marsh and shore generally found nowhere near the woods, yuck it up.

Voter fraud is about as rare as snipe in most parts of the country, including Missouri. As evidence of that we have the testimony of (a) a five-year study by the federal Election Assistance Commission; (b) a report from the Missouri Secretary of State showing nobody in the state tried to vote with a fake I.D. in 2006; (c) Department of Justice statistics showing only 86 people were convicted of voter fraud-related crimes in the last five years, many of them on trivial errors; and (d) a federal judge's ruling last week that the justice department had failed to demonstrate that voter fraud had occurred in Missouri last year.

Undaunted by these facts, Republicans in the Legislature lurk about like Elmer Fudd with their gunny sacks and sticks, promoting bills to require voters to present photo identification before they're allowed to cast a ballot. They passed such a bill last year, but the courts threw it out as unfair to those who couldn't afford the cost and hassle involved in getting a photo I.D. card.
This year's versions of the photo I.D. bills would allow voters without photo I.D. to cast "provisional ballots," which may or may not get counted. So, despite the fact that a photo I.D. requirement would disenfranchise many voters in the cause of solving a problem that doesn't exist, the Missouri House could pass such a bill this week.

Evidence continues to mount that the hunt master for the national voter I.D. snipe hunt is none other than Karl Rove, President George W. Bush's deputy chief of staff and political guru. As The New York Times suggested Sunday, "The more we learn about the White House purge of United States attorneys, the more a single thread runs through it: the Bush administration's campaign to transform the minor problem of voter fraud into a supposed national scourge."

Not only did the administration suggest that some of the eight fired prosecutors had been insufficiently aggressive in pursuing voter fraud cases, it changed the wording of the Election Assistance Commission's findings on the voter fraud issue. What originally read, "there is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud" became "there is a great deal of debate on the pervasiveness of fraud."

Moreover, the release of the commission's report was delayed for nine months, during which period eight states, including Missouri, dealt with voter I.D. laws. Since the 3 percent to 4 percent of the electorate who don't have photo I.D.s tend to be poor, disabled or elderly voters, suppressing their vote would tend to help Republican candidates.

Investigators looking for evidence of fraud need look no further than the e-mail messages emanating from Mr. Rove's offices. Alas, thousands, perhaps millions, of those messages are now "missing." Perhaps Attorney General Alberto Gonzales will shed some light on the problem when his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee is rescheduled. In the meantime, Missouri lawmakers should put down the sticks and gunny sacks and back slowly out of the woods before their constituents realize they've been snookered, too.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
To complete our evaluation of the contracting process and related issues for the voter fraud research and voter intimidation and voter identification research projects, we will need copies of all e-mails and a number of documents related to the projects including copies of all of the various drafts (versions) of the reports. I am requesting that all EAC personnel be notified that they are to preserve all of the documents including e-mails related to the projects. We are in the process of setting up an e-mail account to receive the documents. It is imperative that all documents related to the projects be preserved. As soon as the account is set up we will notify you of the address.

In addition, we are requesting access to the backup e-mail files maintained by GSA and EAC. As a result, we are requesting that no backup tapes or files be destroyed.

Curtis Crider
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission
Phone - (202) 566-3125
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.
All:

The Office of Inspector General has initiated an evaluation of the contracting process used by the EAC for the voter fraud and voter intimidation projects. In order for us to complete our evaluation, we need copies of all e-mails or other documents that you have regarding either project. Electronic documents can be sent to an e-mail account that we have set up—eaccon@eac.gov.

If you have any hard copy documents, please let me know.

If you do not have any documents or e-mails, please send me an e-mail to that effect.

Thank you,

Curtis Crider
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission
Phone - (202) 566-3125
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.
A question has been raised on the e-mails.

Q. Are these emails among staff, to recipients outside the office, or both?

A. We would like ALL e-mails including those among staff and recipients outside of the office.

Curtis Crider
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission
Phone - (202) 566-3125
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.

All:

The Office of Inspector General has initiated an evaluation of the contracting process used by the EAC for the voter fraud and voter intimidation projects. In order for us to complete our evaluation, we need copies of all e-mails or other documents that you have regarding either project. Electronic documents can be sent to an e-mail account that we have set up - eaccon@eac.gov. If you have any hard copy documents, please let me know.

If you do not have any documents or e-mails, please send me an e-mail to that effect.

Thank you,

Curtis Crider
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission
Phone - (202) 566-3125
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.
All:

The Office of Inspector General has initiated an evaluation of the contracting process used by the EAC for the voter identification project. In order for us to complete our evaluation, we need copies of all e-mails or other documents that you have regarding the project. Electronic documents can be sent to an e-mail account that we have set up - eaccon@eac.gov.

If you have any hard copy documents, please let me know.

If you do not have any documents or e-mails, please send me an e-mail to that effect.

Thank you,

Curtis Crider
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission
Phone - (202) 566-3125
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.
yep, I have already sent most of my emails to Curtis and he said they have been helpful.

Shall I look through yours as well?

Elle L.K. Collver
Special Assistant to the Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
office: (202) 566-2256
fax: (202) 566-1302

Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV

Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV
04/23/2007 03:59 PM
To “Elle Collver” <ecollver@eac.gov>
cc
Subject Fw: documentation for evaluation

We need to start looking. I am sure you already have. Thanks

------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Curtis Crider
----- Original Message ----- 
From: Curtis Crider
Sent: 04/23/2007 03:24 PM EDT
To: EAC Personnel
Subject: documentation for evaluation

All:

The Office of Inspector General has initiated an evaluation of the contracting process used by the EAC for the voter identification project. In order for us to complete our evaluation, we need copies of all e-mails or other documents that you have regarding the project. Electronic documents can be sent to an e-mail account that we have set up – eaccon@eac.gov.
If you have any hard copy documents, please let me know.

If you do not have any documents or e-mails, please send me an e-mail to that effect.

Thank you,

Curtis Crider
Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.
Mr. Eric Miller from the U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General will be conducting the investigation of the EAC's handling of the voter fraud report and voter identification report. He will begin conducting interviews within the next couple of days. He will be assisted by Mr. Joe Ansnick.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Curtis Crider  
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission  
Phone - (202) 566-3125  
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.
The investigator's name is Eric Myers - sorry for the confusion.

Curtis Crider
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission
Phone - (202) 566-3125
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.

Mr. Eric Miller from the U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General will be conducting the investigation of the EAC’s handling of the voter fraud report and voter identification report. He will begin conducting interviews within the next couple of days. He will be assisted by Mr. Joe Ansnick.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Curtis Crider
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission
Phone - (202) 566-3125
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.
Hello Curtis:

I was reviewing the memo that you brought to the Chair today regarding the research on Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation. I have sent electronic and hard copies to the commissioners and senior staff. However, I was wondering if there if going to be a separate memo addressing the Voter ID issues. Per your request the staff is in the process of sending emails to your designated inbox and all of those issues. Please advise.

Many thanks,

Elle

Elle L.K. Collver
Special Assistant to the Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
office: (202) 566-2256
fax: (202) 566-1392
Hello everyone,
The chair wanted to distribute the attached memo from the IG, which contains guidance about how we proceed during the review of the voter ID and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research projects. She will continue to keep staff informed as this review moves forward, and she thanks everyone for their continued cooperation and hard work.

IG Memo to Chair on Review of Studies (4-27-07).pdf

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Memorandum

To: Donetta Davidson
   Chair, U.S. Elections Commission

From: Curtis Crider
       Inspector General


In your letter of April 23, 2007, you requested my comments concerning several activities that the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) was considering to undertake pending our review of the Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Study and on related questions. My responses to your proposed activities and questions follow:

1. The EAC would like to prepare a summary of the differences between the draft report prepared by the consultants and the final report adopted by the EAC.

Answer: We believe that such a summary will be helpful to our investigation. Please provide us with a copy of the summary of differences upon its completion.

2. Would there be any prohibition against the Director of Communications speaking with EAC employees, consultants or working group members when questions arise from members of the press or under the Freedom of Information Act?

Answer: We are not aware of any prohibition. However, we suggest that EAC not comment or limit its comments on this matter because of the ongoing investigation. Any FOIA requests should be promptly responded to stating that the matter is under investigation. Once the investigation is completed, appropriate information should be made available to the FOIA requester.

3. Would there be any prohibition against EAC briefing members of the EAC Standards Board and the EAC Board of Advisors.

Answer: We are not aware of any prohibition. Our preference, however, would be that EAC allow the investigation to be completed before conducting any briefings.

4. Would there be any prohibition against gathering information related to this project in order to respond to inquiries that have been made by members of Congress?
Answer: We are not aware of any prohibition. As previously stated, our preference is that there are no public comments while the investigation is in process or that comments be limited. However, we appreciate the sensitivity of Congressional requests, EAC must decide how best to proceed in this matter. We ask that you share any proposed responses with us prior to their release and that you provide us with a copy of final responses and any attachments.

5. Would there be any prohibition against responding to an inquiry that the Commission has received from an attorney engaged by one of the consultants?

Answer: It is the EAC’s decision whether to respond to the attorney for the consultant. We prefer that the consultants not be released from the confidentiality clause of their contracts until the OIG has completed its investigations.

We understand that EAC will want to respond to criticism of its handling of the Voter Fraud and Intimidation Study, and that management must ultimately decide how best to proceed. Our preference would be that you attempt to defer commenting until we have finished our investigation.

I appreciate you raising these matters to me before acting. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this memorandum.
Good Morning,

The tally vote dated 4/30/07, Authority to Proceed with Side by Side Analysis of Draft Voter Fraud and Intimidation Report with EAC Election Crimes Report and Agreement to Release Draft with the Completed Side by Side Analysis, is withdrawn.

Thank You

DeAnna M. Smith
Paralegal Specialist
Office of the General Counsel
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
202-566-3117 (phone)
202-566-1392 (fax)
www.eac.gov
Commissioners:

Today we had the following media inquiries:

(1) Leslie Robinson, a reporter for the news blog, ColoradoConfidential.com inquired about the rules and regulations that EAC board members must adhere to. She said that one of the EAC members from Colorado, Dan Kopelman, has recently been cited by the Secretary of State for his business of selling voter lists and consulting partisan candidates. She asked if these infractions cause Kopelman to withdraw from the EAC board. We explained that, according to SEC. 213 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA), there are two EAC Standards Board representatives from each state, that one is a local official, one is a state official and that both individuals represent their state on the Board. We said that the state representatives are selected by the Chief State election official from each state. We said that, with respect to Colorado, Mr. Kopelman was selected to serve on the Board by Colorado Secretary of State Michael Coffman. We suggested Ms. Robinson contact their office for questions regarding the appointment of state representatives from Colorado.

(2) Rose Marie Berger, Associate Editor of Sojourners/Call to Renewal, asked for the document on voter fraud authored by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov. We replied that our Inspector General is currently reviewing the circumstances surrounding this research and noted page two of the following memo from the chair. We said that when that process is complete we'll be glad to discuss it further.

04/16/07 - EAC Requests Review of Voter ID, Vote Fraud & Voter Intimidation Research Projects

###

015332
Commissioners:

Today we had the following media inquiries:

(1) Meg Cox, a freelance journalist in Chicago is working on an article about voter fraud and voter ID laws. She asked the following two questions:

1) Is the EAC still sending its "Elections Crimes" report to journalists who request the report on voter fraud and intimidation authored by Wang and Serebrov?
2) If the answer to #1 is yes, is the EAC still sending the "Election Crimes" report in these cases without comment--in other words, without indicating that it is not the Wang/Serebrov report?

We forwarded her questions to Curtis and replied to Ms. Cox that the chair has asked our Inspector General to review the circumstances surrounding this research project, as well as research done about voter ID. We said he has requested that EAC not comment on either one of these projects while his review is ongoing. We referred her to the following link: here, and said we'd be glad to make sure she receives the IG's review when it is completed.

(2) Jenna Portnoy of the Doylestown Intelligenca in Bucks Co., PA called again to ask about EAC's progress in determining the status of Pennsylvania's 102 funds. She wants to know the amount of money, if any, that they will have to return. We said that EAC is still reviewing the certifications submitted by the states and we hope to have this process completed as soon as possible. We said we are also evaluating all the reports submitted by the states regarding their 101 and 251 funds expenditures.
Commissioners:

Today Meg Cox, a freelance journalist in Chicago, sent us the same two questions she sent us last Friday (see below). She had not been satisfied with our response. She is working on an article about voter fraud and voter ID laws. She said she is concerned that journalists are receiving a substitute report from EAC and not the real thing. We replied that we directed her to the one and only report adopted by EAC -- Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study -- We noted that it contains clear language about the role of the consultants, identifies them by name and that their bios are included in the EAC report as Appendix D here. We said we would notify her when the IG has completed his review of this subject. We also noted the following contents of the report:

- Page one: "EAC staff along with two, bipartisan consultants reviewed the existing information available about voting fraud and voter intimidation, including reading articles, books and reports; interviewing subject matter experts; reviewing media reports of fraud and intimidation; and studying reported cases of prosecutions of these types of crimes.

- Page three: To accomplish these tasks, EAC employed two consultants, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, who worked with EAC staff and interns to conduct the research that forms the basis of this report.

- Page four: The consultants drafted a report for EAC that included their summaries of relevant cases, studies and reports on voting fraud and voter intimidation as well as summaries of the interviews that they conducted. The draft report also provided a definition of voting fraud and intimidation and made certain recommendations developed by the consultants or by the working group on how to pursue further study of this subject. This document was vetted and edited by EAC staff to produce this final report.

###

BACKGROUND: Last Friday's Q&A.

Meg Cox, a freelance journalist in Chicago is working on an article about voter fraud and voter ID laws. She asked the following two questions:

1) Is the EAC still sending its "Elections Crimes" report to journalists who request the report on voter fraud and intimidation authored by Wang and Serebrov?
2) If the answer to #1 is yes, is the EAC still sending the "Election Crimes" report in these cases without comment--in other words, without indicating that it is not the Wang/Serebrov report?

We forwarded her questions to Curtis and replied to Ms. Cox that the chair has asked our Inspector General to review the circumstances surrounding this research project, as well as research done about voter ID. We said he has requested that EAC not comment on either one of these projects while his review is ongoing. We referred her to the following link: here. and said we'd be glad to make sure she receives the IG's review when it is completed.
Guess Wendy changed her mind about giving me until the end of the week...

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Rowan Wilson"
Sent: 05/09/2007 10:14 PM AST
To: Jeannie Layson
Cc: "Yani Indrajana Ho" ; perezm@juris.law.nyu.edu; wendy.weiser@nyu.edu
Subject: Letter Regarding Brennan Center's FOIA Request

Dear Ms. Layson:

My firm is representing the Brennan Center in connection with the FOIA requests it has made to the EAC. Attached, for your convenience, is a letter we have sent to you today by regular mail.

Sincerely,

Rowan Wilson

This e-mail is confidential and may be privileged. Use or disclosure of it by anyone other than a designated addressee is unauthorized. If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this e-mail from the computer on which you received it.

Brennan Center Letter to EAC 05-09-2007.pdf
Yes, we have talked about setting up a FOIA reading room like some other agencies. Those cull the most frequently asked for info, but don't post everything. It's just a function of getting caught up to do that. However, I'm open to posting everything.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Rosemary E. Rodriguez

----- Original Message -----
From: Rosemary E. Rodriguez
Sent: 05/10/2007 07:17 PM EDT
To: Jeannie Layson; Thomas Wilkey
Cc: "Staci Fabre"
Subject: Have we considered putting FOIA responses on the web?

That would cut down on the number we are doing and make us more transparent,
And I really appreciate you saying that. Usually I do pretty well under pressure. I think I'm just having a couple of bad days! I'm already in a better mood.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

------ Original Message ------

From: Rosemary E. Rodriguez
Sent: 05/10/2007 07:28 PM EDT
To: Jeannie Layson; Thomas Wilkey; Donetta Davidson
Cc: "Staci Fabre"
Subject: Re: Have we considered putting FOIA responses on the web?

If we announced it, maybe we could stem the flow. We should discuss. And I do appreciate how stressful things are for you right now. My Mayor used to say that press was the hardest job in the ofc. He was under siege his first term (he served 3) and it feels for me a little like deja vu all over again because he was very misunderstood

Best,

Jeannie Layson

------ Original Message ------

From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 05/10/2007 07:21 PM EDT
To: Rosemary Rodriguez; Jeannie Layson; Thomas Wilkey
Cc: "Staci Fabre"
Subject: Re: Have we considered putting FOIA responses on the web?

Yes, we have talked about setting up a FOIA reading room like some other agencies. Those cull the most frequently asked for info, but don't post everything. It's just a function of getting caught up to do that. However, I'm open to posting everything.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

------ Original Message ------

From: Rosemary E. Rodriguez
Sent: 05/10/2007 07:17 PM EDT
To: Jeannie Layson; Thomas Wilkey
Cc: "Staci Fabre"
Subject: Have we considered putting FOIA responses on the web?

That would cut down on the number we are doing and make us more transparent,
Commissioners;
Based on our conversation yesterday concerning the letter from the Attorney representing the Brennan Center Gavin has drafted the attached letter as our response. Since this letter will also be copied to several members of Congress I thought it best to have you look it over before it goes out.
Please let me know if you have any concerns, I'd like to get it out COB today.
And if I don't see you today...Have a great Mother's Day
Tom

--- Forwarded by Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV on 05/11/2007 11:09 AM -----

Tom,
For your review and policy determination.
GG

Brennan Center May 9th-2.doc

Gavin S. Gilmour
Looks good to me, thanks Tom and Gavin.

Thomas R. Wilkey
----- Original Message -----

From: Thomas R. Wilkey
Sent: 05/11/2007 11:16 AM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson; Rosemary Rodriguez; Caroline Hunter; Gracia Hillman
Subject: Fw: Letter

Commissioners,
Based on our conversation yesterday concerning the letter from the letter from the Attorney representing the Brennan Center Gavin has drafted the attached letter as our response. Since this letter will also be copied to several members of Congress I thought it best to have you look it over before it goes out. Please let me know if you have any concerns, I'd like to get it out COB today. And if I don't see you today...Have a great Mother's Day

Tom

Thomas R. Wilkey
Executive Director
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3109 phone
TWilkey@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV on 05/11/2007 11:09 AM -----

Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV
05/11/2007 09:01 AM

To: Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC, Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV, Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc

Subject: Letter

Tom,

For your review and policy determination.
Gavin S. Gilmour  
Deputy General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3100

THIS MESSAGE IS FOR ITS INTENDED RECIPIENT ONLY. IT IS A PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED TO A THIRD PARTY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SENDER.
Got it....thanks
Gavin advises me that we are required to have a FOIA reading room and so we will do that but may not
want to admit that we haven't up to now.
Thanks
Tom

Thomas R. Wilkey
Executive Director
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3109 phone
TWilkey@eac.gov

Rosemary E. Rodriguez
EAC/GOV

Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV
To "Tom Wilkey" <TWilkey@eac.gov>
05/11/2007 01:26 PM
Subject Just sent u a fax
It's already been set up on the redesigned website which Jeannie hopes to unveil next week when we get out from under this paper. The FOIA regulations have been on the Counsel's "to do" list but with everything else going on has not been completed. We have two law clerks coming on for the summer in a couple weeks and this will be an excellent project for them to do.

Thanks
Tom

You are supposed to be relaxing

We'd better get it up before we get dinged for not having it up!

Got it....thanks
Gavin advises me that we are required to have a FOIA reading room and so we will do that but may not
want to admit that we haven’t up to now.
Thanks
Tom

Thomas R. Wilkey
Executive Director
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3190 phone
TWilkey@eac.gov
Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV

Rosemary E.
Rodriguez/EAC/GOV
05/11/2007 01:26 PM
To “Tom Willkey” <TWilkey@eac.gov>
cc
Subject Just sent u a fax
Attached is the letter sent from Tom to the attorneys for the Brennan Center for Justice. Letter was faxed this morning and the hard copy is being mailed this afternoon.

Bert A. Benavides  
Special Assistant to the Executive Director  
U. S. Elections Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
202-566-3114
I would very much like to explore the possibility of reconsidering the decision to release the Fraud Report. How can I get this on our agenda?

Rosemary E. Rodriguez
Commissioner
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-566-3104
Facsimile: 202-566-3127
www.eac.gov
rrodriguez@eac.gov
I would very much like to explore the possibility of reconsidering the decision to release the Fraud Report. How can I get this on our agenda?

Rosemary E. Rodriguez  
Commissioner  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: 202-566-3104  
Facsimile: 202-566-3127  
www.eac.gov  
rrodriguez@eac.gov
I would very much like to explore the possibility of reconsidering the decision to release the Fraud Report. How can I get this on our agenda?
Ahhh...imagining that irresistible "new car" smell?

Check out new cars at Yahoo! Autos.
April 13, 2007

EAC Board of Advisors
EAC Standards Board

RE: EAC Election Crimes Study

Dear Members of the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors:

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission has recently come under fire for not releasing a draft report from EAC's Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation project, which was submitted by two contracted employees, Tova Wang and Job Serebrov. That draft report, which is attached to this letter, is a compilation of summaries from the work that they conducted. We thought it was important to explain the circumstances surrounding this project.

In 2005, the EAC Board of Advisors helped EAC prioritize its research efforts. As a result, EAC developed a research agenda that included studying voting fraud and voter intimidation. In the fall of 2005, EAC hired the two contract employees to conduct an initial review of the information available about voting fraud and voter intimidation. The employees were asked to provide two things: (1) a definition of voting fraud and voter intimidation that could be used in a future and comprehensive study of these topics; and (2) a series of recommendations on how such a future, comprehensive study could be conducted.

In May 2006, a status report regarding this study was presented at the public meetings of the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors. Each board provided feedback on the progress of the study and the direction that it should take. Following those meetings, the project’s working group convened and likewise provided feedback on the study. In July 2006, EAC received a body of research including summaries of the articles, books, interviews, and media reports that were compiled and reviewed by the contract employees. In addition, they provided a draft report of the summaries of the interviews for EAC's review and consideration.

EAC staff reviewed the material, briefed the commissioners, including at our October public meeting and presented for commissioner consideration a report, Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study, which was adopted at our December 2006 public meeting.

After the release of EAC’s report there was some debate about whether EAC should release the draft provided by our contracted employees. The Board of Advisors considered, but did not pass, a resolution urging the release of that document. Recently, EAC testified before a Congressional committee that requested the draft report. A copy was provided to the committee, which released the draft report this week.

Recently, there has been much discussion surrounding EAC’s review process of the material provided by the contract employees, and how much was included in our election crimes report. After receiving the information from the consultants, EAC conducted due diligence. As you will see in the consultants' draft,
they reached conclusions in their summaries that were based almost entirely on the interviews they conducted with 24 people, not on the entire body of work they collected. EAC found the individual accounts were informative and they helped define what issues we should examine in moving forward.

We understand that the topics of voter fraud and voter intimidation are hotly debated and often divisive. We assure you that the process we took to review all of the materials and adopt a final report was not motivated by partisan politics, but by a responsibility, especially as a federal agency, to issue findings only when they are supported by data that can enable EAC to firmly defend its conclusions.

To avoid even the appearance of partisan influence in future research endeavors, EAC has established a bipartisan commission panel to oversee all research. We are currently reviewing our contracting policy and internal procedures to make certain that EAC and its consultants are clear on the products to be delivered. We will also expedite the process in which we complete these projects.

We have always taken input from our advisory boards, Congress, and the public very seriously, and we will continue to provide you with accurate, complete, and supported research, whether that research is conducted by consultants or by EAC staff.

Thank you for your service, your commitment to the election process and your support of EAC.

Also attached is a copy of EAC’s statement on this issue, as well as a statement issued by Congressmen Maurice Hinchey and José Serrano. If you have any questions regarding this study or on any other matter, please don’t hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Donetta Davidson, Chair
Gracia Hillman, Commissioner
Caroline Hunter, Commissioner
Rosemary Rodriguez, Commissioner

c: Project Working Group
Subject: my revisions to boards letter.

AdvBdsletterDRAFT.doc
Dear Members of the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors:

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission has recently come under fire for not releasing a draft report from EAC’s Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation project, which was submitted by two contracted research consultants, Tova Wang and Job Serebrov. That draft report, which is attached to this letter, is a compilation of summaries from the work that they conducted. We thought it was important to explain the circumstances surrounding this project.

In 2005, the EAC Board of Advisors helped EAC prioritize its research efforts. As a result, EAC developed a research agenda that included studying voting fraud and voter intimidation. In the fall of 2005, EAC hired the two contract employees to conduct an initial review of the information available about voting fraud and voter intimidation. The employees were asked to provide two things: (1) a definition of voting fraud and voter intimidation that could be used in a future and comprehensive study of these topics; and (2) a series of recommendations on how such a future, comprehensive study could be conducted.

In May 2006, a status report regarding this study was presented at the public meetings of the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors. Each board provided feedback on the progress of the study and the direction that it should take. Following those meetings, the project’s working group convened and...
likewise provided feedback on the study. In July 2006, EAC received a body of research including summaries of the articles, books, interviews, and media reports that were compiled and reviewed by the contract employees. In addition, they provided a draft report of the summaries of the interviews for EAC’s review and consideration.

EAC staff reviewed the material, briefed the commissioners, including at our October public meeting and presented for commissioner consideration a report, *Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study*, which was adopted at our December 2006 public meeting.

After the release of EAC’s report there was some debate about whether EAC should release the draft provided by our contracted employees. A member of the Board of Advisors, Ms. Barbara Arnwine, went so far as to propose a resolution recommending that the EAC release the original “Voter Fraud and Intimidation Report” to the public, or, alternatively, to the Board of Advisors. The Board of Advisors rejected the resolution, persuaded by argument that the EAC should have complete control of the use of its commissioned research. This is an issue that the EAC, in light of recent events, must necessarily resolve with input from its Congressional Committees of Reference, and the Board of Advisors.

On March __, 2007, EAC testified before a Congressional committee that requested the draft report. A copy was provided to the committee, which released the draft report this week. The release of the draft report by members of Congress has made it widely available. Thus we attach it to this letter. We value your service on the Board of Advisors and believe that you should receive the draft directly from the EAC, and not a secondary source.
Recently, there has been much discussion surrounding EAC's review process of the material provided by the contract employees, and how much was included in our election crimes report. After receiving the information from the consultants, EAC conducted due diligence. As you will see in the consultants' draft, they reached conclusions in their summaries that were based almost entirely on the interviews they conducted with 24 people, not on the entire body of work they collected. EAC found the individual accounts were informative and they helped define what issues we should examine in moving forward.

We understand that the topics of voter fraud and voter intimidation are hotly debated and often divisive, even among members of the EAC. We assure you that we believe the process we took to review all of the materials and adopt a final report was motivated by a responsibility, especially as a federal agency, to issue findings only when they are supported by data that can enable EAC to firmly defend its conclusions.

To avoid even the appearance of partisan influence in future research endeavors, EAC has established a bipartisan commission panel to oversee all research. We are currently reviewing our contracting policy and internal procedures to make certain that EAC and its consultants are clear on the products to be delivered. We will also expedite the process in which we complete these projects.

We will continue to take input from our advisory boards, Congress, and the public very seriously, and we will continue to provide you with accurate, complete, and supported research, whether that research is conducted by consultants or by EAC staff.

Thank you for your service, your commitment to the election process and your support of EAC.

Also attached is a copy of EAC's statement on this issue, as well as a statement issued by Congressmen.
Maurice Hinchey and José Serrano. If you have any questions regarding this study or on any other matter, please don’t hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Donetta Davidson, Chair

Gracia Hillman, Commissioner

Caroline Hunter, Commissioner

Rosemary Rodriguez, Commissioner

cc: Project Working Group
----- Forwarded Message -----
From: "ghillman@eac.gov" <ghillman@eac.gov>
To: jlayson@eac.gov
Cc: Ddavidson@eac.gov; chunter@eac.gov; twilkey@eac.gov; jhodgkins@eac.gov
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2007 5:59:10 PM
Subject: Draft Letter w/edits

Ahhh...imagining that irresistible "new car" smell?

Check out new cars at Yahoo! Autos.
Dear Members of the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors:

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission has recently come under fire for not releasing a draft report from EAC's Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation project, which was submitted by two contracted research consultants, Tova Wang and Job Serebrov. That draft report, which is attached to this letter, is a compilation of summaries from the work that they conducted. We thought it was important to explain the circumstances surrounding this project.

In 2005, the EAC Board of Advisors helped EAC prioritize its research efforts. As a result, EAC developed a research agenda that included studying voting fraud and voter intimidation. In the fall of 2005, EAC hired the two contract employees to conduct an initial review of the information available about voting fraud and voter intimidation. The employees were asked to provide two things: (1) a definition of voting fraud and voter intimidation that could be used in a future and comprehensive study of these topics; and (2) a series of recommendations on how such a future, comprehensive study could be conducted.

In May 2006, a status report regarding this study was presented at the public meetings of the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors. Each board provided feedback on the progress of the study and the direction that it should take. Following those meetings, the project's working group convened and...
likewise provided feedback on the study. In July 2006, EAC received a body of research including summaries of the articles, books, interviews, and media reports that were compiled and reviewed by the contract employees. In addition, they provided a draft report of the summaries of the interviews for EAC's review and consideration.

EAC staff reviewed the material, briefed the commissioners, including at our October public meeting and presented for commissioner consideration a report, *Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study*, which was adopted at our December 2006 public meeting.

After the release of EAC's report there was some debate about whether EAC should release the draft provided by our contracted employees. A member of the Board of Advisors, Ms. Barbara Arnwine, went so far as to propose a resolution recommending that the EAC release the original "Voter Fraud and Intimidation Report" to the public, or, alternatively, to the Board of Advisors. The Board of Advisors rejected the resolution, persuaded by argument that the EAC should have complete control of the use of its commissioned research. This is an issue that the EAC, in light of recent events, must necessarily resolve with input from its Congressional Committees of Reference, and the Board of Advisors.

On March __, 2007, EAC testified before a Congressional committee that requested the draft report. A copy was provided to the committee, which released the draft report this week. The release of the draft report by members of Congress has made it widely available. Thus we attach it to this letter. We value your service on the Board of Advisors and believe that you should receive the draft directly from the EAC, and not a secondary source.
Recently, there has been much discussion surrounding EAC’s review process of the material provided by the contract employees, and how much was included in our election crimes report. After receiving the information from the consultants, EAC conducted due diligence. As you will see in the consultants’ draft, they reached conclusions in their summaries that were based almost entirely on the interviews they conducted with 24 people, not on the entire body of work they collected. EAC found the individual accounts were informative and they helped define what issues we should examine in moving forward.

We understand that the topics of voter fraud and voter intimidation are hotly debated and often divisive, even among members of the EAC. We assure you that we believe the process we took to review all of the materials and adopt a final report was motivated by a responsibility, especially as a federal agency, to issue findings only when they are supported by data that can enable EAC to firmly defend its conclusions.

To avoid even the appearance of partisan influence in future research endeavors, EAC has established a bipartisan commission panel to oversee all research. We are currently reviewing our contracting policy and internal procedures to make certain that EAC and its consultants are clear on the products to be delivered. We will also expedite the process in which we complete these projects.

We will continue to take input from our advisory boards, Congress, and the public very seriously, and we will continue to provide you with accurate, complete, and supported research, whether that research is conducted by consultants or by EAC staff.

Thank you for your service, your commitment to the election process and your support of EAC.

Also attached is a copy of EAC’s statement on this issue, as well as a statement issued by Congressmen
Maurice Hinchey and José Serrano. If you have any questions regarding this study or on any other matter, please don’t hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Donetta Davidson, Chair
Gracia Hillman, Commissioner

Caroline Hunter, Commissioner
Rosemary Rodriguez, Commissioner

cc: Project Working Group
Rosemary E. Rodriguez
Commissioner
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-566-3104
Facsimile: 202-566-3127
www.eac.gov
rrodriguez@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV on 04/14/2007 01:44 PM -----
"Rosemary Rodriguez"

To rrodriguez@eac.gov
cc

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: "ghillman@eac.gov" <ghillman@eac.gov>
To: jlayson@eac.gov
Cc: Ddavidson@eac.gov; chunter@eac.gov; jhodgkins@eac.gov; twikey@eac.gov
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2007 5:59:10 PM
Subject: Draft Letter w/edits

Gracia M. Hillman
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-566-3100
Fax: 202-566-1392
Ahhh...imagining that irresistible "new car" smell?

Check out new cars at Yahoo! Autos.
April 13, 2007

EAC Board of Advisors
EAC Standards Board

RE: EAC Election Crimes Study

Dear Members of the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors:

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission has recently come under fire for not releasing a draft report from EAC’s Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation project, which was submitted by two contracted employees, Tova Wang and Job Serebrov. That draft report, which is attached to this letter, is a compilation of summaries from the work that they conducted. We thought it was important to explain the circumstances surrounding this project.

In 2005, the EAC Board of Advisors helped EAC prioritize its research efforts. As a result, EAC developed a research agenda that included studying voting fraud and voter intimidation. In the fall of 2005, EAC hired the two contract employees to conduct an initial review of the information available about voting fraud and voter intimidation. The employees were asked to provide two things: (1) a definition of voting fraud and voter intimidation that could be used in a future and comprehensive study of these topics; and (2) a series of recommendations on how such a future, comprehensive study could be conducted.

In May 2006, a status report regarding this study was presented at the public meetings of the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors. Each board provided feedback on the progress of the study and the direction that it should take. Following those meetings, the project’s working group convened and likewise provided feedback on the study. In July 2006, EAC received a body of research including summaries of the articles, books, interviews, and media reports that were compiled and reviewed by the contract employees. In addition, they provided a draft report of the summaries of the interviews for EAC’s review and consideration.

EAC staff reviewed the material, briefed the commissioners, including at our October public meeting and presented for commissioner consideration a report, Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study, which was adopted at our December 2006 public meeting.

After the release of EAC’s report there was some debate about whether EAC should release the draft provided by our contracted employees. The Board of Advisors considered, but did not pass, a resolution urging the release of that document. Recently, EAC testified before a Congressional committee that requested the draft report. A copy was provided to the committee, which released the draft report this week.

Recently, there has been much discussion surrounding EAC’s review process of the material provided by the contract employees, and how much was included in our election crimes report. After receiving the information from the consultants, EAC conducted due diligence. As you will see in the consultants’ draft,
they reached conclusions in their summaries that were based almost entirely on the interviews they conducted with 24 people, not on the entire body of work they collected. EAC found the individual accounts were informative and they helped define what issues we should examine in moving forward.

We understand that the topics of voter fraud and voter intimidation are hotly debated and often divisive. We assure you that the process we took to review all of the materials and adopt a final report was not motivated by partisan politics, but by a responsibility, especially as a federal agency, to issue findings only when they are supported by data that can enable EAC to firmly defend its conclusions.

To avoid even the appearance of partisan influence in future research endeavors, EAC has established a bipartisan commission panel to oversee all research. We are currently reviewing our contracting policy and internal procedures to make certain that EAC and its consultants are clear on the products to be delivered. We will also expedite the process in which we complete these projects.

We have always taken input from our advisory boards, Congress, and the public very seriously, and we will continue to provide you with accurate, complete, and supported research, whether that research is conducted by consultants or by EAC staff.

Thank you for your service, your commitment to the election process and your support of EAC.

Also attached is a copy of EAC’s statement on this issue, as well as a statement issued by Congressmen Maurice Hinchey and José Serrano. If you have any questions regarding this study or on any other matter, please don’t hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Donetta Davidson, Chair
Gracia Hillman, Commissioner

Caroline Hunter, Commissioner
Rosemary Rodriguez, Commissioner

cc: Project Working Group
April 13, 2007

EAC Board of Advisors
EAC Standards Board

RE: EAC Election Crimes Study

Dear Members of the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors:

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission has recently come under fire for not releasing a draft report from EAC's Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation project, which was submitted by two contracted employees, Tova Wang and Job Serebrov. That draft report, which is attached to this letter, is a compilation of summaries from the work that they conducted. We thought it was important to explain the circumstances surrounding this project.

In 2005, the EAC Board of Advisors helped EAC prioritize its research efforts. As a result, EAC developed a research agenda that included studying voting fraud and voter intimidation. In the fall of 2005, EAC hired the two contract employees to conduct an initial review of the information available about voting fraud and voter intimidation. The employees were asked to provide two things: (1) a definition of voting fraud and voter intimidation that could be used in a future and comprehensive study of these topics; and (2) a series of recommendations on how such a future, comprehensive study could be conducted.

In May 2006, a status report regarding this study was presented at the public meetings of the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors. Each board provided feedback on the progress of the study and the direction that it should take. Following those meetings, the project's working group convened and likewise provided feedback on the study. In July 2006, EAC received a body of research including summaries of the articles, books, interviews, and media reports that were compiled and reviewed by the contract employees. In addition, they provided a draft report of the summaries of the interviews for EAC's review and consideration.

EAC staff reviewed the material, briefed the commissioners, including at our October public meeting and presented for commissioner consideration a report, Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study, which was adopted at our December 2006 public meeting.

After the release of EAC's report there was some debate about whether EAC should release the draft provided by our contracted employees. The Board of Advisors considered, but did not pass, a resolution urging the release of that document. Recently, EAC testified before a Congressional committee that requested the draft report. A copy was provided to the committee, which released the draft report this week.

Recently, there has been much discussion surrounding EAC's review process of the material provided by the contract employees, and how much was included in our election crimes report. After receiving the information from the consultants, EAC conducted due diligence. As you will see in the consultants' draft,
they reached conclusions in their summaries that were based almost entirely on the interviews they conducted with 24 people, not on the entire body of work they collected. EAC found the individual accounts were informative and they helped define what issues we should examine in moving forward.

We understand that the topics of voter fraud and voter intimidation are hotly debated and often divisive. We assure you that the process we took to review all of the materials and adopt a final report was not motivated by partisan politics, but by a responsibility, especially as a federal agency, to issue findings only when they are supported by data that can enable EAC to firmly defend its conclusions.

To avoid even the appearance of partisan influence in future research endeavors, EAC has established a bipartisan commission panel to oversee all research. We are currently reviewing our contracting policy and internal procedures to make certain that EAC and its consultants are clear on the products to be delivered. We will also expedite the process in which we complete these projects.

We have always taken input from our advisory boards, Congress, and the public very seriously, and we will continue to provide you with accurate, complete, and supported research, whether that research is conducted by consultants or by EAC staff.

Thank you for your service, your commitment to the election process and your support of EAC.

Also attached is a copy of EAC's statement on this issue, as well as a statement issued by Congressmen Maurice Hinchey and José Serrano. If you have any questions regarding this study or on any other matter, please don't hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Donetta Davidson, Chair
Gracia Hillman, Commissioner

Caroline Hunter, Commissioner
Rosemary Rodriguez, Commissioner

cc: Project Working Group
Isn't Peggy away on sick leave? Why do we direct her to Peggy?

Gavin S. Gilmour
----- Original Message ----- 

From: Gavin S. Gilmour
Sent: 04/20/2007 03:04 PM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson; Rosemary Rodriguez; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Juliet Hodgkins
Subject: Draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer

Pursuant to Commissioner Davidson's request, attached is the draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer.

[attachment "Wang Ltr 17apr07.doc" deleted by Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV]

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

THIS MESSAGE IS FOR ITS INTENDED RECIPIENT ONLY. IT IS A PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED TO A THIRD PARTY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SENDER.
I haven't seen her for weeks. But I am in another corner of the office. Perhaps I am ill-informed.

Juliet E. Hodgkins

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Juliet E. Hodgkins
Sent: 04/20/2007 03:30 PM EDT 
To: Rosemary Rodriguez
Cc: Caroline Hunter; Donetta Davidson; Gavin Gilmour; Gracia Hillman; Thomas Wilkey 

Subject: Re: Draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer

Commissioner Rodriguez,

Gavin's Blackberry is not working properly so he asked that I forward to you all the following response:

Julie,

My Blackberry keeps freezing up, again. Perhaps you could forward my comments.

Peggy was proposed as the point of contact for Ms. Wang because she was the original project manager and Tova's prior supervisor/COTR. Peggy would obviously staff requests. As for Peggy's status, I was under the impression that she was still an active employee, but obviously defer that issue to Tom.

GG

Juliet T. Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

Isn't Peggy away on sick leave? Why do we direct her to Peggy?
Pursuant to Commissioner Davidson's request, attached is the draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer.

[attachment "Wang Ltr 17apr07.doc" deleted by Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV]
Pursuant to Commissioner Davidson's request, attached is the draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer.

Wang Ltr 17apr07.doc

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

THIS MESSAGE IS FOR ITS INTENDED RECIPIENT ONLY. IT IS A PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED TO A THIRD PARTY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SENDER.
This letter is in response to your April 16, 2007 inquiry in which you request that your client, Ms. Tova Wang, be authorized by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to discuss certain matters pertaining to her prior employment with the agency.

As I am sure you are aware, Ms. Wang was employed by the EAC under its authority to hire experts and consultants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §3109 (as implemented by 5 C.F.R. §304). As such, her agreement with the EAC created a limited employee/employer relationship. This is clearly stated in her contract. As an employee Ms. Wang has a duty to the Commission. Without direction from the EAC, Ms. Wang has no authority to speak for the EAC, release non-public information or discuss privileged matters with third parties. As you note in your letter, this concept is also clearly stated in her employment contract. The duties and responsibilities that come with Federal service are essential to the proper functioning of our government.

Ultimately, however, Ms. Wang’s responsibilities should not have a significant impact on her ability to discuss her personal opinions on voter fraud. Per her employment contract, the project she worked on was focused on collecting existing information, defining terms and proposing future research methodology so that EAC could conduct a future research project on voter fraud and intimidation. As a result, the information gathered by Ms. Wang and other EAC employees is nothing more than a collection of articles, books and opinions that are publicly available. In fact, the EAC has published much of this information as an attachment to the final report which is available on our Web site. Ms. Wang is free to provide her personal opinion on voter fraud to anyone she wishes. Her only limitation is in speaking for the EAC or releasing privileged documents or information.

If Ms. Wang has questions concerning specific requests for information, or is requested to speak
on behalf of the EAC, she may contact her prior supervisor, Ms. Peggy Sims at (202)566-3127 for assistance.

Sincerely,

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
You know where I stand on this issue but, again, I think we should grant her request. We appear to be stonewalling and I do not think that is good for the agency nor is it good policy. I understand that we have rights to enforce the contract but we can also waive those rights and I think we ought to in this instance.

Gavin S. Gilmour

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Gavin S. Gilmour
Sent: 04/20/2007 03:04 PM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson; Rosemary Rodriguez; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Juliet Hodgkins
Subject: Draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer

Draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer

Pursuant to Commissioner Davidson's request, attached is the draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer.

[attachment "Wang Ltr 17apr07.doc" deleted by Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV]

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

THIS MESSAGE IS FOR ITS INTENDED RECIPIENT ONLY. IT IS A PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED TO A THIRD PARTY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SENDER.
Rosemary E. Rodriguez
----- Original Message ----- 

From: Rosemary E. Rodriguez
Sent: 04/20/2007 05:49 PM EDT
To: Gavin Gilmour; Donetta Davidson; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Juliet Hodgkins
Subject: Re: Draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer

You know where I stand on this issue but, again, I think we should grant her request. We appear to be stonewalling and I do not think that is good for the agency nor is it good policy. I understand that we have rights to enforce the contract but we can also waive those rights and I think we ought to in this instance.

Gavin S. Gilmour
----- Original Message ----- 

From: Gavin S. Gilmour
Sent: 04/20/2007 03:04 PM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson; Rosemary Rodriguez; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Juliet Hodgkins
Subject: Draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer

Pursuant to Commissioner Davidson’s request, attached is the draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer.

[attachment “Wang Ltr 17apr07.doc” deleted by Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV]

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

THIS MESSAGE IS FOR ITS INTENDED RECIPIENT ONLY. IT IS A PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED TO A THIRD PARTY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SENDER.
Pursuant to Commissioner Davidson's request, attached is the draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer.

Wang Ltr 17apr07.doc

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

THIS MESSAGE IS FOR ITS INTENDED RECIPIENT ONLY. IT IS A PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED TO A THIRD PARTY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SENDER.
Tom, is Peggy on sick leave?

Not sure if I sent this--I believe we should grant Tova's request. We are stonewalling and I do not think
that is good for the agency nor is it good policy. I understand that we have rights to enforce the contract
but we can also waive those rights and I think we ought to in this instance.

Gavin S. Gilmour
----- Original Message -----

From: Gavin S. Gilmour
Sent: 04/20/2007 03:04 PM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson; Rosemary Rodriguez; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Juliet Hodgkins
Subject: Draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer

Pursuant to Commissioner Davidson's request, attached is the draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer.

[attachment "Wang Ltr 17apr07.doc" deleted by Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV]

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

THIS MESSAGE IS FOR ITS INTENDED RECIPIENT ONLY. IT IS A PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED TO A THIRD PARTY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SENDER.
Commissioners,
Per the chair’s request, I have drafted the following press release to communicate the commission’s decision to ask the IG to review our contract procedures. Please let me know if this is okay with all of you. I would like this to go out ASAP, so if you could get back to me with any comments before noon, I would appreciate it. Sorry for the short turnaround, but I think circumstances demand that this get out immediately. Thank you.

After you give me the okay on the press release, I will send everything to staff before releasing it.

EAC IGRequest 04-16-07.doc

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
EAC Requests Review of Voter ID, Vote Fraud and Voter Intimidation Research Projects

For Immediate Release
April 16, 2007

WASHINGTON – U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Chair Donetta Davidson today issued a formal request to the commission’s inspector general to conduct a review of the commission’s contracting procedures, including a review of two recent projects focusing on voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation. The chair’s memo to the inspector general is attached.

“The actions taken by the commission regarding these research projects have been challenged, and the commissioners and I agree that it is appropriate and necessary to ask the inspector general to review this matter,” said EAC Chair Davidson.

Chair Davidson has requested that the inspector general specifically review the circumstances surrounding the issuance and management of the voter identification research project and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research project.

Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification...
laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions. The commission declined to adopt the report, but released all of the data to the public. The report and the research, conducted by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics, are available at www.eac.gov.

At a public meeting in December 2006, the commission adopted Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Further Study, available at www.eac.gov. This report was the culmination of research conducted by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov, who were tasked with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the consultants were responsible for “creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and working group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort.”

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

###
Jeannie:

The press release looks okay to me. I appreciate that you are being very careful with the words we use.

If there are changes to any of the words, I want to see them before giving final approval.

Gracia M. Hillman
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-566-3100
Fax: 202-566-1392
www.eac.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message is from a federal agency. Its contents and all attachments, if any, are intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this email and delete this message from your computer.
Could we pls add a sentence about why we did not adopt the fraud report - ie- had conclusions that were not supported by the underlying research.

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
chunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

Commissioners,
Per the chair's request, I have drafted the following press release to communicate the commission's decision to ask the IG to review our contract procedures. Please let me know if this is okay with all of you. I would like this to go out ASAP, so if you could get back to me with any comments before noon, I would appreciate it. Sorry for the short turnaround, but I think circumstances demand that this get out immediately. Thank you.

After you give me the okay on the press release, I will send everything to staff before releasing it.

EAC IGRequest 04-16-07.doc

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
EAC Requests Review of Voter ID, Vote Fraud and Voter Intimidation Research Projects

For Immediate Release
April 16, 2007

WASHINGTON – U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Chair Donetta Davidson today issued a formal request to the commission’s inspector general to conduct a review of the commission’s contracting procedures, including a review of two recent projects focusing on voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation. The chair’s memo to the inspector general is attached.

“The actions taken by the commission regarding these research projects have been challenged, and the commissioners and I agree that it is appropriate and necessary to ask the inspector general to review this matter,” said EAC Chair Davidson.

Chair Davidson has requested that the inspector general specifically review the circumstances surrounding the issuance and management of the voter identification research project and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research project.

Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification.
laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions. The commission declined to adopt the report, but released all of the data to the public. The report and the research, conducted by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics, are available at www.eac.gov.

At a public meeting in December 2006, the commission adopted Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Further Study, available at www.eac.gov. This report was the culmination of research conducted by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov, who were tasked with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the consultants were responsible for “creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and working group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort.”

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.

# # #
It's in there... first sentence in the fourth paragraph: "Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions."

Please let me know if that is sufficient.

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
chunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
04/16/2007 11:33 AM
To: Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc: Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV@EAC, ghillman@eac.gov, Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject: Re: IG Press Release

Could we pls add a sentence about why we did not adopt the fraud report - i.e. had conclusions that were not supported by the underlying research.

Caroline C. Hunter
Commissioner
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3107
chunter@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
04/16/2007 11:13 AM
To: Donetta L. Davidson/EAC/GOV@EAC, ghillman@eac.gov, Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc: Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. Rodriguez/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject: Re: IG Press Release
Commissioners,

Per the chair's request, I have drafted the following press release to communicate the commission's decision to ask the IG to review our contract procedures. Please let me know if this is okay with all of you. I would like this to go out ASAP, so if you could get back to me with any comments before noon, I would appreciate it. Sorry for the short turnaround, but I think circumstances demand that this get out immediately. Thank you.

After you give me the okay on the press release, I will send everything to staff before releasing it.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
WASHINGTON – U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Chair Donetta Davidson today issued a formal request to the commission’s inspector general to conduct a review of the commission’s contracting procedures, including a review of two recent projects focusing on voter identification and vote fraud and voter intimidation. The chair’s memo to the inspector general is attached.

“The actions taken by the commission regarding these research projects have been challenged, and the commissioners and I agree that it is appropriate and necessary to ask the inspector general to review this matter,” said EAC Chair Davidson.

Chair Davidson has requested that the inspector general specifically review the circumstances surrounding the issuance and management of the voter identification research project and the vote fraud and voter intimidation research project.

Last month, the commission voted unanimously to launch a comprehensive study focused on voter identification...
laws after concluding that initial research it received in a report was not sufficient to draw any conclusions. The commission declined to adopt the report, but released all of the data to the public. The report and the research, conducted by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, through its Eagleton Institute of Politics, are available at www.eac.gov.

At a public meeting in December 2006, the commission adopted Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Further Study, available at www.eac.gov. This report was the culmination of research conducted by Tova Wang and Job Serebrov, who were tasked with defining the terms vote fraud and voter intimidation and providing recommendations how to conduct extensive research in the future on these topics. The contract stated that the consultants were responsible for “creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and working group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future EAC research resulting from this effort.”

EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by HAVA. It is charged with administering payments to states and developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, implementing election administration improvements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, accrediting voting system test laboratories and certifying voting equipment and serving as a national clearinghouse and resource of information regarding election administration. The four EAC commissioners are Donetta Davidson, chair; Rosemary Rodriguez, Caroline Hunter and Gracia Hillman.
To complete our evaluation of the contracting process and related issues for the voter fraud research and voter intimidation and voter identification research projects, we will need copies of all e-mails and a number of documents related to the projects including copies of all of the various drafts (versions) of the reports. I am requesting that all EAC personnel be notified that they are to preserve all of the documents including e-mails related to the projects. We are in the process of setting up an e-mail account to receive the documents. It is imperative that all documents related to the projects be preserved. As soon as the account is set up we will notify you of the address.

In addition, we are requesting access to the backup e-mail files maintained by GSA and EAC. As a result, we are requesting that no backup tapes or files be destroyed.

Curtis Crider
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission
Phone - (202) 566-3125
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.
All:

The Office of Inspector General has initiated an evaluation of the contracting process used by the EAC for the voter fraud and voter intimidation projects. In order for us to complete our evaluation, we need copies of all e-mails or other documents that you have regarding either project. Electronic documents can be sent to an e-mail account that we have set up—eaccon@eac.gov. If you have any hard copy documents, please let me know.

If you do not have any documents or e-mails, please send me an e-mail to that effect.

Thank you,

Curtis Crider
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission
Phone - (202) 566-3125
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.
A question has been raised on the e-mails.

Q. Are these emails among staff, to recipients outside the office, or both?

A. We would like ALL e-mails including those among staff and recipients outside of the office.

Curtis Crider
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission
Phone - (202) 566-3125
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.

All:

The Office of Inspector General has initiated an evaluation of the contracting process used by the EAC for the voter fraud and voter intimidation projects. In order for us to complete our evaluation, we need copies of all e-mails or other documents that you have regarding either project. Electronic documents can be sent to an e-mail account that we have set up - eaccon@eac.gov. If you have any hard copy documents, please let me know.

If you do not have any documents or e-mails, please send me an e-mail to that effect.

Thank you,

Curtis Crider
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission
Phone - (202) 566-3125
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.
All:

The Office of Inspector General has initiated an evaluation of the contracting process used by the EAC for the voter identification project. In order for us to complete our evaluation, we need copies of all e-mails or other documents that you have regarding the project. Electronic documents can be sent to an e-mail account that we have set up - eaccon@eac.gov.

If you have any hard copy documents, please let me know.

If you do not have any documents or e-mails, please send me an e-mail to that effect.

Thank you,

Curtis Crider
Office of Inspector General, Election Assistance Commission
Phone - (202) 566-3125
Fax - (202) 566-0957

Important: This electronic transmission is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law.
To "Davidson, Donetta" <ddavidson@eac.gov>, Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV@EAC, Caroline C. Hunter/EAC/GOV@EAC, Rosemary E. 
cc Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC 

Subject Fw: Fraud Report

Commissioners & Tom,

After having received this request, reviewed it and discussed it with the Inspector General and Gavin, I believe that it is ill-advised to continue such a request in light of the pending investigation of this matter by the Inspector General. While I am certain that this was not the intent of this request, the inevitable appearance of this request would suggest that the Commission is seeking to influence an ongoing investigation of the IG. This appearance of inappropriate influence would arise because two employees, who will undoubtedly be contacted by and interviewed as a part of the ongoing IG investigation, are being asked to provide a statement to their supervisors prior to interviews of those persons by the IG. Furthermore, this situation could appear as an attempt by employees and/or the agency to collude on a statement prior to making a formal statement in the investigation of the IG.

This IG's investigation was requested to address issues of public perception. Thus, it is critical that this investigation proceed in a manner that leaves no room for question. As such, I believe that it is inappropriate to proceed with this request.

Juliet T. Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

----- Forwarded by Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV on 04/20/2007 11:54 AM -----

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV
04/19/2007 05:03 PM
To Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC 
cc "Jeannie Layson" <jlayson@eac.gov>

Subject Fraud Report

After much discussion today among the Commissioners would like you both to prepare an in depth overview of the work you did on this report. This would include all of the details of your work on the both the draft report and the final report adopted by the Commissioners. Jeannie has offered to help you in any way. I will discuss this further with each of you between now and tomorrow. I have been at the damn conference all day and have not been able to go to a single session or spend time with people. Thanks

Tom

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
I would very much like to explore the possibility of reconsidering the decision to release the Fraud Report. How can I get this on our agenda?

Rosemary E. Rodriguez
Commissioner
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-566-3104
Facsimile: 202-566-3127
www.eac.gov
rrodriguez@eac.gov
Pursuant to Commissioner Davidson's request, attached is the draft response to Tova Wang's lawyer.

Wang Ltr 17apr07.doc

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

THIS MESSAGE IS FOR ITS INTENDED RECIPIENT ONLY. IT IS A PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED TO A THIRD PARTY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SENDER.
This letter is in response to your April 16, 2007 inquiry in which you request that your client, Ms. Tova Wang, be authorized by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to discuss certain matters pertaining to her prior employment with the agency.

As I am sure you are aware, Ms. Wang was employed by the EAC under its authority to hire experts and consultants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §3109 (as implemented by 5 C.F.R. §304). As such, her agreement with the EAC created a limited employee/employer relationship. This is clearly stated in her contract. As an employee Ms. Wang has a duty to the Commission. Without direction from the EAC, Ms. Wang has no authority to speak for the EAC, release non-public information or discuss privileged matters with third parties. As you note in your letter, this concept is also clearly stated in her employment contract. The duties and responsibilities that come with Federal service are essential to the proper functioning of our government.

Ultimately, however, Ms. Wang’s responsibilities should not have a significant impact on her ability to discuss her personal opinions on voter fraud. Per her employment contract, the project she worked on was focused on collecting existing information, defining terms and proposing future research methodology so that EAC could conduct a future research project on voter fraud and intimidation. As a result, the information gathered by Ms. Wang and other EAC employees is nothing more than a collection of articles, books and opinions that are publicly available. In fact, the EAC has published much of this information as an attachment to the final report which is available on our Web site. Ms. Wang is free to provide her personal opinion on voter fraud to anyone she wishes. Her only limitation is in speaking for the EAC or releasing privileged documents or information.

If Ms. Wang has questions concerning specific requests for information, or is requested to speak
on behalf of the EAC, she may contact her prior supervisor, Ms. Peggy Sims at
assistance.

Sincerely,

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
Got it...thanks
Gavin advises me that we are required to have a FOIA reading room and so we will do that but may not want to admit that we haven't up to now.
Thanks
Tom
We have received your letter dated May 9, 2007, on behalf of your client, the Brennan Center for Justice ("Brennan Center"). We disagree with your client's perception that any EAC search of its records was unreasonable. While the Election Assistance Commission ("EAC") is a tiny agency and often struggles to meet the numerous requests it receives for agency documents, we take each request seriously and strive to be responsive. The EAC takes exception to the procedural, substantive and legal conclusions and representations made in your letter. We believe our search for records was conducted reasonably. Nevertheless, the EAC has decided that the best way to accommodate your request is to perform a new search for documents responsive to your request. We believe a new search will lay to rest your client's perception that our initial search was unreasonable.

The EAC has no desire to withhold information properly releasable under FOIA. Based upon the distribution of your letter, it is important for our agency to demonstrate its existing and continued policy of responsiveness by going beyond what is required and re-conducting the search that you allege was unreasonable. The EAC will essentially start over with regard to this request. As you know, Ms. Jeannie Layson has been in constant contact with Ms. Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center during...
the pendency of its FOIA request. In fact, Ms. Layson recently contacted Ms. Weiser to inform her that she had found additional responsive information in the course of EAC records reviews for similar requests for information. Additionally, Ms. Layson and Ms. Weiser were working together to provide any e-mail attachments or similar documents desired by the Brennan Center which were identified, but omitted in the original response. Due to the procedural and substantive confusion and disagreements surrounding this matter, we will terminate these piecemeal activities in order to prevent any future misunderstandings.

The EAC will conduct a second search and review of its documents. We will not charge the Brennan Center for the document collection, review or copying. For the purpose of clarity and to avoid any confusion, based upon the Brennan Center's previous requests it is seeking:

Also, I believe this is a great opportunity to address the larger audience by including our desire (if it exists) to improve EAC transparency by setting up - in the very near future - a FOIA reading room. I implore you to turn this correspondence into a progressive step for the agency! Rosemary Rodriguez
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
04/03/2007 06:22 PM

To  Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc  jthompson@eac.gov, klynndyson@eac.gov, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC

Subject  Re: Please review my responses

Julie has already raised the point that most concerned me: I don't think it is accurate to say the consultant's recommendations were their findings. The recommendations were a combination of consultant recommendations and working group recommendations for future EAC action. We did not ask the consultants to provide "findings" because this research was never supposed to be the definitive study on the subject. Instead, it was supposed to be an initial effort to see what relevant information is available, to define voting fraud and voter intimidation, and to make recommendations to EAC regarding how to pursue the subject (next steps). --- Peggy

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
04/03/2007 05:33 PM

To  psims@eac.gov, jthompson@eac.gov, klynndyson@eac.gov, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC

Subject  Please review my responses

This are questions from a "freelance" reporter who is very hot about the "Tova Wang report." Please let me know if my answers are accurate, and I welcome any suggestions you may have. I need to get your input by COB tomorrow. I am also looking for more clarification on what didn't make it into the fraud report. She is asking if we included all of their "findings" and their "research."

Thanks.

1) You said that the Wang/Serebrov report has not been released because it was predecisional. Was the Moritz/Eagleton report released because it was not predecisional? The Moritz/Eagleton report was a predecisional document. The commissioners took an action not to adopt a final report based upon the Moritz/Eagleton report, but to release all the predecisional information (the draft report).
2) I understood you to say that the December EAC report includes all of the Wang/Serebrov recommendations but not all of the Wang/Serebrov findings. Is that correct? The report does include all of their recommendations, which were their findings, and all of the research they conducted.

3) I understood you to say that EAC staff added results of their own research to the December EAC report. Is that correct? What I said was EAC staff reviewed the report for accuracy, for grammar and added language that reflected the commission's decision to adopt the final version based upon the initial research provided by the consultants.

4) If I'm correct on questions 2 and 3, would it be accurate to say that readers of the December report cannot tell how much of that report does and does not reflect the original Wang/Serebrov findings? The consultants' recommendations are their findings. All of the recommendations are included in the final report, so readers can make the determination regarding the recommendations.

5) I called earlier today requesting the Wang/Serebrov report, and you sent me the December EAC report. I am concerned that if I had not already been researching this closely, I would have thought that you'd sent me the Wang/Serebrov report and would have reported incorrectly that you had. Does the EAC have any comment on this manner of replying to press inquiries? (I contacted you to request the report after I read in the Statesman Journal of Salem, Oregon, an article by Marie Cocco that says: "The bipartisan commission didn't widely release the consultants' review, but makes it available on request." Did the EAC indeed give Ms. Cocco a copy of the "consultants' review"? Or has she misunderstood you in the way I'm concerned about?) I sent you a link to the "EAC report" because it is what was adopted by the commission based upon the research conducted by the consultants. The final report clearly states how it was compiled and includes bios for both of the consultants. Regarding Ms. Cocco, I explained the entire process to her. I provided the staff update on the project which was presented at a public meeting in May 2006 and the final report, which is posted on the EAC website. Regarding "this manner of responding to press inquiries," I have forwarded your comments to my supervisor so he can review my performance regarding the handling of your inquiry.

6) I understood you to say that the EAC did not release the Wang/Serebrov report in its original form because the EAC has to do due diligence and its staff is small. Do I understand you correctly? As a small agency of 23 employees, including the four commissioners, it is necessary for the agency to contract with consultants to gather the initial data for research projects. After EAC receives the initial data, the agency reviews the data for accuracy. What form of due diligence does the EAC's staff routinely conduct on research that is contracted out to experts before that research is released? You mentioned "vetting" the research. What does that vetting entail? It depends on the project. For instance, if it is information directly related to a mandate within the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), staff will make sure that the information is consistent with the law. In addition, we often ask for input from our Standards Board and Board of Advisors, which combined consist of more than 147 members. If we are using research that will eventually become guidance, we are required by HAVA to seek the input of these boards. Go here for more information about these boards and its members. If the board members have feedback, then we must make the determination whether to incorporate it, and, if so, how to incorporate their changes. If the research is focused on election laws throughout the country, we make sure the laws are cited correctly and that state legislatures haven't changed or amended these laws since the research was conducted. (As you probably know, there have been many new election laws introduced at the state level since 2004.) Throughout the
process, we review for grammar as well as make sure the document flows and is
arranged logically -- the basic tenets of editing.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
With regard to # 3 we did add our own research, because theirs was insufficient on the definition of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

On #6, you might want to include is written in a consistent voice. This might seem elementary, but not in this case. The comments about the boards may be confusing, here, since this was not vetted through those boards.

I am comfortable with the idea that their recommendations were their findings, although I am sure that Tova would disagree. These consultant/employees were asked to provide two things: 1) a definition of the phrases "voting fraud" and "voter intimidation" and 2) recommendations on a research methodology to conduct a comprehensive review in this area. To accomplish this, we asked them to review existing information on voting fraud and voter intimidation. They wholly failed to provide a definition -- they provided a compilation -- a statement which would cover every possible connotation of those phrases. No logic or limitation was applied. A definition is by its very nature a limitation. So, we had to completely rework that -- hence the additional research referred to above. We reviewed state laws concerning voting fraud and voter intimidation to come up with a definition of "voting crimes." With regard to the second part of their charge, the consultants, as well as their working group and some of the interviewees, provided recommendations. All 16 of them were included in the final report. We did not adopt all of them, obviously, but we did adopt all or part of 6 of those recommendations.

Other statements that were contained in the report were just that ... statements, summaries, or opinions ... concerning the existing research that was out there on this topic. I would not classify those as "findings."

Juliet T. Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV

Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
04/03/2007 05:33 PM
To psims@eac.gov, jthompson@eac.gov, klynndyson@eac.gov, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Please review my responses

This are questions from a "freelance" reporter who is very hot about the "Tova Wang report." Please let me know if my answers are accurate, and I welcome any suggestions you may have. I need to get your input by COB tomorrow. I am also looking for more clarification on what didn't make it into the fraud report. She is asking if we included all of their "findings" and their "research."

Thanks.
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1) You said that the Wang/Serebrov report has not been released because it was predecisional. Was the Moritz/Eagleton report released because it was not predecisional? The Moritz/Eagleton report was a predecisional document. The commissioners took an action not to adopt a final report based upon the Moritz/Eagleton report, but to release all the predecisional information (the draft report).

2) I understood you to say that the December EAC report includes all of the Wang/Serebrov recommendations but not all of the Wang/Serebrov findings. Is that correct? The report does include all of their recommendations, which were their findings, and all of the research they conducted.

3) I understood you to say that EAC staff added results of their own research to the December EAC report. Is that correct? What I said was EAC staff reviewed the report for accuracy, for grammar and added language that reflected the commission's decision to adopt the final version based upon the initial research provided by the consultants.

4) If I'm correct on questions 2 and 3, would it be accurate to say that readers of the December report cannot tell how much of that report does and does not reflect the original Wang/Serebrov findings? The consultants' recommendations are their findings. All of the recommendations are included in the final report, so readers can make the determination regarding the recommendations.

5) I called earlier today requesting the Wang/Serebrov report, and you sent me the December EAC report. I am concerned that if I had not already been researching this closely, I would have thought that you sent me the Wang/Serebrov report and would have reported incorrectly that you had. Does the EAC have any comment on this manner of responding to press inquiries? (I contacted you to request the report after I read in the Statesman Journal of Salem, Oregon, an article by Marie Cocco that says: "The bipartisan commission didn't widely release the consultants' review, but makes it available on request." Did the EAC indeed give Ms. Cocco a copy of the "consultants' review"? Or has she misunderstood you in the way I'm concerned about?) I sent you a link to the "EAC report" because it is what was adopted by the commission based upon the research conducted by the consultants. The final report clearly states how it was compiled and includes bios for both of the consultants. Regarding Ms. Cocco, I explained the entire process to her. I provided the staff update on the project which was presented at a public meeting in May 2006 and the final report, which is posted on the EAC website. Regarding "this manner of responding to press inquiries," I have forwarded your comments to my supervisor so he can review my performance regarding the handling of your inquiry.

6) I understood you to say that the EAC did not release the Wang/Serebrov report in its original form because the EAC has to do due diligence and its staff is small. Do I understand you correctly? As a small agency of 23 employees, including the four commissioners, it is necessary for the agency to contract with consultants to gather the initial data for research projects. After EAC receives the initial data, the agency reviews the data for accuracy. What form of due diligence does the EAC's staff routinely conduct on research that is contracted out to experts before that research is released? You mentioned "vetting" the research. What does that vetting entail? It depends on the project. For instance, if it is information directly related to a mandate within the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), staff will make sure that the information is consistent with the law. In addition, we often ask for input from our Standards Board and Board of Advisors, which combined consist of more
than 147 members. If we are using research that will eventually become
guidance, we are required by HAVA to seek the input of these boards. Go here
for more information about these boards and its members. If the board members
have feedback, then we must make the determination whether to incorporate it,
and, if so, how to incorporate their changes. If the research is focused on
election laws throughout the country, we make sure the laws are cited
correctly and that state legislatures haven't changed or amended these laws
since the research was conducted. (As you probably know, there have been many
new election laws introduced at the state level since 2004.) Throughtout the
process, we review for grammar as well as make sure the document flows and is
arranged logically -- the basic tenets of editing.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
This are questions from a "freelance" reporter who is very hot about the "Tova Wang report." Please let me know if my answers are accurate, and I welcome any suggestions you may have. I need to get your input by COB tomorrow. I am also looking for more clarification on what didn't make it into the fraud report. She is asking if we included all of their "findings" and their "research."

Thanks.

1) You said that the Wang/Serebrov report has not been released because it was predecisional. Was the Moritz/Eagleton report released because it was not predecisional? The Moritz/Eagleton report was a predecisional document. The commissioners took an action not to adopt a final report based upon the Moritz/Eagleton report, but to release all the predecisional information (the draft report).

2) I understood you to say that the December EAC report includes all of the Wang/Serebrov recommendations but not all of the Wang/Serebrov findings. Is that correct? The report does include all of their recommendations, which were their findings, and all of the research they conducted.

3) I understood you to say that EAC staff added results of their own research to the December EAC report. Is that correct? What I said was EAC staff reviewed the report for accuracy, for grammar and added language that reflected the commission's decision to adopt the final version based upon the initial research provided by the consultants.

4) If I'm correct on questions 2 and 3, would it be accurate to say that readers of the December report cannot tell how much of that report does and does not reflect the original Wang/Serebrov findings? The consultants' recommendations are their findings. All of the recommendations are included in the final report, so readers can make the determination regarding the recommendations.

5) I called earlier today requesting the Wang/Serebrov report, and you sent me the December EAC report. I am concerned that if I had not already been researching this closely, I would have thought that you'd sent me the Wang/Serebrov report and would have reported incorrectly that you had. Does the EAC have any comment on this manner of replying to press inquiries? (I contacted you to request the report after I read in the Statesman Journal of Salem, Oregon, an article by Marie Cocco that says: "The bipartisan commission didn't widely release the consultants' review, but makes it available on request." Did the EAC indeed give Ms. Cocco a copy of the "consultants' review"? Or has she misunderstood you in the way I'm concerned about?) I sent you a link to the "EAC report" because it is what was adopted by the commission based upon the research conducted by the consultants. The final report clearly states how it was compiled and includes bios for both of the consultants. Regarding Ms. Cocco, I explained the entire process to her. I provided the staff update on the project which was presented at a public meeting in May 2006 and the final report, which is posted on the EAC website.
Regarding "this manner of responding to press inquiries," I have forwarded your comments to my supervisor so he can review my performance regarding the handling of your inquiry.

6) I understood you to say that the EAC did not release the Wang/Serebrov report in its original form because the EAC has to do due diligence and its staff is small. Do I understand you correctly? As a small agency of 23 employees, including the four commissioners, it is necessary for the agency to contract with consultants to gather the initial data for research projects. After EAC receives the initial data, the agency reviews the data for accuracy. What form of due diligence does the EAC's staff routinely conduct on research that is contracted out to experts before that research is released? You mentioned "vetting" the research. What does that vetting entail? It depends on the project. For instance, if it is information directly related to a mandate within the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), staff will make sure that the information is consistent with the law. In addition, we often ask for input from our Standards Board and Board of Advisors, which combined consist of more than 147 members. If we are using research that will eventually become guidance, we are required by HAVA to seek the input of these boards. Go here for more information about these boards and its members. If the board members have feedback, then we must make the determination whether to incorporate it, and, if so, how to incorporate their changes. If the research is focused on election laws throughout the country, we make sure the laws are cited correctly and that state legislatures haven't changed or amended these laws since the research was conducted. (As you probably know, there have been many new election laws introduced at the state level since 2004.) Throughout the process, we review for grammar as well as make sure the document flows and is arranged logically -- the basic tenets of editing.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
Where's the Voter Fraud?

Over the past month, the silence has been deafening.

For the past few years, many on the Right have been vociferously propagating the myth that voter fraud at the polling place is a rampant problem of crisis proportions. But we haven’t heard from them lately. In fact, as far as my research can discover (Nexis and Google news searches of multiple relevant terms), there has not been one confirmed report of any of these types of incidents in the 2006 election. Not one. Even the Republican National Committee’s vote fraud watch operation in their list of complaints from the 2006 election could not come up with one such case.

If you’ve been listening to the likes of John Fund, Thor Hearne, Ken Mehlman, and John Lott, you would think non-citizens are lining up to vote at the polls, mischievous partisans are voting multiple times by impersonating other voters, and dead people are voting in polling places across the country. In order to justify their argument that we need all voters to present government issued photo identification at the polls, they claim that this type of fraud is the biggest problem our electoral system confronts. They have been building and building this argument, hammering and hammering away at it to the point that it has now become the prevailing belief of the American public.

I won’t go into the recitation of all of the previous research that has been done on what a nonexistent problem polling place fraud is and the fraudulent disenfranchisement narrow voter identification requirements cause among perfectly eligible voters—disproportionately minorities, the poor, the elderly, and voters with disabilities (who by the way, according to conventional wisdom, are also all disproportionately Democratic voters). However, confronted with this continuously growing mountain of evidence undermining their case, it has been interesting to observe the evolution of the Right’s spinning of this issue of late.

In recent months, even before this election, slowly recognizing the remarkable weakness of their substantive argument, conservatives’ new tack has been to say that even if its true that there is not much polling place fraud, the simple fact that the American people believe it is occurring is a problem itself in that it is causing them to lose confidence in the election system. Well, no wonder they have the misguided belief that this is a problem— that’s the message the Right has been hammering away at them over the last few years. In any case, the argument goes that we need identification requirements not because they will in actuality do anything to enhance the integrity of the voting process, but because we need to reassure people who have the perception the process is corrupt.

Let me provide just a few examples of this. In their answer in the identification litigation in Indiana, the state outright admitted that there had never been a single, solitary case of polling place fraud in the history of the state. Nevertheless, the state argued. A state may take action to avoid the appearance of fraud as well as its actual occurrence. A Rasmussen Report poll found that 58% of Americans believed that there was a lot or some fraud in American elections, and a Gallup poll after the 2000 election showed that 67% of adults nationally had only some or very little confidence in the way votes are cast and counted in our country. Public perceptions, grounded on publicly reported evidence of fraud such as
that identified above [by the people I mentioned earlier] are a further justification for fraud prevention requirements like Indiana’s photo ID law.

During the argument over photo identification before the Supreme Court in Michigan, the assistant attorney general conceded there is no evidence of widespread voter fraud but rather “a concern about it.” The esteemed Carter-Baker Commission wrote http://www.brennancenter.org/stack_detail.asp?key=97&subkey=9857, “There is no evidence of extensive fraud in US elections or of multiple voting . . . but the electoral system cannot inspire confidence if no safeguards exist to deter or detect fraud or confirm the identity of voters . . . . The problem is not the magnitude of fraud . . . the perception of possible fraud contributes to low confidence in the system.”

The Supreme Court may even be starting to buy into this rhetoric. In the recent Purcell case regarding Arizona’s identification law, Justice Kennedy wrote, “Confidence in the integrity of our electoral processes is essential to the functioning of our participatory democracy. Voter fraud drives honest citizens out of the democratic process and breeds distrust of our government. Voters who fear their legitimate votes will be outweighed by fraudulent ones will feel disenfranchised.”

Georgia has twice passed voter identification requirements, in 1997 and 2005, basing the need for such barriers to the vote on instances of vote buying and absentee ballot fraud— two methods of voting that identification would do nothing about. More myths.

Basing voting rights laws upon purposely created misunderstandings of what the issues are is not a sound way to develop public policy. Rather than creating fake problems and then passing disenfranchising laws that purport to address them, we might do a better job of educating the American electorate as to what the real problems are in our voting system, and what they are not. It is only then that we will begin to address the flaws in the election systems that disenfranchise tens of thousands of voters in every major election.

Tora Wang is a Democracy Fellow at The Century Foundation.

The Century Foundation conducts public policy research and analyses of economic, social, and foreign policy issues, including inequality, retirement security, election reform, media studies, homeland security, and international affairs. The foundation produces books, reports, and other publications, convenes task forces, and working groups and operates eight informational Web sites. With offices in New York City and Washington, D.C., The Century Foundation is nonprofit and nonpartisan and was founded in 1919 by Edward A. Filene.
March 15, 2007

Congressman Jose Serrano, Chairman
House Appropriations Committee
Subcommittee on Financial Services
And General Government
2227 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Via Hand Delivery

RE: Documents requested during March 7, 2007 Hearing

Dear Chairman Serrano:

On March 7, 2007, the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) participated in a hearing on the issue of election integrity. During that hearing, Congressman Hinchey, a member of your subcommittee, requested that certain documents be provided to the Committee. We appreciate the Committee's interest in EAC’s activities, and we are pleased to respond to the request. Congressman Hinchey requested three documents: EAC’s assessment report on CIBER, Inc., the draft report submitted to EAC regarding voter fraud and intimidation, and the draft report submitted to EAC concerning voter identification. For your information, the assessment report on CIBER, Inc. and the final culmination of the voter fraud and intimidation research – Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Further Study -- are available at www.eac.gov. However, we have provided hard copies of these reports as well as the additional information requested.

Assessment Report for CIBER, Inc.

The first requested document was the report of EAC’s contracted laboratory assessor concerning the assessment and review of CIBER, Inc. under EAC’s Interim Laboratory Accreditation Program. It is important to explain the purpose and process of EAC’s Interim Accreditation Program, which was put in place after the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) informed EAC that it would not complete its lab assessments until late 2006 or early 2007.

HAVA Accreditation Program Requirement. As you know, the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (Section 231(a)(1)) mandates EAC “... provide for the certification, decertification and re-certification of voting system hardware and software by accredited laboratories.” Additionally, the statute provides that laboratories are generally to be accredited in a two step process. First, NIST conducts an evaluation of independent non-Federal test laboratories. NIST selects those laboratories technically qualified to test voting systems to federal standards (2002 Voting System Standards and 2005 Voluntary
Voting System Guidelines currently) and recommends them to EAC for accreditation. NIST has determined that it will utilize its preexisting National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program (NVLAP) to perform its HAVA evaluation. Second, after receipt of NIST’s recommendation, HAVA requires EAC issue a laboratory accreditation through a vote of its commissioners. As part of this process, EAC will conduct a review of its own to address non-technical issues such as conflict of interest, financial stability and recordkeeping.

HAVA required that NIST deliver its first set of recommended labs to the EAC “[n]ot later than 6 months after the Commission first adopts the voluntary voting system guidelines.” This deadline passed in June 2006. Four laboratories applied to NIST for evaluation prior to the HAVA deadline, but the required technical reviews and on-site assessments were not completed by the deadline. The first set of NIST recommended laboratories were not received by the EAC until January 18, 2007.

The Need for EAC Interim Accreditation of Laboratories. Obviously, the need for EAC to provide accredited laboratories arose well before NIST’s January 18 recommendation. First, towards the end of 2005 NIST informed the EAC that the expected timeline to complete required document collection and review, pre-assessment and formal on-site assessments of applicants made it highly unlikely that it would be able to provide a list of recommended laboratories before the end of 2006. This determination made it clear that the EAC would need to have an alternative process in place to provide accredited laboratories if it wished to implement its certification program before that time. Furthermore, in July of 2006, the National Association of State Election Directors (NASED) informed EAC that the organization was terminating its voting system qualification program. NASED is a non-governmental, private organization that accredited laboratories and qualified voting systems to federal standards for more than a decade. The organization’s decision to terminate its voting system qualification program just before the 2006 general election required EAC to take immediate action. Without an entity to approve required voting system modifications for the 2006 election, some state election officials would be unable to field their HAVA-compliant systems. To address these situations, EAC was compelled to do two things (1) provide for interim accreditation of testing laboratories and (2) initiate a preliminary, pre-election phase of its voting system testing and certification program.

The pre-election phase of EAC’s certification program was not originally planned, but was ultimately required to serve election officials and the public. The program began on July 24, 2006. The purpose of the pre-election phase of the program is to provide voting system manufacturers with a means to obtain a Federal Certification of voting system modifications during the vital period immediately prior to the November 2006 General Elections. Many states require a Federal or national certification as a condition of state certification. Historically, the three to four month period immediately preceding a General Election produces a number of emergent situations that require the prompt modification of voting systems. These changes are often required by state or local election officials and must be made prior to Election Day. To this end, the pre-election phase of the EAC’s Certification Program is designed to meet the immediate needs of election officials from the date NASED terminated its qualification program until after the November General Election. The pre-election requirements of the certification program are narrowly tailored to meet these needs. Additionally, the pre-election phase of the program was drastically limited in
EAC needed to provide accredited labs on a temporary, interim basis to ensure that the agency had the means to implement its certification program. Additionally, EAC would be compelled to implement a provisional, pre-election certification program to replace services offered by NASED. EAC could not wait for NIST to recommend laboratories. Fortunately, HAVA provided a mechanism for EAC to take such action in Section 231(b)(2)(B). This section requires that EAC publish an explanation when accrediting a laboratory without a NIST recommendation. A notice was published on EAC's Web site to satisfy this requirement.

**EAC's Interim Accreditation Program.** At a public meeting in August 2005 held in Denver, the commissioners received a staff recommendation outlining the details of the interim accreditation program. The staff recommendation included a process in which the three laboratories previously accredited by NASED – CIBER, SysTest Labs, and Wyle Laboratories – would be allowed to apply for interim accreditation. In December of 2005, EAC officially began accepting applications for a limited interim accreditation program. As stated in the letters, the purpose of the interim accreditation program was to provide accredited laboratories to test voting systems to federal standards, until such time as NIST/NVLAP was able to present its first set of recommended laboratories. This accreditation was limited in scope to the 2002 Voluntary Voting System Standards and required the laboratory to apply to the NVLAP program to receive a permanent accreditation. The letters also sought variety of administrative information from the laboratories and required them to sign a Certification of Laboratory Conditions and Practices. This certification required the laboratories to affirm, under penalty of law, information regarding laboratory personnel, conflict of interest policies, recordkeeping, financial stability, technical capabilities, contractors, and material changes.

In order to accredit a laboratory (even on an interim basis), EAC needed to contract with a competent technical expert to serve as a laboratory assessor. EAC sought a qualified assessor with real-world experience in the testing of voting systems. Ultimately, only one individual responded to EAC's solicitation. The individual was (at the time) the only individual known to have the requisite experience and assessor qualifications. The contractor reviewed each of the laboratories that applied. The review was performed in accordance with international standards, the same standards used by NVLAP and other laboratory accreditation bodies. This standard is known as International Standard ISO/IEC 17025, *General Requirements for the Competence of Testing and Calibration Laboratories*. In addition, the EAC assessor (who also currently serves as a NVLAP assessor) applied NIST Handbooks 150, *Procedures and General Requirements* and NIST Handbook 150-22, *Voting System Testing*.

CIBER, SysTest Labs, and Wyle Laboratories applied for accreditation under the interim program. Each, as required, had previously received a NASED accreditation. EAC's
assessor visited each of the labs and conducted a review consistent with the standards noted above. The assessor reviewed laboratory policies, procedures and capabilities to determine if the laboratories could perform the work required. Laboratory assessments do not make conclusions regarding past laboratory work product. Two of the applicant laboratories, SysTest Laboratories, L.L.C., and Wyle Laboratories, Inc. received an interim accreditation. The assessor’s reports and EAC action regarding these laboratories are available on the EAC Web site.² EAC promptly published on its Web site information regarding its decision on accreditation (August and September of 2006). This notice provides some brief background on the interim accreditation process, starting with the fact that three previously NASED accredited laboratories were invited to apply to the program, including information on the program’s requirements and limitations and ending with the identity and contact information of the two laboratories accredited. Information was also electronically forwarded to EAC’s list of stakeholders via e-mail. The EAC stakeholders e-mail list includes almost 900 election officials and interest groups, nationwide. Staff members for EAC oversight and appropriations committees are included in this list of stakeholders. In addition to EAC’s Web site and e-mail announcements, on September 21, 2006 EAC’s Executive Director reiterated the Commission’s decision at a public meeting Web cast to the EAC Web site. This announcement identified the interim accredited labs by name. Furthermore, in October 26, 2006, the two interim accredited laboratories testified at a nationally televised public hearing.

The Interim Accreditation Program and CIBER. The third laboratory, CIBER, has yet to satisfy the requirements of the interim accreditation program. The initial assessment of CIBER revealed a number of management, procedural and policy deficiencies that required remedial action before the laboratory could be considered for accreditation. These deficiencies are identified in the initial CIBER/Wyle report. They were also brought to the attention of CIBER’s President of Federal Solutions in a letter from EAC’s Executive Director dated September 15, 2006. The letter outlines, consistent with recommendation of EAC’s assessor, the steps the laboratory must take to achieve compliance. The letter requires CIBER to:

a. Assign resources, adopt policies and implement systems for developing standardized tests to be used in evaluating the functionality of voting systems and voting system software. Neither ITA Practices, CIBER nor any of its partners will be permitted to rely on test plans suggested by a voting system manufacturer.

b. Assign resources, adopt policies and implement systems for quality review and control of all tests performed on voting systems and the report of results from those tests. This shall include provisions to assure that all

² Note: The Wyle and CIBER assessment was completed as a joint report. The two labs have a cooperative agreement to work together in test voting systems (Wyle performing hardware testing and CIBER software testing).
required tests have been performed by ITA Practices, CIBER or its accredited partner lab.

Finally, the letter required an additional “follow-up” assessment of the laboratory.

The follow-up assessment of CIBER was performed by EAC’s assessor in December of 2006. The findings of this assessment were documented in a report, which is available on the EAC Web site. In the findings, the assessor recognized significant changes CIBER had made to its program in response to the initial assessment, including new policies regarding test procedures, management and personnel. The report also noted a number of non-conformities that had yet to be addressed by the laboratory.

In a letter dated January 3, 2007, CIBER provided a written response to EAC’s follow-up assessment and report. The response sought to address the deficiencies noted in the December assessment. Additionally, CIBER officials requested to meet with EAC staff to discuss their January 3 response. This meeting took place at EAC on January 10, 2007. At the meeting, EAC staff informed CIBER that their report could not serve as the basis of accreditation because it failed to resolve all outstanding issues. A number of CIBER responses to noted deficiencies were listed as “TBD.” EAC’s assessor and Certification Program Director formally reviewed CIBER’s response. EAC provided CIBER notice of the deficiencies that remained outstanding and informed them of the steps they must take to come into compliance by a letter dated February 1, 2007. Due to the fact that the purpose and usefulness of the interim accreditation program is coming to a close, EAC allowed CIBER 30 days in which to document their full compliance. After this time, the program will be closed and no further assessment actions will be performed under the interim program. CIBER was notified of this procedure by letter dated January 26, 2007, and on February 8, 2007, EAC voted to close its interim laboratory accreditation program effective March 5, 2007.

Information related to CIBER’s status in the EAC interim accreditation program was not released prior to January 26, 2007. It was EAC’s belief, in consultation with NIST, that it would be improper to release information regarding an incomplete assessment. However, on January 25, 2007, CIBER took the affirmative action of making this information available to a third party, the New York State Board of Elections. With this action, CIBER made the information public and EAC believed it was incumbent to provide this information to the public. As such, on January 26, 2007, EAC posted on its Web site assessment reports, correspondence, and responses from CIBER related to their progress in the EAC interim accreditation program.

Copies of the two reports issued by the EAC assessor concerning CIBER’s laboratory accreditation assessments are attached as Appendixes 1 and 2 to this letter.
Draft Voter Fraud and Voter Intimidation Report

The second document requested by Congressman Hinchey was the draft report prepared by Job Serebrov and Tova Wang as contracted employees to the EAC. This document was produced by contract employees of the EAC for the EAC. Thus, this draft report was and is considered predecisional under the deliberative process exemption to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

As you may know, the Deliberative Process Privilege protects intra-agency documents that are (1) pre-decisional in nature and (2) part of the deliberative process. In other words, the documents must be part of a process that recommends or presents opinions on a policy matter or governmental decision before that matter is finally decided. It is a well settled matter of law that the work of contract employees and contractors ("consultants") constitute intra-agency documents. This is true even where the consultants are deemed to be independent contractors and are not subject to the degree of control that agency employment entails. The courts have made this determination after recognizing that agencies have a special need for the opinions and recommendations of temporary consultants. Ultimately, deliberative documents are exempt from release (1) to encourage open and frank discussions on policy matters between agency subordinates and superiors, (2) to protect against premature disclosure of proposed policies and (3) to protect against public confusion that might result from disclosure of rationales that were not in fact the ultimate basis for agency action.

The report requested by Congressman Hinchey is a draft, representing one phase of the deliberative process—before the document was vetted by staff, approved by the Executive Director and reviewed and approved by the Commissioners (the relevant policy makers). Ultimately, the draft document was created by contract employees in order to aid the EAC's Commissioners in their decisions regarding voting fraud and voter intimidation. The contract employees had no personal interest in their submissions and had no agency decision-making authority. Each was tasked with simply providing pre-decisional research and information to the EAC. Their efforts were limited to creating a truthful, comprehensive, and unbiased draft report. Only when the report is finalized and is adopted by EAC does it constitute an EAC decision or a policy determination.

The determination of this document as predecisional is born out in the facts surrounding the project at issue, including the contract documents that gave rise to research and writing of this draft report. First, the voter fraud and intimidation study that

---

4 Klamath, at 10.
5 Hoover, 611 F.2d at 1138.
6 NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 41 U.S. at 151.
was requested is a draft of a final document that has already been released after being vetted by staff and approved by the EAC Commissioners. It is available in its final form on EAC's Web site, www.eac.gov. The draft document at issue was created by two contract employees hired pursuant to 5 U.S.C. §3109 (see 42 U.S.C. §15324(b)). Individuals hired under this authority enter into an employment relationship with the EAC. The contract employees were supervised by an EAC program director who participated directly in the project. For example, the supervisor approved, facilitated, scheduled and participated in interviews conducted for the project. Further, the contract employees were provided research materials and other support from EAC law clerks and staff. As stated by their contracts, these consultants were hired so that the EAC could “…obtain consulting services from an individual who can provide advice drawn from broad professional and technical experience in the area of voter fraud and intimidation.” Moreover, the contracts clearly forbid the consultants from releasing the draft they created consistent with the privilege covering the draft report. The contract states

All research, information, documents and any other intellectual property (including but not limited to policies, procedures, manuals, and other work created at the request or otherwise while laboring for the EAC) shall be owned exclusively by the EAC, including copyright. All such work product shall be turned over to the EAC upon completion of your appointment term or as directed by the EAC. The EAC shall have exclusive rights over this material. You may not release government information or documents without the express written permission of the EAC.

Finally, the purpose or subject of the draft report at issue was to make an EAC determination on how voter fraud should be studied by the agency. This was to be done by (1) assessing the nature and quality of the information that presently exists on the subject matter, (2) defining the terms and scope of EAC study as proposed by HAVA, (3) determining what is to be studied and (4) determining how it is to be studied. In addition, the Consultants were asked to develop a definition of the phrases “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation.”

EAC’s interpretation of HAVA and its determination of what it will study and how it will use its resources to study it are matters of agency policy and decision. It would be irresponsible for EAC to accept the product of contracted employees and publish that information without exercising due diligence in vetting the product of the employees’ work and the veracity of the information used to produce that product. EAC conducted this review of the draft voter fraud and intimidation report provided by Ms. Wang and Mr. Serebrov. EAC found that the draft report failed to provide a definition of the terms as required, contained conclusions that were not sought under the terms of the contract or were not supported by the underlying research, and allegations that showed bias. EAC staff edited the draft report to correct the problems mentioned above and included all of the consultants’ and working groups’ recommendations. The final report was adopted by EAC on December 7, 2007 during its public meeting. The final report as well as all of
the underlying research conducted by Mr. Serebrov and Ms. Wang are available on EAC’s Web site, www.eac.gov.

EAC understands and appreciates that the request from a Congressional committee is exempt from the provisions of FOIA, and as such, EAC is providing this draft document despite the fact that the deliberative process exemption clearly applies to its contents. The draft report has been attached as Appendix 3 to this letter.

**Draft Voter Identification Report**

The third document requested is the draft report prepared by Rutgers University in conjunction with Moritz College of Law. Rutgers and Moritz served as contractors to EAC and produced this draft document pursuant to the provisions of the contract governing that relationship. This draft report, like the draft voter fraud and voter intimidation report, is predecisional under the deliberative process exemption to FOIA.

With regard to the Voter Identification draft report, it was created by Rutgers University in conjunction with the Moritz College of Law (Ohio State University) to “...provide research assistance to the EAC for the development of voluntary guidance on provisional voting and voting identification procedures.” The stated objective of the contract was to:

> ...obtain assistance with the collection, analysis and interpretation of information regarding HAVA provisional voting and voter identification requirements for the purpose of drafting guidance on these topics... The anticipated outcome of this activity is the generation of concrete policy recommendations to be issued as voluntary guidance for States.

As with the voter fraud and intimidation study mentioned above, the contractors were provided guidance, information, and were directed by EAC personnel. The final product they delivered (draft report sought) was identified as “a guidance document for EAC adoption.” Clearly, as noted by the contract, the issuance of Federal guidance to states is a matter of government policy and limited to official EAC action. EAC has not completed review and vetting of this document. However, initial review of this document reveals data and analysis that causes EAC concern. The Contractor used a single election’s statistics to conduct this analysis. The two sets of data came from the Census Bureau and included persons who were not eligible to and did not vote. The first analysis using averaged county-level turnout data from the U.S. Census showed no statistically significant correlations. So, a second analysis using a data set based upon the Current Population Survey (which was self-reported and showed a significantly higher turnout rate than other conventional data) was conducted that produced only some evidence of correlation between voter identification requirements and turn out. Furthermore, the initial categorization of voter identification requirements included classifications that actually require no identification at all, such as “state your name.” The research methodology and the statistical analysis used by the Contractor were questioned by independent working and peer review groups comprised of social scientists.
and statisticians. The Contractor and the EAC agree that the report raises more questions than provides answers. After this review process is completed, EAC will make a decision whether to adopt or reject the draft report.

Again, recognizing that a request from a Congressional committee is exempt from the provisions of FOIA, EAC is providing this draft document despite the fact that the deliberative process exemption clearly applies to its contents. The draft report has been attached as Appendix 4 to this letter.

Thank you for your requests and your interest in election administration. If you have further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Donetta Davidson
Chair

cc: Congressmen Maurice Hinchey (letter only)

---

After much discussion today among the Commissioners would like you both to prepare an in depth overview of the work you did on this report. This would include all of the details of your work on the both the draft report and the final report adopted by the Commissioners, Jeannie has offered to help you in any way. I will discuss this further with each of you between now and tomorrow. I have been at the damn conference all day and have not been able to go to a single session or spend time with people.

Thanks

Tom

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
I discussed this with Julie last evening and again this morning and agree with her comments. I believe both the IG review and our responses to Senator Finestein’s letter covers a great deal of what we were asking them to do.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Juliet E. Hodgkins

----- Original Message -----
From: Juliet E. Hodgkins
Sent: 04/20/2007 12:14 PM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Rosemary Rodriguez; Thomas Wilkey; Margaret Sims; Jeannie Layson
Cc: Gavin Gilmour
Subject: Fw: Fraud Report

Commissioners & Tom,

After having received this request, reviewed it and discussed it with the Inspector General and Gavin, I believe that it is ill-advised to continue such a request in light of the pending investigation of this matter by the Inspector General. While I am certain that this was not the intent of this request, the inevitable appearance of this request would suggest that the Commission is seeking to influence an ongoing investigation of the IG. This appearance of inappropriate influence would arise because two employees, who will undoubtedly be contacted by and interviewed as a part of the ongoing IG investigation, are being asked to provide a statement to their supervisors prior to interviews of those persons by the IG. Furthermore, this situation could appear as an attempt by employees and/or the agency to collude on a statement prior to making a formal statement in the investigation of the IG.

This IG’s investigation was requested to address issues of public perception. Thus, it is critical that this investigation proceed in a manner that leaves no room for question. As such, I believe that it is inappropriate to proceed with this request.

Juliet T. Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

----- Forwarded by Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV on 04/20/2007 11:54 AM -----

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV
04/19/2007 05:03 PM

To: Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
Cc: "Jeannie Layson" <jlayson@eac.gov>

Subject: Fraud Report

After much discussion today among the Commissioners would like you both to prepare an in depth
overview of the work you did on this report. This would include all of the details of your work on the both the draft report and the final report adopted by the Commissioners, Jeannie has offered to help you in any way. I will discuss this further with each of you between now and tomorrow. I have been at the damn conference all day and have not been able to go to a single session or spend time with people. Thanks Tom

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Sure thing... not sure I fully understand the ultimate goal concerning the document.

GG

Gavin S. Gilmour  
Deputy General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3100

I would like to talk to you about this request when I get in. I am particularly interested in your thoughts on how this impacts atty-client privilege.

--------------------
From: Thomas R. Wilkey  
Sent: 04/19/2007 05:03 PM EDT  
To: Juliet Hodgkins; Margaret Sims  
Cc: Jeannie Layson  
Subject: Fraud Report

After much discussion today among the Commissioners would like you both to prepare an in depth overview of the work you did on this report.  
This would include all of the details of your work on the both the draft report and the final report adopted by the Commissioners, Jeannie has offered to help you in any way.  
I will discuss this further with each of you between now and tomorrow.  
I have been at the damn conference all day and have not been able to go to a single session or spend time with people.  
Thanks  
Tom

--------------------

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Commissioners & Tom,

After having received this request, reviewed it and discussed it with the Inspector General and Gavin, I believe that it is ill-advised to continue such a request in light of the pending investigation of this matter by the Inspector General. While I am certain that this was not the intent of this request, the inevitable appearance of this request would suggest that the Commission is seeking to influence an ongoing investigation of the IG. This appearance of inappropriate influence would arise because two employees, who will undoubtedly be contacted by and interviewed as a part of the ongoing IG investigation, are being asked to provide a statement to their supervisors prior to interviews of those persons by the IG. Furthermore, this situation could appear as an attempt by employees and/or the agency to collude on a statement prior to making a formal statement in the investigation of the IG.

This IG's investigation was requested to address issues of public perception. Thus, it is critical that this investigation proceed in a manner that leaves no room for question. As such, I believe that it is inappropriate to proceed with this request.

Juliet T. Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
--- Forwarded by Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV on 04/20/2007 11:54 AM ---

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV
04/19/2007 05:03 PM

After much discussion today among the Commissioners would like you both to prepare an in depth overview of the work you did on this report. This would include all of the details of your work on the both the draft report and the final report adopted by the Commissioners, Jeannie has offered to help you in any way. I will discuss this further with each of you between now and tomorrow. I have been at the damn conference all day and have not been able to go to a single session or spend time with people. Thanks

Tom

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
My understanding is that Jeannie requested that Peggy provide a complete recitation of what happened and then Gracia said that I should do the same.

----------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Gavin S. Gilmour
----- Original Message ----- 

From: Gavin S. Gilmour
Sent: 04/20/2007 08:21 AM EDT
To: Juliet Hodgkins
Subject: Re: Fw: Fraud Report

Sure thing... not sure I fully understand the ultimate goal concerning the document.

GG

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

THIS MESSAGE IS FOR ITS INTENDED RECIPIENT ONLY. IT IS A PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED TO A THIRD PARTY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SENDER.

I would like to talk to you about this request when I get in. I am particularly interested in your thoughts on how this impacts atty-client privilege.

----------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Thomas R. Wilkey
----- Original Message ----- 

From: Thomas R. Wilkey
Sent: 04/19/2007 05:03 PM EDT
To: Juliet Hodgkins; Margaret Sims
Cc: Jeannie Layson
Subject: Fraud Report
After much discussion today among the Commissioners would like you both to prepare an in depth overview of the work you did on this report.
This would include all of the details of your work on the both the draft report and the final report adopted by the Commissioners, Jeannie has offered to help you in any way.
I will discuss this further with each of you between now and tomorrow.
I have been at the damn conference all day and have not been able to go to a single session or spend time with people.
Thanks
Tom

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
I discussed this with Julie last evening and again this morning and agree with her comments. I believe both the IG review and our responses to Senator Finestein's letter covers a great deal of what we were asking them to do.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Juliet E. Hodgkins

----- Original Message -----
From: Juliet E. Hodgkins
Sent: 04/20/2007 12:14 PM EDT
To: Donetta Davidson; Gracia Hillman; Caroline Hunter; Rosemary Rodriguez; Thomas Wilkey; Margaret Sims; Jeannie Layson
Cc: Gavin Gilmour
Subject: Fw: Fraud Report

Commissioners & Tom,

After having received this request, reviewed it and discussed it with the Inspector General and Gavin, I believe that it is ill-advised to continue such a request in light of the pending investigation of this matter by the Inspector General. While I am certain that this was not the intent of this request, the inevitable appearance of this request would suggest that the Commission is seeking to influence an ongoing investigation of the IG. This appearance of inappropriate influence would arise because two employees, who will undoubtedly be contacted by and interviewed as a part of the ongoing IG investigation, are being asked to provide a statement to their supervisors prior to interviews of those persons by the IG. Furthermore, this situation could appear as an attempt by employees and/or the agency to collude on a statement prior to making a formal statement in the investigation of the IG.

This IG's investigation was requested to address issues of public perception. Thus, it is critical that this investigation proceed in a manner that leaves no room for question. As such, I believe that it is inappropriate to proceed with this request.

Juliet T. Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

----- Forwarded by Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV on 04/20/2007 11:54 AM ----

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV
04/19/2007 05:03 PM

To: Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
Cc: "Jeannie Layson" <jlayson@eac.gov>
Subject: Fraud Report

After much discussion today among the Commissioners would like you both to prepare an in-depth
overview of the work you did on this report. This would include all of the details of your work on the both the draft report and the final report adopted by the Commissioners, Jeannie has offered to help you in any way. I will discuss this further with each of you between now and tomorrow. I have been at the damn conference all day and have not been able to go to a single session or spend time with people. Thanks Tom

------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Sure thing... not sure I fully understand the ultimate goal concerning the document.

GG

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

THIS MESSAGE IS FOR ITS INTENDED RECIPIENT ONLY. IT IS A PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED TO A THIRD PARTY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SENDER.

I would like to talk to you about this request when I get in. I am particularly interested in your thoughts on how this impacts atty-client privilege.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Thomas R. Wilkey

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Thomas R. Wilkey
Sent: 04/19/2007 05:03 PM EDT
To: Juliet Hodgkins; Margaret Sims
Cc: Jeannie Layson
Subject: Fraud Report

After much discussion today among the Commissioners would like you both to prepare an in depth overview of the work you did on this report. This would include all of the details of your work on the both the draft report and the final report adopted by the Commissioners, Jeannie has offered to help you in any way. I will discuss this further with each of you between now and tomorrow. I have been at the damn conference all day and have not been able to go to a single session or spend time with people. Thanks
Tom
Ok

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Juliet E. Hodgkins
----- Original Message -----

From: Juliet E. Hodgkins
Sent: 04/19/2007 07:53 PM EDT
To: Thomas Wilkey
Subject: Re: Fraud Report

I understand. However, this is less of a request and more of a demand. Sorry, but we need to talk about a few things before tomorrow.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Thomas R. Wilkey
----- Original Message -----

From: Thomas R. Wilkey
Sent: 04/19/2007 07:51 PM EDT
To: Juliet Hodgkins
Subject: Re: Fraud Report

Ok if I can still talk..mi had to put hope with these three for the entire day

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Juliet E. Hodgkins
----- Original Message -----

From: Juliet E. Hodgkins
Sent: 04/19/2007 07:50 PM EDT
To: Thomas Wilkey
Subject: Re: Fraud Report

Please call me at home after your dinner.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Thomas R. Wilkey
----- Original Message -----

From: Thomas R. Wilkey
Sent: 04/19/2007 05:03 PM EDT
To: Juliet Hodgkins; Margaret Sims
Cc: Jeannie Layson
Subject: Fraud Report

After much discussion today among the Commissioners would like you both to prepare an in depth overview of the work you did on this report. This would include all of the details of your work on the both the draft report and the final report adopted.
by the Commissioners, Jeannie has offered to help you in any way.
I will discuss this further with each of you between now and tomorrow.
I have been at the damn conference all day and have not been able to go to a single session or spend
time with people.
Thanks
Tom

-----------------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Perhaps they could simply submit a supporting statement with the number of hours that they worked.

Juliet E. Thompson  
General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3100  
Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV

Julie,

FYI (see below)

I am thinking that Job and Tova will have to resubmit their invoice (maybe we should call them time sheets) and include a summary of their hours worked.

Your thoughts.

GG

Gavin S. Gilmour
Associate General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

----- Forwarded by Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV on 11/02/2005 01:12 PM -----
When do you think everything will be finalized and did you find out how long it will take to get paid for the Oct 25 invoice?

By the way, I think you and Julie gave me your colds.

Job

--- ggilmour@eac.gov wrote:

> Job,
> > Per GSA Finance, the Federal Government does not have tax liability on
> > Personal Services Contracts. You will be issued a 1099 and be responsible for paying the required taxes.
> >
> > Gavin S. Gilmour
> > Associate General Counsel
> > United States Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
> > Washington, DC 20005
> > (202) 566-3100
Commissioners & Tom,

After having received this request, reviewed it and discussed it with the Inspector General and Gavin, I believe that it is ill-advised to continue such a request in light of the pending investigation of this matter by the Inspector General. While I am certain that this was not the intent of this request, the inevitable appearance of this request would suggest that the Commission is seeking to influence an ongoing investigation of the IG. This appearance of inappropriate influence would arise because two employees, who will undoubtedly be contacted by and interviewed as a part of the ongoing IG investigation, are being asked to provide a statement to their supervisors prior to interviews of those persons by the IG. Furthermore, this situation could appear as an attempt by employees and/or the agency to collude on a statement prior to making a formal statement in the investigation of the IG.

This IG's investigation was requested to address issues of public perception. Thus, it is critical that this investigation proceed in a manner that leaves no room for question. As such, I believe that it is inappropriate to proceed with this request.

Juliet T. Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV
04/19/2007 05:03 PM
To Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC, Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc "Jeannie Layson" <jlayson@eac.gov>
Subject Fraud Report

After much discussion today among the Commissioners would like you both to prepare an in depth overview of the work you did on this report.
This would include all of the details of your work on the both the draft report and the final report adopted by the Commissioners, Jeannie has offered to help you in any way.
I will discuss this further with each of you between now and tomorrow.
I have been at the damn conference all day and have not been able to go to a single session or spend time with people.
Thanks
Tom

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
I would like to talk to you about this request when I get in. I am particularly interested in your thoughts on how this impacts attorney-client privilege.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

Thomas R. Wilkey

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Thomas R. Wilkey
Sent: 04/19/2007 05:03 PM EDT
To: Juliet Hodgkins; Margaret Sims
Cc: Jeannie Layson
Subject: Fraud Report

After much discussion today among the Commissioners would like you both to prepare an in depth overview of the work you did on this report.

This would include all of the details of your work on the both the draft report and the final report adopted by the Commissioners, Jeannie has offered to help you in any way.

I will discuss this further with each of you between now and tomorrow.

I have been at the damn conference all day and have not been able to go to a single session or spend time with people.

Thanks

Tom

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Gavin:

When do you think everything will be finalized and did you find out how long it will take to get paid for the Oct 25 invoice?

By the way, I think you and Julie gave me your colds.

Job

--- ggilmour@eac.gov wrote:

> Job,
> 
> Per GSA Finance, the Federal Government does not have tax liability on Personal Services Contracts. You will be issued a 1099 and be responsible for paying the required taxes.
> 
> Gavin S. Gilmour
> Associate General Counsel
> United States Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> (202) 566-3100
Job,

Per GSA Finance, the Federal Government does not have tax liability on Personal Services Contracts. You will be issued a 1099 and be responsible for paying the required taxes.

Gavin S. Gilmour
Associate General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Looks good...

I have some comments... (hand written) we can discuss upon your return..

GG

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

THIS MESSAGE IS FOR ITS INTENDED RECIPIENT ONLY. IT IS A PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED TO A THIRD PARTY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SENDER.

Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV

Commissioners and Tom,

I have attached a draft version of the EAC Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation report. Please have your comments ready no later than Tuesday, Nov. 28, COB, so that I will be prepared to discuss them at our briefing on Wednesday, Nov. 29 at 10:30.

You will note that there are appendixes referenced in the report. These documents are quite lengthy. Thus, I did not attach them to this email. If, however, you want to read the documents, DeAnna has access to them in my absence and can either email them to you or print them for you.

I think that the report is fairly self-explanatory. However, there are two questions that we need to address and that the Commissioners need to comment on:

1. The consultants provided summaries of articles, books, and reports that they read, as well as summaries of the interviews that they conducted. Peggy created two tables summarizing the consultants’ summaries of books, article and reports as well as interviews. We need to make a determination of which summaries we want to attach as appendixes. The only issue that I am aware of (and I have a question pending to Peggy about the quality of these summaries) is a significant disagreement over the summaries...
of interviews with Craig Donsanto and John Tanner of the Dept. of Justice. They disagree with the characterization given by the consultants to what they said in the interview. Obviously, this matter would have to be resolved if we decide to use the consultants' summaries.

2. Tom and I had a conversation with Tova and Job about the fact that we are going to issue a report. Tova was quite insistent about being able to see the report before it is released. I am NOT inclined to give her a copy of the report before it is released. Neither Tova nor Job are still on contract with the EAC. Thus, they are just like any other member of the public. I believe that if we release it to them, then we may have a significant problem withholding the document from others that may ask for it via FOIA request. I believe that the course of action should be to release it to all persons simultaneously.

Happy reading and Happy Thanksgiving!

Voter Fraud & Intimidation Report.doc

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
The stated purpose of the EAC's recently released "fraud report" was not to draw conclusions about fraud, but determine how the subject should be studied by the EAC. As such, it would inappropriate for the EAC to make unsupported conclusions regarding fraud in its preliminary report. Such speculative statements would only serve to compromise its future effort to study this matter in an nonpartisan fashion.

Gavin S. Gilmour
Deputy General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

THIS MESSAGE IS FOR ITS INTENDED RECIPIENT ONLY. IT IS A PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED TO A THIRD PARTY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SENDER.
Comm. DeGregorio
Files
October 24, 2006

Gerald A Reynolds  
Chairman, United States Commission on Civil Rights  
624 9th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20425

RE: October 19, 2006 Letter

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

Your letter of October 19, 2006 requests the status on the EAC’s Voter Fraud and Intimidation Report. I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the purpose and status of this study.

In late 2005, EAC hired two consultants for the purpose of assisting EAC with two things: 1) developing a uniform definition of the phrase voter fraud, and 2) making recommendations on how to further study the existence, prosecution, and means of deterring such voter fraud. In May 2006, a status report on this study was given to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors during their public meetings. During the same week, a working group convened to react to and provide comment on the progress and potential conclusions that could be reached from the work of the two consultants.

The conversation at the working group meeting was lively on the very points that we were trying to accomplish as a part of this study, namely what is voter fraud and how do we pursue studying it. Many of the proposed conclusions that were suggested by the consultants were challenged by the working group members. As such, the consultants were tasked with reviewing the concerns expressed at the working group meeting, conducting additional research as necessary, and providing a draft report to EAC that took into account the working group’s concerns and issues.

That draft report is currently being vetted by EAC staff. EAC will release a final report from this study after it has conducted a review of the draft provided by the consultants. However, it is important to remember the purpose of this study – finding a uniform definition of voter fraud and making recommendations on how to study the existence, prosecution and deterrence of voter fraud -- as it will serve as the basis of the EAC report on this study. Thank you for your letter.

Sincerely,

Paul S. DeGregorio  
Chairman
October 19, 2006

The Honorable Paul S. DeGregorio
Chairman
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Chairman DeGregorio:

On behalf of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, I write to inquire about the status of a report on voter fraud allegedly produced by the Election Assistance Commission. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights held a briefing on October 13, 2006 on voter fraud and voter intimidation. During this briefing, a panelist cited media reports that the Election Assistance Commission had produced a report on voter fraud but had not yet released it to the public. It would be useful to know the status of this report as Election Day approaches. Any information provided by the Election Assistance Commission would be of great value to all voters seeking to effectively exercise their right to vote.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
GERALD A. REYNOLDS
Chairman
The Honorable Paul DeGregorio  
Chairman  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20005-6156

Dear Chairman DeGregorio:

I am writing to express my concern about the fact that the Election Assistance Commission (EAC), in accordance with the statutory mandate that it do so, engaged consultants to study the issues of voting fraud and voter intimidation, but has failed to release to the public the results of that study.

Pursuant to Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), the EAC is required to “conduct and make available to the public studies regarding . . . [n]ationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office” and “[i]dentifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation.” Last week, USA Today reported that it had obtained a report from the EAC on those subjects “four months after it was delivered by two consultants hired to write it. The commission has not distributed it publicly.” Enclosed is a copy of the May 17, 2006 “Status Report on the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Research Project” obtained by USA Today. The report found that “[o]n balance, more researchers find [polling place fraud] to be less of a problem than is commonly described in the political debate,” and that “[t]here is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud, or at least much less than is claimed, including voter impersonation, ‘dead’ voters, noncitizen voting and felon voters. Those few who believe it occurs often enough to be a concern say that it is impossible to show the extent to which it happens,” and are left to refer to anecdotal accounts. At the same time, the report found that “[d]eceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004” and that “[v]oter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities.”

As you know, the Committee on House Administration conducted a hearing in June in the subject of non-citizen voting and a bill offered by Representative Hyde to require all voters to present government-issued photo identification before voting. Although the EAC was in possession of the enclosed report at that time, the report was not released, and therefore did not inform the proceedings. Subsequently, on September 20, the Hyde bill was reported to the floor of the House for debate and a vote. Again, the EAC was in possession of a report which was directly on the topic and reached conclusions in
opposition to the assumptions upon which the bill was based, yet the EAC again chose not release it. Had Members been in possession of the report and informed of its conclusions, the relatively close vote on that measure might have come out otherwise.

This is deeply troubling. Under HAVA, the EAC is charged with the responsibility of serving as "a national clearinghouse and resource for the compilation of information," including information gathered in the course of conduction the studies mandated by Section 241. I would like to know, therefore, upon what grounds the EAC withheld that report when it was most needed to inform discussion and debate.

I ask the EAC to publish the full report immediately, with explanation or minority views, if appropriate.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

RUSH HOLT
Member of Congress

RH/mpm
U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Status Report on the
Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Research
Project

May 17, 2006
INTRODUCTION

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) requires EAC to conduct research on election administration issues. Among the tasks listed in the statute is the development of:

- nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office [section 241(b)(6)]; and
- ways of identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)].

EAC’s Board of Advisors recommended that the agency make research on these matters a high priority.

FOCUS OF CURRENT RESEARCH

In September 2005, the Commission hired two consultants with expertise in this subject matter, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, to:

- develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections;
- perform background research (including Federal and State administrative and case law review), identify current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics, and deliver a summary of this research and all source documentation;
- establish a project working group, in consultation with EAC, composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation;
- provide the description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation and the results of the preliminary research to the working group, and convene the working group to discuss potential avenues for future EAC research on this topic; and
- produce a report to EAC summarizing the findings of the preliminary research effort and working group deliberations that includes recommendations for future research, if any;

As of the date of this report, the consultants have drafted a definition of election fraud, reviewed relevant literature and reports, interviewed persons from government and private sectors with subject matter expertise, analyzed news reports of alleged election fraud, reviewed case law, and established a project working group.
DEFINITION OF ELECTION FRAUD

The consultants drafted a definition of election fraud that includes numerous aspects of voting fraud (including voter intimidation, which is considered a subset of voting fraud) and voter registration fraud, but excludes campaign finance violations and election administration mistakes. This draft will be discussed and probably refined by the project working group, which is scheduled to convene on May 18, 2006.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The consultants found many reports and books that describe anecdotes and draw broad conclusions from a large array of incidents. They found little research that is truly systematic or scientific. The most systematic look at fraud appears to be the report written by Lori Minnite, entitled “Securing the Vote: An Analysis of Election Fraud”. The most systematic look at voter intimidation appears to be the report by Laughlin McDonald, entitled “The New Poll Tax”. The consultants found that books written about this subject all seem to have a political bias and a pre-existing agenda that makes them somewhat less valuable.

Moreover, the consultants found that reports and books make allegations but, perhaps by their nature, have little follow up. As a result, it is difficult to know when something has remained in the stage of being an allegation and gone no further, or progressed to the point of being investigated or prosecuted or in any other way proven to be valid by an independent, neutral entity. This is true, for example, with respect to allegations of voter intimidation by civil rights organizations, and, with respect to fraud, John Fund's frequently cited book, “Stealing Elections”.

Consultants found that researchers agree that measuring something like the incidence of fraud and intimidation in a scientifically legitimate way is extremely difficult from a methodological perspective and would require resources beyond the means of most social and political scientists. As a result, there is much more written on this topic by advocacy groups than social scientists.

Other items of note:

- There is as much evidence, and as much concern, about structural forms of disenfranchisement as about intentional abuse of the system. These include felon disenfranchisement, poor maintenance of databases and identification requirements.
- There is tremendous disagreement about the extent to which polling place fraud, e.g. double voting, intentional felon voting, noncitizen voting, is a serious problem. On balance, more researchers find it to be less of a problem than is commonly described in the political debate; but some reports say it is a major problem, albeit hard to identify.
• There is substantial concern across the board about absentee balloting and the opportunity it presents for fraud.

• Federal law governing election fraud and intimidation is varied and complex and yet may nonetheless be insufficient or subject to too many limitations to be as effective as it might be.

• Deceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004.

• Voter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities, although the American Center for Voting Rights uniquely alleges it is focused on Republicans.

Recommendations

The consultants recommend that subsequent EAC research include a follow up study of allegations made in reports, books and newspaper articles. They also suggest that the research should focus on filling the gap between the lack of reports based on methodical studies by social or political scientists and the numerous, but less scientific, reports published by advocacy groups.

INTERVIEWS

The consultants jointly selected experts from the public and private sector for interviews. The consultants’ analysis of their discussions with these members of the legal, election official, advocacy, and academic communities follows.

Common Themes

• There is virtually universal agreement that absentee ballot fraud is the biggest problem, with vote buying and registration fraud coming in after that. The vote buying often comes in the form of payment for absentee ballots, although not always. Some absentee ballot fraud is part of an organized effort; some is by individuals, who sometimes are not even aware that what they are doing is illegal. Voter registration fraud seems to take the form of people signing up with false names. Registration fraud seems to be most common where people doing the registration were paid by the signature.

• There is widespread but not unanimous agreement that there is little polling place fraud, or at least much less than is claimed, including voter impersonation, "dead" voters, noncitizen voting and felon voters. Those few who believe it occurs often enough to be a concern say that it is impossible to show the extent to which it happens, but do point to instances in the press of such incidents. Most people believe that false registration forms have not resulted in polling place fraud,
although it may create the perception that vote fraud is possible. Those who believe there is more polling place fraud than reported/investigated/prosecuted believe that registration fraud does lead to fraudulent votes. Jason Torchinsky from the American Center for Voting Rights is the only interviewee who believes that polling place fraud is widespread and among the most significant problems in the system.

- Abuse of challenger laws and abusive challengers seem to be the biggest intimidation/suppression concerns, and many of those interviewed assert that the new identification requirements are the modern version of voter intimidation and suppression. However there is evidence of some continued outright intimidation and suppression, especially in some Native American communities. A number of people also raise the problem of poll workers engaging in harassment of minority voters. Other activities commonly raised were the issue of polling places being moved at the last moment, unequal distribution of voting machines, videotaping of voters at the polls, and targeted misinformation campaigns.

- Several people indicate that, for various reasons, DOJ is bringing fewer voter intimidation and suppression cases now, and has increased its focus on matters such as noncitizen voting, double voting, and felon voting. Interviews with DOJ personnel indicate that the Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, focuses on systemic patterns of malfeasance in this area. While the Election Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, continues to maintain an aggressive pursuit of systematic schemes to corrupt the electoral process (including voter suppression), it also has increased prosecutions of individual instances of felon, alien, and double voting.

- The problem of badly kept voter registration lists, with both ineligible voters remaining on the rolls and eligible voters being taken off, remains a common concern. A few people are also troubled by voters being on registration lists in two states. They said that there was no evidence that this had led to double voting, but it opens the door to the possibility. There is great hope that full implementation of the new requirements of HAVA – done well, a major caveat – will reduce this problem dramatically.

Common Recommendations:

- Many of those interviewed recommend better poll worker training as the best way to improve the process; a few also recommended longer voting times or voting on days other than election day (such as weekends) but fewer polling places so only the best poll workers would be employed.

- Many interviewed support stronger criminal laws and increased enforcement of existing laws with respect to both fraud and intimidation. Advocates from across the spectrum expressed frustration with the failure of the Department of Justice to pursue complaints.
With respect to DOJ’s Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, John Tanner indicated that fewer cases are being brought because fewer are warranted – it has become increasingly difficult to know when allegations of intimidation and suppression are credible since it depends on one’s definition of intimidation, and because both parties are doing it. Moreover prior enforcement of the laws has now changed the entire landscape – race based problems are rare now. Although challenges based on race and unequal implementation of identification rules would be actionable, Mr. Tanner was unaware of such situations actually occurring and his office has not pursued any such cases.

Craig Donsanto of DOJ’s Election Crimes Branch, Public Integrity Section, says that while the number of election fraud related complaints have not gone up since 2002, nor has the proportion of legitimate to illegitimate claims of fraud, the number of cases DOJ is investigating and the number of indictments his office is pursuing are both up dramatically. Since 2002, in addition to pursuing systematic election corruption schemes, DOJ has brought more cases against alien voters, felon voters and double voters than ever before. Mr. Donsanto would like more resources so that his agency can do more and would like to have laws that make it easier for the federal government to assume jurisdiction over voter fraud cases.

- A couple of interviewees recommend a new law that would make it easier to criminally prosecute people for intimidation even when there is not racial animus.
- Several advocate expanded monitoring of the polls, including some associated with the Department of Justice.
- Almost everyone hopes that administrators will maximize the potential of statewide voter registration databases to prevent fraud.
- Challenge laws, both with respect to pre-election day challenges and challengers at the polls, need to be revised by all states to ensure they are not used for purposes of wrongful disenfranchisement and harassment.
- Several people advocate passage of Senator Barak Obama’s “deceptive practices” bill.
- There is a split on whether it would be helpful to have nonpartisan election officials – some indicated they thought even if elections officials are elected as non partisan officials, they will carry out their duties in biased ways nonetheless. However, most agree that elections officials pursuing partisan agendas are a problem that must be addressed in some fashion. Suggestions included moving election responsibilities out of the secretary of states’ office; increasing transparency in the process; and enacting conflict of interest rules.
A few recommend returning to allowing use of absentee ballots "for cause" only if it were politically feasible.

A few recommend enacting a national identification card, including Pat Rogers, an attorney in New Mexico, and Jason Torchinsky from ACVR, who advocates the proposal in the Carter-Baker Commission Report.

A couple of interviewees indicated the need for clear standards for the distribution of voting machines.

**NEWS ARTICLES**

Consultants conducted a Nexis search of related news articles published between January 1, 2001 and January 1, 2006. A systematic, numerical analysis of the data collected during this review is currently being prepared. What follows is an overview of these articles provided by the consultants.

**Absentee Ballots**

According to press reports, absentee ballots are abused in a variety of ways:

- Campaign workers, candidates and others coerce the voting choices of vulnerable populations, usually elderly voters.

- Workers for groups and individuals have attempted to vote absentee in the names of the deceased.

- Workers for groups, campaign workers and individuals have attempted to forge the names of other voters on absentee ballot requests and absentee ballots and thus vote multiple times.

It is unclear how often actual convictions result from these activities (a handful of articles indicate convictions and guilty pleas), but this is an area in which there have been a substantial number of official investigations and actual charges filed, according to news reports where such information is available. A few of the allegations became part of civil court proceedings contesting the outcome of the election.

While absentee fraud allegations turn up throughout the country, a few states have had several such cases. Especially of note are Indiana, New Jersey, South Dakota, and most particularly, Texas. Interestingly, there were no articles regarding Oregon, where the entire system is vote by mail.
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Voter Registration Fraud

According to press reports, the following types of allegations of voter registration fraud are most common:

- Registering in the name of dead people;
- Fake names and other information on voter registration forms;
- Illegitimate addresses used on voter registration forms;
- Voters being tricked into registering for a particular party under false pretenses; and
- Destruction of voter registration forms depending on the party the voter registered with.

There was only one self evident instance of a noncitizen registering to vote. Many of the instances reported included official investigations and charges filed, but few actual convictions, at least from the news reporting. There have been multiple reports of registration fraud in California, Colorado, Florida, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Voter Intimidation and Suppression

This is the area which had the most articles, in part because there were so many allegations of intimidation and suppression during the 2004 election. Most of these remained allegations and no criminal investigation or prosecution ensued. Some of the cases did end up in civil litigation.

This is not to say that these alleged activities were confined to 2004 – there were several allegations made during every year studied. Most notable were the high number of allegations of voter intimidation and harassment reported during the 2003 Philadelphia mayoral race.

A very high number of the articles were about the issue of challenges to voters' registration status and challengers at the polling places. There were many allegations that planned challenge activities were targeted at minority communities. Some of the challenges were concentrated in immigrant communities.

However, the tactics alleged varied greatly. The types of activities discussed also include the following:

- Photographing or videotaping voters coming out of polling places;
- Improper demands for identification;
Poll watchers harassing voters;
Poll workers being hostile to or aggressively challenging voters;
Disproportionate police presence;
Poll watchers wearing clothes with messages that seemed intended to intimidate; and
Insufficient voting machines and unmanageably long lines.

Although the incidents reported on occurred everywhere, not surprisingly, many came from “battleground” states. There were several such reports out of Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

“Dead Voters and Multiple Voting”

There were a high number of articles about people voting in the names of the dead and voting more than once. Many of these articles were marked by allegations of big numbers of people committing these frauds, and relatively few of these allegations turning out to be accurate according to investigations by the newspapers themselves, elections officials, and criminal investigators. Often the problem turned out to be a result of administrative error, poll workers mis-marking voter lists, a flawed registration list and/or errors made in the attempt to match names of voters on the list with the names of the people who voted. In a good number of cases, there were allegations that charges of double voting by political leaders were an effort to scare people away from the voting process.

Nonetheless there were a few cases of people actually being charged and/or convicted for these kinds of activities. Most of the cases involved a person voting both by absentee ballot and in person. A few instances involved people voting both during early voting and on Election Day, which calls into question the proper marking and maintenance of the voting lists. In many instances, the person charged claimed not to have voted twice on purpose. A very small handful of cases involved a voter voting in more than one county and there was one substantiated case involving a person voting in more than one state. Other instances in which such efforts were alleged were disproved by officials.

In the case of voting in the name of a dead person, the problem lay in the voter registration list not being properly maintained, i.e. the person was still on the registration list as eligible to vote, and a person took criminal advantage of that. In total, the San Francisco Chronicle found five such cases in March 2004; the AP cited a newspaper analysis of five such persons in an Indiana primary in May 2004; and a senate committee found two people to have voted in the names of the dead in 2005.
As usual, there were a disproportionate number of such articles coming out of Florida. Notably, there were three articles out of Oregon, which has one hundred percent vote-by-mail.

**Vote Buying**

There were a surprising number of articles about vote buying cases. A few of these instances involved long-time investigations concentrated in three states (Illinois, Kentucky, and West Virginia). There were more official investigations, indictments and convictions/pleas in this area.

**Deceptive Practices**

In 2004 there were numerous reports of intentional disinformation about voting eligibility and the voting process meant to confuse voters about their rights and when and where to vote. Misinformation came in the form of flyers, phone calls, letters, and even people going door to door. Many of the efforts were reportedly targeted at minority communities. A disproportionate number of them came from key battleground states, particularly Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. From the news reports found, only one of these instances was officially investigated, the case in Oregon involving the destruction of completed voter registration applications. There were no reports of prosecutions or any other legal proceeding.

**Non-citizen Voting**

There were surprisingly few articles regarding noncitizen registration and voting – just seven all together, in seven different states across the country. They were also evenly split between allegations of noncitizens registering and noncitizens voting. In one case, charges were filed against ten individuals. In another case, a judge in a civil suit found there was illegal noncitizen voting. Three instances prompted official investigations. Two cases, from this Nexis search, remained just allegations of noncitizen voting.

**Felon Voting**

Although there were only thirteen cases of felon voting, some of them involved large numbers of voters. Most notably, of course, are the cases that came to light in the Washington gubernatorial election contest (see Washington summary) and in Wisconsin (see Wisconsin summary). In several states, the main problem was the large number of ineligible felons that remained on the voting list.

**Election Official Fraud**

In most of the cases in which fraud by elections officials is suspected or alleged, it is difficult to determine whether it is incompetence or a crime. There are several cases of ballots gone missing, ballots unaccounted for and ballots ending up in a worker’s possession. In two cases workers were said to have changed peoples’ votes. The one
instance in which widespread ballot box stuffing by elections workers was alleged was in Washington State. The judge in the civil trial of that election contest did not find that elections workers had committed fraud. Four of the cases are from Texas.

Recommendation

The consultants recommend that subsequent EAC research should include a Nexis search that specifically attempts to follow up on the cases for which no resolution is evident from this particular initial search.

CASE LAW RESEARCH

After reviewing over 40,000 cases from 2000 to the present, the majority of which came from appeals courts, the consultants found comparatively few applicable to this study. Of those that were applicable, the consultants found that no apparent thematic pattern emerges. However, it appears to them that the greatest areas of fraud and intimidation have shifted from past patterns of stealing votes to present problems with voter registration, voter identification, the proper delivery and counting of absentee and overseas ballots, provisional voting, vote buying, and challenges to felon eligibility.

Recommendation

Because so few cases provided a picture of these current problems, consultants suggest that subsequent EAC research include a review of state trial-level decisions.

PROJECT WORKING GROUP

Consultants and EAC worked together to select members for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Working Group that included election officials and representatives of advocacy groups and the legal community who have an interest and expertise in the subject matter. (See Attachment A for a list of members.) The working group is scheduled to convene at EAC offices on May 18, 2006 to consider the results of the preliminary research and to offer ideas for future EAC activities concerning this subject.

FINAL REPORT

After convening the project working group, the consultants will draft a final report summarizing the results of their research and the working group deliberations. This report will include recommendations for future EAC research related to this subject matter. The draft report will be reviewed by EAC and, after obtaining any clarifications or corrections deemed necessary, will be made available to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors for review and comment. Following this, a final report will be prepared.
Attachment A

**Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project Working Group**

The Honorable Todd Rokita  
Indiana Secretary of State  
Member, EAC Standards Board and the Executive Board of the Standards Board

Kathy Rogers  
Georgia Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State  
Member, EAC Standards Board

J.R. Perez  
Guadalupe County Elections Administrator, TX

Barbara Arnwine  
Executive Director, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law  
Leader of Election Protection Coalition  
*(To be represented at May 18, 2006 meeting by Jon M. Greenbaum, Director of the Voting Rights Project for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law)*

Robert Bauer  
Chair of the Political Law Practice at the law firm of Perkins Coie, DC  
National Counsel for Voter Protection, Democratic National Committee

Benjamin L. Ginsberg  
Partner, Patton Boggs LLP  
Counsel to national Republican campaign committees and Republican candidates

Mark (Thor) Hearne II  
Partner-Member, Lathrop & Gage, St Louis, MO  
National Counsel to the American Center for Voting Rights

Barry Weinberg  
Former Deputy Chief and Acting Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

**EAC Invited Technical Advisor:**

Craig Donsanto  
Director, Election Crimes Branch, U.S. Department of Justice
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October 19, 2006

The Honorable Paul S. DeGregorio
Chairman
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Chairman DeGregorio:

On behalf of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, I write to inquire about the status of a report on voter fraud allegedly produced by the Election Assistance Commission. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights held a briefing on October 13, 2006 on voter fraud and voter intimidation. During this briefing, a panelist cited media reports that the Election Assistance Commission had produced a report on voter fraud but had not yet released it to the public. It would be useful to know the status of this report as Election Day approaches. Any information provided by the Election Assistance Commission would be of great value to all voters seeking to effectively exercise their right to vote.

Very truly yours,

GERALD A. REYNOLDS
Chairman
October 19, 2006

The Honorable Paul S. DeGregorio  
Chairman  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  

Dear Chairman DeGregorio:

On behalf of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, I write to inquire about the status of a report on voter fraud allegedly produced by the Election Assistance Commission. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights held a briefing on October 13, 2006 on voter fraud and voter intimidation. During this briefing, a panelist cited media reports that the Election Assistance Commission had produced a report on voter fraud but had not yet released it to the public. It would be useful to know the status of this report as Election Day approaches. Any information provided by the Election Assistance Commission would be of great value to all voters seeking to effectively exercise their right to vote.

Very truly yours,

GERALD A. REYNOLDS  
Chairman
October 24, 2006

Gerald A Reynolds  
Chairman, United States Commission on Civil Rights  
624 9th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20425

RE: October 19, 2006 Letter

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

Your letter of October 19, 2006 requests the status on the EAC’s Voter Fraud and Intimidation Report. I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the purpose and status of this study.

In late 2005, EAC hired two consultants for the purpose of assisting EAC with two things: 1) developing a uniform definition of the phrase voter fraud, and 2) making recommendations on how to further study the existence, prosecution, and means of deterring such voter fraud. In May 2006, a status report on this study was given to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors during their public meetings. During the same week, a working group convened to react to and provide comment on the progress and potential conclusions that could be reached from the work of the two consultants.

The conversation at the working group meeting was lively on the very points that we were trying to accomplish as a part of this study, namely what is voter fraud and how do we pursue studying it. Many of the proposed conclusions that were suggested by the consultants were challenged by the working group members. As such, the consultants were tasked with reviewing the concerns expressed at the working group meeting, conducting additional research as necessary, and providing a draft report to EAC that took into account the working group’s concerns and issues.

That draft report is currently being vetted by EAC staff. EAC will release a final report from this study after it has conducted a review of the draft provided by the consultants. However, it is important to remember the purpose of this study – finding a uniform definition of voter fraud and making recommendations on how to study the existence, prosecution and deterrence of voter fraud -- as it will serve as the basis of the EAC report on this study. Thank you for your letter.

Sincerely,

Paul S. DeGregorio  
Chairman
October 18, 2006

Honorable Rush Holt
1019 Longworth Building
Washington, DC 20515

RE: October 16, 2006 Letter

Dear Congressman Holt:

Your letter of October 16, 2006 requests the release of EAC’s Voter Fraud and Intimidation Report. I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the purpose and status of this study.

In late 2005, EAC hired two consultants for the purpose of assisting EAC with two things: 1) developing a uniform definition of the phrase voter fraud, and 2) making recommendations on how to further study the existence, prosecution, and means of deterring such voter fraud. In May 2006, a status report on this study was given to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors during their public meetings. During the same week, a working group convened to react to and provide comment on the progress and potential conclusions that could be reached from the work of the two consultants.

The conversation at the working group meeting was lively on the very points that we were trying to accomplish as a part of this study, namely what is voter fraud and how do we pursue studying it. Many of the proposed conclusions that were suggested by the consultants were challenged by the working group members. As such, the consultants were tasked with reviewing the concerns expressed at the working group meeting, conducting additional research as necessary, and providing a draft report to EAC that took into account the working group’s concerns and issues.

That draft report is currently being vetted by EAC staff. EAC will release a final report from this study after it has conducted a review of the draft provided by the consultants. However, it is important to remember the purpose of this study – finding a uniform definition of voter fraud and making recommendations on how to study the existence, prosecution and deterrence of voter fraud -- as it will serve as the basis of the EAC report on this study.

Thank you for your letter. You can be assured that as soon as a final report on the fraud and intimidation study is available, a copy will be made available to the public.

Sincerely,

Paul S. DeGregorio, Chairman
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REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EAC
VOTER IDENTIFICATION ISSUES

Report Background
The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) (Public Law 107-252) authorizes the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) (Sec. 241, 42 USC 15381) to conduct periodic studies of election administration issues. The purpose of these studies is to promote methods for voting and administering elections, including provisional voting, that are convenient, accessible and easy to use; that yield accurate, secure and expeditious voting systems; that afford each registered and eligible voter an equal opportunity to vote and to have that vote counted; and that are efficient.

This study provides information on voter identification practices in the 2004 election. It makes recommendations for best practices to evaluate future proposals for voter ID requirements, including the systematic collection and evaluation of information from the states. The research was conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University under a contract with the EAC, dated May 24, 2005. The work included a review and legal analysis of state statutes, regulations and litigation concerning voter identification and provisional voting as well as a statistical analysis of the relationship of various requirements for voter identification to turnout in the 2004 election. This report is a companion to a report on Provisional Voting submitted to the EAC on November 28, 2005 under the same contract.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Background and Methods
This report arrives at a time of considerable ferment over the issue of voter identification. The debate across the nation over requiring voters to produce a specific identification document before being permitted to cast a regular (as opposed to a provisional) ballot, has revealed supporters and opponents in polarized camps.

- Proponents of stricter identification requirements base their case on improving the security of the ballot by reducing opportunities for one kind of vote fraud -- multiple voting or voting by those who are not eligible. The proponents argue that their goal is to ensure that only those legally entitled to vote do so, and do so only once at each election.
Opponents seek to forestall more stringent identification requirements, such as for government-issued photo ID, in order to ensure broad access to a regular ballot. They fear that some voters—such as, they argue, racial and ethnic minorities, the young, and elderly voters—may lack convenient access to the required ID documents, or that such voters may be fearful of submitting their ID documents to official scrutiny and thus stay away from the polls.

Both sides argue that their preferred policy will engender faith in the electoral process among citizens.

This report considers policy issues associated with the voter ID debate and investigates whether empirical study can suggest a way to estimate the effects of different voter ID requirements on turnout, and important first step in assessing tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access. The aim is to contribute to the effort to raise the quality of the debate over this contentious topic. The tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access are crucial. A voting system that requires voters to produce an identity document or documents may prevent the ineligible from voting. It may also prevent eligible voters from casting a ballot. If the ID requirement of a ballot protection system blocks ineligible voters from the polls at the cost of preventing eligible voters who lack the required forms of identification, the integrity of the ballot may not have been improved; the harm may be as great as the benefit.

As part of the project’s effort to analyze the relationship between Voter ID requirements, turnout, and their policy implications, a statistical analysis was conducted to examine the potential variation in turnout. This statistical study developed a model to illuminate the relationships between voter ID requirements and turnout. This model’s findings and limitations suggest avenues for further research and analysis that may assist the EAC and the states as they explore policies to balance the goals of ballot integrity and ballot access.

The statistical analysis describes one possible way to estimate what might be the incremental effect on voters’ access to the ballot of an increase in the rigor of voter identification requirements. We do not offer this statistical analysis as the last word, but rather as a preliminary word on the subject. Its findings must be regarded as tentative; the information that might permit greater certainty is simply not available. Indeed, as our recommendations indicate, the next step to improve understanding of the effects of stricter voter identification on turnout and on vote fraud is to collect more information on both topics systematically and regularly.
Making a statistical estimate of the effect of voting regulations on turnout is difficult. The dynamics of turnout are complex, much studied, and only partially understood. Some agreement exists, however, that three factors that exert substantial influence on voter turnout are: the socioeconomic status of the potential voter; legal requirements to vote; and the political context of the election. By focusing on how voters identify themselves at the polls, this report emphasizes legal requirements. The statistical analysis also considers some of the socioeconomic, racial, and age characteristics of the electorate, as well as the political context in 2004 (such as whether a state was a battleground in the presidential race).

Examining tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access requires some measure of the effectiveness of voter ID requirements in reducing multiple voting or voting by ineligible voters. The existing evidence on the incidence of vote fraud, especially on the kind of vote fraud that could be reduced by requiring more rigorous voter identification, is not sufficient to evaluate those tradeoffs. Assessing the effectiveness of voter ID as a way to protect the integrity of the ballot should logically include an estimate of the nature and frequency of vote fraud. This research does not include consideration of vote fraud, nor does it estimate the possible effectiveness of various voter ID regimes to counter attempts at vote fraud. Our analysis also cannot take into account how many potential voters who did not turn out under comparatively stricter voter ID requirements might have been ineligible or eligible to vote.

Despite these qualifications regarding the quality of the available data and the limitations of statistical analysis, however, although it used different statistical methods and two different sets of data on turnout in 2004 election, it points to the same general finding. As discussed at greater length in the appendix to this report, stricter voter identification requirements were correlated with reduced turnout in the models employed. As explained below, these models find that a statistically significant relationship exists, even when controlling for other factors (such as whether the election was in a battleground state) that might affect turnout. Without knowing more about the effects of stricter voter ID on reducing multiple voting or voting by ineligible

---

1 See, for example, Tom William Rice and Patrick J. Kenney, "Voter Turnout in Presidential Primaries," 1985. Political Behavior, 7: 101-112. Identification requirements are not the only legal restrictions on voting. States also differ, for example, in their registration requirements (including how long before the election registration must take place and the identity documents required register).

2 The EAC has contracted with other researchers to study vote fraud issues.

3 Appendix C: Tim Vercellotti, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Analysis of Effects of Voter Identification Requirements on Turnout.
voters, however, the tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access cannot be assessed fully.

Methodology
The report includes detailed information on the nature of the statutory requirements across the country in 2004 and on the statutes and court decisions that provide the legal context for the voter ID debate. We gathered information on the requirements in effect in the 50 states and the District of Columbia in that year. Based on our interpretation of state statutes, supplemented in some cases by conversations with state election officials, we divided the states’ ID requirements into five categories. We believe each category is more rigorous than the one preceding, based on the demands they make on voters. The categories range from “Stating Name” which we judge to be somewhat less demanding than “Signing Name.” “Signature Match” requires poll workers to examine the signature and compare it to a sample, which is slightly more demanding that the voter simply signing. “Present ID” requires voters to offer some documentary evidence of their identity, ranging from a utility bill to a passport. It is more demanding than the previous three categories because it requires that the voter remember to bring this documentation to the polls. (Even a simple ID, such as a utility bill, may not be available to some renters or, say, those in group housing.) We regard a government “Photo ID” as the most rigorous requirement. Such identity documents may not be uniformly and conveniently available to all voters.

For each state, we identified both the “maximum” and “minimum” identification requirements. The term “maximum” refers to the most that voters may be asked to do or show at the polling place (putting aside cases in which particular voter’s eligibility may be questioned pursuant to a state challenge process). The term “minimum,” on the other hand, refers to the most that voters can be required to do or show, in order to cast regular ballot (again leaving aside a state challenge process). We have included “maximum” requirements in our analysis, and not simply “minimum” requirements, because simply asking voters to produce particular identifying information may have a deterrent effect, even if voters are ultimately allowed to cast a regular ballot without that identification. For example, in a state where voters are asked to show photo ID at the polling place, but still allowed to vote by completing an affidavit confirming their eligibility, the “maximum” of being asked to show photo ID may deter some voters even though the “minimum” would allow them to vote without photo ID.

4 Even the most relaxed provisions for identification at the polls—anything stricter than the honor system used in North Dakota—will impose some burden on particular voters. Harvard Law Review 119:1146
It is worth emphasizing that, at the time of the 2004 election, there was no state that had a “minimum” requirement of showing photo ID—in other words, there was no state that required voters to show photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot. For this reason, our report does not measure the impact of laws, like those recently enacted in Indiana and Georgia, which require voters to show photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot without an affidavit exception.

To examine the potential variation on turnout rates associated with each type of voter ID requirements in effect on Election Day 2004, the statistical analysis drew on two sets of data. These were, first, aggregate turnout data at the county level for each state and, second, the reports of individual voters collected in the November 2004 Current Population Survey by the U.S. Census Bureau. Using two different data sets makes it possible to check the validity of one analysis against the other. It also provides insights not possible using only one of the data sets. The aggregate analysis cannot provide valid estimates on the effects of different ID requirements on particular demographic groups (e.g., the old, the young, African-Americans, the poor, or high school graduates). The Current Population Survey data does permit that kind of analysis, although it has the disadvantage of relying on self-reports by respondents about their registration status and experience in the polling place.

To understand legal issues that have been raised in recent litigation over voter ID requirements, we collected and analyzed the few major cases that have been decided so far on this issue. The decisions so far provide some guidance on the constitutional and other constraints as to voter ID requirements.

**Summary of Findings**

As voter identification requirements vary, voter turnout varies as well. This finding emerged from both the statistical analysis’s aggregate data and the individual-level data, although not always for both the maximum and minimum sets of requirements. The overall relationship between the stringency of ID requirements and turnout was fairly small, but still statistically significant.

In the model used with the aggregate data in the statistical analysis, the match signature requirement, the provide a non-photo ID requirement, and the photo ID requirement were all correlated with lower turnout compared to requiring that voters state their names. With the addition of the registration closing data to the aggregate analysis, photo ID is no longer a
significant predictor of turnout. Signature match and non-photo id remain significant and negative predictors in the model.

The reduction in turnout was not the same for all demographic groups in the citizen voting age population.

The non-photo identification requirement showed the most significant and consistent correlation with reduced turnout. This result may be surprising given the intense debates surrounding photo identification requirements. The effect of photo ID requirements cannot, however, be assessed from the data the statistical analysis examined, since none of the states had laws in 2004 that conditioned voting on presentation of photo ID. Each of the five states that had photo ID as a "maximum" requirement (i.e., the most that voters could be asked to show at the polls) accepted another type of identification or an affidavit as a "minimum" requirement in the 2004 election (i.e., they were allowed to cast a regular ballot with something less than photo ID).

Significant questions about the relationship of voter identification requirements to turnout remain unanswered. The data examined in this project could not capture the dynamics of how identification requirements might lower turnout. If ID requirements dampen turnout, is it because individuals are aware of the requirements and stay away from the polls because they cannot or do not want to meet the requirements? Or, do the requirements result in some voters being turned away when they cannot meet the requirements on Election Day? Other factors that may also be correlated with stricter ID laws – such as less user-friendly voter registration systems – may actually be causing lower turnout. The CPS data do not include the information needed to answer this question. Knowing more about the "on the ground" experiences of voters concerning identification requirements could guide policy-makers at the state and local level in determining whether and at what point in the electoral cycle a concerted public information campaign might be most effective in helping voters to meet identification requirements. Such knowledge also could help in designing training for election judges to handle questions about, and potential disputes over, voter identification requirements.

Our analysis of litigation suggests that the courts will look more strictly at requirements that voters produce a photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot, than at non-photo ID laws. The courts have used a balancing test to weigh the legitimate interest in preventing election fraud against the citizen’s right to privacy (protecting social security numbers from public disclosure, for
example) and the reasonableness of requirements for identity documents. To provide both the clarity and certainty in administration of elections needed to forestall destabilizing challenges to outcomes, a best practice for the states may be to limit requirements for voter identification to the minimum needed to prevent duplicate registration and ensure eligibility.

The current lack of understanding of precisely how voter ID requirements affect turnout could be ameliorated by requiring the collection and reporting of additional data, including the reasons potential voters are required to cast a provisional ballot and the reasons for rejecting provisional ballots during the 2006 and subsequent elections. Also useful would be the results of surveys of voters on their experiences in meeting voter ID requirements and on what type of ballot they cast. And, of course, more information is needed on the incidence and varieties of vote fraud, but that inquiry is outside the scope of this report.

**Recommendations for consideration and action by the EAC**

The dynamics of Voter ID requirements —how more rigorous voter ID requirements may affect the decision by potential voters to go or stay away from the polls-- are not perfectly understood. This lack of understanding should be recognized in the policy process in the states. The debate over voter ID in the states would be improved by additional research sponsored by the EAC.

The EAC should consider the following actions to improve understanding of the relationship between voter ID requirements and the two important goals of ensuring ballot access and ensuring ballot integrity.

1. Encourage or sponsor further research to clarify the connection between Voter ID requirements and the number of potential voters actually able to cast a ballot that is actually counted.

2. Recommend as a best practice the publication of a "Voting Impact Statement" by states as they assess their voter ID requirements to protect the integrity of the ballot. The analysis will help ensure that efforts to increase ballot security have a neutral effect on electoral participation by eligible voters. The Voter Impact Statement would estimate the number and demographics of 1) eligible, potential voters that may be kept from the polls

---

5 Arizona held its first election with its new, stricter ID requirements on March 14, 2006. In at least one county (Maricopa) election officials handed a survey to voters that asked if they knew about the voter identification law and if they did, how they found out about it. Edythe Jensen, "New Voter ID Law Goes Smoothly in Chandler," Arizona Republic, March 15, 2006. More surveys of this kind can illuminate the dynamics of voter ID and voting in ways that are not possible now because of insufficient data.
or permitted to cast a provisional ballot by a stricter ID requirement; and 2) and assess
the number of ineligible voters who will be prevented from voting by the stricter ID
requirements.

3. Encourage or require the states in the 2006 election and beyond, to collect and report
reliable, credible information on the relationship between ballot access and ballot
security. EAC should publish an analysis of this information to provide a sound factual
basis for the states to consider as they estimate the incidence of the kinds of vote fraud
that more stringent ID requirements may prevent. The analysis should describe the
dynamics of the voter ID process in preserving the security of the ballot. EAC can also
use this information to encourage the states to assess the effectiveness of programs to
ensure that all eligible voters have required ID and are permitted to vote in future
elections. Well-designed longitudinal studies in the states can show the results of
changing voter ID requirements on electoral participation over time. The studies should
include precinct-level data to provide the fine-grained analysis that can provide a solid
foundation for policy.

I. Useful information could be supplied by state-sponsored surveys of voters by local
election officials. It would make clear why those who cast a provisional ballot were
found ineligible to cast a regular ballot. The answers would illuminate the frequency
with which ID issues divert voters into the provisional ballot line.

II. Surveys to ask voters what they know about the voter id requirements would also
provide useful context for evaluating the effect of various voter ID requirements on
electoral participation.

III. Spot checks by state election officials on how the identification process works at
polling places could provide information on how closely actual practice tracks
statutory or regulatory requirements. Such reports should be available to the
public.

4. Encourage states to examine the time period allowed for voters who cast a provisional
ballot because they lacked required ID to return with their identification. In eleven states,
voters who had to cast a provisional ballot because they lacked the ID required for a
regular ballot were permitted to return later with their ID. Their provision of this ID is the
critical step in evaluating the ballots. The length of the period in which the voter may
return with ID is important. In setting the time period for return, which now varies among
the states from the same day to about two weeks, states should consider three factors:
For review by the EAC's Advisory Boards

the convenience of the voter, the total time allowed to evaluate ballots\(^6\), and the safe
harbor provision in presidential elections.

5. Recommendations to the states from EAC should reflect current judicial trends.
Requirements that voters provide some identifying documentation have been upheld, where
photo ID is not the only acceptable form. Whether laws requiring photo ID will be upheld is
more uncertain.

**SUMMARY OF RESEARCH**

**Background and Approach of the Study**

Voter ID requirements are just one set of rules governing voting that may affect turnout. Social
scientists have long studied how election rules affect participation in elections. The general view
today is that the individual citizen makes the choice of whether the vote in a way similar to other
decisions that a rational citizen makes, by comparing costs and benefits. The benefits of voting
are fairly stable and hard to specify given the remote probability that any one vote will make a
difference in an election. But whatever the benefit as perceived by an individual voter, as the
costs of voting (for example, time, hassle, acquisition of information) increase, the likelihood that
a citizen will vote decrease. Not all groups in the population calculate the cost of participation in
the same way, so that election laws (such as registration or identification requirements) may
affect different groups differently.

A short summary of some of the social science literature illustrates what may be a broad
consensus that the rules of elections affect turnout, but note the important differences in the
details of what groups may be most affected.

- Bowler, Brockington and Donovan in "Election Systems and Voter Turnout: Experiments
  in the United States". *The Journal of Politics, 63:3* (August 2001) concluded that
electoral systems help shape turnout by altering the benefits perceived by voters. For
example, cumulative voting systems have 5% greater turnout than plurality systems
- The effect of registration systems has been the subject of many studies over the last 40
  years. Kelley, Ayres, and Bowen in "Registration and Voting: Putting First Things First."
  *American Political Science Review.* 61:2 (June 1967) found that local variations in the

---

\(^6\) Our research on provisional voting reveals that states that provide more than a week to evaluate
provisional ballots end up counting substantially more of those ballots than states that provide less than a
week.
rate of voting are most directly tied to variations in the rate of registering to vote, and that the rate of registering to vote in localities is most directly related to the laws and administration of the registration process. They concluded that the decline in voting over the past 80 years was due, in part, to the rise of registration laws.

- Brians and Grofman in “Election Day Registration’s Effect on U.S. Voter Turnout.” Social Science Quarterly. 82:1 (March 2001), found that relaxing registration laws produces higher turnout. In particular, they observed that relaxing registration laws is more likely to promote voter turnout among those with medium levels of income and education, rather than those at the lowest levels. Highton in “Easy Registration and Voter Turnout,” Journal of Politics. 59:2 (May 1997); concluded similarly that registration laws affect voter turnout, but also observed that easier registration promotes turnout among those in lower socio-economic status.

- Mitchell and Wlezien. “The Impact of Legal Constraints on Voter Registration, Turnout, and the Composition of the American Electorate,” Political Behavior. 17:2 (June 1995) agreed that easier registration promotes higher turnout, but also concluded that higher turnout from easier registration would be unlikely to change the composition of the electorate. Nagler in “The Effect of Registration Laws and Education on U.S. Voter Turnout.” American Political Science Review. 85:4 (December 1991) found that registration laws decrease voter turnout by depressing the eligible electorate, but that lower educated people are not disproportionately impacted by these laws. But Rosenstone and Raymond E. Wolfinger in “The Effect of Registration Laws on Voter Turnout.” American Political Science Review. 72:1 (March 1978) found that while registration laws did affect both voter turnout and the composition of the electorate, the sharpest effect of these restrictions was felt in the South and among the least educated.

- Squire, Wolfinger, and Glass in “Residential Mobility and Voter Turnout.” American Political Science Review. 81:1 (March 1987) found that people who move constitute a major demographic group affected by registration laws. They estimated that altering laws to facilitate voting by recently moved people could increase turnout by 9%. Highton in “Residential Mobility, Community Mobility, and Voter Turnout.” Political Behavior. 22:2 (June 2000) also found that people who move have lower turnout than stable residents, and estimated that the decline was more a result of registration laws than a loss of social connections.
While voter ID may not have been the subject of as much research as the registration process, establishing the eligibility of a person to vote has long been part of the electoral process. Voters may have to identify themselves twice in the electoral process: when registering to vote and then when casting a ballot. The pressures felt by the voter arising from the need to check ID, even so simple a check as a signature match, can be greater at the polls on Election Day than at the time of registration. Poll workers may feel under pressure when faced with long lines and limited time.

**Voter ID requirements on Election Day**

This analysis focuses on ID requirements on Election Day, but with an appreciation that the ID requirements at time of registration and on Election Day are inter-related. The emphasis in this report is on Voter ID requirements on Election Day and afterwards as election judges evaluate provisional ballots. This is the critical period for the electoral system, the time when ballot access and ballot security are in the most sensitive balance.

The report looks at voter ID issues that go beyond the rather narrow identification requirements in HAVA. Much of the current debate in state legislatures over voter ID ranges beyond HAVA to require more rigorous documentation of identity for all would-be voters, not just those who had not registered in person and are casting a ballot for the first time. Current controversies in the states over voter ID seems to have been sparked in part by the HAVA requirements, but goes beyond those requirements, and sets the context for the analysis here.\(^6\)

---

\(^7\) As the Carter-Baker Commission noted, photo ID requirements for in-person voting do little to address the problem of fraudulent registration by mail, especially in states that do not require third-party organizations that register voters to verify ID. Commission on Federal Election Reform, pp 46-47.

\(^8\) Harvard Law Review 119:1127: "Legislators hoping to stiffen their state antifraud laws have taken their cue from identification provisions buried in HAVA."
We recognize that the previously technical, rather dull subject of voter ID requirements has become fiercely partisan and divisive in many states. The polarization of the debate has raised the stakes over this issue, making dispassionate analysis both more valuable and more rare. Voter ID is often described as the critical step in protecting the integrity of the ballot, the process to ensure that the potential voter is eligible and, if eligible, is permitted to cast one ballot and one ballot only. Truly protecting the integrity of the ballot, however, requires a perspective that takes in the entire voting process. It demands more than preventing the ineligible from voting, and should also ensure that all those who are eligible and want to vote can cast a ballot that counts. The protection effort must embrace all forms of voting, including absentee ballots, and consider each step in the process from registration through vote counting.

A voting system that requires voters to produce an identity document or documents may prevent the ineligible from voting. It may also prevent the eligible from casting a ballot. If the ID requirements block ineligible voters from the polls at the cost of preventing eligible voters who cannot obtain or have left at home the required forms of identification, the integrity of the ballot may not have been improved; the harm may be as great as the benefit. Ultimately, a normative evaluation of whether a state should adopt a stricter voter ID requirement (and, if so, what particular form that new requirement should take) will weigh value judgments as well as available factual evidence. Nonetheless, this report has proceeded on the premise that increased understanding of the factual evidence relating to the imposition of voter ID requirements, based on available data and statistical analysis of that data, can help inform the policy process.

Assessing the effectiveness of voter ID as a way to protect the integrity of the ballot should logically include an estimate of the nature and frequency of vote fraud. The EAC has commissioned a separate analysis of the incidence of vote fraud. Consequently, this research does not include consideration of vote fraud nor the possible effectiveness of various voter ID regimes to counter attempts at vote fraud. As a result, our study of the possible effects of voter ID

---

9 "Of the various electoral procedure laws passed in the fifty states since the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections and those still being debated in state legislatures and local media, few arouse more potent partisan feelings than voter identification laws." *Harvard Law Review* 119:1144. John Fund's 2004 book, *Stealing Elections: How Voter Fraud Threaten Our Democracy*, cites (pages 16 – 17) a Rasmussen Research poll that asked respondents if they were more concerned with voting by ineligible participants or with disenfranchisement of eligible voters. Sixty-two percent of Kerry supporters, but only 18 percent of Bush supporters, worried more about *disenfranchisement*; 58 percent of Bush supporters, but only 19 percent of Kerry supporters were more concerned with *voter fraud*. 
REVISED FINAL DRAFT
For review by the EAC's Advisory Boards

ID requirements on turnout cannot take into account how many potential voters who did not turn out under comparatively stricter voter ID requirements might have been ineligible or eligible to vote.

In some states, voters lacking required ID, or who have ID that does not reflect their current address, are able to vote only by casting a provisional ballot. Voter ID requirements that require voters to bring a document to the polls --rather than simply sign their names-- may divert more voters to the provisional ballot. Requiring poll workers to request and check ID, can put stress on the already demanding environment of the polling place. Scrutiny of ID can create lines at the polling places. Further delays can result when voters cast a provisional ballot and fill out the ballot envelope. Voters who cast a provisional ballot because they lack their ID on Election Day, and who then fail to return with the needed document or documents, will have their ballot rejected. And, of course, the cost of processing provisional ballots is greater than the cost of regular ballots.

Each of these potential consequences of more elaborate voter identification processes can increase the chance of litigation. Long lines will, at best, discourage voters and at worst make voting seem a hassle, an impression that could keep more citizens (even those with ID) from the polls.

Evaluating the effect of different Voter ID regimes can be most effective when based on clear standards --legal, equitable, practical. The standards outlined here might be described as questions policy-makers should ask about Voter ID requirements. We suggest 7 questions that address important dimensions of the problem.

1. Is the Voter ID system designed on the basis of valid and reliable empirical studies of the incidence of the sorts of vote fraud it is designed to prevent?

For example, the Florida voter ID law adopted after the 2004 election and pre-cleared by the Department of Justice, permits voters who cannot meet the ID requirements to sign an affidavit on the envelope of a provisional ballot, which will be counted if the signature matches that on the voter's registration form.

The EAC's Election Day Study found "improper ID," to be the third most common reason for a provisional ballot to be rejected. "Improper ID" was cited by 7 states responding to the survey, compared to 14 mentions for voting in the wrong precinct. Election Day Study, Chapter 6, p. 5.

"Often where the battle over voter identification is most heated, real evidence of voter fraud proves scarce: in Georgia, for example, the Secretary of State averred that she had never encountered a single instance of voter impersonation at the polls. State laws might sometimes impose tighter restrictions on in-person voting than on absentee ballots, which yield the greatest incidence of, and provide the easiest avenue for, voter fraud." Harvard Law Review 127:1144 (2006)
2. How effective is the ID requirement in increasing the security of the ballot? How well can it be coordinated with a statewide voter database? \(^{13}\)

3. How practical is the requirement? (Can it be administered smoothly by the staff and budget likely to be made available? How much additional training of polling place workers might be required?) Is it simple enough or can it be defined with sufficient clarity that poll workers throughout the state can administer it uniformly and with a minimum of local interpretation made on the fly under the pressure of Election Day? \(^{14}\)

4. How cost-effective is the system? Does it demonstrably increase the security of the ballot affordably, measured in both monetary and other costs? To improve understanding of the non-monetary component of the costs, conducting a voter impact study might be appropriate. The voter impact study would examine, before the adoption of the regulation, the cost of compliance by the voter (such as the cost in time and money of acquiring a photo ID card), any offsetting benefits to voters, and the possible disparate effects of the regulation on various groups of voters. \(^{15}\) A thorough, objective impact statement that demonstrated the nexus between the identification regime and the integrity of the ballot could provide protection against inevitable legal challenges.

5. If a side effect of the Voter ID regulation is likely to reduce turnout, generally or among particular groups, is it possible to take other steps to ameliorate the adverse consequences? \(^{16}\)

6. Does it comply with the letter and spirit of Voting Rights Act?

7. The seventh question is the most difficult to answer. How neutral is the effect of the Voter ID requirement on the composition of the qualified and eligible electorate? Might it,

\(^{13}\) See the final section of this report for a brief overview of possible effects of a statewide voter database on voter identification issues.

\(^{14}\) In New York, in 2004, disparities in training and voting information were made apparent in a study finding elections officials had wildly varying interpretations of what the state’s voter identification requirement actually was. Tova Wang, "Warning Bell in Ohio," December 5, 2005. Website, the Foundation for National Progress.

\(^{15}\) "Absent clear empirical evidence demonstrating widespread individual voter fraud, legislatures need to fashion narrowly tailored voter identification provisions with an eye toward the inevitable and well-grounded constitutional challenges that will arise in the courts. Only as states grow more adept at administering elections will courts likely demonstrate greater willingness to uphold strict identification requirements." Harvard Law Review 127:1144 (2006)

\(^{16}\) For example, the Carter-Baker Commission coupled its recommendation for a national voter ID card to a call for an affirmative effort by the states to reach out and register the unregistered, that is, to use the new Voter ID regime as a means to enroll more voters. Similarly, Richard Hasen has suggested combining a national voter ID with universal registration. See his "Beyond the Margin of Litigation: Reforming U.S. Election Administration to Avoid Electoral Meltdown," 62 Washington and Lee Law Review 937 (2005).
intentionally or unintentionally, reduce the turnout of particular groups of voters or supporters of one party or another without an offsetting decrease in vote fraud?

Voter ID and Turnout

Based on research for this study by the Moritz College of Law, states had one of five types of maximum requirements in place on Election Day 2004. These are shown in Table 1, Voter ID Requirements. The five categories: at the polling place, voters were asked to either: state their names (10 states); sign their names (13 states and the District of Columbia); sign their names, to be matched to a signature on file (seven states); provide a form of identification that did not necessarily include a photo (15 states); or provide a photo identification (five states).17 Using this information made it possible to code the states according to these requirements, and examine the assumption that voter identification requirements would pose an increasingly demanding requirement in this order: stating one's name, signing one's name, matching one's signature to a signature on file, providing a form of identification, and providing a form of photo identification, however, in all "photo ID" states in 2004, voters without photo ID could cast a regular ballot after signing an affidavit concerning their identity and eligibility or provide other forms of ID). The report refers to this set of ID requirements as "maximum," the most rigorous ID the voter can be asked to present at the polling place in order to cast a regular ballot.18

Election laws in several states offer exceptions to these requirements if potential voters lack the necessary form of identification. Laws in those states set a minimum standard – that is the minimum requirement that a voter may be required to satisfy in order to vote using a regular ballot. States can be categorized based on the minimum requirement for voting with a regular ballot. In 2004 the categories were somewhat different compared to the maximum requirement, in that none of the states required photo identification as a minimum standard for voting with a regular ballot. That is, voters who lacked photo ID would still be allowed to vote in all states, if able to meet another requirement. Four states required voters to swear an affidavit as to their identity (Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, and North Dakota). The five categories for minimum requirements were: state name (12 states), sign name (14 states and the District of Columbia), match one's signature to a signature on file (six states), provide a non-photo identification (14 states), or swear an affidavit (four states). The analysis also examined this array of minimum

17 Oregon conducts elections entirely by mail. Voters sign their mail-in ballots, and election officials match the signatures to signatures on file. For the purposes of this analysis, Oregon is classified as a state that requires a signature match.
18 As noted above, our analysis does not consider additional requirements that particular voters may be subjected to as part of an official challenge process, in the event that their eligibility is called into question.
identification requirements to assess how they correlated with turnout: state name, sign name, match signature, provide non-photo identification, and, given the potential legal consequences for providing false information, swearing an affidavit. As noted above, no state had a "minimum" requirement of showing photo ID. This analysis therefore cannot estimate the effect of laws, such as those recently enacted in Indiana and Georgia that require voters to show photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot without an affidavit or other exception.

We recognize the difficulties in summarizing each state's voter ID requirements. The problem is illustrated by the number of footnotes to Table 1 below. The variety of statutory and regulatory details among the states is complex.

Moving beyond the statutes and regulations, we also recognize that the assignment of each state to one category may fail to reflect actual practice at many polling places. As in any system run by fallible humans, the voter ID process is subject to variation in practice.19 Voters may have been confronted with demands for identification different from the directives in state statutes or regulation. It seems reasonable to conclude, however, that while actual practices may vary, the variance is around each state's legal requirement for ID. The analysis of the effect of state requirements on turnout must be viewed with some caution. We believe that the categories used in this report provide an acceptable level of discrimination among voter identification regimes.

19 One state election official told us that, "We have 110 election jurisdictions in Illinois, and I have reason to believe [the voter ID requirements] are administered little bit differently in each one. We wish it weren't that way, but it probably is."
TABLE 1 - Voter ID Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Maximum Forms of ID Required 2004</th>
<th>Current ID Requirement for First-Time Voters</th>
<th>Current ID Requirements for All Other Voters</th>
<th>Verification Method for Provisional Ballots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Gov-issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Gov-issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID*</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Apply ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Apply ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Apply ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID*</td>
<td>DOB and Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Apply ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Apply ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Apply ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Apply ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Apply ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>No Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn.</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix 1 for a more detailed summary, including citations and statutory language, of the identification requirements in each state.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>ID Requirement</th>
<th>Signature/Address Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* States applies only HAVA’s ID requirement, applicable to first-time voters who registered by mail and did not provide applicable ID at the time of registration.

1 Arizona voters who lack a photo ID may present 2 forms of ID with no photograph.

2 Florida required a photo ID in 2004, but voters without that credential could sign an affidavit concerning their identity and eligibility and cast a regular ballot. Florida subsequently changed its law to require that voters present photo ID to cast a regular ballot, though voters without photo ID may still cast a provisional ballot by signing an affidavit, which ballot should ordinarily be counted.

3 Louisiana required a photo ID in 2004. Voters without that credential could sign an affidavit concerning their identity and eligibility and cast a regular ballot.

4 Pennsylvania requires ID of all first-time voters, whether they registered by mail or in-person.

5 Voters lacking a photo ID could vote by providing another form of ID in 2004.

6 Voters lacking a photo ID could vote by providing another form of ID in 2004.

7 Tennessee voters must provide signature and address. In counties without computerized lists, the signature is compared to the registration card. In counties with computerized lists, the signature is compared to a signature on ID presented with the registration.

8 Texas voters must present a current registration certificate. Those without a certificate can vote provisionally after completing an affidavit.

 Relationship of Voter ID requirements to Turnout

The statistical analysis examined the potential variation in turnout rates based on the type of voter identification required in each state on Election Day 2004 using two sets of data: aggregate turnout data at the county level for each state, as compiled by the Eagleton Institute of Politics, and individual-level survey data included in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau.

The statistical analysis examined turnout among U.S. citizens of voting age in both the aggregate and the individual-level data. Determining citizenship status in the individual-level data simply involved restricting the analyses to individuals who identified themselves as citizens in the November 2004 Current Population Survey. (Those who said they were not citizens did not have the opportunity to answer the supplemental voting questions contained in the Current Population Survey.)
Findings of the statistical analysis

The analysis looked at the voter identification requirements in two ways, as a continuous variable and as a series of discrete variables. As a continuous variable the maximum voter identification requirements are ranked according to how demanding they were judged to be, with photo ID as the most demanding requirement. As discrete variables, the statistical analysis assume that stating name is the least demanding ID requirement and compare each other requirement to it.

The analysis treating the requirements as a continuous variable offers some statistical support for the premise that as the level of required proof increases, turnout declines. Averaging across counties in each state, statewide turnout is negatively correlated with maximum voter identification requirements ($r = -.30, p < .05$). In considering the array of minimum requirements, with affidavit as the most demanding requirement, however, the correlation between voter identification and turnout is negative, but it is not statistically significant ($r = -.20, p = .16$). This suggests that the relationship between turnout rates and minimum requirements may not be linear. Breaking down the turnout rates by type of requirement reveals in greater detail the relationship between voter identification requirements and voter turnout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voter Identification Required in the States</th>
<th>Mean Voter Turnout for States in that Category</th>
<th>Voter Identification Required in the States</th>
<th>Mean Voter Turnout for States in that Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Name</td>
<td>64.2 %</td>
<td>State Name</td>
<td>63.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>61.1 %</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>60.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Signature</td>
<td>60.9 %</td>
<td>Match Signature</td>
<td>61.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Non-Photo ID</td>
<td>59.3 %</td>
<td>Provide Non-Photo ID</td>
<td>59.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Photo ID</td>
<td>58.1 %</td>
<td>Swear Affidavit</td>
<td>60.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Turnout (All States)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table displays the mean turnout using the aggregate county level data for each state in 2004.

The aggregate data show that 60.9 percent of the estimated citizen voting age population voted in 2004. Differences in voter turnout at the state level in 2004 varied based on voter identification requirements. Taking into account the maximum requirements, an average of 64.6 percent of the voting age population turned out in states that required voters to state their names, compared to 58.1 percent in states that required photo identification. A similar trend...
emerged when considering minimum requirements. Sixty-three percent of the voting age population turned out in states requiring voters to state their names, compared to 60.1 percent in states that required an affidavit from voters. Given the lack of a clear, consistent linear relationship between turnout and minimum identification requirements, however, we opted to treat the voter identification requirements as a series of dichotomous variables in subsequent analyses.21

Voter identification requirements are just one factor that may affect voter turnout. Multivariate models that take into account other predictors of turnout can paint a more complete picture of the relationship between voter identification requirements and turnout. This analysis estimated the effects of voter identification requirements in multivariate models that also took into account the electoral context in 2004 and demographic characteristics of the population in each county. While the model takes account of several important variables, statistical models do not capture all the messiness of the real world. It is a simplification of a complex reality, and its results should be treated with appropriate caution.

The model also took into account such variables as:

- Was the county in a presidential battleground state?
- Was the county was in a state with a competitive race for governor and/or the U.S. Senate?
- Percentage of the voting-age population in each county that was Hispanic or African-American 22
- Percentage of county residents age 65 and older
- Percentage of county residents below the poverty line

Another contextual factor to consider is voter registration requirements, such as the deadline for registration. As states set the deadline farther away from Election Day, the task of remembering to register to vote becomes more challenging. Thus our model takes into account the number of days between each state’s registration deadline and the election.

21 The voter identification requirements are coded as a series of dummy variables, coding each variable as one if the requirement existed in a given state, and zero otherwise. This yielded five dichotomous variables for maximum requirements (state name, sign name, match signature, non-photo identification, or photo identification), and five dichotomous variables for minimum requirements (state name, sign name, match signature, non-photo identification, or providing an affidavit). Omitted is the variable for stating one's name so that it could serve as the reference category in comparison with the other four identification requirements in each of the statistical analyses.

22 The U.S. Census projections for 2003 provided the data for the percentage of the voting-age population in each county that was Hispanic or African-American and for the percentage of county residents age 65 and older.
The dependent variable in each model was voter turnout at the county level, with turnout calculated as the percentage of the citizen voting-age population that voted in the 2004 election.

The results of this modeling suggest that voter identification requirements such as signature matching, a non-photo ID or a photo ID are associated with lower turnout than in states that required voters to simply state their name, holding constant the electoral context and demographic variables.

Contextual factors, such as whether the county was in a battleground state or whether that state had a competitive race for governor and/or U.S. Senate, were associated with increased voter turnout. The time between the closing date for registration and the election was correlated with a slight negative effect on turnout. As the percentage of Hispanics in the county's population increased, turnout declined. The percentage of senior citizens in the county and household median income were associated with higher turnout. The percentage of African-Americans in the county did not have a significant effect in the model. The percentage of senior citizens in the county and household median income showed a positive correlation with turnout. In this aggregate model, the percentage of African-Americans in the county was not associated with a significant difference in turnout.

The relationship of the minimum voter identification requirements to turnout was not demonstrated. None of the dummy variables for voter identification requirements were statistically significant. Being a battleground state and having a competitive statewide race were significant and positive, as was the percentage of senior citizens in the county and household median income. The percentage of Hispanics in the county’s population continued to be associated with reduced turnout, as was the number of days between the closing date for registration and the election.

Analysis of the aggregate data at the county level generates some support for the hypothesis that stricter identification requirements are correlated with lower turnout. For the maximum

---

23 This test incorporated a series of interactions between the maximum and minimum voter identification requirements and the percentage of African-Americans and Hispanics living in the counties. In each case the interactions did not improve the fit of the models to the data. See tables A-1 and A-2 in the appendix of Vercellotti's paper in the appendices.
requirements, a signature match, non-photo identification or photo identification were correlated with lower turnout in 2004, compared to requiring that voters simply state their names.

Aggregate data, however, cannot fully capture the individual demographic factors that may figure into the decision to turn out to vote. Voter identification requirements could have a relationship to the turnout of particular groups of voters, in ways that county-level aggregate data on turnout would not capture. To explore the effects of voter identification requirements on turnout more completely, it is important to examine individual-level data as well.

Individual-level Analysis

Individual-level turnout data exists in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. The Census Bureau conducts the CPS monthly to measure unemployment and other workforce data, but the bureau adds a battery of voter participation questions to the November survey in even-numbered years to coincide with either a presidential or midterm Congressional election.

One of the of the CPS is the sheer size of the sample. The survey’s Voting and Registration Supplement consisted of interviews, either by telephone or in person, with 96,452 respondents. The large sample size permits analyses of smaller groups, such as Black or Hispanic voters or voters with less than a high school education. The statistical analysis in relying on the CPS is based on reports from self-described registered voters. Omitted are those who said they were not registered to vote, as are those who said they cast absentee ballots because the identification requirements for absentee ballots may differ from those required when one votes in person. Eliminated from the sample are respondents who said they were not U.S. citizens; the questionnaire design skipped those individuals past the voter registration and turnout questions in the survey. In addition to the voter identification requirements, the models include other socioeconomic, demographic, and political environment factors that might have

24 For example, previous research has found that education is a powerful determinant of turnout (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980, but see also Nagler 1991). Married people also are more likely to vote than those who are not married (Alvarez and Ansolabehere 2002; Alvarez, Nagler and Wilson 2004; Fisher, Kenny, and Morton 1993). 25 It is important to note that the Census Bureau allows respondents to answer on behalf of themselves and others in the household during the interview. While proxy reporting of voter turnout raises the possibility of inaccurate reports concerning whether another member of the household voted, follow-up interviews with those for whom a proxy report had been given in the November 1984 CPS showed 99 percent agreement between the proxy report and the information given by the follow-up respondent (U.S. Census Bureau 1990).
The dependent variable in these analyses is whether a respondent said he or she voted in the November 2004 election.\textsuperscript{27}

In the model, three of the voter identification requirements have a statistically significant correlation with whether survey respondents said they had voted in 2004. That is, compared to states that require voters only to state their names, the requirement to sign one’s name, provide a non-photo ID, or photo ID in the maximum requirements or affidavit in the minimum is associated with lower turnout.

Of the other state factors, only the competitiveness of the presidential race showed a significant, correlation with increased turnout. In terms of demographic influences, African-American voters were more likely than white voters or other voters to say they had cast a ballot, while Asian-Americans were less likely than white or other voters to say they had turned out. Hispanic voters were not statistically different from white or other voters in terms of reported turnout. Consistent with previous research, income, and marital status all were positive predictors of voting. Women also were more likely to say they voted than men. Among the age categories, those ages 45 to 64 and 65 and older were more likely than those ages 18 to 24 to say they voted. Respondents who had earned a high school diploma, attended some college, graduated from college or attended graduate school were all more likely to say they voted than those who had not finished high school.

While the probit models provide statistical evidence for the relationship of voter identification requirements and other variables to turnout, probit coefficients do not lend themselves to intuitive interpretation.\textsuperscript{28} Table 3 below shows predicted probabilities (calculated from the probit coefficients) of voting for each level of voter identification requirements while holding all other independent variables in the models at their means.\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{26} The models are estimated using probit analysis, which calculates the effects of independent variables on the probability that an event occurred – in this case whether a respondent said he or she voted and using robust standard errors to control for correlated error terms for observations from within the same state.

\textsuperscript{27} The U.S. Census Bureau reported, based on the November 2004 CPS, that 89 percent of those who identified themselves as registered voters said they voted in 2004 (U.S. Census Bureau 2005). Previous research has shown that, generally speaking, some survey respondents overstate their incidence of voting. Researchers speculate that over-reports may be due to the social desirability that accompanies saying one has done his or her civic duty, or a reluctance to appear outside the mainstream of American political culture (U.S. Census Bureau 1990). It is also possible that voting is an indication of civic engagement that predisposes voters to agree to complete surveys at a higher rate than non-voters (Flanigan and Zingale 2002). Hence the voter turnout rates reported in the CPS tend to be up to 10 percentage points higher than the actual turnout rate for the nation (Flanigan and Zingale 2002). Even with this caveat, however, the CPS serves as a widely accepted source of data on voting behavior.

\textsuperscript{28} A probit model is a popular specification of a generalized linear regression model, using the probit link function.

\textsuperscript{29} In the case of dichotomous independent variables, holding them at their mean amounted to holding them at the percentage of the sample that was coded 1 for the variable (Long 1997).
Table 3. Predicted probability of voter turnout – all voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum requirement</th>
<th>Minimum requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from “state name” to “photo ID” or “affidavit”</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 54,973

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies stating one’s name to providing photo identification or an affidavit, with all other variables held constant. N.S. = nonsignificant coefficient in the probit model.


Taking into account that signature matches were not a predictor of turnout, the differences in predicted probability decline from stating one’s name to providing a photo identification or affidavit. Voters in states that required photo identification were 2.7 percent less likely to vote than voters in states where individuals had to give their names.\(^\text{30}\) In terms of the minimum requirement, voters in states that required an affidavit at minimum were 4 percent less likely to turn out than voters in states where they had to give their names.

The differences were more pronounced for those lower in education. Constraining the model to show predicted probabilities only for those with less than a high school diploma, the probability of voting was 5.1 percent lower in states that required photo identification as the maximum requirement and 7 percent lower in states that required an affidavit as the minimum requirement compared to states where stating one’s name was the maximum or minimum requirement.

\(^\text{30}\) The voter turnout percentages may seem disproportionately high compared to the turnout rates reported in the aggregate data analysis. It is important to consider that the turnout rates in the aggregate data were a proportion of all citizens of voting-age population, while the turnout rates for the individual-level data are the proportion of only registered voters who said they voted.
Race and ethnicity have generated particular interest in the debate over voter ID requirements. The analysis using the aggregate data shed no light on the association between voter ID requirements and turnout for African-American and Hispanic voters. But in the models using the individual data, some significant relationships emerged for African-American, Hispanic and Asian citizens. For the entire population, the signature, non-photo identification and photo identification requirements all were associated with lower turnout compared to the requirement that voters simply state their names. These correlations translated into reduced probabilities of voting of about 3 to 4 percent for the entire sample, with larger differences for specific subgroups. For example, the predicted probability that Hispanics would vote in states that required non-photo identification was about 10 percentage points lower than in states where Hispanic voters gave their names. The difference was about 6 percent for African-Americans and Asian-Americans, and about 2 percent for white voters.

The model also showed that Hispanic voters were less likely to vote in states that required non-photo identification as opposed to stating one's name. Hispanic voters were 10 percent less likely to vote in non-photo identification states compared to states where voters only had to give their name.

Varying voter identification requirements were associated with lower turnout rates for Asian-American voters as well. Asian-American voters were 8.5 percent less likely to vote in states that required non-photo identification compared to states that require voters to state their names under the maximum requirements, and they were 6.1 percent less likely to vote where non-photo identification was the minimum requirement.

Conclusions of the Statistical Analysis

The statistical analysis found that, as voter identification requirements vary, voter turnout varies as well. This finding emerged from both the aggregate data and the individual-level data, although not always for both the maximum and minimum sets of requirements. The overall relationship between ID requirements and turnout for all registered voters was fairly small, but still statistically significant.

31 Incorporating discrete variables for Hispanics, African-Americans, and Asian-Americans into one model carries the implicit assumption that the remaining variables, including education and income, will influence each of these groups in a similar manner in terms of deciding whether to vote. These assumptions are not always born out by the data (see Leighley and Vedlitz, 1999.) To isolate the effects of voter identification and other variables on voter turnout within specific racial and ethnic groups, the sample is divided into sub-samples and the model re-run to calculate the data discussed and shown in Tables 5, 6, and 7 in Appendix C.
In the aggregate data, the match signature requirement, the provide a non-photo ID requirement, and the photo ID requirement were all correlated with lower turnout compared to requiring that voters state their names.

The signature, non-photo ID, and photo ID requirements were all correlated with lower turnout compared to the requirement that voters simply state their names. That the non-photo identification requirement was the most consistent in terms of statistical significance across the groups is intriguing given the intense debates surrounding photo identification requirements.

Significant questions about the relationship between voter identification requirements and turnout remain unanswered. The data examined in the statistical analysis could not capture the dynamics of how identification requirements might lower turnout, nor could they rule out that other attributes of a state’s electoral system might explain the statistically significant correlations that the study found. If ID requirements dampen turnout, is it because individuals are aware of the requirements and stay away from the polls because they cannot or do not want to meet the requirements? Or, do the requirements result in some voters being turned away when they cannot meet the requirements on Election Day, or forced to cast a provisional ballot that is not ultimately counted? The CPS data do not include measures that can answer this question. Knowing more about the “on the ground” experiences of voters concerning identification requirements could guide policy-makers at the state and local level in determining whether and at what point in the electoral cycle a concerted public information campaign might be most effective in helping voters to meet identification requirements. Such knowledge also could help in designing training for election judges to handle questions about, and potential disputes over, voter identification requirements.

Litigation Over Voter ID Requirements

A handful of cases have challenged identification requirements in court in recent years. In general, requirements that voters provide some identifying documentation have been upheld, where photo ID is not the only acceptable form. Whether laws requiring photo ID will be upheld is more doubtful.

To date, only two cases have considered laws requiring voters to show photo ID (Common Cause v. Billups and Indiana Democratic Party v. Rokita). Cases challenging the mandatory disclosure of voters’ Social Security numbers on privacy grounds have yielded mixed results.

Non-photo identification. For the most part, courts have looked favorably on requirements that voters present some form of identifying documents if the photo identification is not the
only form accepted. In *Colorado Common Cause v. Davidson*, No. 04CV7709, 2004 WL 2360485, at *1 (Colo. Dist. Ct. Oct. 18, 2004), plaintiffs challenged a law requiring all in-person voters to show identification (not just first-time registrants). The court upheld this requirement against a constitutional challenge. Similarly, in *League of Women Voters v. Blackwell*, 340 F. Supp. 2d 823 (N.D. Ohio 2004), the court rejected a challenge to an Ohio directive requiring first-time voters who registered by mail to provide one of the HAVA-permitted forms of identification, in order to have their provisional ballots counted. Specifically, the directive provided that their provisional ballots would be counted if the voter (a) orally recited his driver's license number or the last four digits of his social security number or (b) returned to the polling place before it closed with some acceptable identification (including reciting those identification numbers). *Id.* This was found to be consistent with HAVA.

*Photo ID.* Since the 2004 election, two states have adopted laws requiring photo identification at the polls in order to have one's vote counted, without an affidavit exception: Georgia and Indiana.32 Both these requirements were enacted in 2005 and both have been challenged in court. The Georgia law required voters attempting to cast a ballot in person present a valid form of photographic identification. O.C.G.A. § 21-2-417. On October 18, 2005, the District Court granted the plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction, enjoining the application of the new identification requirements on constitutional grounds. In granting the injunction, the court held that plaintiffs' claims under both the Fourteenth Amendment (equal protection) and Twenty-Fourth Amendment (poll tax) had a substantial likelihood of succeeding on the merits at trial (*Common Cause v. Billups*, Prelim. Inj. 96, 104). In January 2006, Georgia enacted a modified version of its photo ID law, which the court has not yet ruled on. In the other state that has enacted a photo ID requirement (Indiana), legal challenges have also been filed. (*Indiana Democratic Party v. Rokita* and *Crawford v. Marion County Election Board*). On April 14, 2006, the district court granted defendants' motion for summary judgment, concluding that plaintiffs had failed to produce evidence showing that the state's ID law would have an adverse impact on voters. Another case of significance, for purposes of photo ID requirements, is *American Civil Liberties Union of Minnesota v. Kiffmeyer*, No. 04-CV-4653, 2004 WL

---

32 Indiana's law does allow voters without ID to cast provisional ballots, and then to appear before the county board of elections to execute an affidavit saying that they are indigent and unable to obtain the requisite ID without payment of a fee. But in contrast to other states, voters cannot cast a ballot that will be counted by submitting an affidavit at the polls, affirming that they are the registered voter and are otherwise eligible to vote.
In that case, the court enjoined a Minnesota law that allowed the use of tribal photo ID cards, only for an Indian who lived on the reservation. 2004 WL 2428690, at *1. The Court found no rational basis for distinguishing based on whether or not the cardholder lives on the reservation. Id. at *1. These decisions indicate that courts are likely to carefully scrutinize the evidence regarding the impact of photo ID requirements.

Privacy. In Greidinger v. Davis, 988 F.2d 1344 (4th Cir. 1993), the court struck down on due process grounds a Virginia law requiring disclosure of voters’ social security numbers for voter registration. The social security numbers recorded in voter registration lists had been disclosed to the public and political parties that had requested the lists. The court found that the requirement to give the social security number effectively conditioned rights on the consent to an invasion of privacy. It concluded that this public disclosure of the social security numbers was not necessary to achieve the government’s interest in preventing fraud. On the other hand, in McKay v. Thompson, 226 F.3d 752 (6th Cir. 2000), the court rejected privacy challenges based on both the Constitution and federal statutes, to a Tennessee law requiring social security numbers for voter registration since 1972. 226 F.3d at 755. Second, the NVRA only permits requiring the minimum amount of information necessary to prevent duplicate voter registration and to determine eligibility. The distinction appears to be between the use of Social Security numbers for internal purposes only, which was deemed permissible, and the disclosure of those numbers to the public, which was not.

These decisions suggest that the courts will carefully scrutinize the evidence, where states require that voters produce a photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot. The courts have used a balancing test to weigh the legitimate interest in preventing election fraud against the citizen’s right to privacy (protecting social security numbers from public disclosure, for example) and the reasonableness of requirements for identity documents. To provide both the clarity and certainty in administration of elections needed to forestall destabilizing challenges to outcomes, these early decisions suggest that best practice may be to limit requirements for voter identification to the minimum needed to prevent duplicate registration and ensure eligibility.

Developments since 2004
Since the passage of HAVA, with its limited requirements for voter identification, and following the 2004 election, debate over voter ID has taken place in state legislatures across the country. That debate has not been characterized by solid information on the consequences of tightening requirements for voters to identify themselves before being permitted to cast a regular, rather than a provisional, ballot.

Better information might improve the quality of the debate. Answers to the following key questions are not available in a form that might satisfy those on both sides of the argument.

- What is the overall incidence of vote fraud?
- How does fraud take place in the various stage of the process: registration, voting at the polls, absentee voting, or ballot counting?
- What contribution can tighter requirements for voter ID make to reducing vote fraud?
- What would be the other consequences of increasingly demanding requirements for voters to identify themselves? This is the question addressed, within the limits of the available data, in the analysis in this report.

Answering these questions would provide the information needed for more informed judgment in the states as they consider the tradeoffs among the competing goals of ballot integrity, ballot access, and administrative efficiency. The Carter-Baker Commission recognized the tradeoffs when it tied recommendation for national ID to an affirmative effort by government to identify unregistered voters and make it easy for them to register.

State Voter Databases and Voter ID

With the implementation of the HAVA Computerized Statewide Voter Registration List, an application for voter registration for an election for Federal office may not be accepted or processed unless the application includes a driver's license number or last four digits of the Social Security number on the voter registration form. This information can be used to verify the identity of the registrant through interfacing with lists maintained by the Motor Vehicle office and Social Security office. If registrants do not have either a driver's license or Social Security number, the State will assign a unique identifier number to that person.

Some states are wrestling now with these unresolved issues. In New Jersey, for example, pending legislation would require that voters must be able to confirm their registration through a secure access to the Statewide Voter Registration List. It also requires voters to present ID at
the polls in order to cast a regular ballot if the numbers recorded on the registration have not been verified (or if no verifiable number appears on the registration). It recognizes the HAVA requirement that if the number provided by the voter has not been verified and if the voter does not present ID at the polls, that voter may cast a provisional ballot. The bill does not specify they have to provide ID within 48 hours in order for their vote to count, as is the case with first-time mail-in registrants.

As some states gain experience in this area, the EAC would perform a useful service by making timely recommendations of best practices for all states to consider.

Conclusions
The analysis of voter ID requirements is complex. It takes into account important values associated with an electoral process, such as ballot access and integrity. The continuing effort to understand how voter ID requirements may affect turnout and the integrity of the ballot could benefit from additional factual information, including statistical analyses. Our research includes a statistical study of this kind. It indicated that the level of voter turnout in a state is correlated with the stringency of the voter ID requirement imposed by that state. Additional empirical research of this nature, with additional data collected by or for the EAC, would further illuminate the relationship between stricter voter ID rules and turnout, perhaps explaining if awareness of a strict ID requirement tends to discourage would-be voters from going to the polls. Or, additional research may shed light on whether, if voters did go to the polls, stricter Voter ID requirements will divert more voters into the line for provisional ballots. The consequence of increased reliance on provisional ballots can be longer lines at the polls and confusion, without necessarily a clear demonstration that the security of the ballot is correspondingly increased.  

The debate over voter ID in the states would be improved by additional research sponsored by the EAC. That might include longitudinal studies of jurisdictions that have changed voter ID requirements, as well as precinct-level analyses that would allow more finely tuned assessment of the correlation between stricter identification requirements and turnouts. Further research could also identify methods to eliminate the need for voters to bring specific identity documents. 

[33] In this connection, the Brennan Center’s response to the Carter-Baker Commission report observes that, “while it might be true that in a close election "a small amount of fraud could make the margin of difference," it is equally true that the rejection of a much larger number of eligible voters could make a much bigger difference in the outcome.” Response to the Report of the 2005 Commission on Federal Election Reform, The Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law and Spencer Overton, On Behalf Of The National Network on State Election Reform, September 19, 2005.
with them to the polls, while assuring that each voter who casts a ballot is eligible and votes only once.
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REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EAC
VOTER IDENTIFICATION ISSUES

Report Background
The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) (Public Law 107-252) authorizes the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) (Sec. 241, 42 USC 15381) to conduct periodic studies of election administration issues. The purpose of these studies is to promote methods for voting and administering elections, including provisional voting, that are convenient, accessible and easy to use; that yield accurate, secure and expeditious voting systems; that afford each registered and eligible voter an equal opportunity to vote and to have that vote counted; and that are efficient.

This study provides information on voter identification practices in the 2004 election. It makes recommendations for best practices to evaluate future proposals for voter ID requirements, including the systematic collection and evaluation of information from the states. The research was conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University under a contract with the EAC, dated May 24, 2005. The work included a review and legal analysis of state statutes, regulations and litigation concerning voter identification and provisional voting as well as a statistical analysis of the relationship of various requirements for voter identification to turnout in the 2004 election. This report is a companion to a report on Provisional Voting submitted to the EAC on November 28, 2005 under the same contract.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Background and Methods
This report arrives at a time of considerable ferment over the issue of voter identification. The debate across the nation over requiring voters to produce a specific identification document before being permitted to cast a regular (as opposed to a provisional) ballot, has revealed supporters and opponents in polarized camps.

- Proponents of stricter identification requirements base their case on improving the security of the ballot by reducing opportunities for one kind of vote fraud -- multiple voting or voting by those who are not eligible. The proponents argue that their goal is to ensure that only those legally entitled to vote do so, and do so only once at each election.
Opponents seek to forestall more stringent identification requirements, such as for government-issued photo ID, in order to ensure broad access to a regular ballot. They fear that some voters—such as, they argue, racial and ethnic minorities, the young, and elderly voters—may lack convenient access to the required ID documents, or that such voters may be fearful of submitting their ID documents to official scrutiny and thus stay away from the polls.

Both sides argue that their preferred policy will engender faith in the electoral process among citizens.

This report considers policy issues associated with the voter ID debate and investigates whether empirical study can suggest a way to estimate the effects of different voter ID requirements on turnout, and important first step in assessing tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access. The aim is to contribute to the effort to raise the quality of the debate over this contentious topic. The tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access are crucial. A voting system that requires voters to produce an identity document or documents may prevent the ineligible from voting. It may also prevent eligible voters from casting a ballot. If the ID requirement of a ballot protection system blocks ineligible voters from the polls at the cost of preventing eligible voters who lack the required forms of identification, the integrity of the ballot may not have been improved; the harm may be as great as the benefit.

As part of the project’s effort to analyze the relationship between Voter ID requirements, turnout, and their policy implications, a statistical analysis was conducted to examine the potential variation in turnout. This statistical study developed a model to illuminate the relationships between voter ID requirements and turnout. This model’s findings and limitations suggest avenues for further research and analysis that may assist the EAC and the states as they explore policies to balance the goals of ballot integrity and ballot access.

The statistical analysis describes one possible way to estimate what might be the incremental effect on voters’ access to the ballot of an increase in the rigor of voter identification requirements. We do not offer this statistical analysis as the last word, but rather as a preliminary word on the subject. Its findings must be regarded as tentative; the information that might permit greater certainty is simply not available. Indeed, as our recommendations indicate, the next step to improve understanding of the effects of stricter voter identification on turnout and on vote fraud is to collect more information on both topics systematically and regularly.
Making a statistical estimate of the effect of voting regulations on turnout is difficult. The dynamics of turnout are complex, much studied, and only partially understood. Some agreement exists, however, that three factors that exert substantial influence on voter turnout are: the socioeconomic status of the potential voter; legal requirements to vote; and the political context of the election. By focusing on how voters identify themselves at the polls, this report emphasizes legal requirements. The statistical analysis also considers some of the socioeconomic, racial, and age characteristics of the electorate, as well as the political context in 2004 (such as whether a state was a battleground in the presidential race).

Examining tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access requires some measure of the effectiveness of voter ID requirements in reducing multiple voting or voting by ineligible voters. The existing evidence on the incidence of vote fraud, especially on the kind of vote fraud that could be reduced by requiring more rigorous voter identification, is not sufficient to evaluate those tradeoffs. Assessing the effectiveness of voter ID as a way to protect the integrity of the ballot should logically include an estimate of the nature and frequency of vote fraud. This research does not include consideration of vote fraud, nor does it estimate the possible effectiveness of various voter ID regimes to counter attempts at vote fraud. Our analysis also cannot take into account how many potential voters who did not turn out under comparatively stricter voter ID requirements might have been ineligible or eligible to vote.

Despite these qualifications regarding the quality of the available data and the limitations of statistical analysis, however, although it used different statistical methods and two different sets of data on turnout in 2004 election, it points to the same general finding. As discussed at greater length in the appendix to this report, stricter voter identification requirements were correlated with reduced turnout in the models employed. As explained below, these models find that a statistically significant relationship exists, even when controlling for other factors (such as whether the election was in a battleground state) that might affect turnout. Without knowing more about the effects of stricter voter ID on reducing multiple voting or voting by ineligible voters, identifying the nature and frequency of vote fraud remains important.

---

1 See, for example, Tom William Rice and Patrick J. Kenney, "Voter Turnout in Presidential Primaries." 1985. Political Behavior, 7: 101-112. Identification requirements are not the only legal restrictions on voting. States also differ, for example, in their registration requirements (including how long before the election registration must take place and the identity documents required register).

2 The EAC has contracted with other researchers to study vote fraud issues.

3 Appendix C: Tim Vercellotti, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Analysis of Effects of Voter Identification Requirements on Turnout.
voters, however, the tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access cannot be assessed fully.

Methodology
The report includes detailed information on the nature of the statutory requirements across the country in 2004 and on the statutes and court decisions that provide the legal context for the voter ID debate. We gathered information on the requirements in effect in the 50 states and the District of Columbia in that year. Based on our interpretation of state statutes, supplemented in some cases by conversations with state election officials, we divided the states’ ID requirements into five categories. We believe each category is more rigorous than the one preceding, based on the demands they make on voters. The categories range from “Stating Name” which we judge to be somewhat less demanding than “Signing Name.” “Signature Match” requires poll workers to examine the signature and compare it to a sample, which is slightly more demanding that the voter simply signing. “Present ID” requires voters to offer some documentary evidence of their identity, ranging from a utility bill to a passport. It is more demanding than the previous three categories because it requires that the voter remember to bring this documentation to the polls. (Even a simple ID, such as a utility bill, may not be available to some renters or, say, those in group housing.) We regard a government “Photo ID” as the most rigorous requirement. Such identity documents may not be uniformly and conveniently available to all voters.

For each state, we identified both the “maximum” and “minimum” identification requirements. The term “maximum” refers to the most that voters may be asked to do or show at the polling place (putting aside cases in which particular voter’s eligibility may be questioned pursuant to a state challenge process). The term “minimum,” on the other hand, refers to the most that voters can be required to do or show, in order to cast regular ballot (again leaving aside a state challenge process). We have included “maximum” requirements in our analysis, and not simply “minimum” requirements, because simply asking voters to produce particular identifying information may have a deterrent effect, even if voters are ultimately allowed to cast a regular ballot without that identification. For example, in a state where voters are asked to show photo ID at the polling place, but still allowed to vote by completing an affidavit confirming their eligibility, the “maximum” of being asked to show photo ID may deter some voters even though the “minimum” would allow them to vote without photo ID.

---

4 Even the most relaxed provisions for identification at the polls—anything stricter than the honor system used in North Dakota—will impose some burden on particular voters. Harvard Law Review 119:1146
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It is worth emphasizing that, at the time of the 2004 election, there was no state that had a "minimum" requirement of showing photo ID – in other words, there was no state that required voters to show photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot. For this reason, our report does not measure the impact of laws, like those recently enacted in Indiana and Georgia, which require voters to show photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot without an affidavit exception.

To examine the potential variation on turnout rates associated with each type of voter ID requirements in effect on Election Day 2004, the statistical analysis drew on two sets of data. These were, first, aggregate turnout data at the county level for each state and, second, the reports of individual voters collected in the November 2004 Current Population Survey by the U. S. Census Bureau. Using two different data sets makes it possible to check the validity of one analysis against the other. It also provides insights not possible using only one of the data sets. The aggregate analysis cannot provide valid estimates on the effects of different ID requirements on particular demographic groups (e.g., the old, the young, African-Americans, the poor, or high school graduates). The Current Population Survey data does permit that kind of analysis, although it has the disadvantage of relying on self-reports by respondents about their registration status and experience in the polling place.

To understand legal issues that have been raised in recent litigation over voter ID requirements, we collected and analyzed the few major cases that have been decided so far on this issue. The decisions so far provide some guidance on the constitutional and other constraints as to voter ID requirements.

Summary of Findings
As voter identification requirements vary, voter turnout varies as well. This finding emerged from both the statistical analysis's aggregate data and the individual-level data, although not always for both the maximum and minimum sets of requirements. The overall relationship between the stringency of ID requirements and turnout was fairly small, but still statistically significant.

In the model used with the aggregate data in the statistical analysis, the match signature requirement, the provide a non-photo ID requirement, and the photo ID requirement were all correlated with lower turnout compared to requiring that voters state their names. With the addition of the registration closing data to the aggregate analysis, photo ID is no longer a
significant predictor of turnout. Signature match and non-photo id remain significant and negative predictors in the model.

The reduction in turnout was not the same for all demographic groups in the citizen voting age population.

The non-photo identification requirement showed the most significant and consistent correlation with reduced turnout. This result may be surprising given the intense debates surrounding photo identification requirements. The effect of photo ID requirements cannot, however, be assessed from the data the statistical analysis examined, since none of the states had laws in 2004 that conditioned voting on presentation of photo ID. Each of the five states that had photo ID as a "maximum" requirement (i.e., the most that voters could be asked to show at the polls) accepted another type of identification or an affidavit as a "minimum" requirement in the 2004 election (i.e., they were allowed to cast a regular ballot with something less than photo ID).

Significant questions about the relationship of voter identification requirements to turnout remain unanswered. The data examined in this project could not capture the dynamics of how identification requirements might lower turnout. If ID requirements dampen turnout, is it because individuals are aware of the requirements and stay away from the polls because they cannot or do not want to meet the requirements? Or, do the requirements result in some voters being turned away when they cannot meet the requirements on Election Day? Other factors that may also be correlated with stricter ID laws — such as less user-friendly voter registration systems — may actually be causing lower turnout. The CPS data do not include the information needed to answer this question. Knowing more about the "on the ground" experiences of voters concerning identification requirements could guide policy-makers at the state and local level in determining whether and at what point in the electoral cycle a concerted public information campaign might be most effective in helping voters to meet identification requirements. Such knowledge also could help in designing training for election judges to handle questions about, and potential disputes over, voter identification requirements.

Our analysis of litigation suggests that the courts will look more strictly at requirements that voters produce a photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot, than at non-photo ID laws. The courts have used a balancing test to weigh the legitimate interest in preventing election fraud against the citizen's right to privacy (protecting social security numbers from public disclosure, for
example) and the reasonableness of requirements for identity documents. To provide both the clarity and certainty in administration of elections needed to forestall destabilizing challenges to outcomes, a best practice for the states may be to limit requirements for voter identification to the minimum needed to prevent duplicate registration and ensure eligibility.

The current lack of understanding of precisely how voter ID requirements affect turnout could be ameliorated by requiring the collection and reporting of additional data, including the reasons potential voters are required to cast a provisional ballot and the reasons for rejecting provisional ballots during the 2006 and subsequent elections. Also useful would be the results of surveys of voters on their experiences in meeting voter ID requirements and on what type of ballot they cast. And, of course, more information is needed on the incidence and varieties of vote fraud, but that inquiry is outside the scope of this report.

Recommendations for consideration and action by the EAC

The dynamics of Voter ID requirements –how more rigorous voter ID requirements may affect the decision by potential voters to go or stay away from the polls-- are not perfectly understood. This lack of understanding should be recognized in the policy process in the states. The debate over voter ID in the states would be improved by additional research sponsored by the EAC.

The EAC should consider the following actions to improve understanding of the relationship between voter ID requirements and the two important goals of ensuring ballot access and ensuring ballot integrity.

1. Encourage or sponsor further research to clarify the connection between Voter ID requirements and the number of potential voters actually able to cast a ballot that is actually counted.

2. Recommend as a best practice the publication of a "Voting Impact Statement" by states as they assess their voter ID requirements to protect the integrity of the ballot. The analysis will help ensure that efforts to increase ballot security have a neutral effect on electoral participation by eligible voters. The Voter Impact Statement would estimate the number and demographics of 1) eligible, potential voters that may be kept from the polls

---

5 Arizona held its first election with its new, stricter ID requirements on March 14, 2006. In at least one county (Maricopa) election officials handed a survey to voters that asked if they knew about the vote('= identify law and if they did, how they found out about it. Edeyhe Jensen, "New Voter ID Law Goes Smoothly in Chandler," Arizona Republic, March 15, 2006. More surveys of this kind can illuminate the dynamics of voter ID and voting in ways that are not possible now because of insufficient data.
or permitted to cast a provisional ballot by a stricter ID requirement; and 2) and assess
the number of ineligible voters who will be prevented from voting by the stricter ID
requirements.

3. Encourage or require the states in the 2006 election and beyond, to collect and report
reliable, credible information on the relationship between ballot access and ballot
security. EAC should publish an analysis of this information to provide a sound factual
basis for the states to consider as they estimate the incidence of the kinds of vote fraud
that more stringent ID requirements may prevent. The analysis should describe the
dynamics of the voter ID process in preserving the security of the ballot. EAC can also
use this information to encourage the states to assess the effectiveness of programs to
ensure that all eligible voters have required ID and are permitted to vote in future
elections. Well-designed longitudinal studies in the states can show the results of
changing voter ID requirements on electoral participation over time. The studies should
include precinct-level data to provide the fine-grained analysis that can provide a solid
foundation for policy.

I. Useful information could be supplied by state-sponsored surveys of voters by local
election officials. It would make clear why those who cast a provisional ballot were
found ineligible to cast a regular ballot. The answers would illuminate the frequency
with which ID issues divert voters into the provisional ballot line.

II. Surveys to ask voters what they know about the voter id requirements would also
provide useful context for evaluating the effect of various voter ID requirements on
electoral participation.

III. Spot checks by state election officials on how the identification process works at
polling places could provide information on how closely actual practice tracks
statutory or regulatory requirements. Such reports should be available to the
public.

4. Encourage states to examine the time period allowed for voters who cast a provisional
ballot because they lacked required ID to return with their identification. In eleven states,
voters who had to cast a provisional ballot because they lacked the ID required for a
regular ballot were permitted to return later with their ID. Their provision of this ID is the
critical step in evaluating the ballots. The length of the period in which the voter may
return with ID is important. In setting the time period for return, which now varies among
the states from the same day to about two weeks, states should consider three factors:
REVISED FINAL DRAFT
For review by the EAC’s Advisory Boards

the convenience of the voter, the total time allowed to evaluate ballots, and the safe harbor provision in presidential elections.

5. Recommendations to the states from EAC should reflect current judicial trends.
Requirements that voters provide some identifying documentation have been upheld, where photo ID is not the only acceptable form. Whether laws requiring photo ID will be upheld is more uncertain.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH

Background and Approach of the Study
Voter ID requirements are just one set of rules governing voting that may affect turnout. Social scientists have long studied how election rules affect participation in elections. The general view today is that the individual citizen makes the choice of whether the vote in a way similar to other decisions that a rational citizen makes, by comparing costs and benefits. The benefits of voting are fairly stable and hard to specify given the remote probability that any one vote will make a difference in an election. But whatever the benefit as perceived by an individual voter, as the costs of voting (for example, time, hassle, acquisition of information) increase, the likelihood that a citizen will vote decrease. Not all groups in the population calculate the cost of participation in the same way, so that election laws (such as registration or identification requirements) may affect different groups differently.

A short summary of some of the social science literature illustrates what may be a broad consensus that the rules of elections affect turnout, but note the important differences in the details of what groups may be most affected.

- Bowler, Brockington and Donovan in “Election Systems and Voter Turnout: Experiments in the United States”. *The Journal of Politics*, 63:3 (August 2001) concluded that electoral systems help shape turnout by altering the benefits perceived by voters. For example, cumulative voting systems have 5% greater turnout than plurality systems.
- The effect of registration systems has been the subject of many studies over the last 40 years. Kelley, Ayres, and Bowen in "Registration and Voting: Putting First Things First." *American Political Science Review*. 61:2 (June 1967) found that local variations in the

---

6 Our research on provisional voting reveals that states that provide more than a week to evaluate provisional ballots end up counting substantially more of those ballots than states that provide less than a week.
rate of voting are most directly tied to variations in the rate of registering to vote, and that
the rate of registering to vote in localities is most directly related to the laws and
administration of the registration process. They concluded that the decline in voting over
the past 80 years was due, in part, to the rise of registration laws.

- Brians and Grofman in "Election Day Registration's Effect on U.S. Voter Turnout." Social Science Quarterly. 82:1 (March 2001), found that relaxing registration laws produces higher turnout. In particular, they observed that relaxing registration laws is more likely to promote voter turnout among those with medium levels of income and education, rather than those at the lowest levels. Highton in "Easy Registration and Voter Turnout," Journal of Politics. 59:2 (May 1997), concluded similarly that registration laws affect voter turnout, but also observed that easier registration promotes turnout among those in lower socio-economic status.

- Mitchell and Wlezien. "The Impact of Legal Constraints on Voter Registration, Turnout, and the Composition of the American Electorate," Political Behavior. 17:2 (June 1995) agreed that easier registration promotes higher turnout, but also concluded that higher turnout from easier registration would be unlikely to change the composition of the electorate. Nagler in "The Effect of Registration Laws and Education on U.S. Voter Turnout." American Political Science Review. 85:4 (December 1991) found that registration laws decrease voter turnout by depressing the eligible electorate, but that lower educated people are not disproportionately impacted by these laws. But Rosenstone and Raymond E. Wolfinger in "The Effect of Registration Laws on Voter Turnout." American Political Science Review. 72:1 (March 1978) found that while registration laws did affect both voter turnout and the composition of the electorate, the sharpest effect of these restrictions was felt in the South and among the least educated.

- Squire, Wolfinger, and Glass in "Residential Mobility and Voter Turnout." American Political Science Review. 81:1 (March 1987) found that people who move constitute a major demographic group affected by registration laws. They estimated that altering laws to facilitate voting by recently moved people could increase turnout by 9%. Highton in "Residential Mobility, Community Mobility, and Voter Turnout." Political Behavior. 22:2 (June 2000) also found that people who move have lower turnout than stable residents, and estimated that the decline was more a result of registration laws than a loss of social connections.
Highton and Wolfinger in "Estimating the Effects of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993." *Political Behavior.* 20:2 (June 1998) concluded that the Motor Voter laws led to a significant increase in voting; that eliminating voter purges for not voting also increases voting; and that these effects are felt most heavily by the young (under 30) and the mobile (moved within past 2 years). Knack, in "Does 'Motor Voter' Work? Evidence from State-Level Data." *Journal of Politics.* 57:3 (August 1995), also found that motor voter does lead to increased registration and voting, but that other parts of NVRA of 1993, like mail-in registrations, agency-based registrations, and limitations on voter purges had not been as influential two years after the passage of the act.

While voter ID may not have been the subject of as much research as the registration process, establishing the eligibility of a person to vote has long been part of the electoral process. Voters may have to identify themselves twice in the electoral process: when registering to vote and then when casting a ballot. The pressures felt by the voter arising from the need to check ID, even so simple a check as a signature match, can be greater at the polls on Election Day than at the time of registration. Poll workers may feel under pressure when faced with long lines and limited time.

**Voter ID requirements on Election Day**

This analysis focuses on ID requirements on Election Day, but with an appreciation that the ID requirements at time of registration and on Election Day are inter-related. The emphasis in this report is on Voter ID requirements on Election Day and afterwards as election judges evaluate provisional ballots. This is the critical period for the electoral system, the time when ballot access and ballot security are in the most sensitive balance.

The report looks at voter ID issues that go beyond the rather narrow identification requirements in HAVA. Much of the current debate in state legislatures over voter ID ranges beyond HAVA to require more rigorous documentation of identity for all would-be voters, not just those who had not registered in person and are casting a ballot for the first time. Current controversies in the states over voter ID seems to have been sparked in part by the HAVA requirements, but goes beyond those requirements, and sets the context for the analysis here.

---

7 As the Carter-Baker Commission noted, photo ID requirements for in-person voting do little to address the problem of fraudulent registration by mail, especially in states that do not require third-party organizations that register voters to verify ID. Commission on Federal Election Reform, pp 46-47.

8 Harvard Law Review 119:1127. "Legislators hoping to stiffen their state antifraud laws have taken their cue from identification provisions buried in HAVA."
We recognize that the previously technical, rather dull subject of voter ID requirements has become fiercely partisan and divisive in many states. The polarization of the debate has raised the stakes over this issue, making dispassionate analysis both more valuable and more rare. Voter ID is often described as the critical step in protecting the integrity of the ballot, the process to ensure that the potential voter is eligible and, if eligible, is permitted to cast one ballot and one ballot only. Truly protecting the integrity of the ballot, however, requires a perspective that takes in the entire voting process. It demands more than preventing the ineligible from voting, and should also ensure that all those who are eligible and want to vote can cast a ballot that counts. The protection effort must embrace all forms of voting, including absentee ballots, and consider each step in the process from registration through vote counting.

A voting system that requires voters to produce an identity document or documents may prevent the ineligible from voting. It may also prevent the eligible from casting a ballot. If the ID requirements block ineligible voters from the polls at the cost of preventing eligible voters who cannot obtain or have left at home the required forms of identification, the integrity of the ballot may not have been improved; the harm may be as great as the benefit. Ultimately, a normative evaluation of whether a state should adopt a stricter voter ID requirement (and, if so, what particular form that new requirement should take) will weigh value judgments as well as available factual evidence. Nonetheless, this report has proceeded on the premise that increased understanding of the factual evidence relating to the imposition of voter ID requirements, based on available data and statistical analysis of that data, can help inform the policy process.

Assessing the effectiveness of voter ID as a way to protect the integrity of the ballot should logically include an estimate of the nature and frequency of vote fraud. The EAC has commissioned a separate analysis of the incidence of vote fraud. Consequently, this research does not include consideration of vote fraud nor the possible effectiveness of various voter ID regimes to counter attempts at vote fraud. As a result, our study of the possible effects of voter

---

9 "Of the various electoral procedure laws passed in the fifty states since the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections and those still being debated in state legislatures and local media, few arouse more potent partisan feelings than voter identification laws." *Harvard Law Review* 119:1144. John Fund's 2004 book, *Stealing Elections: How Voter Fraud Threaten Our Democracy*, cites (pages 16 - 17) a Rasmussen Research poll that asked respondents if they were more concerned with voting by ineligible participants or with disenfranchisement of eligible voters. Sixty-two percent of Kerry supporters, but only 18 percent of Bush supporters, worried more about *disenfranchisement*; 58 percent of Bush supporters, but only 19 percent of Kerry supporters were more concerned with *voter fraud*. 
ID requirements on turnout cannot take into account how many potential voters who did not turn out under comparatively stricter voter ID requirements might have been ineligible or eligible to vote.

In some states, voters lacking required ID, or who have ID that does not reflect their current address, are able to vote only by casting a provisional ballot. Voter ID requirements that require voters to bring a document to the polls --rather than simply sign their names-- may divert more voters to the provisional ballot. Requiring poll workers to request and check ID, can put stress on the already demanding environment of the polling place. Scrutiny of ID can create lines at the polling places. Further delays can result when voters cast a provisional ballot and fill out the ballot envelope. Voters who cast a provisional ballot because they lack their ID on Election Day, and who then fail to return with the needed document or documents, will have their ballot rejected. And, of course, the cost of processing provisional ballots is greater than the cost of regular ballots.

Each of these potential consequences of more elaborate voter identification processes can increase the chance of litigation. Long lines will, at best, discourage voters and at worst make voting seem a hassle, an impression that could keep more citizens (even those with ID) from the polls.

Evaluating the effect of different Voter ID regimes can be most effective when based on clear standards --legal, equitable, practical. The standards outlined here might be described as questions policy-makers should ask about Voter ID requirements. We suggest 7 questions that address important dimensions of the problem.

1. Is the Voter ID system designed on the basis of valid and reliable empirical studies of the incidence of the sorts of vote fraud it is designed to prevent?12

---

10 For example, the Florida voter ID law adopted after the 2004 election and pre-cleared by the Department of Justice, permits voters who cannot meet the ID requirements to sign an affidavit on the envelope of a provisional ballot, which will be counted if the signature matches that on the voter's registration form.

11 The EAC's Election Day Study found "improper ID," to be the third most common reason for a provisional ballot to be rejected. "Improper ID" was cited by 7 states responding to the survey, compared to 14 mentions for voting in the wrong precinct. Election Day Study, Chapter 6, p. 5.

12 "Often where the battle over voter identification is most heated, real evidence of voter fraud proves scarce: in Georgia, for example, the Secretary of State averred that she had never encountered a single instance of voter impersonation at the polls. State laws might sometimes impose tighter restrictions on in-person voting than on absentee ballots, which yield the greatest incidence of, and provide the easiest avenue for, voter fraud..." Harvard Law Review 127:1144 (2006)
2. How effective is the ID requirement in increasing the security of the ballot? How well can it be coordinated with a statewide voter database?  
3. How practical is the requirement? (Can it be administered smoothly by the staff and budget likely to be made available? How much additional training of polling place workers might be required?) Is it simple enough or can it be defined with sufficient clarity that poll workers throughout the state can administer it uniformly and with a minimum of local interpretation made on the fly under the pressure of Election Day? 
4. How cost-effective is the system? Does it demonstrably increase the security of the ballot affordably, measured in both monetary and other costs? To improve understanding of the non-monetary component of the costs, conducting a voter impact study might be appropriate. The voter impact study would examine, before the adoption of the regulation, the cost of compliance by the voter (such as the cost in time and money of acquiring a photo ID card), any offsetting benefits to voters, and the possible disparate effects of the regulation on various groups of voters. A thorough, objective impact statement that demonstrated the nexus between the identification regime and the integrity of the ballot could provide protection against inevitable legal challenges.
5. If a side effect of the Voter ID regulation is likely to reduce turnout, generally or among particular groups, is it possible to take other steps to ameliorate the adverse consequences?
6. Does it comply with the letter and spirit of Voting Rights Act?
7. The seventh question is the most difficult to answer. How neutral is the effect of the Voter ID requirement on the composition of the qualified and eligible electorate? Might it,

---

13 See the final section of this report for a brief overview of possible effects of a statewide voter database on voter identification issues.
14 In New York, in 2004, disparities in training and voting information were made apparent in a study finding elections officials had wildly varying interpretations of what the state's voter identification requirement actually was. Tova Wang, "Warning Bell in Ohio," December 5, 2005. Website, the Foundation for National Progress.
15 “Absent clear empirical evidence demonstrating widespread individual voter fraud, legislatures need to fashion narrowly tailored voter identification provisions with an eye toward the inevitable and well-grounded constitutional challenges that will arise in the courts. Only as states grow more adept at administering elections will courts likely demonstrate greater willingness to uphold strict identification requirements.” Harvard Law Review 127:1144 (2006).
16 For example, the Carter-Baker Commission coupled its recommendation for a national voter ID card to a call for an affirmative effort by the states to reach out and register the unregistered, that is, to use the new Voter ID regime as a means to enroll more voters. Similarly, Richard Hasen has suggested combining a national voter ID with universal registration. See his "Beyond the Margin of Litigation: Reforming U.S. Election Administration to Avoid Electoral Meltdown," 62 Washington and Lee Law Review 937 (2005).
intentionally or unintentionally, reduce the turnout of particular groups of voters or supporters of one party or another without an offsetting decrease in vote fraud?

Voter ID and Turnout

Based on research for this study by the Moritz College of Law, states had one of five types of maximum requirements in place on Election Day 2004. These are shown in Table 1, "Voter ID Requirements. The five categories: at the polling place, voters were asked to either: state their names (10 states); sign their names (13 states and the District of Columbia); sign their names, to be matched to a signature on file (seven states); provide a form of identification that did not necessarily include a photo (15 states); or provide a photo identification (five states).

Using this information made it possible to code the states according to these requirements, and examine the assumption that voter identification requirements would pose an increasingly demanding requirement in this order: stating one's name, signing one's name, matching one's signature to a signature on file, providing a form of identification, and providing a form of photo identification, however, in all "photo ID" states in 2004, voters without photo ID could cast a regular ballot after signing an affidavit concerning their identity and eligibility or provide other forms of ID). The report refers to this set of ID requirements as "maximum," the most rigorous ID the voter can be asked to present at the polling place in order to cast a regular ballot.

Election laws in several states offer exceptions to these requirements if potential voters lack the necessary form of identification. Laws in those states set a minimum standard — that is the minimum requirement that a voter may be required to satisfy in order to vote using a regular ballot. States can be categorized based on the minimum requirement for voting with a regular ballot. In 2004 the categories were somewhat different compared to the maximum requirement, in that none of the states required photo identification as a minimum standard for voting with a regular ballot. That is, voters who lacked photo ID would still be allowed to vote in all states, if able to meet another requirement. Four states required voters to swear an affidavit as to their identity (Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, and North Dakota). The five categories for minimum requirements were: state name (12 states), sign name (14 states and the District of Columbia), match one's signature to a signature on file (six states), provide a non-photo identification (14 states), or swear an affidavit (four states). The analysis also examined this array of minimum

17 Oregon conducts elections entirely by mail. Voters sign their mail-in ballots, and election officials match the signatures to signatures on file. For the purposes of this analysis, Oregon is classified as a state that requires a signature match.

18 As noted above, our analysis does not consider additional requirements that particular voters may be subjected to as part of an official challenge process, in the event that their eligibility is called into question.
identification requirements to assess how they correlated with turnout: state name, sign name, match signature, provide non-photo identification, and, given the potential legal consequences for providing false information, swearing an affidavit. As noted above, no state had a "minimum" requirement of showing photo ID. This analysis therefore cannot estimate the effect of laws, such as those recently enacted in Indiana and Georgia that require voters to show photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot without an affidavit or other exception.

We recognize the difficulties in summarizing each state's voter ID requirements. The problem is illustrated by the number of footnotes to Table 1 below. The variety of statutory and regulatory details among the states is complex.

Moving beyond the statutes and regulations, we also recognize that the assignment of each state to one category may fail to reflect actual practice at many polling places. As in any system run by fallible humans, the voter ID process is subject to variation in practice. Voters may have been confronted with demands for identification different from the directives in state statutes or regulation. It seems reasonable to conclude, however, that while actual practices may vary, the variance is around each state's legal requirement for ID. The analysis of the effect of state requirements on turnout must be viewed with some caution. We believe that the categories used in this report provide an acceptable level of discrimination among voter identification regimes.

---

19 One state election official told us that, "We have 110 election jurisdictions in Illinois, and I have reason to believe [the voter ID requirements] are administered little bit differently in each one. We wish it weren't that way, but it probably is."
TABLE 1 – Voter ID Requirements\textsuperscript{20}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Maximum Forms of ID Required 2004</th>
<th>Current ID Requirement for First-Time Voters</th>
<th>Current ID Requirements for All Other Voters</th>
<th>Verification Method for Provisional Ballots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Gov-issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Gov-issued Photo ID\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Photo ID\textsuperscript{2}</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Photo ID\textsuperscript{AA}</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID\textsuperscript{AA}</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID\textsuperscript{A}</td>
<td>DOB and Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>No Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn.</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{20} See Appendix 1 for a more detailed summary, including citations and statutory language, of the identification requirements in each state.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>ID Requirement</th>
<th>Address &amp; Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Photo ID*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Photo ID*</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* States applies only HAVA’s ID requirement, applicable to first-time voters who registered by mail and
did not provide applicable ID at the time of registration.

1 Arizona voters who lack a photo ID may present 2 forms of ID with no photograph.

2 Florida required a photo ID in 2004, but voters without that credential could sign an affidavit concerning
their identity and eligibility and cast a regular ballot. Florida subsequently changed its law to require that
voters present photo ID to cast a regular ballot, though voters without photo ID may still cast a
provisional ballot by signing an affidavit, which ballot should ordinarily be counted.

3 Louisiana required a photo ID in 2004. Voters without that credential could sign an affidavit concerning
their identity and eligibility and cast a regular ballot.

4 Pennsylvania requires ID of all first-time voters, whether they registered by mail or in-person.

5 Voters lacking a photo ID could vote by providing another form of ID in 2004.

6 Voters lacking a photo ID could vote by providing another form of ID in 2004.

7 Tennessee voters must provide signature and address. In counties without computerized lists, the
signature is compared to the registration card. In counties with computerized lists, the signature is
compared to a signature on ID presented with the registration.

8 Texas voters must present a current registration certificate. Those without a certificate can vote
provisionally after completing an affidavit.

Relationship of Voter ID requirements to Turnout

The statistical analysis examined the potential variation in turnout rates based on the type of
voter identification required in each state on Election Day 2004 using two sets of data:
aggregate turnout data at the county level for each state, as compiled by the Eagleton Institute
of Politics, and individual-level survey data included in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau.

The statistical analysis examined turnout among U.S. citizens of voting age in both the
aggregate and the individual-level data. Determining citizenship status in the individual-level
data simply involved restricting the analyses to individuals who identified themselves as citizens
in the November 2004 Current Population Survey. (Those who said they were not citizens did
not have the opportunity to answer the supplemental voting questions contained in the Current Population Survey.)
Findings of the statistical analysis

The analysis looked at the voter identification requirements in two ways, as a continuous variable and as a series of discrete variables. As a continuous variable the maximum voter identification requirements are ranked according to how demanding they were judged to be, with photo ID as the most demanding requirement. As discrete variables, the statistical analysis assume that stating name is the least demanding ID requirement and compare each other requirement to it.

The analysis treating the requirements as a continuous variable offers some statistical support for the premise that as the level of required proof increases, turnout declines. Averaging across counties in each state, statewide turnout is negatively correlated with maximum voter identification requirements (r = -.30, p < .05). In considering the array of minimum requirements, with affidavit as the most demanding requirement, however, the correlation between voter identification and turnout is negative, but it is not statistically significant (r = -.20, p = .16). This suggests that the relationship between turnout rates and minimum requirements may not be linear. Breaking down the turnout rates by type of requirement reveals in greater detail the relationship between voter identification requirements and voter turnout.

Table 2 – Variation in 2004 State Turnout Based on Voter Identification Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voter Identification Requirement Required in the States</th>
<th>Mean Voter Turnout for States in that Category</th>
<th>Voter Identification Requirement Required in the States</th>
<th>Mean Voter Turnout for States in that Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Name</td>
<td>64.2 %</td>
<td>State Name</td>
<td>63.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>61.1 %</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>60.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Signature</td>
<td>60.9 %</td>
<td>Match Signature</td>
<td>61.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Non-Photo ID</td>
<td>59.3 %</td>
<td>Provide Non-Photo ID</td>
<td>59.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Photo ID</td>
<td>58.1 %</td>
<td>Swear Affidavit</td>
<td>60.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Turnout (All States)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table displays the mean turnout using the aggregate county level data for each state in 2004.

The aggregate data show that 60.9 percent of the estimated citizen voting age population voted in 2004. Differences in voter turnout at the state level in 2004 varied based on voter identification requirements. Taking into account the maximum requirements, an average of 64.6 percent of the voting age population turned out in states that required voters to state their names, compared to 58.1 percent in states that required photo identification. A similar trend
emerged when considering minimum requirements. Sixty-three percent of the voting age population turned out in states requiring voters to state their names, compared to 60.1 percent in states that required an affidavit from voters. Given the lack of a clear, consistent linear relationship between turnout and minimum identification requirements, however, we opted to treat the voter identification requirements as a series of dichotomous variables in subsequent analyses.21

Voter identification requirements are just one factor that may affect voter turnout. Multivariate models that take into account other predictors of turnout can paint a more complete picture of the relationship between voter identification requirements and turnout. This analysis estimated the effects of voter identification requirements in multivariate models that also took into account the electoral context in 2004 and demographic characteristics of the population in each county. While the model takes account of several important variables, statistical models do not capture all the messiness of the real world. It is a simplification of a complex reality, and its results should be treated with appropriate caution.

The model also took into account such variables as:

- Was the county in a presidential battleground state?
- Was the county was in a state with a competitive race for governor and/or the U.S. Senate?
- Percentage of the voting-age population in each county that was Hispanic or African-American 22
- Percentage of county residents age 65 and older
- Percentage of county residents below the poverty line

Another contextual factor to consider is voter registration requirements, such as the deadline for registration. As states set the deadline farther away from Election Day, the task of remembering to register to vote becomes more challenging. Thus our model takes into account the number of days between each state's registration deadline and the election.

21 The voter identification requirements are coded as a series of dummy variables, coding each variable as one if the requirement existed in a given state, and zero otherwise. This yielded five dichotomous variables for maximum requirements (state name, sign name, match signature, non-photo identification, or photo identification), and five dichotomous variables for minimum requirements (state name, sign name, match signature, non-photo identification, or providing an affidavit). Omitted is the variable for stating one's name so that it could serve as the reference category in comparison with the other four identification requirements in each of the statistical analyses.

22 The U.S. Census projections for 2003 provided the data for the percentage of the voting-age population in each county that was Hispanic or African-American and for the percentage of county residents age 65 and older.
The dependent variable in each model was voter turnout at the county level, with turnout calculated as the percentage of the citizen voting-age population that voted in the 2004 election.

The results of this modeling suggest that voter identification requirements such as signature matching, a non-photo ID or a photo ID are associated with lower turnout than in states that required voters to simply state their name, holding constant the electoral context and demographic variables.

Contextual factors, such as whether the county was in a battleground state or whether that state had a competitive race for governor and/or U.S. Senate, were associated with increased voter turnout. The time between the closing date for registration and the election was correlated with a slight negative effect on turnout. As the percentage of Hispanics in the county’s population increased, turnout declined. The percentage of senior citizens in the county and household median income were associated with higher turnout. The percentage of African-Americans in the county did not have a significant effect in the model. The percentage of senior citizens in the county and household median income showed a positive correlation with turnout. In this aggregate model, the percentage of African-Americans in the county was not associated with a significant difference in turnout.

The relationship of the minimum voter identification requirements to turnout was not demonstrated. None of the dummy variables for voter identification requirements were statistically significant. Being a battleground state and having a competitive statewide race were significant and positive, as was the percentage of senior citizens in the county and household median income. The percentage of Hispanics in the county’s population continued to be associated with reduced turnout, as was the number of days between the closing date for registration and the election.  

Analysis of the aggregate data at the county level generates some support for the hypothesis that stricter identification requirements are correlated with lower turnout. For the maximum

---

23 This test incorporated a series of interactions between the maximum and minimum voter identification requirements and the percentage of African-Americans and Hispanics living in the counties. In each case the interactions did not improve the fit of the models to the data. See tables A-1 and A-2 in the appendix of Vercellotti's paper in the appendices.
requirements, a signature match, non-photo identification or photo identification were correlated with lower turnout in 2004, compared to requiring that voters simply state their names.

Aggregate data, however, cannot fully capture the individual demographic factors that may figure into the decision to turn out to vote. Voter identification requirements could have a relationship to the turnout of particular groups of voters, in ways that county-level aggregate data on turnout would not capture. To explore the effects of voter identification requirements on turnout more completely, it is important to examine individual-level data as well.

Individual-level Analysis

Individual-level turnout data exists in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. The Census Bureau conducts the CPS monthly to measure unemployment and other workforce data, but the bureau adds a battery of voter participation questions to the November survey in even-numbered years to coincide with either a presidential or midterm Congressional election.

One of the of the CPS is the sheer size of the sample. The survey's Voting and Registration Supplement consisted of interviews, either by telephone or in person, with 96,452 respondents. The large sample size permits analyses of smaller groups, such as Black or Hispanic voters or voters with less than a high school education. The statistical analysis in relying on the CPS is based on reports from self-described registered voters. Omitted are those who said they were not registered to vote, as are those who said they cast absentee ballots because the identification requirements for absentee ballots may differ from those required when one votes in person. Eliminated from the sample are respondents who said they were not U.S. citizens; the questionnaire design skipped those individuals past the voter registration and turnout questions in the survey. In addition to the voter identification requirements, the models include other socioeconomic, demographic, and political environment factors that might have

---

24 For example, previous research has found that education is a powerful determinant of turnout (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980, but see also Nagler 1991). Married people also are more likely to vote than those who are not married (Alvarez and Ansolabehere 2002; Alvarez, Nagler and Wilson 2004; Fisher, Kenny, and Morton 1993).

25 It is important to note that the Census Bureau allows respondents to answer on behalf of themselves and others in the household during the interview. While proxy reporting of voter turnout raises the possibility of inaccurate reports concerning whether another member of the household voted, follow-up interviews with those for whom a proxy report had been given in the November 1984 CPS showed 99 percent agreement between the proxy report and the information given by the follow-up respondent (U.S. Census Bureau 1990).
influenced turnout in 2004. The dependent variable in these analyses is whether a respondent said he or she voted in the November 2004 election.

In the model, three of the voter identification requirements have a statistically significant correlation with whether survey respondents said they had voted in 2004. That is, compared to states that require voters only to state their names, the requirement to sign one's name, provide a non-photo ID, or photo ID in the maximum requirements or affidavit in the minimum is associated with lower turnout.

Of the other state factors, only the competitiveness of the presidential race showed a significant correlation with increased turnout. In terms of demographic influences, African-American voters were more likely than white voters or other voters to say they had cast a ballot, while Asian-Americans were less likely than white or other voters to say they had turned out. Hispanic voters were not statistically different from white or other voters in terms of reported turnout. Consistent with previous research, income, and marital status all were positive predictors of voting. Women also were more likely to say they voted than men. Among the age categories, those ages 45 to 64 and 65 and older were more likely than those ages 18 to 24 to say they voted. Respondents who had earned a high school diploma, attended some college, graduated from college or attended graduate school were all more likely to say they voted than those who had not finished high school.

While the probit models provide statistical evidence for the relationship of voter identification requirements and other variables to turnout, probit coefficients do not lend themselves to intuitive interpretation. Table 3 below shows predicted probabilities (calculated from the probit coefficients) of voting for each level of voter identification requirements while holding all other independent variables in the models at their means.

---

26 The models are estimated using probit analysis, which calculates the effects of independent variables on the probability that an event occurred – in this case whether a respondent said he or she voted and using robust standard errors to control for correlated error terms for observations from within the same state.

27 The U.S. Census Bureau reported, based on the November 2004 CPS, that 89 percent of those who identified themselves as registered voters said they voted in 2004 (U.S. Census Bureau 2005). Previous research has shown that, generally speaking, some survey respondents overstate their incidence of voting. Researchers speculate that over-reports may be due to the social desirability that accompanies saying one has done his or her civic duty, or a reluctance to appear outside the mainstream of American political culture (U.S. Census Bureau 1990). It is also possible that voting is an indication of civic engagement that predisposes voters to agree to complete surveys at a higher rate than non-voters (Flanigan and Zingale 2002). Hence the voter turnout rates reported in the CPS tend to be up to 10 percentage points higher than the actual turnout rate for the nation (Flanigan and Zingale 2002). Even with this caveat, however, the CPS serves as a widely accepted source of data on voting behavior.

28 A probit model is a popular specification of a generalized linear regression model, using the probit link function.

29 In the case of dichotomous independent variables, holding them at their mean amounted to holding them at the percentage of the sample that was coded 1 for the variable (Long 1997).
Table 3. Predicted probability of voter turnout – all voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification Requirement</th>
<th>Maximum requirement</th>
<th>Minimum requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference from “state name” to “photo ID” or “affidavit”</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>54,973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies stating one’s name to providing photo identification or an affidavit, with all other variables held constant. N.S. = nonsignificant coefficient in the probit model.


Taking into account that signature matches were not a predictor of turnout, the differences in predicted probability decline from stating one’s name to providing a photo identification or affidavit. Voters in states that required photo identification were 2.7 percent less likely to vote than voters in states where individuals had to give their names. In terms of the minimum requirement, voters in states that required an affidavit at minimum were 4 percent less likely to turn out than voters in states where they had to give their names.

The differences were more pronounced for those lower in education. Constraining the model to show predicted probabilities only for those with less than a high school diploma, the probability of voting was 5.1 percent lower in states that required photo identification as the maximum requirement and 7 percent lower in states that required an affidavit as the minimum requirement compared to states where stating one’s name was the maximum or minimum requirement.

The voter turnout percentages may seem disproportionately high compared to the turnout rates reported in the aggregate data analysis. It is important to consider that the turnout rates in the aggregate data were a proportion of all citizens of voting-age population, while the turnout rates for the individual-level data are the proportion of only registered voters who said they voted.
Race and ethnicity have generated particular interest in the debate over voter ID requirements. The analysis using the aggregate data shed no light on the association between voter ID requirements and turnout for African-American and Hispanic voters. But in the models using the individual data, some significant relationships emerged for African-American, Hispanic and Asian citizens. For the entire population, the signature, non-photo identification and photo identification requirements all were associated with lower turnout compared to the requirement that voters simply state their names. These correlations translated into reduced probabilities of voting of about 3 to 4 percent for the entire sample, with larger differences for specific subgroups. For example, the predicted probability that Hispanics would vote in states that required non-photo identification was about 10 percentage points lower than in states where Hispanic voters gave their names. The difference was about 6 percent for African-Americans and Asian-Americans, and about 2 percent for white voters.

The model also showed that Hispanic voters were less likely to vote in states that required non-photo identification as opposed to stating one’s name. Hispanic voters were 10 percent less likely to vote in non-photo identification states compared to states where voters only had to give their name.

Varying voter identification requirements were associated with lower turnout rates for Asian-American voters as well. Asian-American voters were 8.5 percent less likely to vote in states that required non-photo identification compared to states that require voters to state their names under the maximum requirements, and they were 6.1 percent less likely to vote where non-photo identification was the minimum requirement.

Conclusions of the Statistical Analysis
The statistical analysis found that, as voter identification requirements vary, voter turnout varies as well. This finding emerged from both the aggregate data and the individual-level data, although not always for both the maximum and minimum sets of requirements. The overall relationship between ID requirements and turnout for all registered voters was fairly small, but still statistically significant.

31 Incorporating discrete variables for Hispanics, African-Americans, and Asian-Americans into one model carries the implicit assumption that the remaining variables, including education and income, will influence each of these groups in a similar manner in terms of deciding whether to vote. These assumptions are not always born out by the data (see Leighley and Vedlitz, 1999.) To isolate the effects of voter identification and other variables on voter turnout within specific racial and ethnic groups, the sample is divided into sub-samples and the model re-run to calculate the data discussed and shown in Tables 5, 6, and 7 in Appendix C.
In the aggregate data, the match signature requirement, the provide a non-photo ID requirement, and the photo ID requirement were all correlated with lower turnout compared to requiring that voters state their names.

The signature, non-photo ID, and photo ID requirements were all correlated with lower turnout compared to the requirement that voters simply state their names. That the non-photo identification requirement was the most consistent in terms of statistical significance across the groups is intriguing given the intense debates surrounding photo identification requirements.

Significant questions about the relationship between voter identification requirements and turnout remain unanswered. The data examined in the statistical analysis could not capture the dynamics of how identification requirements might lower turnout, nor could they rule out that other attributes of a state's electoral system might explain the statistically significant correlations that the study found. If ID requirements dampen turnout, is it because individuals are aware of the requirements and stay away from the polls because they cannot or do not want to meet the requirements? Or, do the requirements result in some voters being turned away when they cannot meet the requirements on Election Day, or forced to cast a provisional ballot that is not ultimately counted? The CPS data do not include measures that can answer this question. Knowing more about the "on the ground" experiences of voters concerning identification requirements could guide policy-makers at the state and local level in determining whether and at what point in the electoral cycle a concerted public information campaign might be most effective in helping voters to meet identification requirements. Such knowledge also could help in designing training for election judges to handle questions about, and potential disputes over, voter identification requirements.

Litigation Over Voter ID Requirements

A handful of cases have challenged identification requirements in court in recent years. In general, requirements that voters provide some identifying documentation have been upheld, where photo ID is not the only acceptable form. Whether laws requiring photo ID will be upheld is more doubtful. To date, only two cases have considered laws requiring voters to show photo ID (Common Cause v. Billups and Indiana Democratic Party v. Rokita). Cases challenging the mandatory disclosure of voters' Social Security numbers on privacy grounds have yielded mixed results.

Non-photo identification. For the most part, courts have looked favorably on requirements that voters present some form of identifying documents if the photo identification is not the
only form accepted. In Colorado Common Cause v. Davidson, No. 04CV7709, 2004 WL 2360485, at *1 (Colo. Dist. Ct. Oct. 18, 2004), plaintiffs challenged a law requiring all in-person voters to show identification (not just first-time registrants). The court upheld this requirement against a constitutional challenge. Similarly, in League of Women Voters v. Blackwell, 340 F. Supp. 2d 823 (N.D. Ohio 2004), the court rejected a challenge to an Ohio directive requiring first-time voters who registered by mail to provide one of the HAVA-permitted forms of identification, in order to have their provisional ballots counted. Specifically, the directive provided that their provisional ballots would be counted if the voter (a) orally recited his driver's license number or the last four digits of his social security number or (b) returned to the polling place before it closed with some acceptable identification (including reciting those identification numbers). Id. This was found to be consistent with HAVA.

Photo ID. Since the 2004 election, two states have adopted laws requiring photo identification at the polls in order to have one's vote counted, without an affidavit exception: Georgia and Indiana. Both these requirements were enacted in 2005 and both have been challenged in court. The Georgia law required voters attempting to cast a ballot in person present a valid form of photographic identification. O.C.G.A. § 21-2-417. On October 18, 2005, the District Court granted the plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction, enjoining the application of the new identification requirements on constitutional grounds. In granting the injunction, the court held that plaintiffs’ claims under both the Fourteenth Amendment (equal protection) and Twenty-Fourth Amendment (poll tax) had a substantial likelihood of succeeding on the merits at trial (Common Cause v. Billups, Prelim. Inj. 96, 104). In January 2006, Georgia enacted a modified version of its photo ID law, which the court has not yet ruled on. In the other state that has enacted a photo ID requirement (Indiana), legal challenges have also been filed. (Indiana Democratic Party v. Rokita and Crawford v. Marion County Election Board). On April 14, 2006, the district court granted defendants’ motion for summary judgment, concluding that plaintiffs had failed to produce evidence showing that the state's ID law would have an adverse impact on voters. Another case of significance, for purposes of photo ID requirements, is American Civil Liberties Union of Minnesota v. Kiffmeyer, No. 04-CV-4653, 2004 WL

32 Indiana’s law does allow voters without ID to cast provisional ballots, and then to appear before the county board of elections to execute an affidavit saying that they are indigent and unable to obtain the requisite ID without payment of a fee. But in contrast to other states, voters cannot cast a ballot that will be counted by submitting an affidavit at the polls, affirming that they are the registered voter and are otherwise eligible to vote.
2428690, at *1 (D. Minn. Oct. 28, 2004). In that case, the court enjoined a Minnesota law that allowed the use of tribal photo ID cards, only for an Indian who lived on the reservation. 2004 WL 2428690, at *1. The Court found no rational basis for distinguishing based on whether or not the cardholder lives on the reservation. Id. at *1.

3. These decisions indicate that courts are likely to carefully scrutinize the evidence regarding the impact of photo ID requirements.

Privacy. In Greidinger v. Davis, 988 F.2d 1344 (4th Cir. 1993), the court struck down on due process grounds a Virginia law requiring disclosure of voters' social security numbers for voter registration. The social security numbers recorded in voter registration lists had been disclosed to the public and political parties that had requested the lists. The court found that the requirement to give the social security number effectively conditioned rights on the consent to an invasion of privacy. It concluded that this public disclosure of the social security numbers was not necessary to achieve the government's interest in preventing fraud. On the other hand, in McKay v. Thompson, 226 F.3d 752 (6th Cir. 2000), the court rejected privacy challenges based on both the Constitution and federal statutes, to a Tennessee law requiring social security numbers for voter registration since 1972. 226 F.3d at 755. Second, the NVRA only permits requiring the minimum amount of information necessary to prevent duplicate voter registration and to determine eligibility. The distinction appears to be between the use of Social Security numbers for internal purposes only, which was deemed permissible, and the disclosure of those numbers to the public which was not.

These decisions suggest that the courts will carefully scrutinize the evidence, where states require that voters produce a photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot. The courts have used a balancing test to weigh the legitimate interest in preventing election fraud against the citizen's right to privacy (protecting social security numbers from public disclosure, for example) and the reasonableness of requirements for identity documents. To provide both the clarity and certainty in administration of elections needed to forestall destabilizing challenges to outcomes, these early decisions suggest that best practice may be to limit requirements for voter identification to the minimum needed to prevent duplicate registration and ensure eligibility.

Developments since 2004
Since the passage of HAVA, with its limited requirements for voter identification, and following the 2004 election, debate over voter ID has taken place in state legislatures across the country. That debate has not been characterized by solid information on the consequences of tightening requirements for voters to identify themselves before being permitted to cast a regular, rather than a provisional, ballot.

Better information might improve the quality of the debate. Answers to the following key questions are not available in a form that might satisfy those on both sides of the argument.

- What is the overall incidence of vote fraud?
- How does fraud take place in the various stages of the process: registration, voting at the polls, absentee voting, or ballot counting?
- What contribution can tighter requirements for voter ID make to reducing vote fraud?
- What would be the other consequences of increasingly demanding requirements for voters to identify themselves? This is the question addressed, within the limits of the available data, in the analysis in this report.

Answering these questions would provide the information needed for more informed judgment in the states as they consider the tradeoffs among the competing goals of ballot integrity, ballot access, and administrative efficiency. The Carter-Baker Commission recognized the tradeoffs when it tied its recommendation for national ID to an affirmative effort by government to identify unregistered voters and make it easy for them to register.

State Voter Databases and Voter ID

With the implementation of the HAVA Computerized Statewide Voter Registration List, an application for voter registration for an election for Federal office may not be accepted or processed unless the application includes a driver's license number or last four digits of the Social Security number on the voter registration form. This information can be used to verify the identity of the registrant through interfacing with lists maintained by the Motor Vehicle office and Social Security office. If registrants do not have either a driver's license or Social Security number, the State will assign a unique identifier number to that person.

Some states are wrestling now with these unresolved issues. In New Jersey, for example, pending legislation would require that voters must be able to confirm their registration through a secure access to the Statewide Voter Registration List. It also requires voters to present ID at
the polls in order to cast a regular ballot if the numbers recorded on the registration have not been verified (or if no verifiable number appears on the registration). It recognizes the HAVA requirement that if the number provided by the voter has not been verified and if the voter does not present ID at the polls, that voter may cast a provisional ballot. The bill does not specify they have to provide ID within 48 hours in order for their vote to count, as is the case with first-time mail-in registrants.

As some states gain experience in this area, the EAC would perform a useful service by making timely recommendations of best practices for all states to consider.

Conclusions

The analysis of voter ID requirements is complex. It takes into account important values associated with an electoral process, such as ballot access and integrity. The continuing effort to understand how voter ID requirements may affect turnout and the integrity of the ballot could benefit from additional factual information, including statistical analyses. Our research includes a statistical study of this kind. It indicated that the level of voter turnout in a state is correlated with the stringency of the voter ID requirement imposed by that state. Additional empirical research of this nature, with additional data collected by or for the EAC, would further illuminate the relationship between stricter voter ID rules and turnout, perhaps explaining if awareness of a strict ID requirement tends to discourage would-be voters from going to the polls. Or, additional research may shed light on whether, if voters did go to the polls, stricter Voter ID requirements will divert more voters into the line for provisional ballots. The consequence of increased reliance on provisional ballots can be longer lines at the polls and confusion, without necessarily a clear demonstration that the security of the ballot is correspondingly increased.

The debate over voter ID in the states would be improved by additional research sponsored by the EAC. That might include longitudinal studies of jurisdictions that have changed voter ID requirements, as well as precinct-level analyses that would allow more finely tuned assessment of the correlation between stricter identification requirements and turnouts. Further research could also identify methods to eliminate the need for voters to bring specific identity documents.

33 In this connection, the Brennan Center's response to the Carter-Baker Commission report observes that, "while it might be true that in a close election "a small amount of fraud could make the margin of difference," it is equally true that the rejection of a much larger number of eligible voters could make a much bigger difference in the outcome." Response to the Report of the 2005 Commission on Federal Election Reform, The Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law and Spencer Overton, On Behalf Of The National Network on State Election Reform, September 19, 2005
with them to the polls, while assuring that each voter who casts a ballot is eligible and votes only once.
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REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EAC
VOTER IDENTIFICATION ISSUES

Report Background
The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) (Public Law 107-252) authorizes the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) (Sec. 241, 42 USC 15381) to conduct periodic studies of election administration issues. The purpose of these studies is to promote methods for voting and administering elections, including provisional voting, that are convenient, accessible and easy to use; that yield accurate, secure and expeditious voting systems; that afford each registered and eligible voter an equal opportunity to vote and to have that vote counted; and that are efficient.

This study provides information on voter identification practices in the 2004 election. It makes recommendations for best practices to evaluate future proposals for voter ID requirements, including the systematic collection and evaluation of information from the states. The research was conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University under a contract with the EAC, dated May 24, 2005. The work included a review and legal analysis of state statutes, regulations and litigation concerning voter identification and provisional voting as well as a statistical analysis of the relationship of various requirements for voter identification to turnout in the 2004 election. This report is a companion to a report on Provisional Voting submitted to the EAC on November 28, 2005 under the same contract.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Background and Methods
This report arrives at a time of considerable ferment over the issue of voter identification. The debate across the nation over requiring voters to produce a specific identification document before being permitted to cast a regular (as opposed to a provisional) ballot, has revealed supporters and opponents in polarized camps.

- Proponents of stricter identification requirements base their case on improving the security of the ballot by reducing opportunities for one kind of vote fraud --multiple voting or voting by those who are not eligible. The proponents argue that their goal is to ensure that only those legally entitled to vote do so, and do so only once at each election.
Opponents seek to forestall more stringent identification requirements, such as for government-issued photo ID, in order to ensure broad access to a regular ballot. They fear that some voters—such as, they argue, racial and ethnic minorities, the young, and elderly voters—may lack convenient access to the required ID documents, or that such voters may be fearful of submitting their ID documents to official scrutiny and thus stay away from the polls.

Both sides argue that their preferred policy will engender faith in the electoral process among citizens.

This report considers policy issues associated with the voter-ID debate and investigates whether empirical study can suggest a way to estimate the effects of different voter ID requirements on turnout, and important first step in assessing tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access. The aim is to contribute to the effort to raise the quality of the debate over this contentious topic. The tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access are crucial. A voting system that requires voters to produce an identity document or documents may prevent the ineligible from voting. It may also prevent eligible voters from casting a ballot. If the ID requirement of a ballot protection system blocks ineligible voters from the polls at the cost of preventing eligible voters who lack the required forms of identification, the integrity of the ballot may not have been improved; the harm may be as great as the benefit.

As part of the project’s effort to analyze the relationship between Voter ID requirements, turnout, and their policy implications, a statistical analysis was conducted to examine the potential variation in turnout. This statistical study developed a model to illuminate the relationships between voter ID requirements and turnout. This model’s findings and limitations suggest avenues for further research and analysis that may assist the EAC and the states as they explore policies to balance the goals of ballot integrity and ballot access.

The statistical analysis describes one possible way to estimate what might be the incremental effect on voters’ access to the ballot of an increase in the rigor of voter identification requirements. We do not offer this statistical analysis as the last word, but rather as a preliminary word on the subject. Its findings must be regarded as tentative; the information that might permit greater certainty is simply not available. Indeed, as our recommendations indicate, the next step to improve understanding of the effects of stricter voter identification on turnout and on vote fraud is to collect more information on both topics systematically and regularly.
Making a statistical estimate of the effect of voting regulations on turnout is difficult. The dynamics of turnout are complex, much studied, and only partially understood. Some agreement exists, however, that three factors that exert substantial influence on voter turnout are: the socioeconomic status of the potential voter; legal requirements to vote; and the political context of the election. By focusing on how voters identify themselves at the polls, this report emphasizes legal requirements. The statistical analysis also considers some of the socioeconomic, racial, and age characteristics of the electorate, as well as the political context in 2004 (such as whether a state was a battleground in the presidential race).

Examining tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access requires some measure of the effectiveness of voter ID requirements in reducing multiple voting or voting by ineligible voters. The existing evidence on the incidence of vote fraud, especially on the kind of vote fraud that could be reduced by requiring more rigorous voter identification, is not sufficient to evaluate those tradeoffs. Assessing the effectiveness of voter ID as a way to protect the integrity of the ballot should logically include an estimate of the nature and frequency of vote fraud. This research does not include consideration of vote fraud, nor does it estimate the possible effectiveness of various voter ID regimes to counter attempts at vote fraud. Our analysis also cannot take into account how many potential voters who did not turn out under comparatively stricter voter ID requirements might have been ineligible or eligible to vote.

Despite these qualifications regarding the quality of the available data and the limitations of statistical analysis, however, although it used different statistical methods and two different sets of data on turnout in 2004 election, it points to the same general finding. As discussed at greater length in the appendix to this report, stricter voter identification requirements were correlated with reduced turnout in the models employed. As explained below, these models find that a statistically significant relationship exists, even when controlling for other factors (such as whether the election was in a battleground state) that might affect turnout. Without knowing more about the effects of stricter voter ID on reducing multiple voting or voting by ineligible voters, the EAC has contracted with other researchers to study vote fraud issues. Our analysis also cannot take into account how many potential voters who did not turn out under comparatively stricter voter ID requirements might have been ineligible or eligible to vote.

1 See, for example, Tom William Rice and Patrick J. Kenney, "Voter Turnout in Presidential Primaries." 1985, Political Behavior, 7: 101-112. Identification requirements are not the only legal restrictions on voting. States also differ, for example, in their registration requirements (including how long before the election registration must take place and the identity documents required register).

2 The EAC has contracted with other researchers to study vote fraud issues.

3 Appendix C: Tim Vercellotti, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Analysis of Effects of Voter Identification Requirements on Turnout.
Methodology
The report includes detailed information on the nature of the statutory requirements across the country in 2004 and on the statutes and court decisions that provide the legal context for the voter ID debate. We gathered information on the requirements in effect in the 50 states and the District of Columbia in that year. Based on our interpretation of state statutes, supplemented in some cases by conversations with state election officials, we divided the states' ID requirements into five categories. We believe each category is more rigorous than the one preceding, based on the demands they make on voters. The categories range from "Stating Name" which we judge to be somewhat less demanding than "Signing Name." "Signature Match" requires poll workers to examine the signature and compare it to a sample, which is slightly more demanding that the voter simply signing. "Present ID" requires voters to offer some documentary evidence of their identity, ranging from a utility bill to a passport. It is more demanding than the previous three categories because it requires that the voter remember to bring this documentation to the polls. (Even a simple ID, such as a utility bill, may not be available to some renters or, say, those in group housing.) We regard a government "Photo ID" as the most rigorous requirement. Such identity documents may not be uniformly and conveniently available to all voters.

For each state, we identified both the "maximum" and "minimum" identification requirements. The term "maximum" refers to the most that voters may be asked to do or show at the polling place (putting aside cases in which particular voter's eligibility may be questioned pursuant to a state challenge process). The term "minimum," on the other hand, refers to the most that voters can be required to do or show, in order to cast regular ballot (again leaving aside a state challenge process). We have included "maximum" requirements in our analysis, and not simply "minimum" requirements, because simply asking voters to produce particular identifying information may have a deterrent effect, even if voters are ultimately allowed to cast a regular ballot without that identification. For example, in a state where voters are asked to show photo ID at the polling place, but still allowed to vote by completing an affidavit confirming their eligibility, the "maximum" of being asked to show photo ID may deter some voters even though the "minimum" would allow them to vote without photo ID.

---

4 Even the most relaxed provisions for identification at the polls — anything stricter than the honor system used in North Dakota — will impose some burden on particular voters. Harvard Law Review 119:1146
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It is worth emphasizing that, at the time of the 2004 election, there was no state that had a "minimum" requirement of showing photo ID – in other words, there was no state that required voters to show photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot. For this reason, our report does not measure the impact of laws, like those recently enacted in Indiana and Georgia, which require voters to show photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot without an affidavit exception.

To examine the potential variation on turnout rates associated with each type of voter ID requirements in effect on Election Day 2004, the statistical analysis drew on two sets of data. These were, first, aggregate turnout data at the county level for each state and, second, the reports of individual voters collected in the November 2004 Current Population Survey by the U.S. Census Bureau. Using two different data sets makes it possible to check the validity of one analysis against the other. It also provides insights not possible using only one of the data sets. The aggregate analysis cannot provide valid estimates on the effects of different ID requirements on particular demographic groups (e.g., the old, the young, African-Americans, the poor, or high school graduates). The Current Population Survey data does permit that kind of analysis, although it has the disadvantage of relying on self-reports by respondents about their registration status and experience in the polling place.

To understand legal issues that have been raised in recent litigation over voter ID requirements, we collected and analyzed the few major cases that have been decided so far on this issue. The decisions so far provide some guidance on the constitutional and other constraints as to voter ID requirements.

Summary of Findings
As voter identification requirements vary, voter turnout varies as well. This finding emerged from both the statistical analysis's aggregate data and the individual-level data, although not always for both the maximum and minimum sets of requirements. The overall relationship between the stringency of ID requirements and turnout was fairly small, but still statistically significant.

In the model used with the aggregate data in the statistical analysis, the match signature requirement, the provide a non-photo ID requirement, and the photo ID requirement were all correlated with lower turnout compared to requiring that voters state their names. With the addition of the registration closing data to the aggregate analysis, photo ID is no longer a
significant predictor of turnout. Signature match and non-photo id remain significant and negative predictors in the model.

The reduction in turnout was not the same for all demographic groups in the citizen voting age population.

The non-photo identification requirement showed the most significant and consistent correlation with reduced turnout. This result may be surprising given the intense debates surrounding photo identification requirements. The effect of photo ID requirements cannot, however, be assessed from the data the statistical analysis examined, since none of the states had laws in 2004 that conditioned voting on presentation of photo ID. Each of the five states that had photo ID as a “maximum” requirement (i.e., the most that voters could be asked to show at the polls) accepted another type of identification or an affidavit as a “minimum” requirement in the 2004 election (i.e., they were allowed to cast a regular ballot with something less than photo ID).

Significant questions about the relationship of voter identification requirements to turnout remain unanswered. The data examined in this project could not capture the dynamics of how identification requirements might lower turnout. If ID requirements dampen turnout, is it because individuals are aware of the requirements and stay away from the polls because they cannot or do not want to meet the requirements? Or, do the requirements result in some voters being turned away when they cannot meet the requirements on Election Day? Other factors that may also be correlated with stricter ID laws – such as less user-friendly voter registration systems – may actually be causing lower turnout. The CPS data do not include the information needed to answer this question. Knowing more about the “on the ground” experiences of voters concerning identification requirements could guide policy-makers at the state and local level in determining whether and at what point in the electoral cycle a concerted public information campaign might be most effective in helping voters to meet identification requirements. Such knowledge also could help in designing training for election judges to handle questions about, and potential disputes over, voter identification requirements.

Our analysis of litigation suggests that the courts will look more strictly at requirements that voters produce a photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot, than at non-photo ID laws. The courts have used a balancing test to weigh the legitimate interest in preventing election fraud against the citizen's right to privacy (protecting social security numbers from public disclosure, for
example) and the reasonableness of requirements for identity documents. To provide both the clarity and certainty in administration of elections needed to forestall destabilizing challenges to outcomes, a best practice for the states may be to limit requirements for voter identification to the minimum needed to prevent duplicate registration and ensure eligibility.

The current lack of understanding of precisely how voter ID requirements affect turnout could be ameliorated by requiring the collection and reporting of additional data, including the reasons potential voters are required to cast a provisional ballot and the reasons for rejecting provisional ballots during the 2006 and subsequent elections. Also useful would be the results of surveys of voters on their experiences in meeting voter ID requirements and on what type of ballot they cast. And, of course, more information is needed on the incidence and varieties of vote fraud, but that inquiry is outside the scope of this report.

Recommendations for consideration and action by the EAC

The dynamics of Voter ID requirements—how more rigorous voter ID requirements may affect the decision by potential voters to go or stay away from the polls—are not perfectly understood. This lack of understanding should be recognized in the policy process in the states. The debate over voter ID in the states would be improved by additional research sponsored by the EAC.

The EAC should consider the following actions to improve understanding of the relationship between voter ID requirements and the two important goals of ensuring ballot access and ensuring ballot integrity.

1. Encourage or sponsor further research to clarify the connection between Voter ID requirements and the number of potential voters actually able to cast a ballot that is actually counted.
2. Recommend as a best practice the publication of a "Voting Impact Statement" by states as they assess their voter ID requirements to protect the integrity of the ballot. The analysis will help ensure that efforts to increase ballot security have a neutral effect on electoral participation by eligible voters. The Voter Impact Statement would estimate the number and demographics of 1) eligible, potential voters that may be kept from the polls

---

5 Arizona held its first election with its new, stricter ID requirements on March 14, 2006. In at least one county (Maricopa) election officials handed a survey to voters that asked if they knew about the voter identification law and if they did, how they found out about it. Edythe Jensen, "New Voter ID Law Goes Smoothly in Chandler," Arizona Republic, March 15, 2006. More surveys of this kind can illuminate the dynamics of voter ID and voting in ways that are not possible now because of insufficient data.
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or permitted to cast a provisional ballot by a stricter ID requirement; and 2) and assess
the number of ineligible voters who will be prevented from voting by the stricter ID
requirements.

3. Encourage or require the states in the 2006 election and beyond, to collect and report
reliable, credible information on the relationship between ballot access and ballot
security. EAC should publish an analysis of this information to provide a sound factual
basis for the states to consider as they estimate the incidence of the kinds of vote fraud
that more stringent ID requirements may prevent. The analysis should describe the
dynamics of the voter ID process in preserving the security of the ballot. EAC can also
use this information to encourage the states to assess the effectiveness of programs to
ensure that all eligible voters have required ID and are permitted to vote in future
elections. Well-designed longitudinal studies in the states can show the results of
changing voter ID requirements on electoral participation over time. The studies should
include precinct-level data to provide the fine-grained analysis that can provide a solid
foundation for policy.

I. Useful information could be supplied by state-sponsored surveys of voters by local
election officials. It would make clear why those who cast a provisional ballot were
found ineligible to cast a regular ballot. The answers would illuminate the frequency
with which ID issues divert voters into the provisional ballot line.

II. Surveys to ask voters what they know about the voter ID requirements would also
provide useful context for evaluating the effect of various voter ID requirements on
electoral participation.

III. Spot checks by state election officials on how the identification process works at
polling places could provide information on how closely actual practice tracks
statutory or regulatory requirements. Such reports should be available to the
public.

4. Encourage states to examine the time period allowed for voters who cast a provisional
ballot because they lacked required ID to return with their identification. In eleven states,
voters who had to cast a provisional ballot because they lacked the ID required for a
regular ballot were permitted to return later with their ID. Their provision of this ID is the
critical step in evaluating the ballots. The length of the period in which the voter may
return with ID is important. In setting the time period for return, which now varies among
the states from the same day to about two weeks, states should consider three factors:
the convenience of the voter, the total time allowed to evaluate ballots\(^6\), and the safe harbor provision in presidential elections.

5. Recommendations to the states from EAC should reflect current judicial trends. Requirements that voters provide some identifying documentation have been upheld, where photo ID is not the only acceptable form. Whether laws requiring photo ID will be upheld is more uncertain.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH

Background and Approach of the Study

Voter ID requirements are just one set of rules governing voting that may affect turnout. Social scientists have long studied how election rules affect participation in elections. The general view today is that the individual citizen makes the choice of whether the vote in a way similar to other decisions that a rational citizen makes, by comparing costs and benefits. The benefits of voting are fairly stable and hard to specify given the remote probability that any one vote will make a difference in an election. But whatever the benefit as perceived by an individual voter, as the costs of voting (for example, time, hassle, acquisition of information) increase, the likelihood that a citizen will vote decrease. Not all groups in the population calculate the cost of participation in the same way, so that election laws (such as registration or identification requirements) may affect different groups differently.

A short summary of some of the social science literature illustrates what may be a broad consensus that the rules of elections affect turnout, but note the important differences in the details of what groups may be most affected.

- Bowler, Brockington and Donovan in "Election Systems and Voter Turnout: Experiments in the United States". The Journal of Politics, 63:3 (August 2001) concluded that electoral systems help shape turnout by altering the benefits perceived by voters. For example, cumulative voting systems have 5% greater turnout than plurality systems

- The effect of registration systems has been the subject of many studies over the last 40 years. Kelley, Ayres, and Bowen in "Registration and Voting: Putting First Things First." American Political Science Review. 61:2 (June 1967) found that local variations in the

\(^6\) Our research on provisional voting reveals that states that provide more than a week to evaluate provisional ballots end up counting substantially more of those ballots than states that provide less than a week.
rate of voting are most directly tied to variations in the rate of registering to vote, and that
the rate of registering to vote in localities is most directly related to the laws and
administration of the registration process. They concluded that the decline in voting over
the past 80 years was due, in part, to the rise of registration laws.

- Brians and Grofman in "Election Day Registration's Effect on U.S. Voter Turnout." Social Science Quarterly. 82:1 (March 2001), found that relaxing registration laws produces higher turnout. In particular, they observed that relaxing registration laws is more likely to promote voter turnout among those with medium levels of income and education, rather than those at the lowest levels. Highton in "Easy Registration and Voter Turnout," Journal of Politics. 59:2 (May 1997), concluded similarly that registration laws affect voter turnout, but also observed that easier registration promotes turnout among those in lower socio-economic status.

- Mitchell and Wlezien. "The Impact of Legal Constraints on Voter Registration, Turnout, and the Composition of the American Electorate," Political Behavior. 17:2 (June 1995) agreed that easier registration promotes higher turnout, but also concluded that higher turnout from easier registration would be unlikely to change the composition of the electorate. Nagler in "The Effect of Registration Laws and Education on U.S. Voter Turnout." American Political Science Review. 85:4 (December 1991) found that registration laws decrease voter turnout by depressing the eligible electorate, but that lower educated people are not disproportionately impacted by these laws. But Rosenstone and Raymond E. Wolfinger in "The Effect of Registration Laws on Voter Turnout." American Political Science Review. 72:1 (March 1978) found that while registration laws did affect both voter turnout and the composition of the electorate, the sharpest effect of these restrictions was felt in the South and among the least educated.

- Squire, Wolfinger, and Glass in "Residential Mobility and Voter Turnout." American Political Science Review. 81:1 (March 1987) found that people who move constitute a major demographic group affected by registration laws. They estimated that altering laws to facilitate voting by recently moved people could increase turnout by 9%. Highton in "Residential Mobility, Community Mobility, and Voter Turnout." Political Behavior. 22:2 (June 2000) also found that people who move have lower turnout than stable residents, and estimated that the decline was more a result of registration laws than a loss of social connections.
Highton and Wolfinger in "Estimating the Effects of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993." *Political Behavior.* 20:2 (June 1998) concluded that the Motor Voter laws led to a significant increase in voting; that eliminating voter purges for not voting also increases voting; and that these effects are felt most heavily by the young (under 30) and the mobile (moved within past 2 years). Knack, in "Does 'Motor Voter' Work? Evidence from State-Level Data." *Journal of Politics.*, 57:3 (August 1995), also found that motor voter does lead to increased registration and voting, but that other parts of NVRA of 1993, like mail-in registrations, agency-based registrations, and limitations on voter purges had not been as influential two years after the passage of the act.

While voter ID may not have been the subject of as much research as the registration process, establishing the eligibility of a person to vote has long been part of the electoral process. Voters may have to identify themselves twice in the electoral process: when registering to vote and then when casting a ballot. The pressures felt by the voter arising from the need to check ID, even so simple a check as a signature match, can be greater at the polls on Election Day than at the time of registration. Poll workers may feel under pressure when faced with long lines and limited time.

**Voter ID requirements on Election Day**

This analysis focuses on ID requirements on Election Day, but with an appreciation that the ID requirements at time of registration and on Election Day are inter-related.\(^7\) The emphasis in this report is on Voter ID requirements on Election Day and afterwards as election judges evaluate provisional ballots. This is the critical period for the electoral system, the time when ballot access and ballot security are in the most sensitive balance.

The report looks at voter ID issues that go beyond the rather narrow identification requirements in HAVA. Much of the current debate in state legislatures over voter ID ranges beyond HAVA to require more rigorous documentation of identity for all would-be voters, not just those who had not registered in person and are casting a ballot for the first time. Current controversies in the states over voter ID seems to have been sparked in part by the HAVA requirements, but goes beyond those requirements, and sets the context for the analysis here.\(^8\)

---

7 As the Carter-Baker Commission noted, photo ID requirements for in-person voting do little to address the problem of fraudulent registration by mail, especially in states that do not require third-party organizations that register voters to verify ID. Commission on Federal Election Reform, pp 46-47.

8 Harvard Law Review 119:1127: "Legislators hoping to stiffen their state antifraud laws have taken their cue from identification provisions buried in HAVA."
We recognize that the previously technical, rather dull subject of voter ID requirements has become fiercely partisan and divisive in many states. The polarization of the debate has raised the stakes over this issue, making dispassionate analysis both more valuable and more rare. Voter ID is often described as the critical step in protecting the integrity of the ballot, the process to ensure that the potential voter is eligible and, if eligible, is permitted to cast one ballot and one ballot only. Truly protecting the integrity of the ballot, however, requires a perspective that takes in the entire voting process. It demands more than preventing the ineligible from voting, and should also ensure that all those who are eligible and want to vote can cast a ballot that counts. The protection effort must embrace all forms of voting, including absentee ballots, and consider each step in the process from registration through vote counting.

A voting system that requires voters to produce an identity document or documents may prevent the ineligible from voting. It may also prevent the eligible from casting a ballot. If the ID requirements block ineligible voters from the polls at the cost of preventing eligible voters who cannot obtain or have left at home the required forms of identification, the integrity of the ballot may not have been improved; the harm may be as great as the benefit. Ultimately, a normative evaluation of whether a state should adopt a stricter voter ID requirement (and, if so, what particular form that new requirement should take) will weigh value judgments as well as available factual evidence. Nonetheless, this report has proceeded on the premise that increased understanding of the factual evidence relating to the imposition of voter ID requirements, based on available data and statistical analysis of that data, can help inform the policy process.

Assessing the effectiveness of voter ID as a way to protect the integrity of the ballot should logically include an estimate of the nature and frequency of vote fraud. The EAC has commissioned a separate analysis of the incidence of vote fraud. Consequently, this research does not include consideration of vote fraud nor the possible effectiveness of various voter ID regimes to counter attempts at vote fraud. As a result, our study of the possible effects of voter

9 "Of the various electoral procedure laws passed in the fifty states since the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections and those still being debated in state legislatures and local media, few arouse more potent partisan feelings than voter identification laws." Harvard Law Review 119:1144. John Fund's 2004 book, Stealing Elections: How Voter Fraud Threaten Our Democracy, cites (pages 16–17) a Rasmussen Research poll that asked respondents if they were more concerned with voting by ineligible participants or with disenfranchisement of eligible voters. Sixty-two percent of Kerry supporters, but only 18 percent of Bush supporters, worried more about disenfranchisement; 58 percent of Bush supporters, but only 19 percent of Kerry supporters were more concerned with voter fraud.
ID requirements on turnout cannot take into account how many potential voters who did not turn out under comparatively stricter voter ID requirements might have been ineligible or eligible to vote.

In some states, voters lacking required ID, or who have ID that does not reflect their current address, are able to vote only by casting a provisional ballot. Voter ID requirements that require voters to bring a document to the polls --rather than simply sign their names-- may divert more voters to the provisional ballot. Requiring poll workers to request and check ID, can put stress on the already demanding environment of the polling place. Scrutiny of ID can create lines at the polling places. Further delays can result when voters cast a provisional ballot and fill out the ballot envelope. Voters who cast a provisional ballot because they lack their ID on Election Day, and who then fail to return with the needed document or documents, will have their ballot rejected. And, of course, the cost of processing provisional ballots is greater than the cost of regular ballots.

Each of these potential consequences of more elaborate voter identification processes can increase the chance of litigation. Long lines will, at best, discourage voters and at worst make voting seem a hassle, an impression that could keep more citizens (even those with ID) from the polls.

Evaluating the effect of different Voter ID regimes can be most effective when based on clear standards --legal, equitable, practical. The standards outlined here might be described as questions policy-makers should ask about Voter ID requirements. We suggest 7 questions that address important dimensions of the problem.

1. Is the Voter ID system designed on the basis of valid and reliable empirical studies of the incidence of the sorts of vote fraud it is designed to prevent?

10 For example, the Florida voter ID law adopted after the 2004 election and pre-cleared by the Department of Justice, permits voters who cannot meet the ID requirements to sign an affidavit on the envelope of a provisional ballot, which will be counted if the signature matches that on the voter's registration form.

11 The EAC's Election Day Study found "improper ID," to be the third most common reason for a provisional ballot to be rejected. "Improper ID" was cited by 7 states responding to the survey, compared to 14 mentions for voting in the wrong precinct. Election Day Study, Chapter 6, p. 5.

12 "Often where the battle over voter identification is most heated, real evidence of voter fraud proves scarce: in Georgia, for example, the Secretary of State averred that she had never encountered a single instance of voter impersonation at the polls. State laws might sometimes impose tighter restrictions on in-person voting than on absentee ballots, which yield the greatest incidence of, and provide the easiest avenue for, voter fraud." Harvard Law Review 127:1144 (2006)
2. How effective is the ID requirement in increasing the security of the ballot? How well can it be coordinated with a statewide voter database?13

3. How practical is the requirement? (Can it be administered smoothly by the staff and budget likely to be made available? How much additional training of polling place workers might be required?) Is it simple enough or can it be defined with sufficient clarity that poll workers throughout the state can administer it uniformly and with a minimum of local interpretation made on the fly under the pressure of Election Day?14

4. How cost-effective is the system? Does it demonstrably increase the security of the ballot affordably, measured in both monetary and other costs? To improve understanding of the non-monetary component of the costs, conducting a voter impact study might be appropriate. The voter impact study would examine, before the adoption of the regulation, the cost of compliance by the voter (such as the cost in time and money of acquiring a photo ID card), any offsetting benefits to voters, and the possible disparate effects of the regulation on various groups of voters.15 A thorough, objective impact statement that demonstrated the nexus between the identification regime and the integrity of the ballot could provide protection against inevitable legal challenges.

5. If a side effect of the Voter ID regulation is likely to reduce turnout, generally or among particular groups, is it possible to take other steps to ameliorate the adverse consequences?16

6. Does it comply with the letter and spirit of Voting Rights Act?

7. The seventh question is the most difficult to answer. How neutral is the effect of the Voter ID requirement on the composition of the qualified and eligible electorate? Might it,

---

13 See the final section of this report for a brief overview of possible effects of a statewide voter database on voter identification issues.

14 In New York, in 2004, disparities in training and voting information were made apparent in a study finding elections officials had wildly varying interpretations of what the state's voter identification requirement actually was. Tova Wang, "Warning Bell in Ohio," December 5, 2005. Website, the Foundation for National Progress.

15 "Absent clear empirical evidence demonstrating widespread individual voter fraud, legislatures need to fashion narrowly tailored voter identification provisions with an eye toward the inevitable and well-grounded constitutional challenges that will arise in the courts. Only as states grow more adept at administering elections will courts likely demonstrate greater willingness to uphold strict identification requirements." Harvard Law Review 127:1144 (2006)

16 For example, the Carter-Baker Commission coupled its recommendation for a national voter ID card to a call for an affirmative effort by the states to reach out and register the unregistered, that is, to use the new Voter ID regime as a means to enroll more voters. Similarly, Richard Hasen has suggested combining a national voter ID with universal registration. See his "Beyond the Margin of Litigation: Reforming U.S. Election Administration to Avoid Electoral Meltdown," 62 Washington and Lee Law Review 937 (2005).
intentionally or unintentionally, reduce the turnout of particular groups of voters or supporters of one party or another without an offsetting decrease in vote fraud?

Voter ID and Turnout

Based on research for this study by the Moritz College of Law, states had one of five types of maximum requirements in place on Election Day 2004. These are shown in Table 1, Voter ID Requirements. The five categories: at the polling place, voters were asked to either: state their names (10 states); sign their names (13 states and the District of Columbia); sign their names, to be matched to a signature on file (seven states); provide a form of identification that did not necessarily include a photo (15 states); or provide a photo identification (five states).17 Using this information made it possible to code the states according to these requirements, and examine the assumption that voter identification requirements would pose an increasingly demanding requirement in this order: stating one’s name, signing one’s name, matching one’s signature to a signature on file, providing a form of identification, and providing a form of photo identification, however, in all “photo ID” states in 2004, voters without photo ID could cast a regular ballot after signing an affidavit concerning their identity and eligibility or provide other forms of ID). The report refers to this set of ID requirements as “maximum,” the most rigorous ID the voter can be asked to present at the polling place in order to cast a regular ballot.18

Election laws in several states offer exceptions to these requirements if potential voters lack the necessary form of identification. Laws in those states set a minimum standard— that is the minimum requirement that a voter may be required to satisfy in order to vote using a regular ballot. States can be categorized based on the minimum requirement for voting with a regular ballot. In 2004 the categories were somewhat different compared to the maximum requirement, in that none of the states required photo identification as a minimum standard for voting with a regular ballot. That is, voters who lacked photo ID would still be allowed to vote in all states, if able to meet another requirement. Four states required voters to swear an affidavit as to their identity (Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, and North Dakota). The five categories for minimum requirements were: state name (12 states), sign name (14 states and the District of Columbia), match one’s signature to a signature on file (six states), provide a non-photo identification (14 states), or swear an affidavit (four states). The analysis also examined this array of minimum

17 Oregon conducts elections entirely by mail. Voters sign their mail-in ballots, and election officials match the signatures to signatures on file. For the purposes of this analysis, Oregon is classified as a state that requires a signature match.
18 As noted above, our analysis does not consider additional requirements that particular voters may be subjected to as part of an official challenge process, in the event that their eligibility is called into question.
identification requirements to assess how they correlated with turnout: state name, sign name, match signature, provide non-photo identification, and, given the potential legal consequences for providing false information, swearing an affidavit. As noted above, no state had a “minimum” requirement of showing photo ID. This analysis therefore cannot estimate the effect of laws, such as those recently enacted in Indiana and Georgia that require voters to show photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot without an affidavit or other exception.

We recognize the difficulties in summarizing each state’s voter ID requirements. The problem is illustrated by the number of footnotes to Table 1 below. The variety of statutory and regulatory details among the states is complex.

Moving beyond the statutes and regulations, we also recognize that the assignment of each state to one category may fail to reflect actual practice at many polling places. As in any system run by fallible humans, the voter ID process is subject to variation in practice. Voters may have been confronted with demands for identification different from the directives in state statutes or regulation. It seems reasonable to conclude, however, that while actual practices may vary, the variance is around each state’s legal requirement for ID. The analysis of the effect of state requirements on turnout must be viewed with some caution. We believe that the categories used in this report provide an acceptable level of discrimination among voter identification regimes.

---

19 One state election official told us that, “We have 110 election jurisdictions in Illinois, and I have reason to believe [the voter ID requirements] are administered little bit differently in each one. We wish it weren’t that way, but it probably is.”
**TABLE 1 – Voter ID Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Maximum Forms of ID Required 2004</th>
<th>Current ID Requirement for First-Time Voters</th>
<th>Current ID Requirements for All Other Voters</th>
<th>Verification Method for Provisional Ballots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Gov-issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Gov-issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Photo ID^2</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Photo ID^2</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID^2</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Gov. Issued Photo ID</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Photo ID^2</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID^2</td>
<td>DOB and Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>No Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn.</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID*</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

20 See Appendix 1 for a more detailed summary, including citations and statutory language, of the identification requirements in each state.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Photo ID</th>
<th>Photo ID</th>
<th>Photo ID</th>
<th>Address &amp; Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Match Sig.</td>
<td>Address &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Bring ID Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Provide ID</td>
<td>Give Name</td>
<td>Affidavit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* States applies only HAVA’s ID requirement, applicable to first-time voters who registered by mail and did not provide applicable ID at the time of registration.
1 Arizona voters who lack a photo ID may present 2 forms of ID with no photograph.
2 Florida required a photo ID in 2004, but voters without that credential could sign an affidavit concerning their identity and eligibility and cast a regular ballot. Florida subsequently changed its law to require that voters present photo ID to cast a regular ballot, though voters without photo ID may still cast a provisional ballot by signing an affidavit, which ballot should ordinarily be counted.
3 Louisiana required a photo ID in 2004. Voters without that credential could sign an affidavit concerning their identity and eligibility and cast a regular ballot.
4 Pennsylvania requires ID of all first-time voters, whether they registered by mail or in-person.
5 Voters lacking a photo ID could vote by providing another form of ID in 2004.
6 Voters lacking a photo ID could vote by providing another form of ID in 2004.
7 Tennessee voters must provide signature and address. In counties without computerized lists, the signature is compared to the registration card. In counties with computerized lists, the signature is compared to a signature on ID presented with the registration.
8 Texas voters must present a current registration certificate. Those without a certificate can vote provisionally after completing an affidavit.

Relationship of Voter ID requirements to Turnout

The statistical analysis examined the potential variation in turnout rates based on the type of voter identification required in each state on Election Day 2004 using two sets of data: aggregate turnout data at the county level for each state, as compiled by the Eagleton Institute of Politics, and individual-level survey data included in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau.

The statistical analysis examined turnout among U.S. citizens of voting age in both the aggregate and the individual-level data. Determining citizenship status in the individual-level data simply involved restricting the analyses to individuals who identified themselves as citizens in the November 2004 Current Population Survey. (Those who said they were not citizens did not have the opportunity to answer the supplemental voting questions contained in the Current Population Survey.)
Findings of the statistical analysis
The analysis looked at the voter identification requirements in two ways, as a continuous variable and as a series of discrete variables. As a continuous variable the maximum voter identification requirements are ranked according to how demanding they were judged to be, with photo ID as the most demanding requirement. As discrete variables, the statistical analysis assume that stating name is the least demanding ID requirement and compare each other requirement to it.

The analysis treating the requirements as a continuous variable offers some statistical support for the premise that as the level of required proof increases, turnout declines. Averaging across counties in each state, statewide turnout is negatively correlated with maximum voter identification requirements ($r = -.30, p < .05$). In considering the array of minimum requirements, with affidavit as the most demanding requirement, however, the correlation between voter identification and turnout is negative, but it is not statistically significant ($r = -.20, p = .16$). This suggests that the relationship between turnout rates and minimum requirements may not be linear. Breaking down the turnout rates by type of requirement reveals in greater detail the relationship between voter identification requirements and voter turnout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voter Identification</th>
<th>Maximum Requirement</th>
<th>Minimum Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required in the States</td>
<td>Mean Voter Turnout for States in that Category</td>
<td>Mean Voter Turnout for States in that Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Name</td>
<td>64.2 %</td>
<td>State Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Name</td>
<td>61.1 %</td>
<td>Sign Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Signature</td>
<td>60.9 %</td>
<td>Match Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Non-Photo ID</td>
<td>59.3 %</td>
<td>Provide Non-Photo ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Photo ID</td>
<td>58.1 %</td>
<td>Swear Affidavit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Turnout (All States)** | 60.9 %

This table displays the mean turnout using the aggregate county level data for each state in 2004.

The aggregate data show that 60.9 percent of the estimated citizen voting age population voted in 2004. Differences in voter turnout at the state level in 2004 varied based on voter identification requirements. Taking into account the maximum requirements, an average of 64.6 percent of the voting age population turned out in states that required voters to state their names, compared to 58.1 percent in states that required photo identification. A similar trend
emerged when considering minimum requirements. Sixty-three percent of the voting age population turned out in states requiring voters to state their names, compared to 60.1 percent in states that required an affidavit from voters. Given the lack of a clear, consistent linear relationship between turnout and minimum identification requirements, however, we opted to treat the voter identification requirements as a series of dichotomous variables in subsequent analyses.\(^{21}\)

Voter identification requirements are just one factor that may affect voter turnout. Multivariate models that take into account other predictors of turnout can paint a more complete picture of the relationship between voter identification requirements and turnout. This analysis estimated the effects of voter identification requirements in multivariate models that also took into account the electoral context in 2004 and demographic characteristics of the population in each county. While the model takes account of several important variables, statistical models do not capture all the messiness of the real world. It is a simplification of a complex reality, and its results should be treated with appropriate caution.

The model also took into account such variables as:

- Was the county in a presidential battleground state?
- Was the county in a state with a competitive race for governor and/or the U.S. Senate?
- Percentage of the voting-age population in each county that was Hispanic or African-American \(^{22}\)
- Percentage of county residents age 65 and older
- Percentage of county residents below the poverty line

Another contextual factor to consider is voter registration requirements, such as the deadline for registration. As states set the deadline farther away from Election Day, the task of remembering to register to vote becomes more challenging. Thus our model takes into account the number of days between each state’s registration deadline and the election.

\(^{21}\) The voter identification requirements are coded as a series of dummy variables, coding each variable as one if the requirement existed in a given state, and zero otherwise. This yielded five dichotomous variables for maximum requirements (state name, sign name, match signature, non-photo identification, or photo identification), and five dichotomous variables for minimum requirements (state name, sign name, match signature, non-photo identification, or providing an affidavit). Omitted is the variable for stating one’s name so that it could serve as the reference category in comparison with the other four identification requirements in each of the statistical analyses.

\(^{22}\) The U.S. Census projections for 2003 provided the data for the percentage of the voting-age population in each county that was Hispanic or African-American and for the percentage of county residents age 65 and older.
The dependent variable in each model was voter turnout at the county level, with turnout calculated as the percentage of the citizen voting-age population that voted in the 2004 election.

The results of this modeling suggest that voter identification requirements such as signature matching, a non-photo ID or a photo ID are associated with lower turnout than in states that required voters to simply state their name, holding constant the electoral context and demographic variables.

Contextual factors, such as whether the county was in a battleground state or whether that state had a competitive race for governor and/or U.S. Senate, were associated with increased voter turnout. The time between the closing date for registration and the election was correlated with a slight negative effect on turnout. As the percentage of Hispanics in the county's population increased, turnout declined. The percentage of senior citizens in the county and household median income were associated with higher turnout. The percentage of African-Americans in the county did not have a significant effect in the model. The percentage of senior citizens in the county and household median income showed a positive correlation with turnout. In this aggregate model, the percentage of African-Americans in the county was not associated with a significant difference in turnout.

The relationship of the minimum voter identification requirements to turnout was not demonstrated. None of the dummy variables for voter identification requirements were statistically significant. Being a battleground state and having a competitive statewide race were significant and positive, as was the percentage of senior citizens in the county and household median income. The percentage of Hispanics in the county's population continued to be associated with reduced turnout, as was the number of days between the closing date for registration and the election.

Analysis of the aggregate data at the county level generates some support for the hypothesis that stricter identification requirements are correlated with lower turnout. For the maximum

---

23 This test incorporated a series of interactions between the maximum and minimum voter identification requirements and the percentage of African-Americans and Hispanics living in the counties. In each case the interactions did not improve the fit of the models to the data. See tables A-1 and A-2 in the appendix of Vercellotti's paper in the appendices.
requirements, a signature match, non-photo identification or photo identification were correlated with lower turnout in 2004, compared to requiring that voters simply state their names.

Aggregate data, however, cannot fully capture the individual demographic factors that may figure into the decision to turn out to vote. Voter identification requirements could have a relationship to the turnout of particular groups of voters, in ways that county-level aggregate data on turnout would not capture. To explore the effects of voter identification requirements on turnout more completely, it is important to examine individual-level data as well.

Individual-level Analysis

Individual-level turnout data exists in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. The Census Bureau conducts the CPS monthly to measure unemployment and other workforce data, but the bureau adds a battery of voter participation questions to the November survey in even-numbered years to coincide with either a presidential or midterm Congressional election.

One of the of the CPS is the sheer size of the sample. The survey’s Voting and Registration Supplement consisted of interviews, either by telephone or in person, with 96,452 respondents. The large sample size permits analyses of smaller groups, such as Black or Hispanic voters or voters with less than a high school education. The statistical analysis in relying on the CPS is based on reports from self-described registered voters. Omitted are those who said they were not registered to vote, as are those who said they cast absentee ballots because the identification requirements for absentee ballots may differ from those required when one votes in person. Eliminated from the sample are respondents who said they were not U.S. citizens; the questionnaire design skipped those individuals past the voter registration and turnout questions in the survey. In addition to the voter identification requirements, the models include other socioeconomic, demographic, and political environment factors that might have

---

24 For example, previous research has found that education is a powerful determinant of turnout (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980, but see also Nagler 1991). Married people also are more likely to vote than those who are not married (Alvarez and Ansolabehere 2002; Alvarez, Nagler and Wilson 2004; Fisher, Kenny, and Morton 1993).

25 It is important to note that the Census Bureau allows respondents to answer on behalf of themselves and others in the household during the interview. While proxy reporting of voter turnout raises the possibility of inaccurate reports concerning whether another member of the household voted, follow-up interviews with those for whom a proxy report had been given in the November 1984 CPS showed 99 percent agreement between the proxy report and the information given by the follow-up respondent (U.S. Census Bureau 1990).
influenced turnout in 2004. The dependent variable in these analyses is whether a respondent said he or she voted in the November 2004 election.

In the model, three of the voter identification requirements have a statistically significant correlation with whether survey respondents said they had voted in 2004. That is, compared to states that require voters only to state their names, the requirement to sign one's name, provide a non-photo ID, or photo ID in the maximum requirements or affidavit in the minimum is associated with lower turnout.

Of the other state factors, only the competitiveness of the presidential race showed a significant correlation with increased turnout. In terms of demographic influences, African-American voters were more likely than white voters or other voters to say they had cast a ballot, while Asian-Americans were less likely than white or other voters to say they had turned out. Hispanic voters were not statistically different from white or other voters in terms of reported turnout. Consistent with previous research, income, and marital status all were positive predictors of voting. Women also were more likely to say they voted than men. Among the age categories, those ages 45 to 64 and 65 and older were more likely than those ages 18 to 24 to say they voted. Respondents who had earned a high school diploma, attended some college, graduated from college or attended graduate school were all more likely to say they voted than those who had not finished high school.

While the probit models provide statistical evidence for the relationship of voter identification requirements and other variables to turnout, probit coefficients do not lend themselves to intuitive interpretation. Table 3 below shows predicted probabilities (calculated from the probit coefficients) of voting for each level of voter identification requirements while holding all other independent variables in the models at their means.

---

26 The models are estimated using probit analysis, which calculates the effects of independent variables on the probability that an event occurred – in this case whether a respondent said he or she voted and using robust standard errors to control for correlated error terms for observations from within the same state.

27 The U.S. Census Bureau reported, based on the November 2004 CPS, that 89 percent of those who identified themselves as registered voters said they voted in 2004 (U.S. Census Bureau 2005). Previous research has shown that, generally speaking, some survey respondents overstate their incidence of voting. Researchers speculate that over-reports may be due to the social desirability that accompanies saying one has done his or her civic duty, or a reluctance to appear outside the mainstream of American political culture (U.S. Census Bureau 1990). It is also possible that voting is an indication of civic engagement that predisposes voters to agree to complete surveys at a higher rate than non-voters (Flanigan and Zingale 2002). Hence the voter turnout rates reported in the CPS tend to be up to 10 percentage points higher than the actual turnout rate for the nation (Flanigan and Zingale 2002). Even with this caveat, however, the CPS serves as a widely accepted source of data on voting behavior.

28 A probit model is a popular specification of a generalized linear regression model, using the probit link function.

29 In the case of dichotomous independent variables, holding them at their mean amounted to holding them at the percentage of the sample that was coded 1 for the variable (Long 1997).
Table 3. Predicted probability of voter turnout – all voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum requirement</th>
<th>Minimum requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State name</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign name</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match signature</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-photo ID</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo ID</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from &quot;state name&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to &quot;photo ID&quot; or &quot;affidavit&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 54,973

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies stating one's name to providing photo identification or an affidavit, with all other variables held constant. N.S. = nonsignificant coefficient in the probit model.


Taking into account that signature matches were not a predictor of turnout, the differences in predicted probability decline from stating one's name to providing a photo identification or affidavit. Voters in states that required photo identification were 2.7 percent less likely to vote than voters in states where individuals had to give their names. In terms of the minimum requirement, voters in states that required an affidavit at minimum were 4 percent less likely to turn out than voters in states where they had to give their names.

The differences were more pronounced for those lower in education. Constraining the model to show predicted probabilities only for those with less than a high school diploma, the probability of voting was 5.1 percent lower in states that required photo identification as the maximum requirement and 7 percent lower in states that required an affidavit as the minimum requirement compared to states where stating one's name was the maximum or minimum requirement.

30 The voter turnout percentages may seem disproportionately high compared to the turnout rates reported in the aggregate data analysis. It is important to consider that the turnout rates in the aggregate data were a proportion of all citizens of voting-age population, while the turnout rates for the individual-level data are the proportion of only registered voters who said they voted.
Race and ethnicity have generated particular interest in the debate over voter ID requirements. The analysis using the aggregate data shed no light on the association between voter ID requirements and turnout for African-American and Hispanic voters. But in the models using the individual data, some significant relationships emerged for African-American, Hispanic and Asian citizens. For the entire population, the signature, non-photo identification and photo identification requirements all were associated with lower turnout compared to the requirement that voters simply state their names. These correlations translated into reduced probabilities of voting of about 3 to 4 percent for the entire sample, with larger differences for specific subgroups. For example, the predicted probability that Hispanics would vote in states that required non-photo identification was about 10 percentage points lower than in states where Hispanic voters gave their names. The difference was about 6 percent for African-Americans and Asian-Americans, and about 2 percent for white voters.

The model also showed that Hispanic voters were less likely to vote in states that required non-photo identification as opposed to stating one's name. Hispanic voters were 10 percent less likely to vote in non-photo identification states compared to states where voters only had to give their name.

Varying voter identification requirements were associated with lower turnout rates for Asian-American voters as well. Asian-American voters were 8.5 percent less likely to vote in states that required non-photo identification compared to states that require voters to state their names under the maximum requirements, and they were 6.1 percent less likely to vote where non-photo identification was the minimum requirement.

Conclusions of the Statistical Analysis
The statistical analysis found that, as voter identification requirements vary, voter turnout varies as well. This finding emerged from both the aggregate data and the individual-level data, although not always for both the maximum and minimum sets of requirements. The overall relationship between ID requirements and turnout for all registered voters was fairly small, but still statistically significant.

31 Incorporating discrete variables for Hispanics, African-Americans, and Asian-Americans into one model carries the implicit assumption that the remaining variables, including education and income, will influence each of these groups in a similar manner in terms of deciding whether to vote. These assumptions are not always born out by the data (see Leighley and Vedlitz, 1999.) To isolate the effects of voter identification and other variables on voter turnout within specific racial and ethnic groups, the sample is divided into sub-samples and the model re-run to calculate the data discussed and shown in Tables 5, 6, and 7 in Appendix C.
In the aggregate data, the match signature requirement, the provide a non-photo ID requirement, and the photo ID requirement were all correlated with lower turnout compared to requiring that voters state their names.

The signature, non-photo ID, and photo ID requirements were all correlated with lower turnout compared to the requirement that voters simply state their names. That the non-photo identification requirement was the most consistent in terms of statistical significance across the groups is intriguing given the intense debates surrounding photo identification requirements.

Significant questions about the relationship between voter identification requirements and turnout remain unanswered. The data examined in the statistical analysis could not capture the dynamics of how identification requirements might lower turnout, nor could they rule out that other attributes of a state’s electoral system might explain the statistically significant correlations that the study found. If ID requirements dampen turnout, is it because individuals are aware of the requirements and stay away from the polls because they cannot or do not want to meet the requirements? Or, do the requirements result in some voters being turned away when they cannot meet the requirements on Election Day, or forced to cast a provisional ballot that is not ultimately counted? The CPS data do not include measures that can answer this question. Knowing more about the “on the ground” experiences of voters concerning identification requirements could guide policy-makers at the state and local level in determining whether and at what point in the electoral cycle a concerted public information campaign might be most effective in helping voters to meet identification requirements. Such knowledge also could help in designing training for election judges to handle questions about, and potential disputes over, voter identification requirements.

**Litigation Over Voter ID Requirements**

A handful of cases have challenged identification requirements in court in recent years. In general, requirements that voters provide some identifying documentation have been upheld, where photo ID is not the only acceptable form. Whether laws requiring photo ID will be upheld is more doubtful. To date, only two cases have considered laws requiring voters to show photo ID (*Common Cause v. Billups* and *Indiana Democratic Party v. Rokita*). Cases challenging the mandatory disclosure of voters’ Social Security numbers on privacy grounds have yielded mixed results.

*Non-photo identification.* For the most part, courts have looked favorably on requirements that voters present some form of identifying documents if the photo identification is not the
only form accepted. In Colorado Common Cause v. Davidson, No. 04CV7709, 2004 WL 2360485, at *1 (Colo. Dist. Ct. Oct. 18, 2004), plaintiffs challenged a law requiring all in- person voters to show identification (not just first-time registrants). The court upheld this requirement against a constitutional challenge. Similarly, in League of Women Voters v. Blackwell, 340 F. Supp. 2d 823 (N.D. Ohio 2004), the court rejected a challenge to an Ohio directive requiring first-time voters who registered by mail to provide one of the HAVA-permitted forms of identification, in order to have their provisional ballots counted. Specifically, the directive provided that their provisional ballots would be counted if the voter (a) orally recited his driver's license number or the last four digits of his social security number or (b) returned to the polling place before it closed with some acceptable identification (including reciting those identification numbers). Id. This was found to be consistent with HAVA.

Photo ID. Since the 2004 election, two states have adopted laws requiring photo identification at the polls in order to have one's vote counted, without an affidavit exception: Georgia and Indiana. Both these requirements were enacted in 2005 and both have been challenged in court. The Georgia law required voters attempting to cast a ballot in person present a valid form of photographic identification. O.C.G.A. § 21-2-417. On October 18, 2005, the District Court granted the plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction, enjoining the application of the new identification requirements on constitutional grounds. In granting the injunction, the court held that plaintiffs' claims under both the Fourteenth Amendment (equal protection) and Twenty-Fourth Amendment (poll tax) had a substantial likelihood of succeeding on the merits at trial (Common Cause v. Billups, Prelim. Inj. 96, 104). In January 2006, Georgia enacted a modified version of its photo ID law, which the court has not yet ruled on. In the other state that has enacted a photo ID requirement (Indiana), legal challenges have also been filed. (Indiana Democratic Party v. Rokita and Crawford v. Marion County Election Board). On April 14, 2006, the district court granted defendants' motion for summary judgment, concluding that plaintiffs had failed to produce evidence showing that the state's ID law would have an adverse impact on voters. Another case of significance, for purposes of photo ID requirements, is American Civil Liberties Union of Minnesota v. Kiffmeyer, No. 04-CV-4653, 2004 WL 28

Indiana's law does allow voters without ID to cast provisional ballots, and then to appear before the county board of elections to execute an affidavit saying that they are indigent and unable to obtain the requisite ID without payment of a fee. But in contrast to other states, voters cannot cast a ballot that will be counted by submitting an affidavit at the polls, affirming that they are the registered voter and are otherwise eligible to vote.
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2428690, at *1 (D. Minn. Oct. 28, 2004). In that case, the court enjoined a Minnesota law that allowed the use of tribal photo ID cards, only for an Indian who lived on the reservation. 2004 WL 2428690, at *1. The Court found no rational basis for distinguishing based on whether or not the cardholder lives on the reservation. Id. at *1, 3. These decisions indicate that courts are likely to carefully scrutinize the evidence regarding the impact of photo ID requirements.

Privacy. In Greidinger v. Davis, 988 F.2d 1344 (4th Cir. 1993), the court struck down on due process grounds a Virginia law requiring disclosure of voters' social security numbers for voter registration. The social security numbers recorded in voter registration lists had been disclosed to the public and political parties that had requested the lists. The court found that the requirement to give the social security number effectively conditioned rights on the consent to an invasion of privacy. It concluded that this public disclosure of the social security numbers was not necessary to achieve the government’s interest in preventing fraud. On the other hand, in McKay v. Thompson, 226 F.3d 752 (6th Cir. 2000), the court rejected privacy challenges based on both the Constitution and federal statutes, to a Tennessee law requiring social security numbers for voter registration since 1972. 226 F.3d at 755. Second, the NVRA only permits requiring the minimum amount of information necessary to prevent duplicate voter registration and to determine eligibility. The distinction appears to be between the use of Social Security numbers for internal purposes only, which was deemed permissible, and the disclosure of those numbers to the public which was not.

These decisions suggest that the courts will carefully scrutinize the evidence, where states require that voters produce a photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot. The courts have used a balancing test to weigh the legitimate interest in preventing election fraud against the citizen’s right to privacy (protecting social security numbers from public disclosure, for example) and the reasonableness of requirements for identity documents. To provide both the clarity and certainty in administration of elections needed to forestall destabilizing challenges to outcomes, these early decisions suggest that best practice may be to limit requirements for voter identification to the minimum needed to prevent duplicate registration and ensure eligibility.

Developments since 2004
Since the passage of HAVA, with its limited requirements for voter identification, and following the 2004 election, debate over voter ID has taken place in state legislatures across the country. That debate has not been characterized by solid information on the consequences of tightening requirements for voters to identify themselves before being permitted to cast a regular, rather than a provisional, ballot.

Better information might improve the quality of the debate. Answers to the following key questions are not available in a form that might satisfy those on both sides of the argument.

- What is the overall incidence of vote fraud?
- How does fraud take place in the various stages of the process: registration, voting at the polls, absentee voting, or ballot counting?
- What contribution can tighter requirements for voter ID make to reducing vote fraud?
- What would be the other consequences of increasingly demanding requirements for voters to identify themselves? This is the question addressed, within the limits of the available data, in the analysis in this report.

Answering these questions would provide the information needed for more informed judgment in the states as they consider the tradeoffs among the competing goals of ballot integrity, ballot access, and administrative efficiency. The Carter-Baker Commission recognized the tradeoffs when it tied recommendation for national ID to an affirmative effort by government to identify unregistered voters and make it easy for them to register.

State Voter Databases and Voter ID

With the implementation of the HAVA Computerized Statewide Voter Registration List, an application for voter registration for an election for Federal office may not be accepted or processed unless the application includes a driver's license number or last four digits of the Social Security number on the voter registration form. This information can be used to verify the identity of the registrant through interfacing with lists maintained by the Motor Vehicle office and Social Security office. If registrants do not have either a driver's license or Social Security number, the State will assign a unique identifier number to that person.

Some states are wrestling now with these unresolved issues. In New Jersey, for example, pending legislation would require that voters must be able to confirm their registration through a secure access to the Statewide Voter Registration List. It also requires voters to present ID at
the polls in order to cast a regular ballot if the numbers recorded on the registration have not
been verified (or if no verifiable number appears on the registration). It recognizes the HAVA
requirement that if the number provided by the voter has not been verified and if the voter does
not present ID at the polls, that voter may cast a provisional ballot. The bill does not specify they
have to provide ID within 48 hours in order for their vote to count, as is the case with first-time
mail-in registrants.

As some states gain experience in this area, the EAC would perform a useful service by making
timely recommendations of best practices for all states to consider.

Conclusions
The analysis of voter ID requirements is complex. It takes into account important values
associated with an electoral process, such as ballot access and integrity. The continuing effort
to understand how voter ID requirements may affect turnout and the integrity of the ballot could
benefit from additional factual information, including statistical analyses. Our research includes
a statistical study of this kind. It indicated that the level of voter turnout in a state is correlated
with the stringency of the voter ID requirement imposed by that state. Additional empirical
research of this nature, with additional data collected by or for the EAC, would further illuminate
the relationship between stricter voter ID rules and turnout, perhaps explaining if awareness of a
strict ID requirement tends to discourage would-be voters from going to the polls. Or, additional
research may shed light on whether, if voters did go to the polls, stricter Voter ID requirements
will divert more voters into the line for provisional ballots. The consequence of increased
reliance on provisional ballots can be longer lines at the polls and confusion, without
necessarily a clear demonstration that the security of the ballot is correspondingly increased. 33

The debate over voter ID in the states would be improved by additional research sponsored by
the EAC. That might include longitudinal studies of jurisdictions that have changed voter ID
requirements, as well as precinct-level analyses that would allow more finely tuned assessment
of the correlation between stricter identification requirements and turnouts. Further research
could also identify methods to eliminate the need for voters to bring specific identity documents

33 In this connection, the Brennan Center's response to the Carter-Baker Commission report observes
that, "while it might be true that in a close election "a small amount of fraud could make the margin of
difference," it is equally true that the rejection of a much larger number of eligible voters could make a
much bigger difference in the outcome." Response to the Report of the 2005 Commission on Federal
Election Reform, The Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law and Spencer Overton, On Behalf
Of The National Network on State Election Reform, September 19, 2005
with them to the polls, while assuring that each voter who casts a ballot is eligible and votes only once.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background and Methodology

This report to the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) presents recommendations for best practices to improve the process of provisional voting. It is based on research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and the Moritz College of Law at Ohio State University under a contract to the EAC dated May 24, 2005.

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA, Public Law 107-252) authorizes the EAC (SEC. 241, 42 USC 15381) to conduct periodic studies of election administration issues. The purpose of these studies is to promote methods for voting and administering elections, including provisional voting, that are convenient, accessible and easy to use; that yield accurate, secure and expeditious voting systems; that afford each registered and eligible voter an equal opportunity to vote and to have that vote counted; and that are efficient. Section 302(a) of HAVA required states to establish provisional balloting procedures by January 2004.\(^1\) The process HAVA outlined left considerable room for variation among the states, arguably including such critical questions as who qualifies as a registered voter eligible to cast a provisional ballot that will be counted and in what jurisdiction (precinct or larger unit) the ballot must be cast in order to be counted.\(^2\)

The general requirement for provisional voting is that, if a registered voter appears at a polling place to vote in an election for Federal office, but either the potential voter's name does not appear on the official list of eligible voters for the polling place, or an election official asserts that the individual is not eligible to vote, that potential voter must be permitted to cast a provisional ballot. In some states, those who should receive a provisional ballot include, in the words of the EAC’s Election Day Survey, “first-time voters who registered by mail without identification and cannot provide identification, as required under HAVA…”\(^3\) HAVA also provides that those who vote pursuant to a court order keeping the polls open after the established closing hour shall vote by provisional ballot. Election administrators are required by HAVA to notify individuals of their opportunity to cast a provisional ballot.

\(^1\) The Election Center’s National Task Force Report on Election Reform in July 2001 had described provisional ballots as providing “voters whose registration status cannot be determined at the polls or verified at the election office the opportunity to vote. The validity of these ballots is determined later, thus ensuring that no eligible voter is turned away and those truly ineligible will not have their ballots counted.” It recommended “in the absence of election day registration or other solutions to address registration questions, provisional ballots must be adopted by all jurisdictions.” See www.electioncenter.org.

\(^2\) The 2004 election saw at least a dozen suits filed on the issue of whether votes cast in the wrong precinct but the correct county should be counted. One federal circuit court decided the issue in Sandusky County Democratic Party v. Blackwell, 387 F.3d 565 (6th Cir. 2004), which held that votes cast outside the correct precinct did not have to be counted. The court relied on the presumption that Congress must be clear in order to alter the state-federal balance; thus Congress, the court concluded would have been clearer had it intended to eliminate state control over polling location (387 F.3d at 578). An alternative argument, that HAVA’s definition of “jurisdiction” incorporates the broader definition in the National Voting Rights Act, however, has not been settled by a higher court. But for now states do seem to have discretion in how they define “jurisdiction” for the purpose of counting a provisional ballot.

\(^3\) The definition of who was entitled to a provisional ballot could differ significantly among the states. In California, for example, the Secretary of State directed counties to provide voters with the option of voting on a provisional paper ballot if they felt uncomfortable casting votes on the paperless e-voting machines. “I don’t want a voter to not vote on Election Day because the only option before them is a touch-screen voting machine. I want that voter to have the confidence that he or she can vote on paper and have the confidence that their vote was cast as marked,” Secretary Shelley said. See http://www.wired.com/news/vote/0,2645,63288,00.html. (Our analysis revealed no differences in the use of provisional ballots in the counties with these paperless e-voting machines.) In Ohio, long lines at some polling places resulted in legal action directing that voters waiting in line be given provisional ballots to enable them to vote before the polls closed. (Columbus Dispatch, November 3, 2004.)
Our research began in late May 2005. It focused on six key questions raised by the EAC:

1. How did the states prepare for the onset of the HAVA provisional ballot requirement?
2. How did this vary between states that had previously had some form of provisional ballot and those that did not?
3. How did litigation affect implementation?
4. How effective was provisional voting in enfranchising qualified voters?
5. Did state and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots?
6. Did local election officials have a clear understanding of how to implement provisional voting?

To answer those questions, we:

1. Surveyed 400 local (mostly county) election officials to learn their views about the administration of provisional voting and to gain insights into their experience in the 2004 election.
2. Reviewed the EAC’s Election Day Survey, news and other published reports in all 50 states to understand the local background of provisional voting and develop leads for detailed analysis.
3. Analyzed statistically provisional voting data from the 2004 election to determine associations between the use of provisional voting and such variables as states’ experience with provisional voting, use of statewide registration databases, counting out-of-precinct ballots, and use of different approaches to voter identification.
4. Collected and reviewed the provisional voting statutes and regulations in all 50 states.
5. Analyzed litigation affecting provisional voting or growing out of disputes over provisional voting in all states.

Our research is intended to provide EAC with a strategy to engage the states in a continuing effort to strengthen the provisional voting process and increase the consistency with which provisional voting is administered, particularly within a state. As EAC and the states move forward to assess and adopt the recommendations made here, provisional voting merits continuing observation and research. The situation is fluid. As states, particularly those states that did not offer a provisional ballot before 2004, gain greater experience with the process and as statewide voter databases are adopted, the provisional voting process will demand further, research-based refinement.

KEY FINDINGS

Variation among the states

In the 2004 election, nationwide about 1.9 million votes, or 1.6% of turnout, were cast as provisional ballots. More than 1.2 million, or just over 63%, were counted. Provisional ballots accounted for a little more than 1% of the final vote tally. These totals obscure the wide variation in provisional voting among the states.4

4 Attachment 1 provides detailed information on how this study classifies the states according to the characteristics of their provisional voting procedures. It also describes how the data used in the statistical analysis may differ from the data in the Election Day Survey, which became available as our research was concluding.

5 HAVA allows the states considerable latitude in how to implement provisional voting, including deciding who beyond the required categories of voters should receive provisional ballots and how to determine which provisional ballots should be counted.
Six states accounted for two-thirds of all the provisional ballots cast. The percentage of provisional ballots in the total vote varied by a factor of 1,000—from a high of 7% in Alaska to Vermont's 0.006%.
The portion of provisional ballots cast that were counted ranged from 96% in Alaska to 6% in Delaware.
States with voter registration databases counted, on average, 20% of the provisional ballots cast.
States without databases counted ballots at more than twice that rate: 44%.7
States that provided more time to evaluate provisional ballots counted a greater proportion of those ballots. Those that provided less than one week counted an average of 35.4% of their ballots, while states that permitted more than 2 weeks, counted 60.8%.

An important source of variation among states was a state's previous experience with provisional voting. The share of provisional ballots in the total vote was six times greater in states that had used provisional ballots before than in states where the provisional ballot was new. In the 25 states that had some experience with provisional voting before HAVA, a higher portion of the total vote was cast as provisional ballots and a greater percentage of the provisional ballots cast were counted than in the 18 new to provisional balloting.8

Variation within states
Within states, too, there was little consistency among different jurisdictions. Of the 20 states for which we have county-level provisional ballot data, the rate of counting provisional ballots varied by as much as 90% to 100% among counties in the same state. This suggests that additional factors (including the training of election judges or poll workers) beyond statewide factors, such as experience or the existence of voter registration databases, also influence the use of provisional ballots.

In Ohio some counties counted provisional ballots not cast in the assigned precinct even though the state's policy was to count only those ballots cast in the correct precinct.
Some counties in Washington tracked down voters who would otherwise have had their provisional ballots rejected because they had failed to complete part of their registration form, gave them the chance to correct those omissions, and then counted the provisional ballot.

Resources available to administer provisional voting varied considerably among and within states. Differences in demographics and resources result in different experiences with provisional voting. For example, the Election Day Survey found that staffing problems appeared to be particularly acute for jurisdictions in the lowest income and education categories. Small, rural jurisdictions and large, urban jurisdictions tended to report higher rates of an inadequate number of poll workers within polling places or precincts.

Jurisdictions with lower education and income tend to report more inactive voter registrations, lower turnout, and more provisional ballots cast.

---

6 California, New York, Ohio, Arizona, Washington, and North Carolina. The appearance of Arizona, Washington and North Carolina on this list shows that the number of provisional ballots cast depends on factors other than the size of the population.
7 As the Carter-Baker Commission report put it, "provisional ballots were needed half as often in states with unified databases as in states without." Report on the Commission on Federal Election Reform, "Building Confidence in U.S. Elections," September 2005, p. 16.
8 See the appendix for our classification of "old" and "new" states and explanation of why the total is less than 50.
Jurisdictions with higher levels of income and education reported higher average numbers of poll workers per polling place or precinct and reported lower rates of staffing problems per precinct.

In precincts located in districts where many voters live in poverty and have low levels of income and education, the voting process, in general, may be managed poorly. Provisional ballots cannot be expected to work much better. In these areas, the focus should be on broader measures to improve the overall functionality of struggling voting districts, although improving the management of provisional balloting may help at the margin.

The lessons of litigation
Successful legal challenges highlight areas where provisional voting procedures were wanting. A flurry of litigation occurred around the country in October 2004 concerning the so-called “wrong precinct issue” — whether provisional ballots cast by voters in a precinct other than their designated one would be counted for statewide races. Most courts, including the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (the only federal appeals court to rule on the issue), rejected the contention that HAVA requires the counting of these wrong-precinct provisional ballots. This litigation was significant nonetheless.

First, the Sixth Circuit decision established the precedent that voters have the right to sue in federal court to remedy violations of HAVA.

Second — and significantly — the litigation clarified the right of voters to receive provisional ballots, even though the election officials were certain they would not be counted. The decision also defined an ancillary right — the right to be directed to the correct precinct. There voters could cast a regular ballot that would be counted. If they insisted on casting a provisional ballot in the wrong precinct, they would be on notice that it would be a symbolic gesture only.

Third, these lawsuits prompted election officials to take better care in instructing precinct officials on how to notify voters about the need to go to the correct precinct in order to cast a countable ballot.

States move to improve their processes
Shortly after the 2004 election, several states came to the conclusion that the administration of their provisional voting procedures needed to be improved, and they amended their statutes. The new legislation highlights areas of particular concern to states about their provisional voting process.

Florida, Indiana, Virginia, and Washington have clarified or extended the timeline to evaluate the ballots.

Colorado, New Mexico, North Carolina, and Washington have passed legislation focused on improving the efficacy and consistency of the voting and counting process.

Colorado, Arkansas, and North Dakota took up the issue of counting provisional ballots cast in the wrong precinct.

The wide variation in the implementation of provisional voting among and within states suggests that EAC can help states strengthen their processes. Research-based recommendations for best, or at least better, practices that draw on the experience gained in the 2004 election can be useful in states’ efforts to achieve greater consistency in the administration of provisional voting. The important effect of experience on the administration of the provisional ballot process indicates that the states have much they can learn from each other.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BEST PRACTICES

State efforts to improve the provisional voting process have been underway since the 2004 election. By recommending best practices, the EAC will offer informed advice while respecting diversity among the states.

Take a quality-improvement approach
Defining what constitutes a successful provisional voting system is difficult. Defining quality requires a broad perspective about how well the system works, how open it is to error recognition and correction, and how well provisional voting processes are connected to the registration and voter identification regimes. A first step is for states to recognize that improving quality begins with seeing the provisional voting process as a system and taking a systems approach to regular evaluation through standardized metrics with explicit goals for performance. EAC can facilitate action by the states by recommending as a best practice that:

- Each state collect data systematically on the provisional voting process to permit evaluation of its voting system and assess changes from one election to the next. The data collected should include: provisional votes cast and counted by county; reasons why provisional ballots were not counted, measures of variance among jurisdictions, and time required to evaluate ballots by jurisdiction.

Emphasize the importance of clarity
Above all else, the EAC should emphasize the importance of clarity in the rules by which each state governs provisional voting. As state legislators and election officials prepare for the 2006 election, answers to the questions listed in the recommendation section of this report could be helpful. Among those questions are:

- Does the provisional voting system distribute, collect, record, and tally provisional ballots with sufficient accuracy to be seen as procedurally legitimate by both supporters and opponents of the winning candidate?
- Do the procedural requirements of the system permit cost-efficient operation?
- How great is the variation in the use of provisional voting in counties or equivalent levels of voting jurisdiction within the state? Is the variation great enough to cause concern that the system may not be administered uniformly across the state?

Court decisions suggest areas for action
The court decisions following the 2004 election also suggest procedures for states to incorporate into their procedures for provisional voting. EAC should recommend to the states that they:

- Promulgate clear standards for evaluating provisional ballots, and provide training for the officials who will apply those standards.
- Provide effective materials to be used by local jurisdictions in training poll workers on such procedures as how to locate polling places for potential voters who show up at the wrong place.
- Make clear that the only permissible requirement to obtain a provisional ballot is an affirmation that the voter is registered in the jurisdiction and eligible to vote in an election for federal office. Poll workers need appropriate training to understand their duty to give such voters a provisional ballot.

Assess each stage of the provisional voting process
Beyond the procedures suggested by court decisions, states should assess each stage of the provisional voting process. They can begin by assessing the utility and clarity of the information for voters on their websites and by considering what information might be added to sample ballots mailed to voters before elections. The better voters understand their rights and obligations, the easier the system will be to manage, and the more legitimate the appearance of the process.

Avoiding error at the polling place will allow more voters to cast a regular ballot and all others who request it to cast a provisional ballot. Our recommendations for best practices to avoid error at the polling place include:

- The layout and staffing of the multi-precinct polling place is important. States should ensure that training materials distributed to every jurisdiction make poll workers familiar with the options available to voters.
- The provisional ballot should be of a design or color sufficiently different from a regular ballot to avoid confusion over counting and include take-away information for the voter on the steps in the ballot evaluation process.
- Because provisional ballots offer a fail-safe, supplies of the ballots at each polling place should be sufficient for all the potential voters likely to need them. Best practice would be for states should provide guidelines (as do Connecticut and Delaware) to estimate the supply of provisional ballots needed at each polling place.

The clarity of criteria for evaluating voter eligibility is critical to a sound process for deciding which of the cast provisional ballots should be counted.

- State statutes or regulations should define a reasonable period for voters who lack the HAVA-specified ID or other information bearing on their eligibility to provide it in order to facilitate the state's ability to verify that the person casting the provisional ballot is the same one who registered. At least 11 states allow voters to provide ID or other information one to 13 days after voting. Kansas allows voters to proffer their ID by electronic means or by mail, as well as in person.
- More provisional voters have their ballots counted in those states that count ballots cast outside the correct precinct. While HAVA arguably leaves this decision up to the states, pointing out the effect of the narrower definition on the portion of ballots counted could be useful to the states in deciding this question. States should be aware, however, of the additional burden placed on the ballot-evaluation process when out-of-precinct ballots are considered. And tradeoffs are involved if out-of-precinct voters are unable to vote for the local offices that might appear on the ballot in their district of residence.
- If a state does require voters to appear at their assigned precinct, where the same polling site serves more than one precinct, a voter's provisional ballot should count so long as the voter cast that ballot at the correct polling site even if at the wrong precinct within that location. While the best practice might be for poll workers to direct the voter to correct precinct poll workers' advice is not always correct, and the voter should be protect against ministerial error.
- Officials should follow a written procedure, and perhaps a checklist, to identify the reason why a provisional ballot is rejected. Colorado's election rules offer particularly clear guidance to the official evaluating a provisional ballot.

In verifying provisional ballots, the time by which election officials must make their eligibility determinations is particularly important in presidential elections because of the need to certify electors to the Electoral College. Our research did not identify an optimum division of the five weeks available.
• The best practice here is for states to consider the issue and make a careful decision about how to complete all steps in the evaluation of ballots and challenges to those determinations within the five weeks available.

After the election, timely information to voters about the disposition of their provisional ballot can enable voters to determine if they are registered for future elections and, if not, what they need to do to become registered.

• Best practice for the states is to establish mechanisms to ensure that voters casting provisional ballots are informed whether they are now registered for future elections and, if not, what they need to do to become registered.

Final observation
The detailed examination of each stage in the provisional voting process can lay the foundation each state needs to improve its system. Efforts to improve provisional voting may be most effective as part of a broader effort by state and local election officials to strengthen their systems. Collecting and analyzing data about those systems will enable states to identify which aspects of the registration and electoral system are most important in shunting voters into the provisional ballot process. Responsible officials can then look to their registration system, identification requirements or poll worker training as ways to reduce the need for voters to cast their ballots provisionally.
In the 2004 election, nationwide about 1.9 million votes, or 1.6% of turnout, were cast as provisional ballots. More than 1.2 million or just over 63% were counted. Provisional ballots accounted for a little more than 1% of the final vote tally.

These totals obscure the wide variation in provisional voting among the states. Six states accounted for two-thirds of all the provisional ballots cast. State by state, the percentage of provisional ballots in the total vote varied by a factor of 1,000 -- from a high of 7% in Alaska to Vermont's 0.006%. The portion of provisional ballots cast that were actually counted also displayed wide variation, ranging from 96% in Alaska to 6% in Delaware. States with voter registration databases counted, on average, 20% of the provisional ballots cast. Those without databases counted provisional ballots at more than twice that rate, 44%.

An important source of variation was a state's previous experience with provisional voting. The share of provisional ballots in the total vote was six times greater in states that had used provisional ballots before than in states where the provisional ballot was new. In the 25 states that had some experience with provisional voting before HAVA, a higher portion of the total vote was cast as provisional ballots and a greater percentage of the provisional ballots cast were counted than in the 18 new to provisional balloting.

- The percentage of the total vote cast as provisional ballots averaged more than 2% in the 25 experienced states. This was 4 times the rate in states new to provisional voting, which averaged 0.47%.
- The experienced states counted an average of 58% of the provisional ballots cast, nearly double the proportion in the new states, which counted just 33% of cast provisional ballots.
- The combined effect of these two differences was significant. In experienced states 1.53% of the total vote came from counted provisional ballots. In new states, provisional ballots accounted for only 0.23% of the total vote.

Those voting with provisional ballots in experienced states had their ballots counted more frequently than those in the new states. This experience effect is evidence that there is room for improvement in provisional balloting procedures, especially in those states new to the process. That conclusion gains support from the perspectives of the local election officials revealed in the survey conducted as a part of this research. Local (mostly county level) election officials from "experienced" states were more likely to:

9 HAVA allows the states considerable latitude in how to implement provisional voting, including deciding who beyond the required categories of voters should receive provisional ballots and how to determine which provisional ballots should be counted.
10 California, New York, Ohio, Arizona, Washington, and North Carolina. The appearance of Arizona, Washington and North Carolina on this list shows that the number of provisional ballots cast depends on factors other than the size of the population.
11 See the appendix for our classification of "old" and "new" states and explanation of why the total is less than 50.
12 To compensate for the wide differences in vote turnout among the 50 states the average figures here are calculated as the mean of the percent cast or counted rather than from the raw numbers of ballots cast or counted.
13 Managing the provisional voting process can strain the capacity election administrators. For example, Detroit, counted 123 of the 1,350 provisional ballots cast there in 2004. A recent study concluded that Detroit's 6-day time limit to process provisional ballots was very challenging and unrealistic. To overcome this challenge, the entire department's employees were mobilized to process provisional ballots. (emphasis added.) GAO Report-05-997, "Views of Selected Local Officials on Managing Voter Registration and Ensuring Citizens Can Vote," September 2006.
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- Be prepared to direct voters to their correct precincts with maps;
- Regard provisional voting as easy to implement;
- Report that provisional voting sped up and improved polling place operations
- Conclude that the provisional voting process helped officials maintain accurate registration databases.

Officials from "new" states, on the other hand, were more likely to agree with the statement that provisional voting created unnecessary problems for election officials and poll workers.

If experience with provisional voting does turn out to be a key variable in performance, that is good news. As states gain experience with provisional ballots their management of the process could become more consistent and more effective over subsequent elections. Further information from the EAC on best practices and the need for more consistent management of the election process could sharpen the lessons learned by experience. The EAC can facilitate the exchange of experience among the states and can offer all states information on more effective administration of provisional voting.

Concluding optimistically that experience will make all the difference, however, may be unwarranted. Only if the performance of the "new" states was the result of administrative problems stemming from inexperience will improvement be automatic as election officials move along the learning curve. Two other possibilities exist. Our current understanding of how provisional voting worked in 2004 is not sufficient to determine unambiguously which view is correct.

1. "New" states may have a political culture different from "old" states. That is, underlying features of the "new" states political system may be the reason they had not adopted some form of provisional voting before HAVA. The "new" states may strike a different balance among the competing objectives of ballot access, ballot security and practical administration. They may ascribe more responsibility to the individual voter to take such actions as registering early, finding out where the right precinct is, or re-registering after changing address. They may value keeping control at the local level, rather than ceding authority to state or federal directives. The training they offer poll workers about provisional ballots may not be as frequent or effective as in other states. If the inconsistent performance in the "new" states arises out of this kind of political culture, improving effectiveness in the use of the provisional ballots -- as measured by intrastate consistency in administration--- will be harder and take longer to achieve.

2. "Old" states may devote fewer resources to updating their registration files or databases because they consider provisional ballots as a reasonable fail safe way for voters with registration problems a way to cast a ballot. The adoption of statewide voter registration databases in compliance with HAVA therefore may reduce the variation in the use of provisional ballots among the states.

Other influences decreasing consistency among the states include:
The more rigorous the verification requirements, the smaller the percentage of provisional ballots that were counted. Some states verified provisional ballots by comparing the voter's signature to a sample, some matched such identifying data as address, birth date, or social security number, others required voters who lacked ID at the polling place to return later with the ID to evaluate the provisional ballot, and some required provisional voters to execute an affidavit. In the 4 states that simply matched signatures, nearly 3.5% of the total turnout consisted of provisional ballots, and just under three-fourths of those ballots (73%) were counted.

In the 14 states that required voters to provide such additional information as address or date of birth just over 1.5% of the total turnout consisted of provisional ballots, and 55% of those ballots were counted.

In the 14 states that required an affidavit (attesting, for example, that the voter was legally registered and eligible to vote in the jurisdiction) just over one-half (0.6%) of turnout came from provisional ballots, and less than one-third (30%) were counted. (But note that HAVA requires all voters to certify that they are eligible and registered in order to cast a provisional ballot, which is functionally an affidavit. The 14 states described here used an explicit affidavit form.)

In the 10 states that required voters to return later with identifying documents just under 1.5% of the total turnover came from provisional ballots, and more than half (52%) of these were counted. Voters apparently found this requirement less onerous than the affidavit, even though it required a separate trip to a government office.

Voter registration databases provided information that reduced the number of provisional ballots counted. In states using provisional voting for the first time, states with registered-voter databases counted only 20% of the ballots that were cast. States without such databases counted more than double that rate (44%). As HAVA's requirement for adoption of statewide databases spreads across the country, this variation among states is likely to narrow. Real-time access to a continually updated, statewide list of registered voters should reduce the number of provisional ballots used and reduce the percentage counted since most of those who receive them will be less likely to be actually registered in the state.

States that counted out-of-precinct ballots counted 56% of the provisional ballots cast. States that counted ballots cast only in the proper precinct counted an average of 42% of provisional ballots.

---

15 See Table 2 in Appendix 2 for information on the verification method used in each state.

16 The Election Day Survey found that states using statewide voter registration databases reported a lower incidence of casting provisional ballots than states without voter registration databases, suggesting that better administration of voter registration rolls might be associated with fewer instances where voters would be required to cast a provisional ballot due to a problem with their voter registration.

17 The Election Day Survey concluded that: "Jurisdictions with jurisdiction-wide provisional ballot acceptance reported higher rates of provisional ballots cast, 2.09 percent of registration or 4.67 percent of ballots cast in polling places, than those with in-precinct-only acceptance, 0.72 and 1.18 percent, respectively. Predictably, those jurisdictions with more permissive jurisdiction-wide acceptance reported higher rates of counting provisional ballots, 71.50 percent, than other jurisdictions, 52.50 percent."
- In experienced states, the disparity was even more pronounced: 52% of provisional ballots cast were counted in states requiring in-district ballots, while 70% were counted in those allowing out-of-precinct ballots.

- If all states had counted out-of-precinct ballots, perhaps 290,000 more provisional ballots would have been counted across the country.  

- States that provide a longer the time to evaluate provisional ballots counted a higher proportion of those ballots. 

  - Fourteen states permitted less than one week to evaluate provisional ballots, 15 states permitted between one and two weeks, and 14 states permitted greater than two weeks. 

  - Those states that permitted less than one week counted an average of 35.4% of their ballots. 

  - States that permitted between one and two weeks counted 47.1%. 

  - States that permitted more than 2 weeks, counted 60.8% of the provisional ballots cast. 

  - The effect of allowing more time for evaluation is felt most strongly in states where more than 1% of the overall turnout was of provisional ballots. In states where provisional ballots were used most heavily, those that permitted less than one week to evaluate ballots counted 58.6% while those that permitted one to two weeks counted 65.0% of ballots, and those states that permitted greater than three weeks verified the highest proportion of provisional ballots, at 73.8%. 

Variation Within States

Not only was there little consistency among states in the use of provisional ballots, there was also little consistency within states. This was true in both new and old states. Of the 20 states for which we have county-level provisional ballot data, the rate of counting provisional ballots varied by as much as 90% to 100% among counties in the same state. This suggests that additional factors beyond statewide factors, such as verification requirements or the time provided for ballot evaluation, also influence the provisional voting process. Reacting to the lack of consistency within states, the Carter-Baker Commission recommended that “states, not counties or municipalities, should establish uniform procedures for the verification and counting of provisional ballots, and that procedure should be applied uniformly throughout the state.”

Election Line reported that:

---

18 This estimate is a rough approximation. States that recognize out-of-precinct ballots counted, on average, 56% of the provisional votes cast. Applying that ratio to the 1.9 million provisional ballots cast nationwide would result in 1.1 million provisional ballots that would have been counted if all states accepted out-of-precinct votes. States that did not recognize out-of-precinct ballots counted 42% of the provisional ballots cast, or about 813,000 ballots, for a difference of about 290,000 votes.

19 See Appendix, Relationship Between Time Allotted to Verify Provisional Ballots and the Level of Ballots that are Verified, David Andersen, The Eagleton Institute of Politics

20 Many thanks to Ben Shepler, of the Moritz College of Law, for assembling complete data on the time requirements states permitted for the counting of provisional ballots.

21 43 states are included in this analysis, including Washington D.C. The 7 election-day registration states are omitted, as is Mississippi, which never provided data on provisional ballots. North Carolina is also omitted from the regressions, as it does not have a statewide policy on how it verifies provisional ballots.

22 Recommendation 2.3.2 of the Report of the Commission on Federal Election Reform, “Building Confidence in U.S. Elections,” September 2005, p.16. The report also observed that, “...different procedures for counting provisional ballots within and between states led to legal challenges and political protests. Had the margin of victory for the presidential contest been narrower, the lengthy dispute that followed the 2000 election could have been repeated.”
In Ohio some counties counted provisional ballots not cast in the assigned precinct even though the state's policy was to count only those ballots cast in the correct precinct.

Some counties in Washington tracked down voters who would otherwise have had their provisional ballots rejected because they had failed to complete part of their registration form, gave them the chance to correct those omissions, and then counted the provisional ballot. This would probably not have come to light except for the sharp examination caused by the very close election for governor.

Resources available to administer provisional voting varied considerably among and within states. The result is that differences in demographics and resources result in different experiences with provisional voting. For example, the Election Day Survey found that:

- Jurisdictions with lower education and income tend to report more inactive voter registrations, lower turnout, and more provisional ballots cast.
- Jurisdictions with higher levels of income and education reported higher average numbers of poll workers per polling place or precinct and reported lower rates of staffing problems per precinct.
- Staffing problems appeared to be particularly acute for jurisdictions in the lowest income and education categories. Small, rural jurisdictions and large, urban jurisdictions tended to report higher rates of an inadequate number of poll workers within polling places or precincts.
- Predominantly non-Hispanic, Black jurisdictions reported a greater percentage of polling places or precincts with an inadequate number of poll workers. Predominantly non-Hispanic, Native American jurisdictions reported the second highest percentage of staffing problems.

The conclusions to be drawn from these findings are clear. In voting districts with lower education levels, poverty, and inadequately-staffed polling places, the voting process is unlikely to function well. More people will end up casting provisional ballots. That makes the provisional voting process especially important in such districts. But if jurisdictions struggle with regular voting, how well are they likely to do with the more complicated provisional balloting process? In precincts were the voting process, in general, is managed poorly, provisional ballots cannot be expected to work much better. In these areas, the focus should be on broader measures to improve the overall functionality of struggling voting districts, although improving the management of provisional balloting may help at the margin.

Effectiveness of Provisional Voting

The certainty of our conclusions about the effectiveness of provisional voting is limited because of the complexity of the problem and a lack of important information. An ideal assessment of how well provisional ballots worked in 2004 would require knowing the decisions of local officials in 200,000 precincts on how to inform voters about provisional voting; their performance in providing a provisional ballot to those qualified to receive one, and their decisions whether to count a provisional ballot. Information needed about the eligibility or registration status of provisional voters is also not available.

We see no automatic correlation between the quality of a state's voting system and either the number of provisional ballots cast or counted. Low numbers could reflect accurate statewide voting data and good voter education. Or they could suggest that provisional ballots were not
made easily available. High numbers could be seen as signifying an effective provisional voting system or a weak registration process. But we do know that in 2004 provisional ballots allowed 1.2 million citizens to vote, citizens who would otherwise have been turned away from the polls.

Since we do not know the total number of registered voters who might have voted but could not makes a precise, quantitative estimate of the effectiveness of provisional voting impossible. The Cal Tech – MIT Voting Technology Project, however, estimated that 4 – 6 million votes were lost in the 2000 presidential election for the reasons shown in Table 1 below. The estimate is an approximation, but it may provide data good enough for a general assessment of the size of the pool of potential voters who might have been helped by the provisional ballot process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Votes Lost (Millions)</th>
<th>Cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5 – 2</td>
<td>Faulty equipment and confusing ballots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 – 3</td>
<td>Registration mix-ups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>Polling place operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Absentee ballot administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the universe of voters who could be helped by provisional voting might be 2.5 – 3 million voters. In 2004, about 1.2 million provisional voters were counted. A rough estimate, then, of the effectiveness of provisional voting in 2004, then, might be 40% to 50% (ballots counted/votes lost). Whatever the precise figure, it seems reasonable to conclude that there is considerable room for improvement in the administration of provisional voting.

**Legislative Response**

Indeed, several states came to the conclusion that the administration of their provisional voting procedures needed to be improved and amended their statutes after the 2004 election. State legislation adopted since the election points to particular areas of concern.

---

23 Another interpretation of the data should be considered. The Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS) developed the category of "registration mix-ups" to assess the states' registration systems. After each election the CPS asks people if they were registered and if they voted. The CPS gives breakdowns of reasons why people did not vote. Survey responders tend to deflect blame when answering questions about voting. In the narrow context of provisional ballots, 'registration problems' would cover only voters who went to the polls where the determination that they were not registered was wrong or they were registered, but in the wrong precinct. If they were in the wrong precinct, provisional voting can help them in only 17 states. In 2004, only 6.8% of those not voting and registered blamed registration problems, while 8.9% reported so in 2000.

24 Twelve states made statutory or regulatory changes: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, North Carolina, Virginia and Wyoming. See Table 4 in Appendix 2.
Not enough time to examine and count the provisional ballots. Florida, Indiana, Virginia, and Washington all have clarified or extended the timeline to evaluate the ballots. But taking more time can prove a problem, particularly in presidential elections with the looming deadline to certify the vote for the Electoral College.\(^{26}\)

**Lack of uniform rules for counting ballots and effective training of the election officials in interpreting and applying those rules to determine the validity of ballots.** Colorado, New Mexico, North Carolina, and Washington have all passed legislation focused on improving the efficacy and consistency of the voting and counting process.

**Litigation**

Successful legal challenges to the process highlight areas where provisional voting procedures were wanting. A flurry of litigation occurred around the country in October 2004 concerning the so-called “wrong precinct issue” – whether provisional ballots cast by voters in a precinct other than their designated one would be counted for statewide races. These lawsuits were largely unsuccessful in their stated goal: most courts, including the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (the only federal appeals court to rule on the issue), rejected the contention that HAVA requires the counting of these wrong-precinct provisional ballots.

This litigation was significant nonetheless.

- First, the Sixth Circuit decision established the precedent that voters have the right to sue in federal court to remedy violations of HAVA.

- Second --and significantly-- the litigation clarified the right of voters to receive provisional ballots, even though the election officials were certain they would not be counted. The decision also defined an ancillary right --the right to be directed to the correct precinct. There voters could cast a regular ballot that would be counted. If they insisted on casting a provisional ballot in the wrong precinct, they would be on notice that it would be a symbolic gesture only.

- Third, these lawsuits prompted election officials to take better care in instructing precinct officials on how to notify voters about the need to go to the correct precinct in order to cast a countable ballot -- although the litigation regrettably came too late to be truly effective in this regard. In many states, on Election Day 2004, the procedures in place for notifying voters about where to go were less than ideal, reflecting less-than-ideal procedures for training poll workers on this point.

There was also pre-election litigation over the question whether voters who had requested an absentee ballot were entitled to cast a provisional ballot. In both cases (one in Colorado and one, decided on Election Day, in Ohio), the federal courts ruled that HAVA requires that these voters receive a provisional ballot. Afterwards, it is for state officials under state law to

26 The resources available to evaluate and count provisional ballots within a tight schedule may not be easily available. The General Accounting Office reports that Detroit, where 1,350 provisional ballots were cast and 123 counted, found the 6-day time frame for processing provisional ballots “very challenging and unrealistic. To overcome this challenge, the entire department’s employees were mobilized to process provisional ballots.” The report also found that in Los Angeles County, “staff had to prepare duplicate ballots to remove ineligible or invalid contests when voters cast their ballots at the wrong precinct. To overcome this challenge, staffing was increased to prepare the duplicate ballots.” In a close, contested election, “duplicate” ballots would doubtless receive long and careful scrutiny.” See Appendix 7, GAO, “Views of Selected Local Election Officials on Managing Voter Registration and Ensuring Eligible Citizens Can Vote,” September 2005. (GAO Report-05-997)
determine whether these provisional ballots will be counted, in part by determining if these provisional voters already had voted an absentee ballot (in which case one ballot should be ruled ineligible, in order to avoid double voting). These decisions confirm the basic premise that provisional ballots should be available whenever voters believe they are entitled to them, so that their preferences can be recorded, with a subsequent determination whether these preferences count as valid votes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Because every provisional ballot counted represents a voter who, if the system had worked perfectly, should have voted by regular ballot, the advent of statewide registration databases is likely to reduce the use provisional ballots. The one area in which such databases may not make a difference is for those who voted by provisional ballot because they did not bring required identification documents to the polling place. The statewide voter registration database will facilitate verifying that ballot, but the voter will still have vote provisionally. Beyond that exception, even with statewide registries in every state, provisional voting will remain an important failsafe, and voters should have confidence that the failsafe will operate correctly.

The wide variation in the implementation of provisional voting among and particularly within states suggests that EAC can help states strengthen their processes. Research-based recommendations for best, or at least better, practices based on the experience gained in the 2004 election can be useful in states' efforts to achieve greater consistency in the administration of provisional voting.

Recommendations for Best Practices

Recent legislative activity shows that state efforts to improve the provisional voting process are underway. Those states, as well as others that have not yet begun to correct shortcomings that became apparent in 2004, can benefit from considering the best practices described here. By recommending best practices, the EAC will offer informed advice while respecting diversity among the states. One way to strengthen the recommendations and build a constituency for them would be for EAC to ask its advisory committee members to recommend as best practices procedures that have worked in their states.

Self-evaluation of Provisional Voting –4 Key Questions

The first need to achieve greater consistency within each state is to think about provisional voting systematically. As legislators, election officials, and citizens in the states prepare for the 2006 election, they should ask themselves these questions about their provisional voting systems.

1. Does the provisional voting system distribute, collect, record, and tally provisional ballots with sufficient accuracy to be seen as procedurally legitimate by both supporters and opponents of the winning candidate? Does the tally include all votes cast by properly registered voters who correctly completed the steps required?

2. Is the provisional voting system sufficiently robust to perform well under the pressure of a close election when ballot evaluation will be under scrutiny and litigation looms?

3. Do the procedural requirements of the system permit cost-efficient operation? Are the administrative demands of the system reasonably related to the staff and other resource requirements available?
4. How great is the variation in the use of provisional voting in counties or equivalent levels of voting jurisdiction within the state? Is the variation great enough to cause concern that the system may not be administered uniformly across the state?

If the answers to these questions leave room for doubt about the effectiveness of the system or some of its parts, the EAC's recommendation of best practices should provide the starting point for a state's effort to improve its provisional voting system.

**Best Practices For Each Step In The Process**

We examined each step of the provisional voting process to identify specific areas where the states should focus their attention to reduce the inconsistencies noted in our analysis. We offer recommendations in each area appropriate to the responsibilities that HAVA assigns the EAC for the proper functioning of the provisional voting process.

**The Importance of Clarity**

The EAC should emphasize above all else the importance of clarity in the rules governing every stage of provisional voting. As the Century Foundation's recent report observed, "Close elections increasingly may be settled in part by the evaluating and counting of provisional ballots... To avoid post election disputes over provisional ballots—disputes that will diminish public confidence in the accuracy and legitimacy of the result-- well in advance of the election, states should establish, announce, and publicize clear statewide standards for every aspect of the provisional ballot process, from who is entitled to receive a provisional ballot to which ones are counted."[^26]

Litigation surrounding the 2004 election resulted in decisions that, if reflected in state statutes or regulations and disseminated in effective training for poll workers, can increase the clarity of provisional ballot procedures, increase predictability, and bolster confidence in the system. By taking the following steps, states can incorporate those court rulings into their procedures.

- **Promulgate, ideally by legislation, clear standards for evaluating provisional ballots, and provide training for the officials who will apply those standards.** For example, in Washington State, the court determined that an election official's failure in evaluating ballots to do a complete check against all signature records is an error serious enough to warrant recanvassing.[^27] Clear direction by regulation or statute on what records to use in evaluating ballots could have saved precious time and effort and increased the reliability of the provisional voting system.

- **States should provide poll workers standard information resources for the training of poll workers by local jurisdictions.** Training materials might include, for example, maps or databases with instruction on how to locate polling places for potential voters who show up at the wrong place. Usable and useful information in the hands of poll workers can protect voters from being penalized by ministerial errors at the polling place.[^28]


[^27]: See *Washington State Republican Party v. King County Division of Records*, 103 P3d 725, 727-728 (Wash. 2004)

[^28]: See *Pafio v. Sunderland* 924 N.E.2d 488, 490 (NY, 2005) See also *Order, Hawkins v. Blunt*, No.04-4177-CV-C-RED (W.D. Mo. October 12, 2004). While rejecting the notion that all ballots cast in the wrong precinct should be counted, the court ruled that provisional votes cast in the wrong precinct should be thrown out provided that the voter had been directed to the correct precinct. This meant that provisional votes cast in the wrong precinct (and even the...
State training materials provided to local jurisdictions should make clear that the only permissible requirement to obtain a provisional ballot is an affirmation that the voter is registered in the jurisdiction and eligible to vote in an election for federal office. Recent legislation in Arizona indicates that recommendations should emphasize HAVA's requirement that persons appearing at the polling place claiming to be registered voters cannot be denied a ballot because they do not have identification with them. Poll workers may need appropriate training to understand their duty to give such voters a provisional ballot.

A. Registration and Pre-Election Information for Voters

Providing crisp, clear information to voters before the election is important to the success of the provisional voting process. The better voters understand their rights and obligations, the easier the system will be to manage, and the more legitimate the appearance of the process. States can begin by assessing the utility and clarity of the information for voters on their websites and by considering what information might be added to sample ballots mailed to voters before elections. Best practices in this area would include:

1. If states require identification at the time of registration, the kind of IDs required should be stated precisely and clearly and be publicly and widely available in a form that all voters can understand. For example, “You must bring your driver's license. If you don't have a driver's license, then you must bring an ID card with your photograph on it and this ID card must be issued by a government agency.”

2. The process to re-enfranchise felons should be clear and straightforward. To avoid litigation over the registration status of felons, best practice should be defined as making re-enfranchisement automatic, or no more burdensome than the process required for any new registrant.

3. State or county websites for voters should offer full, clear information on boundaries of precincts, location of polling places, requirements for identification, and other necessary guidance that will facilitate registration and the casting of a regular ballot. An 800 number should also be provided. Models are available: the statewide databases in Florida and Michigan provide voters with provisional voting information, registration verification and precinct location information.

B. At the Polling Place

The court placed a duty upon election officials to make sure the voters were in the correct locations. Note that this question would not arise in a state that counted ballots cast in the wrong polling place but within the correct county.

30 The Florida Democratic Party v. Hood, 342 F. Supp. 2d 1073, 1075-76 (N.D. Fla. 2004). The court explained that provisional voting is designed to correct the situation that occurs when election officials do not have perfect knowledge and when they make incorrect determinations about eligibility (the "fail-safe" notion). Denying voters provisional ballots because of on-the-spot determinations directly contradicts this idea. Even before the cited decision, the Florida Secretary of State's office had determined that any voter who makes the declaration required by federal law is entitled to vote a provisional ballot, even if the voter is in the wrong precinct.
31 Websites in 29 states describe, with varying degrees of specificity, the identification voters may need. In 18 states voters can learn something about the precinct in which they should vote. And in 6 states (California, District of Columbia, Kentucky, Michigan, North Carolina, and South Carolina) they can verify their registration on the website.
32 The Century Foundation, op. cit.
Avoiding error at the polling place will allow more voters to cast a regular ballot and all others who request it to cast a provisional ballot.

1. The layout and staffing of the polling place, particularly the multi-precinct polling place is important. Greeters, maps, and prominently posted voter information about provisional ballots, ID requirements, and related topics can help the potential voters cast their ballot in the right place. States should require poll workers to be familiar with the options and provide the resources needed for them to achieve the knowledge needed to be helpful and effective. Colorado has clear regulations on polling place requirements, including HAVA information and voting demonstration display.33 Many states require training of poll workers. In some states that requirement is recent: after the 2004 election, New Mexico adopted a requirement for poll workers to attend an “election school.”34 A state statutory requirement for training could facilitate uniform instruction of poll workers in those states that do not already provide it.

2. The provisional ballot should be of a design or color sufficiently different from a regular ballot to avoid confusion over counting, as occurred in Washington State. The ballot might include a tear-off leaflet with information for voters such as: “Reasons Why Your Provisional Ballot Might Not Be Counted” on one side and “What to Do if My Provisional Ballot Is Not Counted” on the other.

3. Because provisional ballots offer a fail-safe, supplies of the ballots at each polling place should be sufficient for all the potential voters likely to need them. In 2004, some polling places ran out of ballots, with unknown effects on the opportunity to vote. In Middlesex County, New Jersey, for example, on Election Day the Superior Court ordered the county clerk to assure that sufficient provisional ballots were available at several heavily used polling places, and it authorized the clerk “in the event additional provisional ballots are required . . . to photocopy official provisional ballots.”35 At least two states, Connecticut and Delaware, provide guidelines to local election officials on how to estimate the demand for provisional ballots. Connecticut sets the number at 1% of the voters in the district, Delaware at 6%.36 States that do not offer a practical method to guide the supply of provisional ballots at polling places should consider doing so. The guideline should take into account both the number of voters in the district and the number of provisional ballots actually cast in recent elections.

4. To achieve the procedural clarity needed to forestall disputes, states should establish a clear chain of custody for the handling of provisional ballots from production through distribution, collection and, finally, evaluation. A number of states have clear procedures for at least parts of this chain of custody. All states should examine their chain-of-custody requirements for clarity. Illinois includes the potentially beneficial requirement that ballots be transported by bi-partisan teams, which offers the potential to avoid some charges of election fraud.

---

34 2005 N.M. Laws 270 page no. 4-5.
35 Voting Order, November 2, 2004, Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Middlesex County.
36 Connecticut: “Equal to or not less than 1% of the number of electors who are eligible to vote in any given district, or such other number as the municipal clerk and the registrars agree is sufficient to protect voting rights. Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 9-232). Delaware: Each County Department of Elections Office Is required to provide to each election district a number of provisional ballots equal to 6% of registered voters in that district, with a minimum allocation of 15 ballots. Additional supplies to be delivered when the supply becomes “very low.” Del.Code Ann. Tit 15 § 4948(e).
C. Evaluating Voter Eligibility and Counting Provisional Ballots

The clarity of criteria for evaluating voter eligibility is critical to a sound process for deciding which of the cast provisional ballots should be counted. Public recognition of the validity of those criteria is important in establishing the legitimacy of the system as a whole. The experience in 2004 in North Carolina, Washington, and Ohio underlines the importance of clear criteria. As the Century Foundation report put it, "Whatever procedures the states choose [to determine if a provisional ballot should be counted], the paramount consideration—as with all others concerning provisional voting—is that they be clear and thus not susceptible to post-election manipulation and litigation." Nonetheless, the *Panio v. Sutherland* decision in New York shows the difficulty of defining the range of administrative errors from which the provisional voters should be held harmless. Even when the standard is "clerical error" judges can differ over what that means exactly. Possibly a state law might be able to clarify a definition by giving examples of clerical errors, but even then the definition is unlikely to be perfect.

1. State statutes or regulations should define a reasonable period for voters who lack the HAVA-specified ID or other information bearing on their eligibility to provide it in order to facilitate the state’s ability to verify that the person casting the provisional ballot is the same one who registered. While there may be a concern to ensure that the individual who returns with the ID may not be the same individual who cast the provisional ballot, the spirit of HAVA demands that the opportunity to prove identity be provided after Election Day. A signature match can go far in establishing that the individual who voted and the individual returning later with identification is, in fact, the same person. Encouraging a voter who lacks ID on Election Day to return later to help the verification process by providing proper identification will strengthen the system and increase public confidence in the electoral process. Our data indicate that some voters would prefer to return with ID rather than to sign an affidavit, perhaps because of uncertainty about the legal process involved in the affidavit. At least 11 states allow voters to provide ID or other information one to 13 days after voting. Of particular interest is Kansas, which allows voters to proffer their ID by electronic means or by mail, as well as in person.

2. More provisional ballots are counted in those states that verify ballots cast outside the correct precinct. *While HAVA arguably leaves this decision up to the states, pointing out the effect of the narrower definition on the portion of ballots counted could be useful to the states in deciding this question. States should be aware, however, of the*  

---

37 The Century Foundation, op. cit.
39 In Kansas, the voter can provide ID to a County Election Officer any time before the County Board of Canvassers meets to count provisional ballots KS. ST. 25-1122(d). ID can be presented in person, OR via mail or electronic means. *Id.* The Board must meet either on the Friday or Monday following a Tuesday election. *Id.* at 25-3104.
Deadlines in other states are: Alabama—5:00 P.M. on the Monday following the election AL ST § 17-10A-2(c)(1) Florida: until 5:00 P.M. on the third day following the election Fla. Stat. Ann. § 101.048 (adopted after the 2004 election); Georgia—no later than 2 days after the election. GA ST § 21-2-417; 419. Illinois—2 days to submit additional information 10 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. § 18A-15(d); Indiana—in 2004 the deadline was the close of the polls IN, ST. § 3-11.7-5-2(a). The time period was extended to 13 days by the adoption of Indiana Code 3-11-8, Section 25, Subsection (1); Maryland—until the meeting of the Election Board; MD ELEC LAW § 11-903. New Jersey—until the close of business on the second day after the election 19:53C-3(i); Nevada—until 5:00 P.M. on the Friday following the election NV ST 293.3085; New Mexico—until 7:00 P.M. on Election Day NM ADC 1.10.22 (8) (H).
40 See Andersen, op. cit, pgs. 23 – 24 for an analysis of the significant effect of counting out-of-precinct ballots. The Election Day Survey found that, "Most notably, jurisdictions that permitted jurisdiction-wide acceptance of provisional ballots reported higher rates of provisional ballots being cast, but also reported a much higher incidence of provisional ballots being counted, than other jurisdictions."
additional burden placed on the ballot-evaluation process when out-of-precinct ballots are considered. And tradeoffs are involved if out-of-precinct voters are unable to vote for the local offices that might appear on the ballot in their district of residence. One option for states is to involve the voters in the decision by pointing out that voters who cast their provisional ballots in the wrong precinct may not be able to participate in the local election. The voter could then decide to go to the correct precinct or vote provisionally for the higher offices at the top of the ticket only.

3. Alternatively, if a state chooses to require voters to appear at their assigned precinct, where the same polling site serves more than one precinct, a voter's provisional ballot should count so long as the voter cast that ballot at the correct polling site even if at the wrong precinct within that location. Ideally the voter could be directed to the correct machine, but poll worker advice will not always be correct: One way to assess the balance of issues here is to consider that, if a voter in a multi-precinct polling place is sent to the wrong machine, the error is probably the poll worker's, and the voter should not be penalized.

4. Officials should follow a written procedure, and perhaps a checklist, to identify the reason why a provisional ballot is rejected (e.g., check the applicable box "unregistered voter"; "lack of signature match" "wrong precinct," etc.) Those forms should be disclosed publicly when completed. Colorado's election rules offer particularly clear guidance to the official evaluating a provisional ballot.

**Colorado Rejection Codes (Any ballot given a rejection code shall not be counted):**

- **RFS** (Rejection federal or state) No federal or state candidates or issues to duplicate.
- **RNS** (Rejection not signed) Provisional Ballot Affidavit not signed.
- **RIN** (Rejection incomplete information provided) Required information is incomplete and the designated election official is unable to confirm voter's eligibility.
- **RNR** (Rejection not registered) Voter did not register by the voter registration deadline or by emergency registration, Colorado voter registration record was not found, or voter was previously cancelled and has not been reinstated pursuant to 1-2-605(10). C.R.S.
- **REE** (Rejection envelope empty) Provisional ballot envelope is empty.
- **RAB** (Rejection voter voted absentee) Designated election official has confirmed that voter voted an absentee ballot.
- **REV** (Rejection based on ballot cast in early voting) Voter voted early.
- **RIP** (Rejection based on incorrect party) Incorrect Party in Primary Election.
- **RFE** (Rejection felon not eligible to vote) Individual was convicted of a felony and is either serving a sentence of confinement or detention or is on parole.
- **RWC** (Rejection elector not registered in county or State of Colorado) Non-county or non-state resident; therefore voter not eligible to vote in the county where the provisional ballot was voted.
- **RID** (Rejection first time voter has not supplied identification upon registration or thereafter prior to and during time voter voted) First Time Voter who

41 Chances are administrative error accounts for the voter being directed to the wrong precinct under these circumstances.

42 8 CCR 1505-1, at 26.5.4, adopted August 4, 2005. See also 1-2-509(3) C.R.S.
registered by mail or through a voter registration drive, is tagged as id
deficient, and did not provide id at the time of voting.

RRD (Rejection registration deficient) Voter had deficient or incomplete registration and required information was not provided prior to or at the time of filling in the provisional ballot envelope. Voter's eligibility cannot be established.

D. Verification of Provisional Ballots
1. States that use the information on the provisional ballot to permit voters who have changed their addresses to update their registrations should adopt clear procedures on that process and specify how the new information will be communicated between different Boards of Elections.

2. In verifying provisional ballots, the time by which election officials must make their eligibility determinations is particularly important in presidential elections because of the need to certify electors to the Electoral College. States should consider in particular how to divide the time allowed them by the safe-harbor provisions that apply in presidential elections to the certification to the Electoral College. Some part of this five-week period will be consumed by the eligibility evaluation, but states should take care to provide a sufficient period of time as well for challenges. If a state consumes 21 days following the election in the eligibility evaluations, only two weeks will remain for legal challenges to be concluded. Is that sufficient? Or should the state provide the resources needed to complete the eligibility determinations in 10 days or two weeks, leaving three weeks or more for legal challenges in a close election? Our research did not identify an optimum division of the five weeks available. The prudent course here would be to encourage states to consider the issue and then make a careful decision about how to complete all steps in the evaluation of ballots and challenges to those determinations within the five weeks available.

E. Post-election Information for Voters
Timely information to voters about the disposition of their provisional ballot will provide helpful feedback and more important enable voters to determine if they are registered for future elections and, if not, what they need to do to become registered.

1. Establish mechanisms to ensure that voters casting provisional ballots are informed whether they are now registered for future elections and, if not, what they need to do to become registered.

F. State Laws Governing Litigation over Provisional Voting
1. Establish special, streamlined litigation procedures for Election Day complaints that individuals are being denied the right to cast a provisional ballot.

Broader Considerations

G. Integrity and the Appearance of Integrity
1. State laws or regulations providing for non-partisan or bi-partisan bodies to make a public determination of the validity of provisional ballots would increase confidence in the system.
2. To improve transparency, state laws or regulations should require the purging process for registration to be public and with an opportunity for voters to correct an erroneous determination that they should be purged.

3. State laws or regulations should require the evaluation process for provisional ballots to be public, while protecting the names of those who voted provisionally.

H. Continuous Assessment of the Provisional Ballot — Process and Performance

Defining what makes for a successful provisional voting system is difficult. The most successful system is probably not the one with the most provisional votes cast (that could indicate problems with the registration system). Nor is it the system with the greatest number counted or with the fewest counted necessarily superior because the evaluation process could be flawed.

Defining quality requires a broad perspective about how well the system works, how open it is to error recognition and correction, and how well provisional voting processes are connected to the registration and voter identification regimes. The EAC should consider engaging one of the national quality organizations or processes, such as Six Sigma or the Baldridge Quality process to evaluate the provisional ballot process. Pending such a review, the EAC can recommend that states take the following actions.

1. Recognize that the first step to improving quality is to see the provisional voting process as a system and take a systems approach to regular evaluation through standardized metrics with explicit goals for performance.

2. States should begin by collecting data systematically on the provisional voting process so that they can evaluate their voting system and assess changes from one election to the next. The effort should start in the 2006 election, and the data collected should include:
   -- Provisional votes cast and counted by jurisdiction, say counties, with details on why the voter had to vote provisionally (lack of ID, not on list, challenged at polling place, issued absentee ballot, etc) and number of ballots actually counted in each category.
   -- Reasons why provisional ballots were not counted, using categories such as those that have been adopted by Colorado, described earlier in this report.
   -- Measures of variance among jurisdictions.
   -- Number of poll workers trained in administration of provisional voting by polling place
   -- Number of jurisdictions posting information on provisional voting in the polling place
   -- Time required to evaluate ballots by jurisdiction

43 Six Sigma is a measure of quality that strives for near perfection. Six Sigma is a disciplined, data-driven approach and methodology for eliminating defects (driving towards six standard deviations between the mean and the nearest specification limit) in any process -- from manufacturing to transactional and from product to service.

44 The Baldridge Criteria for Performance Excellence provide a systems perspective for understanding performance management. They reflect validated, leading-edge management practices against which an organization can measure itself. With their acceptance nationally and internationally as the model for performance excellence, the Criteria represent a common language for communication among organizations for sharing best practices. The Criteria are also the basis for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award process.
Improving understanding of the provisional voting process through analysis of detailed information will enable state and local election officials to strengthen their systems. By collecting and analyzing this data states can identify which aspects of the registration and electoral system are most important in shunting voters into the provisional ballot process. Responsible officials can then look to their registration system, identification requirements or poll worker training as a way to reduce the need for voters to cast their ballots provisionally.
ATTACHMENT 1 – Data Sources for Classification of the States

Our research on provisional voting divided the various states into several categories to allow an assessment of how different factors may have influenced the process of casting and counting provisional ballots. This analysis was conducted before the release of the Election Day Study, and the categories we used may differ in some respects from its work. The variables used to analyze a state’s use of provisional ballots:

1. New vs. Old (states that used a provisional ballot before the 2004 election)
2. Use of a statewide database of registered voters vs. no use of a statewide database
3. Counting out-of-precinct ballots vs. not counting out-of-precinct ballots
4. Voter identification requirements
5. Method used to verify provisional ballots
6. Levels of provisional ballots cast and counted

We first assigned states within these categories based on classifications done by Electionline.org in its studies. The Electionline data was the only published information available at the time of our research. We reviewed the Electionline data carefully, and, in select cases, updated it with new, detailed information that had become available after its publication. The changes we made are explained below.

--Idaho, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Wisconsin and Wyoming were excluded from our analysis. They have election-day registration systems, and did not need to use HAVA-compliant provisional ballots.

--North Dakota does not register voters, so it also was excluded from HAVA requirements and did not use provisional voting.

--Mississippi has not reported its provisional voting results and could not be included in our analysis, though it was compliant in 2004.

--Pennsylvania did not report its totals for the Election Day Study, but we obtained information on Pennsylvania and included it in our analysis.

New vs. Old States

We classified states as “new” or “old” based on the 2001 Electionline study of provisional voting, but condensed its classifications into a single dichotomous variable, new/old with all other cases excluded. The Electionline study divided states into five categories of their use of provisional ballots in the 2000 election:

1. Use of provisional ballots (P)
2. Limited use of provisional ballots (LP)
3. Affidavit ballots (A)
4. No system in place (N)
5. Unnecessary/Not Applicable (U/NA)

We included in the list of “Old States” all states listed as using provisional ballots, limited use of provisional ballots or affidavit ballots. States in all three categories would have been familiar with key aspects of provisional voting. States that had no provisional voting system in place for the 2002 election, and were HAVA compliant in 2004, were listed as “new” states, as 2004 would have been the first year in which they would be offering the option of provisional voting. States that were listed as unnecessary or not applicable were excluded from this study, as they

45 This study can be found at: http://electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Provisional%20Voting.pdf.
were exempt from the HAVA regulations in 2004 because they either allowed same-day registration or did not register voters.

Rhode Island is the only state categorized as an old state by Electionline that we moved into the list of new states. Electionline's map shows Rhode Island as a state that used provisional voting in 2000, but in the state description, it is listed as having no system in place. We learned from the Rhode Island Board of Elections that the state had previously permitted potential voters to sign an affidavit if they did not appear on a precinct's list of registered voters, but felt they were registered to vote. Based on the signed affidavit, the election official would then contact a county official to see if the voter was on a more complete registration list. If the voter's name was on the complete list, that voter was permitted to cast a regular ballot. As this process did not grant the voter a provisional ballot, but served as a different type of administrative failsafe, we concluded that Rhode Island's first use of provisional voting was in 2004 and, therefore, classified the state as "new" to the system of provisional balloting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old States</th>
<th>New States</th>
<th>HAVA Exempt or NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statewide List of Registered Voters

The Electionline preview of the 2004 Election was the starting point for compiling a list of states that had a statewide database of registered voters. That study listed 34 States that did not have their statewide database systems complete, and 16 that did, including the District of Columbia. North Dakota does not register voters, so does not need to compile such a database. Electionline's criterion for concluding that a state had a statewide list was that the state have participation from all jurisdictions in a statewide system. We added Oklahoma to the list of states with statewide databases because we found it had met the Electionline criteria by the 2004 election, albeit too late for inclusion in the Electionline survey.

Out-of-Precinct Ballots

We based our classification of states that allow the counting of ballots cast outside the correct precinct on the data in the 2004 Electionline preview of the 2004 election. States that evaluated ballots cast in a precinct where the voter was not registered were categorized as “out-of-precinct.” States that invalidated such ballots were categorized as “In-precinct only.”

Table 2
CATEGORIZATION OF STATES -- Counting Out-Of-Precinct Ballots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out-of-Precinct</th>
<th>In-Precinct Only</th>
<th>HAVA EXEMPT OR NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In Illinois, it is not clear that all counties followed this procedure. Some counties may not have counted out-of-precinct ballots.
Verification Method

We identified four different ways states assessed provisional ballots to determine if they should be counted: signature match, match voter data, signed affidavits, and bringing back identification later. We gathered information about these verification techniques by checking state websites and consulting journalistic accounts. We consulted state legislation to provide further information where needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature Match</th>
<th>Data Match</th>
<th>Affidavit</th>
<th>Return with ID</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>N. Dakota</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Carolina</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4   | 14 | 14 | 10 | 9 |

* North Carolina lacked clear standards to evaluate provisional ballots and is excluded from this analysis.
Data Collection

To assemble our data for analysis, we began by using the data on provisional votes cast and counted reported by Electionline. To increase the accuracy of this data, we surveyed each state's election websites for updated data, and for reported numbers on the county level. We then sent emails to 49 (we excluded Alaska, see below) states and the District of Columbia, requesting updated data on the number of provisional votes cast and counted by county. We received information from 25 states by our cut-off date of August 25, 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Did Not Receive Updated Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Updated information by State

26 States 25 States

48 Alaska was not contacted via email, as the state does not have voting districts comparable to counties in other states and could not be matched with comparable census data.

49 Maryland reported provisional ballots that were counted per county, but not number cast.

50 Nebraska reported an incomplete list of provisional ballots cast and counted by county, but designated counties by number, rather than by name.
June 15, 2006

John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers University
191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick NJ 08901-8557

Dear Mr. Weingart:

During a recent briefing by staff, the EAC discussed and reviewed possible next steps with the provisional voting and voter identification studies as well as the Eagleton contract which is scheduled to conclude on June 30, 2006.

We were in agreement that Eagleton’s work on the EAC contract should conclude, as scheduled, by June 30, 2006. In preparation for this conclusion, the EAC requests that the comments and suggestions which were noted during the EAC’s recent Board of Advisors and Standards Boards meeting (and were described in Mr. O’Neil’s June 8, 2006 letter to Chairman DeGregorio) be included in the final draft report on provisional voting which Eagleton will deliver to the EAC on or about June 30, 2006. The Commissioners have determined that they will take this final draft report and, from it, may develop guidance and best practice recommendations that will be presented to the Board of Advisors and Standards Boards for further review.

The EAC Commissioners have also reviewed and considered next steps with the voter identification draft report which Eagleton has prepared. While the final disposition of the results and findings of this study, on the part of the EAC, are still unclear, the Commissioners have asked that the final draft report of this study also be prepared and submitted to the EAC not later than June 30, 2006.

We look forward to receiving these reports. On behalf of the EAC thank you for the considerable time and energy which the Eagleton/Moritz team has devoted to these critical election issues.

Sincerely,

Thomas R. Wilkey
June 8, 2006

Dear Chairman DeGregorio:

Karen Lynn-Dyson relayed the Commission’s decision in your meeting of June 1 to take more time to consider how to proceed with the delivery of EAC research reports on provisional voting and voter identification.

The Eagleton-Moritz research team, of course, encourages the Commission’s thoughtful consideration of the two reports, but we are mindful of the need to deliver revised documents that respond to the Commission’s comments by the close of our contract on June 30th. We believe that if we receive the Commission’s final comments on the Provisional Voting report by June 19 we will be able to complete any additional work that the Commission might request and incorporate the results in our final reports before the end of the contract period.

Based on suggestions raised at the meetings, we already plan to supplement the Provisional Voting report with some brief, additional information about the influence of the fail-safe ballot provisions of the National Voting Rights Act on the experience with provisional voting in 2004.

We understand that the Commission must submit the final draft Voter ID report to the same review process by your advisory boards as was followed with the Provisional Voting paper. We understand that step is a prerequisite for wider release. We would appreciate your advice on how to handle this review, given the rapidly approaching end of our contract.

We hope the commission will use both reports, as intended from the outset of this project, as the basis for recommendations for better, if not best, practices to the states. If the Commission cannot decide to issue such recommendations to the states, we hope it will promptly release the reports to provide the states and the broader elections community with this information, analysis and perspective on the issues.

We recognize, based on the reactions at the meetings of the Standards Board and, particularly, the Board of Advisors, that some of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the reports will be controversial with some of the Commission’s constituencies. But we also believe, based on the comments of the Peer Review Group, the advisors assembled by the Commission, and our response to their critiques, that the reports are grounded on solid research by a well-qualified, nonpartisan team and that the reports will provide new information for the policy process. We believe this information will contribute to achieving the EAC mission of providing helpful information that the states may or may not choose to implement.
The information in the reports can improve the policy process by raising the level of debate over increasingly volatile issues related to election administration. We believe our reports will prove useful to the states as they complete preparations for the 2006 elections. Moreover, the elections community is aware of this work, and awaits the analysis and conclusions.

We look forward to working with you to conclude this research in a way that will serve the public interest.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Thomas O'Neill

Thomas M. O'Neill
Project Director
EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS

FAX COVER SHEET

Date: 6/8/06

To: Paul J. DeGregorio

Fax Number: 202-566-3627

Phone Number: 

Total Number of Pages (including cover sheet): 3

Comments:

From: John Weingart X 290
June 8, 2006

Dear Chairman DeGregorio:

Karen Lynn-Dyson relayed the Commission's decision in your meeting of June 1 to take more time to consider how to proceed with the delivery of EAC research reports on provisional voting and voter identification.

The Eagleton-Moritz research team, of course, encourages the Commission's thoughtful consideration of the two reports, but we are mindful of the need to deliver revised documents that respond to the Commission's comments by the close of our contract on June 30th. We believe that if we receive the Commission's final comments on the Provisional Voting report by June 19 we will be able to complete any additional work that the Commission might request and incorporate the results in our final reports before the end of the contract period.

Based on suggestions raised at the meetings, we already plan to supplement the Provisional Voting report with some brief, additional information about the influence of the fail-safe ballot provisions of the National Voting Rights Act on the experience with provisional voting in 2004.

We understand that the Commission must submit the final draft Voter ID report to the same review process by your advisory boards as was followed with the Provisional Voting paper. We understand that step is a prerequisite for wider release. We would appreciate your advice on how to handle this review, given the rapidly approaching end of our contract.

We hope the commission will use both reports, as intended from the outset of this project, as the basis for recommendations for better, if not best, practices to the states. If the Commission cannot decide to issue such recommendations to the states, we hope it will promptly release the reports to provide the states and the broader elections community with this information, analysis and perspective on the issues.

We recognize, based on the reactions at the meetings of the Standards Board and, particularly, the Board of Advisors, that some of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the reports will be controversial with some of the Commission's constituencies. But we also believe, based on the comments of the Peer Review Group, the advisors assembled by the Commission, and our response to their critiques, that the reports are grounded on solid research by a well-qualified, nonpartisan team and that the reports will provide new information for the policy process. We believe this information will contribute to achieving the EAC mission of providing helpful information that the states may or may not choose to implement.
The information in the reports can improve the policy process by raising the level of debate over increasingly volatile issues related to election administration. We believe our reports will prove useful to the states as they complete preparations for the 2006 elections. Moreover, the elections community is aware of this work, and awaits the analysis and conclusions.

We look forward to working with you to conclude this research in a way that will serve the public interest.

Very truly yours,

Thomas M. O'Neill
Project Director
August 18, 2005

Dear Commissioners:

At the meeting of the Board of Advisors in Portland, Oregon, our notebooks included an EAC Information Research Update, dated July 18, 2005. The Update indicates that the EAC has awarded a contract to the Eagleton Institute / Moritz College of Law ("Moritz") to conduct research into "Provisional Voting / ID Requirements."

Obviously, the duty of the EAC as outlined in Section 241 to conduct research on election issues is a very important one. That is why it is clearly an absolute necessity that the researchers who are awarded contracts to conduct that research be objective and nonpartisan in their work. It would be inappropriate and potentially very damaging and embarrassing to the EAC (and the Board of Advisors) if this research is conducted by entities that have a preconceived opinion or bias on the issue being researched or are, in fact, advocates on the issue. Any findings or recommendations such biased entities put in their final report would be open to question and could cause great harm.

Unfortunately, hiring the faculty at Moritz to conduct research on provisional balloting and voter identification provisions calls into question whether the research can be conducted in an objective manner and reach conclusions that are not pre-determined by the public and pre-existing views of the researchers. This is crystal clear from an easily-conducted review of the Moritz website.

The Associate Director of the Election Law program at Moritz, Daniel Tokaji, is an outspoken opponent of voter identification requirements and commentator on provisional voting. Here is a brief summary of some of his recent comments, taken from the Moritz website:

It's therefore questionable at best whether an ID requirement is really necessary to combat voting fraud. Supporters of the ID requirement have yet to make a convincing case that existing methods of discouraging and punishing fraud are insufficient. While the anti-fraud benefits of stricter ID laws are dubious, there is evidence that an ID requirement would impose a severe burden on many voters, particularly those of low income....In their present form, the ID bills presently on the table are likely unconstitutional.... (ID and the Right to Vote, April 12, 2005)

"Ohio's election reform is a mixed bag. Establishing a clear rule for provisional ballots is a good idea, but I don't think there's a good reason for refusing to count provisional ballots cast out of precinct, given that a statewide registration database (which should allow for easy verification of eligibility) has to be in place by 2006. It would be much better to move to in-precinct early voting than mail-in absentee voting, but it seems that Ohio doesn't want to spend the money." (Reform Comes to Ohio, May 20, 2005).
"Nevertheless, DOJ seems likely to sign off on this [Arizona's proposition 200 implementing rules], given that they've take the position - quite clearly an erroneous one, in my view - that voters need not even be given a provisional ballot if they lack ID." (Arizona Voter ID, July 18, 2005).

"It remains to be seen, of course, whether DOJ will rigorously enforce Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, when it comes to practices - like the Georgia ID law - that threaten to result in the denial of minority votes...." (Preclearance, Preclearance, Preclearance, July 20, 2005).

"...I tend to doubt that the preclearance process will prove to be an effective remedy for measures like the Georgia ID law. Even though this law will have a "retrogressive" effect, by serving as a barrier to minority voters' participation...." (The Voting Rights Act, Then and Now, July 31, 2005)

"We should remember that, at the turn of the 20th Century, allegations of "good government" were used by white Democrats in a remarkably successful strategy to suppress the black vote. The result of those very successful efforts was to impose barriers like the literacy test, which excluded African Americans from voting throughout the South for the better part of the century, until after the Voting Rights Act of 1965. If you go back and read some of the documents from the late 1800's and early 1900's, as I've recently been doing, the similarity to the sort of arguments being advanced now in support of photo ID laws is frightening. It is beyond unfortunate to see the same sort of tactics, albeit dressed up in more respectable garb, being employed at the start of the 21st Century." (Vote Suppression, Fraud and Voter ID, August 3, 2005)

In addition to these postings, Dr. Tokaji is acting as an advocate on voter identification issues, having submitted a comment letter to the Department of Justice dated August 18, 2005, along with a number of other professors, urging an objection to a voter identification provision currently before the Department for review under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Obviously, this advocacy is occurring after the EAC awarded this contract and during the pendancy of the research work. The issue here is not whether Dr. Tokaji's opinions are correct or incorrect, or the appropriateness of his submitting a comment letter to the Department of Justice. The point is the strongly held, pre-existing notions about both provisional balloting and voter identification espoused by the Associate Director of Moritz's election law program and his advocacy on these issues. This raises serious concerns about the propriety of Moritz being provided with federal tax dollars to conduct non-partisan and impartial research into such a sensitive and high profile area of election law. We cannot be certain that data collected and conclusions reached by this research project will not be predetermined to comport with the views of Moritz's officials.
I would strongly recommend that this contract be reconsidered by the
EAC. Under these circumstances, any report issued by Moritz will be
open to serious questions as to its validity and objectivity.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530

Telephone (202) 305-9750
Facsimile (202) 307-2839
August 19, 2005

Hans:

I'm currently at the Seattle airport awaiting a return flight to D.C., so I apologize if my response below is somewhat incomplete. I think the issue you raise certainly deserves our full consideration, so I will look forward to additional responses and dialogue from others included in this distribution list.

A couple of quick points in response to your concerns (and I am speaking for myself below, and not for the entire commission):

(1) The RFP that was issued by the EAC pertaining to the research on provisional voting and voter ID requirements was widely advertised (as all our RFP's are). We did so because we wanted to receive a wide range of possible contractors to conduct this important research. This was a competitive RFP process which, if my memory serves me correct, produced a good number of responses from interested entities.

(2) Carol Paquette assembled a review panel (I'm not sure how many persons were involved in the review panel) to score the responses to this RFP...the submission by the Eagleton Institute included, as a part of their proposal, the Moritz School of Law at Ohio State University as a partner in conducting the legal research required for Eagleton to provide a final report (due in October) to the EAC. The review panel scored the Eagleton submission as best, considering a variety of factors.

(3) The lead entity in this project is the Eagleton Institute. While the project manager's name from Eagleton escapes me right now, the lead from Moritz is not Dan Tokagi, but Ned Foley, who directs the election law section (or something to that effect) at Moritz. Certainly it is true that Professor Tokagi is contributing to the work product being assemble by Moritz, which consists primarily of reviewing election and administrative codes from all 50 states to ascertain how each state deals with provisional voting and voter ID requirements.

(4) As is the case with all federal contractors, both Eagleton Institute and Moritz are contractually obligated to produce objective, sound and unbiased research and analysis on this project. While it is certainly prudent to consider the potential bias of any prospective contractor(s), after receiving the recommendation from the review panel and Carol Paquette (at the time, the acting EAC Executive Director), we unanimously agreed among the commissioners that the recommendation was worthy of support. At the time, we were aware, for example, that the Eagleton Institute had been involved last year in some litigation involving provisional ballots. We were also aware, as you point out, of Professor Tokagi's personal views regarding the issue of voter ID and provisional voting. Nevertheless, there was unanimous agreement in supporting the staff (and review panel) recommendation to move forward with the proposal submitted by Eagleton Institute.

(5) Finally, to ensure that the final work product from both Eagleton and Moritz is objective and representative of all view points on these important issues, Eagleton proposed early in the process -- and we enthusiastically agreed -- to the formation of a balanced peer review panel which will review the work, on an on-going basis, of Eagleton and Moritz. All EAC commissioners have had an opportunity to provide names to Eagleton to ensure appropriate political balance on this peer review panel and Eagleton has been responsive to our various suggestions.

By way of summary, let me say that I believe we have an obligation to closely scrutinize the conduct of all of our federal contractors. If things come to light that bring into question the
objectivity of any of our contractors, I believe the EAC ought to conduct its due diligence and deal with such matters accordingly, including the possibility of contract termination.

I would be happy to conduct such due diligence with regard to this particular contract. However, I must say, with all due respect, that I do not think any breach has occurred, either by Eagleton or Moritz, which would necessitate termination of this contract. I think appropriate checks and balances have been accounted for in this contract, and I believe these checks and balances will ensure an objective and sound final product from Eagleton.

I welcome your continued feedback, Hans.

Kindest regards,

RAY MARTINEZ III
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
August 19, 2005

To Gracia, Ray, Donetta, Tom, Julie, Karen

In his note regarding the Eagleton contract, Hans has raised some of the same concerns I raised from the beginning of any discussions I had regarding this contract with our staff, and at our first formal meeting with Eagleton. In reviewing their work product from time to time, I continue to have concerns about a lack of balanced input and have repeatedly voiced them with staff and with Eagleton. I did this when the initial peer review group was proposed and again during their presentation at our meeting in Pasadena (the outreach slide in their public presentation showed outreach to seven groups, of which only one could be considered conservative-leaning). Now, as I have just had the opportunity to read their July progress report, it appears that Eagleton seems to be going into a larger analysis of the voter fraud issue than was authorized in the contract. My suspicion is that Dan Tokaji is injecting his views into this to dismiss or diminish the concerns some people may have about voter fraud. I could be wrong, but his previous writings lead me to believe otherwise.

I only found one mention of voter fraud in the contract with Eagleton. It is in Section 3.5 regarding provisional voting, where it discusses "minimizing opportunity for voter fraud." Yet, on page 4 of the July progress report from Eagleton, in describing their work plan for the next month it states: "we will expand upon vote fraud research and examine further the relationship between instances of vote fraud and ensuing election reforms." This clearly seems to be going beyond the mandate we gave them as I thought they were going to be looking at voter fraud relating to provisional voting (as the contract calls for), not voter fraud as it relates to election reforms. While voter fraud was never mentioned in the contract regarding the voter ID issue, page 5 of their July report indicates that their narratives "will include an appraisal of the prevalence and nature of voter fraud." In addition to this, page 6 describes a look into the "relationship between voter ID regime and vote fraud."

Voter fraud is clearly an issue that is perceived differently from the Right and from the Left. I have struggled with determining what a clear definition of voter fraud is myself, and therefore want to obtain various perspectives and good analysis on this issue before I formulate a solid conclusion in my mind. It has been my understanding all along that the whole voter fraud/voter intimidation issue is going to studied by the EAC using a balanced group of consultants—not Eagleton and Moritz, who are likely to focus on just on the number of prosecutions of voter fraud, rather than the complaints made or the fact that many election officials are frustrated that some prosecutors don't take their complaints about voter fraud seriously. I am not convinced at this point that we will get a balanced and objective study from Eagleton/Moritz on voter fraud. I am puzzled on why they seem to be expending a significant portion of their time on this and would want to know if we somehow authorized them to do more research into the voter fraud issue.

On page 7 of their July report Eagleton indicates that communications with the EAC on the Peer Review Group "were not clear or timely." I would like to know what this refers to. Also, I may have missed it, but I do not recall seeing the final list of who is serving as the Peer Review group.

The August 15th copy of the July report that I received from Karen did not include the attachment of the financial report of expenses incurred. I would like to see that attachment.

Outside of our NIST work, this contract represents our largest single outside expenditure of our operational funds. Any single expenditure of $500,000+ needs to be closely monitored. I, for one, am not going to sign off on any report that appears to have been written from a biased viewpoint, especially one that doesn't appear to be interested in hearing from conservative organizations or right-leaning researchers, or seems to minimize any input from them. I've already had questions...
from congressional staff and others on why we picked Eagleton and Moritz, as they are perceived by some as biased against Republicans. I assured the critics that we have insisted all along on an objective study from Eagleton. An unbalanced or biased study from them will not only hurt my credibility, but also that of the EAC. I'm not suggesting that we stop their work, but I do want Tom and Julie to inform them in no uncertain terms that we will not accept a report that does not seriously consider all viewpoints on provisional voting and the voter ID issue, and that any study or interpretations they present to us reflect a diversity of opinions on these subjects. We also need for staff to determine whether their considerable work into the voter fraud area is authorized in the contract. We should not be paying for and receiving work we did not authorize.

The contract clearly calls for "alternative approaches" on voter ID requirements and "alternatives" on provisional voting. I agreed to support this contract to Eagleton because I was assured that we would receive a variety of approaches from their work, and not just those from a liberal perspective.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
August 19, 2005

Paul:

I am directing this email only to the commissioners, because I don't think we should air our disagreements among staff until we have at least had a chance to discuss controversial issues with each other in person. It appears from Gracia's email that we will have a chance do so next week in Denver.

In the meantime, I feel compelled to respond to your email regarding Eagleton.

(1) As I stated last night in my email to Hans, we have an on-going responsibility to monitor the expenditure of all our federal funds, including to government contractors who are contractually obligated to deliver unbiased research. However, I will remind you that we did not contract with Eagleton merely to provide a compilation of state laws and procedures. Rather, we contracted with Eagleton (and indirectly with Moritz through Eagleton) to provide both research AND analysis of provisional voting and voter ID. Invariably, the analysis portion of their final product will be from a professional (and institutional) perspective, and will NOT represent any one researcher's personal point of view. If it does, then Eagleton and Moritz risk damaging their credibility not just with the EAC, but with other federal government agencies which undoubtedly contract with their respective institutions on other projects. I doubt seriously that either institution would risk such damage and allow one team member to inject bias into the work. Moreover, the peer review group that is (or has) been assembled by Eagleton is designed to cure any lingering concerns about potential institutional or personal bias...Eagleton has been responsive to your feedback on this issue, to the point where they have removed all perspective representatives of the advocacy community on the peer review group (because they felt they could not achieve political "balance" from the advocacy groups). If there is some person (or persons) which you would like to see Eagleton include in the review group, it is my understanding that such inclusion is but a mere phone call away.

(2) You will recall that at our meeting last week, I raised the exact same concern about the Eagleton progress report, and asked for clarification from staff regarding the details of this particular work (i.e., fraud) on the part of Eagleton. I expect staff (or us directly) to ask questions of Eagleton (as we would any contractor) and determine if their work in this area is within the scope of work (and contract) we all agreed to. If it isn't then we re-direct them, just as we have done, for example with Kim Brace and EDS.

(3) Finally, I must express my disappointment, Paul, regarding your comments on Professor Tokagi that you chose to include in your email. While I may disagree with Hans on his particular analysis of the perceived personal bias of this contract, at least his allegations regarding Professor Tokagi's potential bias are grounded in fact (and he recited them as such in his email). You, on the other hand, have chosen to accuse Professor Tokagi of manipulating the work on this project based on your "suspicion." With all due respect, that unfortunate accusation borders, in my view, on a breach of professional decorum and I cannot let it go without response.

We clearly have some political issues that are increasingly being injected into nearly every discussion at the EAC table. I have stated both to you and Gracia individually that I believe this trend in part represents a "maturation" of the EAC and I am not uncomfortable with it. However, if we are going to bring accusations of subjectivity and bias to the table, then I will expect that such a filter will be applied across the board to ALL projects undertaken by the EAC, and that such a filter will be based solidly on fact, and not on innuendo, personal hunches or suspicions.
I send this email, as always, with the highest degree of respect and friendship toward you. And yet, my disappointment is evident in your comments regarding an esteemed and respected member of the legal academic community (and someone whom I regard as a personal friend.)

I look forward to our continued discussion on this matter. And as for the substance of Hans' concern regarding Moritz, I stand by my email which I sent to everyone last night.

Regards,

RAY MARTINEZ III
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 566-3100 (W)
(202) 566-3127 (FAX)
www.eac.gov
October 19, 2006

Ralph G. Neas
President, People for the American Way Foundation
2000 M Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036

RE: October 18, 2006 Letter

Dear Mr. Neas:

Your letter of October 18, 2006 requests the release of EAC’s Voter Fraud and Intimidation Report. I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the purpose and status of this study.

In late 2005, EAC hired two consultants for the purpose of assisting EAC with two things: 1) developing a uniform definition of the phrase voter fraud, and 2) making recommendations on how to further study the existence, prosecution, and means of deterring such voter fraud. In May 2006, a status report on this study was given to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors during their public meetings. During the same week, a working group convened to react to and provide comment on the progress and potential conclusions that could be reached from the work of the two consultants.

The conversation at the working group meeting was lively on the very points that we were trying to accomplish as a part of this study, namely what is voter fraud and how do we pursue studying it. Many of the proposed conclusions that were suggested by the consultants were challenged by the working group members. As such, the consultants were tasked with reviewing the concerns expressed at the working group meeting, conducting additional research as necessary, and providing a draft report to EAC that took into account the working group’s concerns and issues.

That draft report is currently being vetted by EAC staff. EAC will release a final report from this study after it has conducted a review of the draft provided by the consultants. However, it is important to remember the purpose of this study – finding a uniform definition of voter fraud and making recommendations on how to study the existence, prosecution and deterrence of voter fraud – as it will serve as the basis of the EAC report on this study.

Thank you for your letter. You can be assured that as soon as a final report on the fraud and intimidation study is available, a copy will be made available to the public.

Sincerely,

Paul S. DeGregorio
Chairman
October 18, 2006

Chairman Paul DeGregorio
Commissioner Donetta L. Davidson
Commissioner Gracia M. Hillman
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Fax: (202) 566-3127

Dear Commissioners,

On October 11th, USA Today published an article describing the report commissioned by the EAC on voter fraud. We write today to urge the EAC to release this report.

As a 25 year old civil rights and civil liberties organization, People For the American Way Foundation (PFAWF) and our sister organization, People For the American Way (PFAW) have long been dedicated to ensuring the integrity of our elections. In particular in the years since the 2000 election, PFAWF and other principle partners such as the NAACP and the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, have carried out a program called Election Protection to ensure that all eligible voters are able to vote and have that vote counted as cast.

We know that voter fraud and intimidation occur— we've seen the long lines, the erroneous purges, the misleading flyers and phone calls. And yet there seems to be little attention to these matters on the state and federal level.

Instead, a disproportionate amount of time and energy are spent on measures that purport to curb voter fraud by requiring voters to produce proof of citizenship and identity to vote. In actuality, these measures do little to secure the elections and much to disenfranchise otherwise eligible voters. Indeed we are weeks away from an election where thousands of eligible voters may be disenfranchised by overly restrictive voter identification laws. That presents a real threat to the integrity of our elections and the health of our democracy.

The report that the EAC commissioned from voting experts would make a vitally important contribution to the national discourse on the reality of voter fraud. In light of the numerous claims regarding the prevalence of voter fraud, this report provides a much
needed analysis about the state of our electoral process. While media reports indicate that this tax-payer funded report is final, even if there are outstanding concerns within the EAC, we implore you to move forward with releasing the report as is, and to hold a public hearing to address any potential issues. Again, the importance of the information in this report is paramount and the public deserves such full disclosure. The report should be released immediately so that those who are concerned about ensuring the integrity of elections can benefit from its findings.

Sincerely,

Ralph G. Neas
President, People For the American Way Foundation

Cc: Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist
Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid
Senator Trent Lott, Chair, Senate Rules and Administration
Senator Chris Dodd, Ranking Member, Senate Rules and Administration
House Majority Leader John Boehner
House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi
Representative Vernon Ehlers, Chair, House Administration
Representative Juanita Millender-McDonald, Ranking Member, House Administration
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Please see the following letter from Ralph Neas, President of People for the American Way Foundation and the responding letter by the EAC. If you have any questions please feel free to contact the EAC @ (202)566-3100.
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Commissioners-

Enclosed please find a preliminary list of Peer Review Group members, whom Eagleton is considering for their Peer Review Group. Tom Wilkey will be bringing this item to you for discussion and input at Monday's Commissioner's meeting.

Eagleton envisions this Peer Review Group as the body that will review the draft analysis that it will prepare on provisional voting and on voter identification. The Group would also provide comment on the development of alternative approaches to provisional voting and voter identification which Eagleton will develop for the EAC.

I have included the e-mail from the Eagleton Project Director, Tom O'Neil, so that you could get a feel for his approach/philosophy to assembling the Group.

Regards-

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

--- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/23/2005 02:25 PM ---

"Tom O'Neil"

To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc
Subject Peer Review Group

Karen,

As you probably recall, one of the features of our proposal was the creation of a Peer Review Group to look over our findings, conclusions and draft reports before we prepare final drafts for the EAC's review. The EAC asked that before recruiting members of the PRG we submit names for EAC's review. The aim, course, is to assemble a panel that is experienced, informed, and balanced.

Attached is a list of potential PRG members drawn from academia, the law, and non-profit organizations with interests in this area. Please look it over.

We may conclude that the PRG should also include two or three former government officials now in academia or related fields. We have a conference call with our partners at Moritz planned for tomorrow or Friday to decide a) if former officials should be included in the PRG and b) if so, who they should be. I'll keep you informed of our thinking as it develops.

Tom
PROPOSED MEMBERS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology
rma@hss.caltech.edu
626-395-4422
Alvarez has taught political science at Caltech since 1992. He received his B.A. in political science from Carleton College; his M.A. and Ph.D. from Duke University. Alvarez focuses on the study of electoral politics. He has published many articles on electoral behavior and public opinion. Support for his research has come from the National Science Foundation, The IBM Corporation, the Carnegie Corporation, of New York, and the Knight Foundation. Alvarez edits the Analytical Methods for Social Research book series and is on the editorial boards of a number of academic journals. He is Co-Director of the Caltech-MIT Voting Technology Project.

Deborah Goldberg, Ph.D.
Program Director, Democracy Program
Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law
161 Avenue Of The Americas, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10013
212-998-6730
Goldberg supervises the Democracy Program's litigation, scholarship, and public education. She was the principal author of Writing Reform: A Guide to Drafting State & Local Campaign Finance Laws, and was lead counsel to the intervenor in the Supreme Court case Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Government PAC. She serves on the Steering Committee of a coalition to restore voting rights to persons with past felony convictions. Goldberg is a graduate of Harvard Law School. Before joining the Brennan Center, she was in private practice. She holds a Ph.D. in philosophy and taught ethics at Columbia University.

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu
Kropf has been on the faculty at Missouri since 1999. She received her BA Summa Cum Laude, Phi Beta Kappa from Kansas State University and her PhD in Political Science from American University. Her work concentrates on Research Methods, Urban Politics, American Government, and Political Behavior. Before joining the faculty at Missouri, she was Project Coordinator at the University of Maryland Survey Research Center. She has published recent on undervoting in presidential elections, and on invalidated ballots in the 1996 presidential election, and on the incremental process of election reform in Missouri.

Wade Henderson, Esq.
Executive Director
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
1629 K Street, NW, 10th Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Wade Henderson is the Executive Director of the LCCR and Counsel to the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund (LCCREF), and leads the organizations’ work on issues involving nationwide election reform. He is a graduate of Howard University and the Rutgers University School of Law. During its over 50 years of existence, LCCR has worked to redefine civil rights issues in broad and inclusive ways. Today, it includes over 180 national organizations. Previously Henderson served as Washington Bureau Director of the NAACP. He began his career as a legislative counsel of the ACLU.

Kay Maxwell
President
League of Women Voters of the U.S.
1730 M Street NW, Suite 1000
Kay J. Maxwell has been a member of the League since 1976. She attended Smith College and earned a B.A. in International Relations from the University of Pennsylvania. She has conducted civic participation training for women leaders in Bosnia, Israel, the West Bank, Rwanda, Kuwait and Jamaica. She has also served as vice president at the International Executive Service Corps (IESC), an international economic development organization. She is a board member of DC Vote, and the New Voters Project.

Tim Storey
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures
7700 East First Place
Denver, CO 80230
303-364-7700
or
444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-5400

Peter G. Veniero, Esq.
Counsel
Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, New Jersey 07102
Tel: 973-643-7000
Veniero chairs the firm's Appellate Practice Group. He earned his B.A. at Drew University, Phi Beta Kappa, and his J.D. (with honors) at the Duke University School of Law. In 1999, he was appointed a justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, where he served for 7 years before re-entering private practice. Before his appointment to the Supreme Court, he served as New Jersey's Attorney General, and in that capacity oversaw the state's election laws. He also served as Chief of Staff and Chief Counsel to Governor Christine Todd Whitman.
STATUS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP RECRUITMENT
(As of August 17, 2005)

R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology

Guy-Oriel Charles
Associate Professor, School of Law
University of Minnesota
612-626-9154

Brad Clark
Professor of Law
George Washington University School of Law

Pamela Susan Karlan
Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law
Stanford Law School
650-725-4851

Martha E. Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
816-235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu

Daniel H. Lowenstein
Professor of Law
UCLA
310-825-4841

John F. Manning
Professor
Harvard Law School

Tim Storey
Program Principal
Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures

Peter G. Verniero, Esq.
Counsel
Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC
(Former NJ Attorney General and Supreme Court Justice)

YES/CONFIRMED
YES
NO
YES
YES/CONFIRMED
YES
NO RESPONSE
YES/CONFIRMED
YES/CONFIRMED
Tim O'Rourke, Dean of the Fulton School of Liberal Arts at Salisbury University in Maryland, has agreed to serve on the Peer Review Committee.

Tom O'Neill
In July 2002, Timothy G. O'Rourke became the Dean of the Fulton School of Liberal Arts at Salisbury University, a comprehensive public university with nearly 7,000 students located on Maryland's Eastern Shore. The largest of the university's four schools, the Fulton School has about 120 full-time faculty and more than 1,800 undergraduate and graduate majors in ten academic departments and accounts for more than two-fifths of the University's credit hour production.

In the seven years before his arrival at Salisbury, Dr. O'Rourke was at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, where he was the Teresa M. Fischer Professor in Citizenship Education, a position established in 1995 in order to promote the informed participation of youth in community and governmental affairs. The inaugural recipient of this professorship, Dr. O'Rourke held a joint appointment as Professor of Educational Leadership and Professor of Political Science. From 1998 to 2002, he served as Executive Director of Kids Voting Missouri, a program in which nearly 68,000 Missouri elementary and secondary students went to official polling sites and voted alongside their parents in the November 7, 2000 presidential election.

From 1992 to 1995, Dr. O'Rourke was professor and head of Political Science at Clemson University. Prior to that, Dr. O'Rourke was, for 14 years, a faculty member in the University of Virginia's Center for Public Service. From 1985 to 1992, Dr. O'Rourke served as the Executive Director of the Virginia Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution. Commission projects included the national opening of Montpelier, Madison's home (1987); the "Constitution Train" to Philadelphia to mark "Virginia Day" (1987); production of Worth Fighting For, an Emmy-Award-winning documentary on the ratification struggle in Virginia (1988); the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the first federal elections (1989); the Virginia visit of Hungarian President Árpád Göncz to mark the "Global Legacy of the Bill of Rights" (1990); and production of What No Just Government Should Refuse, an Emmy-nominated documentary on the writing of the Bill of Rights (1991). From 1983 through 1986, Dr. O'Rourke directed "The Virginia Court Days Forums," series for Virginia public television featuring town meetings on constitutional issues.

Professor O'Rourke is the co-author of State and Local Government: The Third Century of Federalism (1988) and author of The Impact of Reapportionment (1980), named by CHOICE as one of the Outstanding Academic Books of 1980. His articles on the federal Voting Rights Act have appeared in such journals as the Rutgers Law Journal, the Virginia Law Review and the Journal of Law & Politics. He has testified before both U.S. House and Senate committees on various voting issues and has served as an expert witness in voting rights litigation. In addition, he has staffed electoral reform commissions, including the Virginia Beach Mayor's Committee for Reapportionment (1990) and the Charlottesville 'citizens' Committee to Study Council Changes (1980-81). During 1996-97, he served as advisor to the St. Peters Charter commission, which drafted a home rule charter for that city. Dr. O'Rourke's teaching interests include state politics, school law, and voting rights and representation. He is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the University of Pittsburgh (1970) and holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from Duke University (1977). In 2002, Dr. O'Rourke joined four others in the inaugural Class of Distinguished Alumni recognized by the Tyrone Area School District (PA). Dr. O'Rourke and his wifeudy have five grown children and one grandchild and reside in Quantico, Maryland.
Existing Research Analysis

There are many reports and books that describe anecdotes and draw broad conclusions from a large array of incidents. There is little research that is truly systematic or scientific. The most systematic look at fraud is the report written by Lori Minnite. The most systematic look at voter intimidation is the report by Laughlin McDonald. Books written about this subject seem to all have a political bias and a pre-existing agenda that makes them somewhat less valuable.

Researchers agree that measuring something like the incidence of fraud and intimidation in a scientifically legitimate way is extremely difficult from a methodological perspective and would require resources beyond the means of most social and political scientists. As a result, there is much more written on this topic by advocacy groups than social scientists. It is hoped that this gap will be filled in the “second phase” of this EAC project.

Moreover, reports and books make allegations but, perhaps by their nature, have little follow up. As a result, it is difficult to know when something has remained in the stage of being an allegation and gone no further, or progressed to the point of being investigated or prosecuted or in any other way proven to be valid by an independent, neutral entity. This is true, for example, with respect to allegations of voter intimidation by civil rights organizations, and, with respect to fraud, John Fund’s frequently cited book. Again, this is something that it is hoped will be addressed in the “second phase” of this EAC project by doing follow up research on allegations made in reports, books and newspaper articles.

Other items of note:

- There is as much evidence, and as much concern, about structural forms of disenfranchisement as about intentional abuse of the system. These include felon disenfranchisement, poor maintenance of databases and identification requirements.

- There is tremendous disagreement about the extent to which polling place fraud, e.g. double voting, intentional felon voting, noncitizen voting, is a serious problem. On balance, more researchers find it to be less of a problem than is commonly described in the political debate, but some reports say it is a major problem, albeit hard to identify.

- There is substantial concern across the board about absentee balloting and the opportunity it presents for fraud.

- Federal law governing election fraud and intimidation is varied and complex and yet may nonetheless be insufficient or subject to too many limitations to be as effective as it might be.
• Deceptive practices, e.g. targeted flyers and phone calls providing misinformation, were a major problem in 2004.

• Voter intimidation continues to be focused on minority communities, although the American Center for Voting Rights uniquely alleges it is focused on Republicans.
Peer Review Group
Summary of Comments
To the Eagleton/Moritz Group
Under Contract to Provide Research Assistance to the EAC

October 15, 2005

The Peer Review Group (PRG) met by telephone conference on September 21. Those participating included: Michael Alvarez, John C. Harrison, Martha Kropf, Dan Lowenstein, Peter Verniero, Brad Smith, and Tim Storey. This summary also includes additional written remarks submitted by Martha Kropf and additional remarks from a follow-up phone call with Timothy O’Rourke. We are now addressing all the comments including, in some cases, returning to members of the group to seek further elaboration or clarification.

We encouraged the members of the PRG to comment about any aspect of the project. We furnished them with these materials before the meeting.

1. Survey of local (mainly county) officials conducted in June 2005.
2. State-by-state narrative of developments in provisional voting
3. Statistical Analysis of state provisional voting
4. Memorandum on Provisional Voting Litigation
5. Memorandum on Provisional Ballot Litigation by State
6. July Memorandum on Provisional Ballot Litigation by Issue

We suggested that PRG members rank our draft responses to each of the six key questions posed by the EAC along these lines:

1- Research supports conclusions well.
2- Research supports some conclusions. Specific questions are:
3- Research does not support conclusions. Major problems are:

On the Alternatives paper, we asked PRG members to list up to three items they found questionable in light of the research and their own knowledge of provisional voting and election administration and to give us their thoughts on alternative policies that we had no included.

General Suggestions

1. Make transparently clear the meaning of ‘old’ versus ‘new’ states. It is not enough to categorize the states as such, we need to determine why specific states were considered ‘old’ or ‘new’ (i.e. clarify what conditions were met by old states).
2. Be clear in our report about the data that we were unable to obtain and perhaps speculate on why that data was not available. (For example, do we have the documentation the state election boards gave the localities regarding counting practices? If not, why not? Indicate the states for which it was difficult to obtain data.

3. Prescribe less and describe more (tell what voters/administrators have done, not what they should have done or ought to do).

4. Questioned our assumption about public trust – How do we know that decreases in disputes/challenges signify an increase in public trust? We need to explain this assertion.

Specific Review by Area of Analysis/Document

Response to Statistical Review:

- Challenged our emphasis on the number of provisional ballots counted as a percentage of those cast as an indication of success of Provisional Voting. Suggested alternative relationships to consider (PB v. Turnout, PB v. Registered Voters, and PB v. Voting age Population).

- Wanted the inclusion of variation within states among counties (and geographical considerations).

- The report needs to address the quality and validity of the data used in the analysis.

- On Page 8, cautioned using the estimate of 280,000 disenfranchised voters who would have voted if outside precinct voting was permitted.

Response to Question Four:

- Remove the comments in the footnote (p. 1) that offers an alternative way of analyzing the question relating to the possible increase in voter participation as a result of provisional voting because the margin of error in the Census survey does not support a conclusion at this level of significance.

- Address the alternative explanation for why old states may enfranchise more voters than new states (i.e. Kropf’s Failsafe option).

- Include a statistical summary of the relationship between the length of time a state has had PV and the rate at which votes are counted.

Response to Question Five:

- Is it possible to draw any conclusions about the local differences within and among states broken down by county (presumably 20 states worth)?
• Clarify what is meant by “design” and say how many states have/had provisional ballots that are designed differently and look different. Why is design important?

• Page 17 indicates that states with statewide voter databases end up validating fewer PVs. This is important & should be addressed in more detail.

Response to Question Six:

• On the usefulness of instructions, 98% said the instructions were useful. Make it clear that this represents 98% of the officials who got instruction.

• Is the passive voice the best means to communicate this information (for ex. "Second, objectively how well did the process appear to be managed?")

Response to State Narratives:

• When in doubt about whether we have data to support a sentence it is important to be careful about the language we use (say ‘doing XYZ would have revealed’ as opposed to ‘most of what we know about XYZ revealed’…)

• Clarify for the readers what is meant by "provisional vote/total vote". Does that mean provisional votes cast? Counted? Make it clear right at the beginning of every document?

• Footnote states that do not list poll sites or tell people where to vote with the fact that many cities/counties do have a poll finder.

Election Official Survey

• Clarify how we determined who to include in the sample and how we developed the questions in the survey (was a focus group an initial step?) Why were 3,800 election officials deemed eligible to participate (out of how many? 5,000 or so?)

• Clarify old and new states on pg. 2 in National Survey. Comment on how to assess fraud in provisional voting? What is the relationship between PV and turnout?

• Explore more issues about citizenship (18% non-citizen voting in CA)?

• Appendix A says survey was random, but it's not. How was the data weighted for small, medium and large counties, and for other issues? Clarify this in the report.
• Why doesn’t the total of new and old states equal 50 (25 and 18) and why does the National Survey of Election Officials have different numbers? Is FL an ‘old’ state?

• Are the New England states underrepresented in the survey? If so, why?

• Report should offer more information about the response rate.

**Alternatives Document**

• The importance of clarity in state processes for both administrators and voters needs to be better articulated.
  (Better training of poll workers, clarity whether failure to check boxes disqualifies voters, access to better info. at polling locations)

• Cautions the use of definitive statements (such as A-3, perhaps say “This raises the question of…”).

• Have other EAC Guidelines been tested in court yet?

• On page 3: the ‘tracking number’ in # 6 is not feasible. Also, “the information” in # 12 should be changed to “the website and 800 numbers” for clarification.

• Page 6, there were disagreements about # 1 and # 2 of options in Sec. F regarding the installation of a separate body to rule on PV for the integrity process; a motion was made to get rid of them.

• Page 6, Sec. E option # 1 should be eliminated or clarified

• Add to Sec. F a ‘# 5’ requiring states to provide detailed public info. on PV
Contract to Provide Research Assistance to The EAC
For the Development of Voluntary Guidance on
Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Procedures

MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT
September 2005

For
UNITED STATES ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100
Washington, DC 20005

September 14, 2005

Prepared by:
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557
OUTLINE

• Introduction

• Provisional Voting
  o Task 3.5

• Voter Identification Requirements
  o Task 3.10
  o Task 3.11

• Project Management
  o Task 3.1

• Financial Report

INTRODUCTION

This report describes our progress from September 1 through September 30, 2005. It includes brief descriptions of key tasks; progress made; challenges encountered or anticipated; milestones reached; and projections for work to be completed in the coming month.

We focused in September on refining our Provisional Voting research. This refinement was necessary to prepare a strong final analysis paper and develop alternative approaches to Provisional Voting based on the analysis. An important part of this refinement involved reconciling sometimes conflicting data on Provisional Voting from different sources, including the Election Day Study, which finally became available in September. With a clearer understanding of our data, we began the critical work of selecting alternatives to recommend to the EAC as guidance or best practices responsive to both our research and the needs of the Commission.

Three meetings this month helped us accomplish the necessary refinement. We briefed the EAC on our work on September 6, held the first meeting of the Peer Review Group (PRG) on September 21, and gained the benefit of the EAC’s reaction to the September 6 briefing in a conference call on September 30.

The completion of our work on Provisional Voting has been delayed by the time needed to absorb and incorporate the findings of the EAC Election Day Study, to recruit and receive the comments of the PRG, and to receive the Commission’s comments on the September 6 briefing. The schedule called for the release of the Election Day Study last spring, the submission of the Preliminary Guidance Document to the EAC’s advisory boards in mid-September, and a public hearing on the Guidance Document in late October. We now plan to submit to the EAC a final draft of our report, a preliminary guidance document, and draft
best practices before the end of October. And we understand that after review of those materials, the EAC will decide whether to issue a guidance document or recommend best practices. Projecting a late November date for those decisions seems reasonable. If the EAC does decide to issue a Guidance Document on Provisional Voting, the time needed for a review by the advisory boards is likely to delay a public hearing until January.

While we have made a good start on the Voter ID sections of our research, most time and resources this month were dedicated to resolving issues involved in Provisional Voting.

This report is divided into 3 sections: Provisional Voting, Voter Identification Requirements, and Project Management. Each section references specific tasks described in paragraph 3 of the contract. The Financial Report will be sent separately by the Rutgers Division of Grant and Contract Accounting.

Please direct questions or comments about this report to Tom O'Neill at:
Tasks 3.4 – 3.9 in our contract relate to Provisional Voting. Work on the first of these must be complete before proceeding to later tasks. Task 3.4 was completed in August, and Task 3.5 is well underway.

**Task 3.5: Analysis and Alternative Approaches.** Assess the potential, problems, and challenges of Provisional Voting and develop alternative means to achieve the goals of Provisional Voting.

**LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS, AND LITIGATION**

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation. This information constitutes the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task. It has provided a base of understanding for the analysis of states' actual experience with Provisional Voting in 2004, for which the Eagleton team has lead responsibility.

**Description:** The Moritz team has created a 50-state chart to summarize information on Provisional Voting, compiled statutes, case law and administrative procedures regarding Provisional Voting and is near completion with this research.

**Progress:** We have completed the memorandum outlining Provisional Voting legislative changes since the 2004 election and we are continuing to clarify the laws prior to these changes.

**Challenges:** The variety in the form and frequency of Provisional Voting legislation from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

**Work Plan:** The analysis of the information, data, and survey results concerning Provisional Voting was completed in September, on schedule. We are now revising it in response to comments by the Peer Review Group (PRG). We are also revising the alternatives document to reflect the critique of the PRG and the guidance from the EAC in response to the September 6 briefing.

**PREPARATION FOR AND EXPERIENCE WITH PROVISIONAL VOTING**

The Eagleton team has researched and compiled a narrative of each state’s experience with Provisional Voting in 2004. The report findings from the survey of 400 local election officials are now complete. The survey results have proven to be instrumental in shaping our
understanding of actual practice in administering Provisional Voting, including the steps local officials took to prepare for the election.

**PROVISIONAL VOTING NARRATIVES**

**Description:** To construct the narratives, a researcher examined newspaper accounts, state websites, and reports from third-party organizations to gather information on the experience with Provisional Voting in the 2004 election. To organize the information derived from this examination, we created an information system that catalogues information about the states (i.e. whether a state was new to Provisional Voting, the percentage of provisional votes counted, the method of notifying voters if their vote was counted, etc.) and combined it with Moritz’s collection and analysis of statutes, regulations and litigation.

**Progress:** We completed a state-by-state narrative of developments in Provisional Voting and distributed it to the EAC and the PRG. This work has been helpful in understanding the context of the data collected on provisional voting from the states.

**Challenges:** The primary obstacle to constructing the narratives was difficulty in communicating and obtaining necessary information from various state officials. As a result, the narratives underwent several revisions to incorporate up-to-date and reliable information. Now that so many other analyses, including the Election Day Survey, have been released, we were challenged by different interpretations of the same basic facts. But the reconciliation of interpretation and data collection has been invaluable in establishing rigor in our report.

**Work Plan:** We completed revisions of the narratives incorporating comments from the PRG.

**PROVISIONAL VOTING STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

**Description:** Throughout September the Eagleton research team revised and clarified its statistical analysis, and worked to reconcile the classifications of this analysis (such as states counting only those provisional ballots cast within the proper precinct versus states that counted ballots cast within the proper county) with the classification made in other parts of this study or in other studies (such as the Election Day Study or Electionline reports).

**Progress:** In response to comments from the PRG, we have clarified and sharpened the presentation on the methods used and results achieved in the statistical analysis. We have double checked the classification of variables upon which the study is based and reconciled differences in various areas of the overall study. This effort is nearing completion.

**Challenges:** The difficulties encountered have been a result of communication delays and time constraints. Overall, these are not problems or hindrances, but simply slow down the process.
Work Plan: In mid-October we aim to complete a final revision of the statistical analysis and a full reconciliation of all data within the study.

SURVEY OF COUNTY ELECTION OFFICIALS

Description: The Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (CPIP) conducted a national survey of county election officials to measure several aspects of Provisional Voting.

Progress: The analysis of the survey results and findings report is complete. As a result of the critique by the PRG, the research team is revising and clarifying the descriptions of the survey design and sample selection process to make the research methods more transparent.

Work Plan: We used the information from the survey in drafting the analysis and alternatives document required under Task 3.5. We will include necessary clarifications regarding survey design and sample selection in the final analysis and alternatives document.

Peer Review Group
Most members of the PRG met by telephone conference on September 21 to comment on all the research described above. Participating in the meeting were Michael Alvarez, Martha Kropf, Dan Lowenstein, Peter Verniero, Brad Smith, and Tim Storey. Timothy O’Rourke contributed his comments separately. The group provided a detailed critique of our approach, methods, and conclusions, and we are now revising each document in response to the comments and suggestions. It praised the quality of the work and the rigor of much of the analysis. A summary of the suggestions from the members of the PRG is attached to this report.

Challenges and Work Plan
Making arrangements for review of drafts by the PRG and by the EAC has taken longer than anticipated by the Work Plan. The schedule called for all research and analysis to have been completed and incorporated into a Draft Preliminary Guidance Document by mid September. The review process by the EAC and PRG took longer than contemplated by the Work Plan. And we now understand that the EAC will make a separate decision --that will require additional time-- whether to issue a Guidance Document or recommendations for best practices. It has not, therefore, been possible to schedule a public hearing or arrange for review of our work by the EAC’s advisory boards, as called for in the Work Plan. We now aim to complete our reports and recommendations for guidance by the end of October, and to then await a response from the EAC before scheduling submission to the advisory boards or making arrangements for a hearing.
VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The contract lists 7 tasks (3.10 – 3.16) related to Voter Identification Requirements. The research on Voter ID requirements is proceeding concurrently with our work on the experience of Provisional Voting, and is becoming the principal focus of our research.

Task 3.10: Legislation, regulations, and litigation

The research team at the Moritz College of Law has the lead responsibility for the collection and analysis of legislation, administrative procedures and litigation with regard to Voter Identification Requirements. This collection of material is nearing completion. It will constitute the compendium of legislation, administrative regulations, and case law called for under this task.

Description: The Moritz team has compiled statutes on Voter Identification, and will provide a summarized analysis of this research to the project team for review.

Progress: The 50 State (plus the District of Columbia) chart has been completed, the voter identification statutes have been collected for all states and D.C., and summaries of the existing voter identification statutes have been written for all states and D.C.

Challenges: Identifying the relevant statutes has been challenging because of the different terminology used from state to state to codify voter identification issues, and because many states have scattered election law provisions throughout their codes. This variety from state to state makes creating a snap-shot view across states a challenge.

Work Plan: Analysis of voter identification data will begin now.

SUPPLEMENTS TO LEGAL ANALYSIS

To supplement the legal analysis, the Eagleton team is undertaking two research efforts: First, compiling information on the debate over voter ID in the states; and second, estimating the effect on turnout of different voter ID regimes. Tracking the continuing political debate over voter identification reveals that the relatively narrow HAVA requirements for voter identification have apparently sparked in many states a broader concern and a sharp political debate over rigorous identification requirements for all voters. The research follows these developments both to monitor possible secondary effects of HAVA on voter ID, and to provide a rich collection of alternative approaches for consideration.

Individual narratives for the states with significant activity in voter ID will provide a resource for understanding the wide range of experience in the 2004 election. The narratives will include an appraisal of the prevalence and nature of vote fraud, a focus of the concern with increasing the rigor of voter ID requirements. We understand that the EAC has issued a
research contract that will focus on vote fraud and vote suppression. Our research in this area will be limited to developing an understanding of the tradeoffs between ballot security and access to the ballot. We have completed the basic database on voter identification issues has been completed, and the next key step will be drafting the first narratives.

**VOTER ID AND TURNOUT ANALYSIS**

The second supplemental analysis will provide objective information on a contentious feature of the debate over voter ID in the states: the effects of more rigorous voter ID regimes on voter turnout and the relationship between the voter ID regime and vote fraud. As part of this effort, Eagleton is undertaking a statistical analysis to gauge the effect of a state’s voter ID regime on turnout, especially turnout by minority and elderly voters.

**Description:** We have created a database and gathered statistics on the effects of state-level voter identification requirements on voter turnout at the county-level in the 2004 election.

**Progress:** The collection of data for the Voter ID-Turnout analysis is complete. The assembled database contains population demographic data, voter registration data and voter turnout data from all 50 states, 3113 Counties, and the District of Columbia. We have also utilized exit poll data collected on Election Day 2004 as a resource for understanding the demographics of voter turnout.

**Challenges:** The analysis of these data has been postponed until the data reconciliation of Provisional Voting is complete. The main challenge now is an issue of time management. As a result of the extensive revision and data reconciliation efforts aimed at the Provisional Voting section of our work VID has been temporarily placed on hold.

**Work Plan:** The analysis of the impact that voter identification requirements have upon voter turnout should be completed by early November.


**PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

**PEER REVIEW GROUP**

**Description:** A feature of our proposal was the creation of a PRG. It reviews our research and methodology and provides valuable feedback and suggestions for the direction of our work.

**Progress:** The research team held its first conference call with PRG members on September 19, 2005. The research team will hold a workshop meeting on October 19, 2005 to address the PRG’s comments.

**Challenges:** To date we still have not heard back from two PRG Members.

**Projections:** Revisions and clarifications to our reports on Provisional Voting will be resolved by the end of October. We will need to schedule a second conference call to review our research with regard to Voter Identification Requirements in late November. As noted earlier, a summary of the comments we have received from the PRG is attached to this report.

**COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT**

Collecting and merging information and data from myriad sources is a demanding requirement of this research. We have developed two principal mechanisms to facilitate the analysis of the material collected or created in the project: an information system and an internal website for easy access to drafts and reports.

**INFORMATION SYSTEM**

**Description:** The statutory data and reports prepared by the Moritz College of Law is being merged with the political and procedural data and analysis prepared by the Eagleton Institute of Politics to provide a cohesive final product to the EAC, which will include a compendium of case law and statutes regarding Provisional Voting and voter identification.

**Progress:** At this point in the research process, many documents are complete after a lengthy process of circulating drafts among team members. We have reorganized our system by separating final drafts from earlier versions of documents, discarding dated files contained in the Information System, and updating the system as a whole.

**Projections:** The entire project team continues to use the Information System which contains the above referenced research, in working toward the preparation for our final reports to the EAC.

**INTRANET**
Description: All project team members have signed on to the Intranet site. The Intranet facilitates the exchange of information and collaboration among project participants.

Progress: Project team members regularly post drafts, completed materials and spreadsheets online for internal review. The intranet has helped team members and serves as an internal website with announcements and important documents readily available to all team members.

FINANCIAL REPORT

The financial reporting for this project is supervised and prepared by the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting (DGCA) at Rutgers. Financial reporting on grant accounts is limited to actual expenses that have been incurred during the reporting period. Our contact at DGCA is: Constance Bornheimer, (732) 932-0165, EXT. 2235.

A detail of expenses incurred from project September 1-September 30, 2005, will be sent under separate cover to: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer at the EAC.
Job Description

U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voter Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project Consultant

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) seeks to identify a senior-level project consultant to develop various project activities and studies related to U.S. election voter fraud and voter intimidation.

The consultant must have knowledge of voter fraud and intimidation along with an understanding of the complexities, nuances and challenges which surround the topics. The EAC is particularly interested in candidates with experience in elections, with public policy and the law. The consultant must be able to demonstrate an ability to approach the issues of voter fraud and intimidation in a balanced, nonpartisan fashion.

This consultant, whose contract would run for the period June-November, 2005, would be responsible for:

- Identifying and convening a working group of key individuals and organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voter fraud and intimidation;

- Developing a project scope of work and a project work plan related to voter fraud and intimidation;

- Authoring a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voter fraud and intimidation. The report will also include suggestions for specific activities the EAC may undertake around these topics.

From this initial research and exploration of these topics the consultant may be retained to help oversee research projects and contracts EAC may develop on the topics of voter fraud and intimidation.

EAC's consultant fees are competitive and are awarded based on the candidate's relevant background and experience.
STATUS OF PEER REVIEW GROUP RECRUITMENT
(As of August 17, 2005)
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Harvard Law School
Contributed $500 to NRCC in 2002 as per opensecrets.org and fec.gov
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Legislative Management Program
National Conference of State Legislatures
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Counsel
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(Former NJ Attorney General and Supreme Court Justice)
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Biographical Sketch
R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
Division of the Humanities and Social Sciences
California Institute of Technology
rma@hss.caltech.edu
http://www.hss.caltech.edu/rma/home.html
626-395-4422

R. Michael Alvarez was selected by Scientific American magazine to be on the 2004 "Scientific American 50" for his outstanding scientific and technological contributions to help improve the U.S. voting system. He has taught political science at Caltech since December 1992. He received his B.A. in political science in 1986 from Carleton College; he received his M.A. and Ph.D. from Duke University in 1990 and 1992, respectively. Alvarez was named an Associate Professor in April 1995, received tenure in June 1997, and was promoted to Professor in March 2002. Alvarez has focused most of his research and teaching on the study of electoral politics in the United States. His first book, Information and Elections, was published in the spring of 1997. This project examined the question of how much American voters know about presidential candidates and how they obtain that information. His second book, Hard Choices, Easy Answers (with John Brehm), is a study of American public opinion about divisive social and political issues. His recent book (published January 2004), Point, Click, and Vote: The Future of Internet Voting (with Thad E. Hall), published by Brookings Institution Press, examines the controversies swirling around the Internet voting in the United States. He has also published many articles on electoral behavior and public opinion in the United States and other advanced industrial democratic nations.

Alvarez has received a number of honors and grants for his work. He was named the "Emerging Scholar" by the American Political Science Association's Voting Behavior and Public Opinion Section in 2002. He was a John M. Olin Faculty Fellow (1994-95) as well as a John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Faculty Fellow (1994, 1997, 1999, 2002). Alvarez received the Sprague Award with John Brehm for their work on public opinion, and the Durr Award with Jonathan Nagler for their work on modeling elections. Also, Alvarez has received financial support for his research from the National Science Foundation, The IBM Corporation, The Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the Knight Foundation. Alvarez edits the Analytical Methods for Social Research book series and is on the editorial boards of a number of academic journals: American Journal of Political Science, American Politics Quarterly, Election Law Journal, Political Behavior, The Journal of Politics and Political Research Quarterly. He was the editor of The Political Methodologist, 1993-96.

Professor Alvarez is Co-Director of the Caltech-MIT Voting Technology Project, researching technological solutions to electoral problems, and is the Principal Investigator of the "Secure Electronic Registration and Voting Experiment" Evaluation. He has been an expert witness in a series of recent court cases, including California's defense of the blanket primary (California Democratic Party v. Jones), Bradley v. Compton, and Cano v. Davis. He has testified before a number of organizations, including the U.S. Senate. He was an outside consultant for Knight Ridder on their 2000 Hispanic Voter Poll, and in 2004 is a consultant to Greenberg, Quinlan, Rosner Research Inc. in their research on the Hispanic electorate. Alvarez is a frequent guest on Pasadena's National Public Radio affiliate, KPCC-FM, and writes opinion pieces for local newspapers. He has been interviewed for National Public Radio, Jim Lehrer's NewsHour, CNN, ABC, NBC News, and for many state, national and international newspapers.
Bradford R. Clark
Professor of Law

Email: bclark@law.gwu.edu
Telephone: (202) 994-2073
Fax: (202) 994-5654

Education: B.A., Florida State University; J.D., Columbia University

Biographical sketch: Before coming to the Law School in 1993, Professor Clark spent several years practicing law in the Washington, D.C., office of Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, where he specialized in appellate litigation. Previously, Professor Clark served as an attorney adviser in the Department of Justice's Office of Legal Counsel, where he provided legal advice to the president, the attorney general, and the heads of executive departments. Professor Clark also served as a law clerk to Judge Robert H. Bork of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit and to Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia. Professor Clark teaches and writes in the areas of civil procedure, constitutional law, and federal courts.

Current Semester Courses: Civil Procedure I, Law Review

© 2005 The George Washington University Law School
Pamela S. Karlan
Kenneth and Harle Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law

karlan@stanford.edu
650/725-4851

Education
• BA, Yale, 1980
• MA, Yale, 1984
• JD, Yale, 1984

Employment History
• Clerk to Judge Abraham D. Sofaer, U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, 1984-85; to Justice Harry A. Blackmun, U.S. Supreme Court, 1985-86
• Assistant Counsel, NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund, 1986-88; Cooperating Attorney, 1988–
• Associate Professor, U. of Virginia, 1988-93; Professor, 1994-98
• Visiting associate Professor, Yale, 1992; NYI 1993
• Visiting Professor, Harvard, 1994-95; Stanford 1996; U. of Virginia, 2002
• Joined the Stanford faculty in 1998; Academic Associate Dean, 1999-2000; Montgomery Professor, 1999–
• Commissioner, California State Fair Political Practices Commission, 2003—

Professional Affiliations
• Member, American Law Institute
• Cooperating Attorney, NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund
• Commissioner, California Fair Political Practices Commission

Honors and Awards
• University of Virginia All-University Outstanding Teaching Award, 1995-96
• State Council on Higher Education in Virginia

http://www.law.stanford.edu/faculty/karlan/
Outstanding Faculty Award, 1997
• The Public Sector 45, *American Lawyer*, 199
• John Bingham Hurlbut Award for Excellence in Teaching, Stanford, 2002

Principal Subjects
• Constitutional law
• Constitutional litigation
• Civil rights and antidiscrimination law
• Legal regulation of the political process
• The Supreme Court

Courses
• Constitutional Law I
• Constitutional Litigation
• Supreme Court Litigation Clinic
• Supreme Court Term

Curriculum Vitae

Selected Publications
• Civil Rights Actions: Enforcing the Constitution 2000 (with John C. Jeffries, Jr., Peter W. Low and George A. Rutherglen)
• "Easing the Spring: Strict Scrutiny and Affirmative Action After the Redistricting Cases," 43 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 1569 (2002) (Cutler Lecture)
Dr. Martha E. Kropf
Department of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
213 Haag Hall, 5100 Rockhill Road, Kansas City, MO 64110
(816) 235-5948; KropfM@umkc.edu

Appointment
University of Missouri-Kansas City, Assistant Professor of Political Science
(Research Methods, Urban Politics, American Government, Political Behavior)
August 1999-present.

Education
American University
Ph.D., Political Science, May 1998
Dissertation: “Viewers Like You: Community Norms and Contributions to Public Broadcasting”

Kansas State University
B.A. in Journalism and Political Science
Graduated in May 1991, Summa Cum Laude, Phi Beta Kappa

Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, Statistics Classes,
June/July 2000. Classes: “Maximum Likelihood Estimation” and “Scaling and Dimensional Analysis”

Past Employment
Project Coordinator, University of Maryland Survey Research Center
May 1997-July 1999
• Worked with all aspects of survey research, specializing in questionnaire design
• Worked directly with clients to design survey instruments
• Ensured that surveys were completed on schedule and within budget
• Coordinated projects for clients such as the Harvard School of Public Health, the Maryland Department of Public Health, and the Prince George’s County, MD Public Schools

Classes Taught
PS 302: Political Research and Analysis
PS 305: Survey Research and Analysis (Service Learning class)
PS 309: Public Opinion and Voting Behavior
PS 315: Public Policy
PS 438: Urban Politics
PS 505: Scope and Methods of Political Science (graduate level methodology)
PS 524: Urban Politics (graduate level)

Publications
Articles


Publications

Articles, continued


Book Chapters


**Publications**

**Articles Under Review**


**Book in Progress:**

Viewers Like You: Community Norms and Contributions to Public Broadcasting.

**Book Reviews**


**Monographs/Grant Reports**


Grants/Contracts

"Issue Advocacy and Soft Money in the 2004 Presidential Election in Missouri." Center for the Study of Elections and Democracy, Brigham Young University. Award: $8,450. (May 2004-February 2005). This award funds research concerning campaign activity in the presidential race in Missouri.

"Public Opinion Toward the Library in the Community." Kansas City, Missouri Public Library. Contract: $6,372. (January 2004-June 2004). This grant/contract funds the survey conducted by my class, "Survey Research and Analysis," which is a service learning class at UMKC.

"Explaining Unrecorded Votes in Elections." University of Missouri System Research Board Grant, Requested $48,468, Awarded $38,468 (with David Kimball).

"Issue Advocacy and Soft Money in the 2002 Missouri Senate Election." Center for the Study of Elections and Democracy, Brigham Young University. Award: $4400. (August 2002-February 2003). This award funds research concerning campaign activity in the Carnahan/Talent Senate race (with Dale A. Neuman).

"Voting and the Media: A New Look at Public Journalism." University of Missouri-Kansas City Faculty Research Grant, Award: $6,000. (December 2001-January 2003).
Grants/Contracts, continued...

"Kansas City Consensus Issue Identification Survey." University of Missouri-Kansas City, Center for the City, Faculty Knowledge Fund, Award: $5,815. (January 2002-May 2002). This award provided the funding for a survey conducted by my class "Survey Research and Analysis" for the Kansas City Consensus, a policy research and advocacy group.

"Invalidated Ballots in the 1996 Presidential Election: A County-Level Analysis." University of Missouri-Kansas City Research Incentive Fund, Award: $350. (April 2001). This award allowed me to purchase data for the voting equipment project.


Pending Grant Applications

"Ballot Design and Unrecorded Votes." (With David Kimball).
- Application submitted to Smith Richardson Foundation Domestic Public Policy Research Fellowship Program, June 2004 ($60,000).
- Application submitted to National Science Foundation, August 2004.

Conferences

Presentations


Conference Presentations, continued...


"Missouri's Legacy: Jean Carnahan and Her Run for Senate." Paper presented at the 2002 Southern Political Science Association Meeting, November 6-9, 2002, Savannah, GA.


Conference Presentations, continued...


"The Missouri Primary." Paper presented at the American Political Science Meeting, Washington, DC, August 31-September 2, 2000 (with E. Terrence Jones and Dale Neuman, with Sam Dreiling and Maureen Gilbride Mears).


"Viewers Like You: Community Norms and Contributions to Public Broadcasting." Paper presented at the 1997 Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action Annual Conference. December 4-6, 1997, Indianapolis, IN; also presented at the 1997 Southern Political Science Meeting, November 5-8, 1997, Norfolk, VA.


"Overworked, Overwrought and Underpaid: Teaching Students to Teach." Paper presented at the 68th Annual Southern Political Science Meeting, November 6-9, 1996, Atlanta, GA (with Julie Dolan, Marni Ezra and Karen O'Connor).


Chair and Discussant, "Mandates and State Violence." 60th Annual Midwest Political Science Association Meeting, April 28, 2002.


Offered Affidavit in Working Families, et. al v. New York City Board of Elections on behalf of the plaintiff (asked to participate by the Brennan Center for Justice, who was representing the plaintiff). (Summer 2003; case settled out of court. The NYC Board of Elections disabled the sensor latches on lever voting machines. The plaintiffs asked the Election Board to reconnect them.)

Offered Affidavit and Deposition in Stewart v. Blackwell, Ohio, on behalf of the plaintiffs, represented by the ACLU. (Fall 2003-present. In this lawsuit, the plaintiffs are asking the state and four counties to stop using punchcard ballots and optical scan voting equipment with central count ballots.)

Testified before the Blunt Commission on Electoral Reform, January 12, 2001, Hearings held at the University of Missouri-Kansas City

*Special Note: My colleague Stephen Knack testified before two United States Congressional Committees about our paper, "Who Uses Inferior Voting Technology?" (Committee on Rules and Administration, Hearing on Election Reform, and Committee on Governmental Affairs, Hearing on Federal Election Practices and Procedures).

American Association for Public Opinion Research
American Political Science Association
Midwest Political Science Association
Southern Political Science Association
Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research
Honors

- University of Missouri-Kansas City Faculty Scholar Award, 2004
- University of Missouri System New Faculty Teaching Scholar, 2001-2002
- Meriwether Lewis Fellow, University of Missouri-Kansas City, May 2001
- Selected for New Faculty Tour (University of Missouri System), 2000
- American University Award for Outstanding Scholarship at the Graduate Level (1998)
- American University School of Public Affairs Award for Outstanding Scholarship at the Graduate Level (1998)
- American University Dissertation Fellowship (1996)
- American University Dean's Scholar (1993-1996)
- Phi Beta Kappa, Pi Sigma Alpha, Mortar Board National Honor Society, Order of Omega

Professional Service

- Reviewer for *Journal of Politics, American Politics Review, Social Sciences Quarterly, American Journal of Political Science, Political Research Quarterly* and *State and Local Government Review*
- Reviewer for Lynne Rienner Publications
- Reviewer for University of Missouri System Research Board Grants

University Service

- Students in the City Steering Committee (Service Learning guidance), October 2003-present (Helped Select Service Learning Faculty Fellows for 2004).
- Selection Committee, Center for the City Faculty Knowledge Fund Grants, 2002-2003
- Search Committee, Research Director Joint Hire, College of Arts and Sciences and Center for the City, December 2002-May 2003.
- Search Committee, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, October 2001-March 2002.
- UMKC Faculty Council on Urban Affairs, May 2001-present.
- University of Missouri System New Faculty Teaching Scholar, 2001-2002.
- University Honors and Awards Advisory Board, 2002-present.
  (Soros Scholarship and Truman Scholarship Selection Committees)

Community Involvement

- "Public Opinion Toward the Library in the Community." Survey conducted for the Kansas City Public Library as a part of my Survey Research and Analysis Class, Spring 2004.
- Data Analysis for "By the People." National deliberative democracy experiment held in various locations around the nation. Organized data entry and conducted data analysis for KCPT-TV, Kansas City's PBS affiliate, January 2004.
- "Issue Identification Survey.” Conducted for Kansas City Consensus as a part of my Survey Research and Analysis Class. Spring 2002.

Community Activities

- Member, Central United Methodist Church. (on the Church and Society Committee).
- National Women's Political Caucus.
- Block Captain, 5700 of Harrison Street, Kansas City, MO

Family

- Husband: John Szmer
- Daughter: Gwendolyn Margaret Szmer, born September 26, 2003
Equal Rights Amendment

Equal Rights Amendment
An amendment to guarantee equal rights to women has still never been ratified and added to the U.S. Constitution, even though it was first introduced in 1923. The Equal Rights Amendment passed Congress in 1972 but lapsed in 1982 when it fell three states short of ratification.

Where we stand: The National Women's Political Caucus supports the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution. more...

Health Care for Women

Long-Term Care Insurance
Long-term care is required for many Americans with permanent disabilities and illnesses. Assisted living, whether at home or in a nursing home,...

Where we stand: The National Women's Political Caucus supports long-term care insurance for women. more...

Equality of insurance Benefits
A majority of insurance companies do not provide coverage for essential services, such as contraceptive drugs and devices. Contraceptives are a...

Where we stand: The National Women's Political Caucus supports mandatory coverage of family planning, including contraceptive drugs and devices. more...

Prescription Drug Coverage by Medicare
In December of 2003 Congress passed a law creating a Medicare prescription drug discount card, allowing those eligible for Medicare to receive...

Where we stand: The National Women's Political Caucus supports full coverage of prescription drugs by Medicare. more...

Judicial Appointments

Pro-Choice Judicial Nominees
In January of 1973 the Supreme Court legalized abortion, giving women the right to choose. The right to choose has been attacked recently,...

Where we stand: The National Women's Political Caucus supports pro-choice judicial nominees who will uphold Roe v. Wade and continue to give women the right to choose. more...

Reproductive Choice

Mandatory Waiting Periods for Abortions
Mandatory waiting periods require women seeking abortions to wait for a period of time before the procedure may be performed. Generally, a...

Where we stand: The National Women's Political Caucus supports a woman's access to abortions without unnecessary hassle and delay. more...

International Human Rights for Women
Women are often the target of human rights violations specifically because they are women. Violence and sexual abuse in the home is still...

Where we stand: The National Women's Political Caucus supports human rights for all women across the globe, so that women may live in a free society. more...

RU486
In 2000, the Food and Drug Administration approved RU486, more commonly known as the abortion pill. RU486 is a non-surgical pill that enables...

Where we stand: The National Women's Political Caucus supports availability of RU486 and emergency contraception. The NWPC does not support pharmacists who determine who can and cannot receive them. more...

Violence Against Women Act

Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization 2005
The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 2000 expires in 2005 and the remarkable gains we've made in ending domestic and sexual violence could come to a halt if Congress does not act quickly.

Where we stand: The National Women's Political Caucus supports the reauthorization and funding of the Violence Against Women Act. more...

Women and Education

Sex Education
Sex education provides accurate information on healthy relationships, peer pressure, contraception and abstinence in order for youth to use...

Where we stand: The National Women's Political Caucus supports comprehensive sex education that allows youth to know all of their options and make informed decisions. more...

Equal Pay
The Equal Pay Act of 1963 worked to end the pay differential that exists between men and women. The act made it illegal for employers to pay...

Where we stand: The National Women's Political Caucus supports equal pay for everyone, regardless of sex or race. more...

Women and Politics

Campaign Finance Reform
The total cost of the presidential and congressional campaigns in 2004 was just under $4 billion, up almost $1 billion from 2000. in...
Where we stand: The National Women's Political Caucus supports campaign finance reform that levels the playing field for candidates to run for office. more...

Working Families

Family Leave Act
The Family Leave Act mandated that an employer must allow an employee to take off up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave in a year in order to care for...

Where we stand: The National Women's Political Caucus supports the Family Leave Act and would like to see an expansion of its coverage. more...

A Living Wage
A living wage would increase the income of low wage earners so that they may be able to support their family without additional government...

Where we stand: The National Women's Political Caucus supports the adoption of a national living wage. more...
Daniel Hays Lowenstein

Biography

Daniel Hays Lowenstein
Professor of Law
Born New York, New York, 1943
A.B. Yale, 1964
LL.B. Harvard, 1967
UCLA Law faculty since 1979
lowenstein@law.ucla.edu

Daniel Lowenstein teaches Election Law, Statutory Interpretation & Legislative Process, Political Theory, and Law & Literature. A leading expert on election law, he has represented members of the House of Representatives in litigation regarding reapportionment and the constitutionality of term limits. He is a member of the Board of Directors of the award-winning theatre troupe Interact and regularly brings the company to the School of Law to perform plays with legal themes, such as Sophocles' Antigone, Ibsen's Rosmerholm, and Wouk's The Caine Mutiny Court Martial.

Professor Lowenstein worked as a staff attorney at California Rural Legal Assistance for two and one-half years. While working for California's Secretary of State, Edmund G. Brown Jr. in 1971, he specialized in election law, and was the main drafter of the Political Reform Act, an initiative statute that California voters approved in 1974, thereby creating a new Fair Political Practices Commission. Governor Brown appointed Professor Lowenstein as first chairman of the Commission. He has served on the national governing board of Common Cause and has been a board member and a vice president of Americans for Nonsmokers' Rights.

Professor Lowenstein's textbook, Election Law (1995), appears to be the first text on American election law since 1877. He has written on such topics as campaign finance, redistricting, bribery, initiative elections, political parties, commercial speech, and The Merchant of Venice.

For information on Interact, click on:
http://www.interactla.org/

Professor Lowenstein represented certain plaintiffs in California Prolife Council PAC v. Scully, challenging California regulations of slate mail. For a pdf file containing the March 1, 2001, order of U.S. District Judge Lawrence K. Karlton declaring these regulations unconstitutional, use the following link:
http://www.law.ucla.edu/faculty/bios/lowenstein/slatemailorder.pdf

Read Professor Lowenstein's 10/02/2003 Daily Journal article: "Valid Ballot – Panel Exploited Precedent to Rationalize Postponement of Recall Vote".
John F. Manning

Professor of Law

Office: Griswold Hall 301
Assistant: Margaret Flynn 496-5487
Phone: (617) 495-5547
Email: jmanning@law.harvard.edu

Research Interests

- Administrative Law
- Federal Courts
- Separation of Powers
- Statutory Interpretation

Education

- Harvard College A.B. Summa Cum Laude 1982, History
- Harvard Law School J.D. Magna Cum Laude 1985

Appointments

- Professor of Law, 2004

Representative Publications
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View bibliography
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- Professors and Assistant Professors of Law
- Professors Emeriti
- Adjunct Professors of Law
- Visiting Professors of Law
- Lecturers on Law
- Alphabetic Faculty Listing

Related Links:

- Faculty Bibliography Search
Individual Contributions Arranged By Type, Giver, Then Recipient

Contributions to Political Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Giver</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Contribution ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANNING, JOHN F.</td>
<td>BROCKTON, MA 02302</td>
<td></td>
<td>NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE CONTRIBUTIONS</td>
<td>11/11/2002</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>22992974691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANNING, JOHN F.</td>
<td>DORCHESTER, MA 02125</td>
<td>UMASS/SOCIAL WORKER</td>
<td>VIA STEPHEN F. LYNCH FOR CONGRESS COMMITTEE</td>
<td>03/26/2002 (Dem)</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>22990614443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Contributions: 750.00

TRY A: NEW QUERY
RETURN TO: FEC HOME PAGE

??
Not sure which one is on the peer review group

015681

http://query.nictusa.com/cgi-bin/qind/
Results:
2 records found in 0.1875 seconds.

Search Criteria:
Donor name: manning, john f  
Cycle(s) selected: 2006, 2004, 2002

Start another search

Total for this search: $750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributor</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANNING, JOHN F</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/11/2002</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>National Republican Cong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROCKTON,MA 02302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANNING, JOHN F</td>
<td>UMASS/SOCIAL</td>
<td>3/26/2002</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>Lynch, Stephen F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORCHESTER,MA 02125</td>
<td>WORKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DR. RONALD D. MICHAELSON

Residence

Personal

Marital Status - Married with 2 children
U.S. Citizen

Education

Bachelor of Arts, Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL 1963
M.A. in Political Science, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL 1965
Ph.D. in Government, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 1970

Professional Experience

Political Consultant, June, 2003 to present
Current clients include the Sangamon County Clerk, the Chicago Board of
Election Commissioners and Strategic Marketing and Mailing, Champaign, IL

Visiting Professor of Political Studies – University of Illinois at Springfield,
January 2005 to present

015833
Executive Director/Illinois State Board of Elections

March, 1976 to May, 2003. The Executive Director has complete administrative and supervisory responsibility for the day-to-day operations of the entire agency which includes a staff of 65 and a budget of approximately $9 million.

Director of Administration/Illinois State Board of Elections

September, 1974 to March, 1976. The Director of Administration had line responsibility for all administrative affairs and policies of the Board, including budget preparation and fiscal control, personnel, systems and procedures, and office management.

Assistant to the Vice President of Academic Affairs and Assistant Professor of Public Affairs/Sangamon State University, Springfield.

February, 1973 to September, 1974. This position included involvement with several key academic issues such as tenure, faculty recruitment, budgeting, grants and contracts as well as a 12-hour teaching load.

Assistant to the Governor/Illinois Governor Richard B. Ogilvie

January, 1969 to January, 1973. This position included policy development work in a number of substantive areas as well as legislative relations, speech writing, and a variety of other administrative and management duties.

PUBLICATIONS


**Teaching Appointments**

Adjunct Professor of Public Affairs at University of Illinois at Springfield, teaching courses in the areas of political studies and public affairs. Began in 1970.

Visiting Professor at Wheaton College (Illinois), teaching courses on an available basis in the political science department. Not a current appointment.

**Professional Associations**
1. Advisory Committee of the Federal Election Commission - past member.

2. Council on Governmental Ethics Laws - Member and past National Chairman.

3. American Society for Public Administration - Member and Past President of the Central Illinois Chapter.


5. The Election Center - member of its Professional Education Committee.
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Assistant to the Governor/Illinois Governor Richard B. Ogilvie

January, 1969 to January, 1973. This position included policy development work in a number of substantive areas as well as legislative relations, speech writing, and a variety of other administrative and management duties.

PUBLICATIONS


Teaching Appointments

Adjunct Professor of Public Affairs at University of Illinois at Springfield, teaching courses in the areas of political studies and public affairs. Began in 1970.

Visiting Professor at Wheaton College (Illinois), teaching courses on an available basis in the political science department. Not a current appointment.

Professional Associations
1. Advisory Committee of the Federal Election Commission - past member.

2. Council on Governmental Ethics Laws - Member and past National Chairman.

3. American Society for Public Administration - Member and Past President of the Central Illinois Chapter.


5. The Election Center - member of its Professional Education Committee.

Awards

Abigail Thernstrom is a Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute in New York, a member of the Massachusetts State Board of Education, and a commissioner on the United States Commission on Civil Rights. She received her Ph.D. from the Department of Government, Harvard University, in 1975.

Thernstrom and her husband, Harvard historian Stephan Thernstrom, are the co-authors of *America in Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible* (Simon & Schuster), which the *New York Times Book Review*, in its annual end-of-the-year issue, named as one of the notable books of 1997. They are currently working on a new book: *Getting the Answers Right: The Racial Gap in Academic Achievement and How to Close It*.


Her frequent media appearances have included Fox News Sunday, Good Morning America, the Jim Lehrer News Hour, Both Sides with Jesse Jackson, and Black Entertainment Television. For some years, she was a stringer for The Economist, and continues to write frequently for a variety of journals and newspapers, including *Commentary*, The Wall Street Journal, The New York Times, The Washington Post, and The Public Interest.

She serves on several boards: the Center for Equal Opportunity, and the Institute for Justice, among others. From 1992 to 1997 she was a member of the Aspen Institute's Domestic Strategy Group.

President Clinton chose her as one of three authors to participate in his first "town meeting" on race in Akron, Ohio, on December 3, 1997, and she was part of a small group that met with the President again in the Oval Office on December 19th.
John Samples

Director, Center for Representative Government

John Samples directs Cato's Center for Representative Government, which studies campaign finance regulation, delegation of legislative authority, term limits, and the political culture of limited government and the civic virtues necessary for liberty. He is an adjunct professor at Johns Hopkins University. Prior to joining Cato, Samples served eight years as director of Georgetown University Press, and before that, as vice president of the Twentieth Century Fund. He has published scholarly articles in Society, History of Political Thought, and Telos. Samples has also been featured in mainstream publications like USA Today, the New York Times, and the Los Angeles Times. He has appeared on NPR, Fox News Channel, and MSNBC. Samples received his Ph.D. in political science from Rutgers University.

Speaking Topics

- Campaign Finance
- Congress
- Elections
- Election Law
- Enumerated Powers
- Federalism
- Politics and Political Parties
- Presidency
- Public Opinion
- Separation of Powers
- Term Limits
- 1st Amendment (free speech, church and state)
- 10th Amendment (enumerated powers)

Selected Media Appearances

Audio of Tom Palmer and John Samples at James Madison University. [Windows Media]

John Samples discusses campaign finance on MSBC's Barnicle. [Real Media]

Books


Studies


Opinion and Commentary

"Mr. Smith Leaves Washington," American Spectator (Online), August 24, 2005

"Happy Days," Spectator.org, June 9, 2005

"Your Blog Will Be Investigated Soon," American Spectator, May 10, 2005


"Dial Down Corruption Fears: Media will expose lawmakers whose relatives don't deserve pay," USA Today, April 19, 2005
John C. Fortier
Research Fellow

Fortier studies politics, the presidency, continuity of government, elections, the electoral college, election reform, and presidential succession and disability. He is the executive director of the Continuity of Government Commission, and is a weekly columnist for The Hill.

Professional Experience
-Executive director, Continuity of Government Commission, 2002-present
-Project manager, Transition to Governing Project, AEI, 1998-2003
-Member, Presidency Research Career Service Award Committee, American Political Science Association, 2004
-Participant, National Election Initiative, Constitution Project, 2001-2002

Education
Ph.D., Boston College
B.A., Georgetown University

Articles and Short Publications
Black Legislators' New Era
Senate Not Likely to Shift
Bush Has Lost Control of the Agenda

Books
After the People Vote

Events
How Is Bush Governing in His Second Term?
Torture for Intelligence in the Post-9/11 World
How Would Each Candidate Govern?

Speaking Engagements
Ensuring the Continuity of the United States Government
Bradley A. Smith
Professor of Law
B.A., cum laude, Kalamazoo College, 1980
J.D., cum laude, Harvard Law School, 1990

One of the nation's leading authorities on Election Law and Campaign Finance, Professor Smith returns to Capital after five years in Washington, D.C., where he served as Commissioner, Vice Chairman, and Chairman of the Federal Election Commission (FEC). Nominated by President Clinton in February of 2000 to fill a Republican-designated seat on the Commission, Professor Smith was confirmed by the Senate in May of 2000 and took his seat the following month. Prior to his nomination, Smith had become a fixture in the national discussion on campaign finance, and was called "the most sought after witness" when Congress considered campaign finance issues. His writings have appeared in such academic journals as the Yale Law Journal, Georgetown Law Journal, and Pennsylvania Law Review, and in popular publications such as the Wall Street Journal, USA Today, and National Review. In 2001, Princeton University Press published his book, "Unfree Speech: The Folly of Campaign Finance Reform," which was praised by syndicated columnist George Will as "the year's most important book on governance." The Times of London called it "a much needed dose of realism which has relevance far beyond America," and Publishers Weekly described it as "a marvelous contrarian view: moderate in tone, elegant in language, clever in argument." Named FEC Chairman in January 2004, Professor Smith oversaw implementation of the McCain-Feingold campaign finance bill, and successfully fought to increase due process protections for defendants in FEC enforcement actions. Professor Smith has spoken at over 30 of the nation's law schools, including Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Stanford, Chicago, Michigan, and NYU. His many media credits include national appearances on ABC, NBC, PBS, Fox, CNBC, MSNBC, C-Span, and Bloomberg Media, including such programs as Hardball with Chris Matthews, and the O'Reilly Factor. He has also appeared on numerous local and national radio programs, and made television appearances in Great Britain, Japan, and Canada.

Prior to joining Capital's faculty in 1993, he served as United States Vice Consul in Ecuador, and worked as an attorney for the law firm of Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease. He has also taught law at George Mason University. Professor Smith was the first Director of Capital's summer study abroad program in Greece, and from 1994 to 2000 served as co-Director of Capital's National Moot Court team with Professor Jeffrey Ferriell, winning six regional championships in the National Appellate Advocacy Competition or National Moot Court Competition. His teaching has included Election Law, Civil Procedure, Law & Economics, Jurisprudence, and Administrative Law.

[ View Publications ]

E-mail Professor Bradley A. Smith at bsmith@law.capital.edu.
Nelson Lund, Patrick Henry Professor of Constitutional Law and 2nd Amendment
B.A., St. John's College; M.A., Catholic University; A.M. and Ph.D., Harvard
University; J.D. University of Chicago

Contact:
• Phone: 703-993-8045
• Room: 4331
• Send an Email
• View Homepage

Subject(s) Taught:
Constitutional Law, Legislation

Curriculum Vitae (PDF)
Recent Publications
Working Papers

PATRICK HENRY PROFESSOR OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND THE
SECOND AMENDMENT NELSON LUND has written widely in the field of
classical law, including articles on constitutional interpretation, federalism,
separation of powers, the Second Amendment, the Commerce Clause, the Speech or
Debate Clause, the Equal Protection Clause, and the Uniformity Clause. In addition, he
has published articles in the fields of employment discrimination and civil rights, the
legal regulation of medical ethics, and the application of economic analysis to legal
institutions and legal ethics.

Professor Lund left the faculty of the University of Chicago to attend its law school,
where he served as executive editor of the University of Chicago Law Review and chapter
chairman of the Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Studies. After law school,
he held positions at the United States Department of Justice in the Office of the Solicitor
General and the Office of Legal Counsel. He also served as a law clerk to the Honorable
Patrick E. Higginbotham of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and
to the Honorable Sandra Day O'Connor of the United States Supreme Court. Following
his clerkship with Justice O'Connor, Professor Lund served in the White House as
associate counsel to the president from 1989 to 1992.

Since joining the faculty at George Mason, Professor Lund has taught Constitutional
Law, Legislation, Federal Election Law, Employment Discrimination, State and Local
Government, and seminars on the Second Amendment and on a variety of topics in
Jurisprudence.
Abigail Thernstrom is a Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute in New York, a member of the Massachusetts State Board of Education, and a commissioner on the United States Commission on Civil Rights. She received her Ph.D. from the Department of Government, Harvard University, in 1975.

Thernstrom and her husband, Harvard historian Stephan Thernstrom, are the co-authors of America in Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible (Simon & Schuster), which the New York Times Book Review, in its annual end-of-the-year issue, named as one of the notable books of 1997. They are currently working on a new book: Getting the Answers Right: The Racial Gap in Academic Achievement and How to Close It.

They are also the editors of a forthcoming volume, Beyond the Color Line: New Perspectives on Race and Ethnicity, and their lengthy review of William G. Bowen and Derek Bok's much-noticed book, The Shape of the River, appeared in the June 1999 issue of the UCLA Law Review.

Abigail Thernstrom's 1987 work, Whose Votes Count? Affirmative Action and Minority Voting Rights (Harvard University Press) won four awards, including the American Bar Association's Certificate of Merit, and the Anisfield-Wolf prize for the best book on race and ethnicity. It was named the best policy studies book of that year by the Policy Studies Organization (an affiliate of the American Political Science Association), and won the Benchmark Book Award from the Center for Judicial Studies.

Her frequent media appearances have included Fox News Sunday, Good Morning America, the Jim Lehrer News Hour, Both Sides with Jesse Jackson, and Black Entertainment Television. For some years, she was a stringer for The Economist, and continues to write frequently for a variety of journals and newspapers, including Commentary, The Wall Street Journal, The New York Times, The Washington Post, and The Public Interest.

She serves on several boards: the Center for Equal Opportunity, and the Institute for Justice, among others. From 1992 to 1997 she was a member of the Aspen Institute's Domestic Strategy Group.

President Clinton chose her as one of three authors to participate in his first "town meeting" on race in Akron, Ohio, on December 3, 1997, and she was part of a small group that met with the President again in the Oval Office on December 19th.
John Samples

Director, Center for Representative Government

John Samples directs Cato's Center for Representative Government, which studies campaign finance regulation, delegation of legislative authority, term limits, and the political culture of limited government and the civic virtues necessary for liberty. He is an adjunct professor at Johns Hopkins University. Prior to joining Cato, Samples served eight years as director of Georgetown University Press, and before that, as vice president of the Twentieth Century Fund. He has published scholarly articles in Society, History of Political Thought, and Telos. Samples has also been featured in mainstream publications like USA Today, the New York Times, and the Los Angeles Times. He has appeared on NPR, Fox News Channel, and MSNBC. Samples received his Ph.D. in political science from Rutgers University.

Media Contact: 202-789-5200
To Book a Speaking Engagement: 202-789-5226
E-Mail: jsamples@cato.org

Speaking Topics

- Campaign Finance
- Congress
- Elections
- Election Law
- Enumerated Powers
- Federalism
- Politics and Political Parties
- Presidency
- Public Opinion
- Separation of Powers
- Term Limits
- 1st Amendment (free speech, church and state)
- 10th Amendment (enumerated powers)

Selected Media Appearances

Audio of Tom Palmer and John Samples at James Madison University. [Windows Media]

John Samples discusses campaign finance on MSBC's Bacle. [Real Media]

Books


Studies


[View All Studies]

Opinion and Commentary
"Mr. Smith Leaves Washington," American Spectator (Online), August 24, 2005

"Happy Days," Spectator.org, June 9, 2005

"Your Blog Will Be Investigated Soon," American Spectator, May 10, 2005


"Dial Down Corruption Fears: Media will expose lawmakers whose relatives don't deserve pay," USA Today, April 19, 2005

[View All Opinion and Commentary]
John C. Fortier
Research Fellow

Fortier studies politics, the presidency, continuity of government, elections, the electoral college, election reform, and presidential succession and disability. He is the executive director of the Continuity of Government Commission, and is a weekly columnist for The Hill.

Professional Experience
-Executive director, Continuity of Government Commission, 2002-present
-Project manager, Transition to Governing Project, AEI, 1998-2003
-Member, Presidency Research Career Service Award Committee, American Political Science Association, 2004
-Participant, National Election Initiative, Constitution Project, 2001-2002

Education
Ph.D., Boston College
B.A., Georgetown University

Articles and Short Publications
Black Legislators’ New Era
Senate Not Likely to Shift
Bush Has Lost Control of the Agenda

Books
After the People Vote.

Events
How Is Bush Governing in His Second Term?
Torture for Intelligence in the Post-9/11 World
How Would Each Candidate Govern?

Speaking Engagements
Ensuring the Continuity of the United States Government
Bradley A. Smith
Professor of Law
B.A., cum laude, Kalamazoo College, 1980
J.D., cum laude, Harvard Law School, 1990

One of the nation's leading authorities on Election Law and Campaign Finance, Professor Smith returns to Capital after five years in Washington, D.C., where he served as Commissioner, Vice Chairman, and Chairman of the Federal Election Commission (FEC). Nominated by President Clinton in February of 2000 to fill a Republican-designated seat on the Commission, Professor Smith was confirmed by the Senate in May of 2000 and took his seat the following month. Prior to his nomination, Smith had become a fixture in the national discussion on campaign finance, and was called "the most sought after witness" when Congress considered campaign finance issues. His writings have appeared in such academic journals as the Yale Law Journal, Georgetown Law Journal, and Pennsylvania Law Review, and in popular publications such as the Wall Street Journal, USA Today, and National Review. In 2001, Princeton University Press published his book, "Unfree Speech: The Folly of Campaign Finance Reform," which was praised by syndicated columnist George Will as "the year's most important book on governance." The Times of London called it "a much needed dose of realism which has relevance far beyond America," and Publishers Weekly described it as "a marvelous contrarian view: moderate in tone, elegant in language, clever in argument." Named FEC Chairman in January 2004, Professor Smith oversaw implementation of the McCain-Feingold campaign finance bill, and successfully fought to increase due process protections for defendants in FEC enforcement actions. Professor Smith has spoken at over 30 of the nation's law schools, including Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Stanford, Chicago, Michigan, and NYU. His many media credits include national appearances on ABC, NBC, PBS, Fox, CNBC, MSNBC, C-Span, and Bloomberg Media, including such programs as Hardball with Chris Matthews, and the O'Reilly Factor. He has also appeared on numerous local and national radio programs, and made television appearances in Great Britain, Japan, and Canada.

Prior to joining Capital's faculty in 1993, he served as United States Vice Consul in Ecuador, and worked as an attorney for the law firm of Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease. He has also taught law at George Mason University. Professor Smith was the first Director of Capital's summer study abroad program in Greece, and from 1994 to 2000 served as co-Director of Capital's National Moot Court team with Professor Jeffrey Ferriell, winning six regional championships in the National Appellate Advocacy Competition or National Moot Court Competition. His teaching has included Election Law, Civil Procedure, Law & Economics, Jurisprudence, and Administrative Law.

[ View Publications ]

E-mail Professor Bradley A. Smith at bsmith@law.capital.edu.
Nelson Lund, Patrick Henry Professor of Constitutional Law and 2nd Amendment
B.A., St. John's College; M.A., Catholic University; A.M. and Ph.D., Harvard
University; J.D. University of Chicago

Contact:
• Phone: 703-993-8045
• Room: 433i
• Send an Email
• View Homepage

Subject(s) Taught:
Constitutional Law, Legislation

Curriculum Vitae (PDF)
Recent Publications
Working Papers

PATRICK HENRY PROFESSOR OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND THE
SECOND AMENDMENT NELSON LUND has written widely in the field of
constitutional law, including articles on constitutional interpretation, federalism,
separation of powers, the Second Amendment, the Commerce Clause, the Speech or
Debate Clause, the Equal Protection Clause, and the Uniformity Clause. In addition, he
has published articles in the fields of employment discrimination and civil rights, the
legal regulation of medical ethics, and the application of economic analysis to legal
institutions and legal ethics.

Professor Lund left the faculty of the University of Chicago to attend its law school,
where he served as executive editor of the University of Chicago Law Review and chapter
chairman of the Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Studies. After law school,
he held positions at the United States Department of Justice in the Office of the Solicitor
General and the Office of Legal Counsel. He also served as a law clerk to the Honorable
Patrick E. Higginbotham of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and
to the Honorable Sandra Day O'Connor of the United States Supreme Court. Following
his clerkship with Justice O'Connor, Professor Lund served in the White House as
associate counsel to the president from 1989 to 1992.

Since joining the faculty at George Mason, Professor Lund has taught Constitutional
Law, Legislation, Federal Election Law, Employment Discrimination, State and Local
Government, and seminars on the Second Amendment and on a variety of topics in
Jurisprudence.

Racial Identity and Political Association: Why the Racial Gerrymandering Cases Violate the Associational Rights of Voters of Color, 91 Cal. L. Rev. 1209 (received First Honorable Mention at the AALS Scholarly Paper Competition January 2003)


Non-Academic Publications
Should Single-Member Districting be Held Unconstitutional, February 5, 2004 Findlaw.com

Why the Federal Election Commission Should not Limit Contributions to Political Issue Organizations, April 2004 Findlaw.com
Guy-Uriel E. Charles

Russell M. and Elizabeth M. Bennett Associate Professor of Law
Faculty Affiliate, Center for the Study of Political Psychology, University of Minnesota
Senior Fellow in Law and Politics, Institute for Race and Poverty, University of Minnesota Law School
Spring Arbor University, B.A. cum laude
University of Michigan Law School, J.D.

Guy-Uriel E. Charles joined the University of Minnesota in the Fall of 2000. He clerked for The Honorable Damon J. Keith of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and has taught as an Adjunct Professor at the University of Toledo School of Law prior to joining the University of Minnesota. He was Editor-in-Chief of the Michigan Journal of Race and Law.


He was a member of the National Research Commission on Elections and Voting and the Century Foundation Working Group on Election Reform.

In the Spring of 2005, he will be the James S. Carpentier Visiting Professor of Law, at Columbia University of Law.

He is a frequent television, print, and radio commentator on issues relating to constitutional law, election law, campaign finance, redistricting, politics, and race.

WORKS-IN-PROGRESS
Race, Representation, and Redistricting
Reexamining Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act (with Prof. Luis Fuentes-Rohwer)

FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS
Regulating Section 527 Organizations (with Prof. Gregg Polsky) (forthcoming George Washington Law Review)

PUBLICATIONS


November 27, 2006

Chairman Paul DeGregorio  
Commissioner Donetta L. Davidson  
Commissioner Gracia M. Hillman  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Fax: (202) 566-3127

Dear Commissioners:

Last month, People For the American Way launched a petition drive asking the Election Assistance Commission to release a report written months ago that reportedly pokes holes in the widespread myth that voter fraud is rampant in America. Allegations of voter fraud have led to restrictive voting requirements that we know disenfranchise eligible voters.

EAC Chairman Paul S. DeGregorio denied our request to make the taxpayer-funded findings available to the public in time for the mid-term elections earlier this month.

Over 12,000 People For the American Way members and activists across the country have signed our petition asking that the report be made available to the public. Any information that can help make our elections fair and open should be made available to the public. We need to solve the problems in our electoral system, not create new and unnecessary barriers to voting.

Sincerely,

Elliot Mincberg  
Legal Director, People For the American Way
November 27, 2006

Dear EAC Commissioners,

The report commissioned by the EAC and drafted by voting experts must be released to the public - with public hearings to follow.

In light of the disenfranchising legislation that is being passed to fix a problem that the report's researchers apparently found insignificant, it is unconscionable and undemocratic for you to keep these findings from the public.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>Address Line 2</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Cullinane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Cullinane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Gilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Hutton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Macchia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Steele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Sundquist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doug</td>
<td>blankensop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Ferrell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel</td>
<td>McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mario</td>
<td>miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consuelo</td>
<td>Goldman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha</td>
<td>Buck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lana</td>
<td>Monteiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Purvis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Lamb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Parris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ernest</td>
<td>burson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c richey</td>
<td>martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAROLD</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jeanne M.</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>Norton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francine</td>
<td>Hasenbein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Shreve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel M.</td>
<td>Beck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>Rudd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Rudd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Shackelford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td>Broyles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Lamberth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott W</td>
<td>Beckett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye</td>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Trapp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Bassett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian</td>
<td>Beckerie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thomas</td>
<td>boyles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamison</td>
<td>Dupree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christa</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Viering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Parenteau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>McNulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>DelWille</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Harwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennie</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doris</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Char</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Hegwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Yates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Jensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Bridgers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharon</td>
<td>knittel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Terbot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alf</td>
<td>Covey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey</td>
<td>Ahring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Offutt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Saunders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delnita</td>
<td>Foust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas M.</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Fitzpatrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda</td>
<td>Stephens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Winters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Riley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Hoeffer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Cooksey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Guthrie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Hearn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Bartos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>Blanchard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melba</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>McCoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Vining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Zirger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marcia</td>
<td>wallace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Sitton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Cother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne and Ch</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Idlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene</td>
<td>Shumate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Greig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Busby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jeanna</td>
<td>ray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoxAnna</td>
<td>Burkhart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>LeDuc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Kearney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Njos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Njos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Hagstrom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Carol</td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Chestnut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Haskin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Nolan</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Cote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>McClain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>Ruppert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey</td>
<td>Sherman-Gin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leticia</td>
<td>Summers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Woien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerri</td>
<td>Bedell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Cooperrider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amparo</td>
<td>Grigera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Merkl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Singer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Tyson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bret</td>
<td>Belko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris</td>
<td>Maley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Maley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray R</td>
<td>Susser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Sandy</td>
<td>Zinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Nichole</td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Lorenzi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Schillaci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Bartholomew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty</td>
<td>Bonillas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Delahoyde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan</td>
<td>Delahoyde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Forkner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Mukey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William K</td>
<td>Noble Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Rowe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Schiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette</td>
<td>Weis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Michaels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Michaelsz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>Decker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro</td>
<td>Ampuero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro J</td>
<td>Ampuero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula J</td>
<td>Diverde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Mayo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Scady-Mayo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Walters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Favor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Woodbrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan</td>
<td>Atlee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlexandriA</td>
<td>Lupu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Mondschein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxanne</td>
<td>Kearns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Swiggers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>Ayers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Boe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri</td>
<td>Flores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marlene</td>
<td>keller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannine</td>
<td>Kuroatkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Lehnert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Orcutt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Soroka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Wyse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Booth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Espinosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Martindale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Luce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Melis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eithne</td>
<td>barton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elias</td>
<td>Batchelder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Belville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeane</td>
<td>Bendorf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Bertels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>DAMON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>FANCHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Fritz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerallee</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>Hawke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layne</td>
<td>Horwitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence</td>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laraine</td>
<td>Kaizer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Kuttner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Leibick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Levey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Madsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARILYN</td>
<td>McCROSSEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Mellott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic</td>
<td>Novielli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meera</td>
<td>Paskal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Perez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Poulson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Reagan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Reiter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Ritchey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane</td>
<td>Roewade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Romesburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Saint-Amour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Shipley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Shrader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terry</td>
<td>swann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Tranby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Trummer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Wedell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Wefers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Woolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Orovan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>hourican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Imbody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td>Bohrman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Burroughs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Grawey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen</td>
<td>Janes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou</td>
<td>Montiel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Perlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Walrafen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack M.</td>
<td>Wolter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Wolter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>D'Orazio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>D'Orazio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illian</td>
<td>hotten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Kimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal</td>
<td>Nigh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>Vangi-Stern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mike</td>
<td>antone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Beck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thierry</td>
<td>Deshayes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa</td>
<td>Goldberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalmon</td>
<td>Kaufer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOLFGANG</td>
<td>LEMME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Marquez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary T.</td>
<td>Metros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri</td>
<td>Pol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>scalzi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gail</td>
<td>sikes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Sinclaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRY</td>
<td>SINGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran</td>
<td>Sloan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Stahl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myna</td>
<td>Stroth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Tropp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ray</td>
<td>UNKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Whitley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joye</td>
<td>winston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Woodward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Dabcevch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chris</td>
<td>armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Baggs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove</td>
<td>Danu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gahlin</td>
<td>deriel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.B.</td>
<td>McClary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vito</td>
<td>Pantaleo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolf</td>
<td>Reinfried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Schermer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Schlossman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvel</td>
<td>Stalcup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne</td>
<td>Grill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Lavender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Dammann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>Dennie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>Diliberto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Gluck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Himler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Jensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Leeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>McAllister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>McDaniel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>McPeak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Mcdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Ormsbee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna</td>
<td>Trwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoAnn</td>
<td>Ulsas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Charette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardella</td>
<td>Enoch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward K</td>
<td>Horton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Kandell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milton</td>
<td>marshall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violet</td>
<td>martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edward</td>
<td>rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan/Tom</td>
<td>Spittler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Donat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Dorch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Erlenbach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Felice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Monefeldt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Wootten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Conway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>Dockery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Fanning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Felsinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>Herrero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Korbeck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare</td>
<td>Kronemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Olmsted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Saar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bill</td>
<td>webb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Wingo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene</td>
<td>Forcier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONNIE</td>
<td>DILLER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lynette</td>
<td>allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>Baron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Bauerle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Bernstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma</td>
<td>Bonilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robert</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Browning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William P</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Cain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liana</td>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Stephen</td>
<td>Cody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>susan</td>
<td>cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten</td>
<td>Cummins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Daider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therese</td>
<td>de Vet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>Decker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Emrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Ensign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloisa</td>
<td>Fasseur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Furst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Gilland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbara</td>
<td>goodman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Goosherst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Graf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cissy Ann</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Greer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Grove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taza</td>
<td>Guthrie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td>Hendrell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kevin</td>
<td>Horstman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine</td>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Jeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Keller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Kerrihard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Kligman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Kramer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Kravette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>Kreider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Lippel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lianda</td>
<td>Ludwig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Lustig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>McMahon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel</td>
<td>McMahon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Milne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Mueller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Mullarkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Muney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne M.</td>
<td>Murray, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Noggle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>O'Leary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Pearce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maria</td>
<td>perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorie</td>
<td>Pettigrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Prete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Sapio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl F.</td>
<td>Schroer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl F.</td>
<td>and Rd Schroer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>betty</td>
<td>Schuessler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Silverman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrick</td>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Spangler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Sterman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinne</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Ussishkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absalom</td>
<td>Valenzuela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Wernette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Wharton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlin</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Robison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry</td>
<td>Spradling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doris</td>
<td>Cassidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbie</td>
<td>O'Neill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maneesh</td>
<td>Pangasa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Dauphin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liliane</td>
<td>Farb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Gersh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Kohler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Greenspun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacki</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>Arrelli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pablo</td>
<td>Arriola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Carlise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Chen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Helperin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Keim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily</td>
<td>Leung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nils</td>
<td>Oihson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Pare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Rufo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas N.</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Polliastrini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>Caley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delia</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>Finley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoda</td>
<td>Slienger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Oliveau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidra</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Taeger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erif</td>
<td>Thunen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Witchner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Fuller</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauri</td>
<td>Fiedler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Morgan</td>
<td>Kousser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>McNeilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Milo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>Milo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES</td>
<td>SAUCER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquelyn</td>
<td>Beerman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Ross-Brooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Mckenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Sderstrom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Beckett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Sties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>Zahiller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allene</td>
<td>Linden Swienko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Kinz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert</td>
<td>Bender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td>Goitein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Mirsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Whitaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Fillbrandt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etta</td>
<td>Robin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Vosburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>margaret</td>
<td>draper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Kalland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy</td>
<td>Moon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Bollock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Farbstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Masck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Sadler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>margaret</td>
<td>Sadler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Reilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maris</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Basart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>Behrsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Bertelsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>Bigler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Bogley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td>Booraem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Boyd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine</td>
<td>Brende</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jane</td>
<td>Brimhall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Burch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>Casalaina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Cato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>Conly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theodora</td>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoda</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marc</td>
<td>davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Dresser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bita</td>
<td>edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne-Lise</td>
<td>Francois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Gere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Godes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sheila</td>
<td>goldmacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>Gonzalez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryn</td>
<td>Graves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma J F</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>Haugan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>Herrera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Hildebrandt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winona</td>
<td>Holl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>Holton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Hutson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Kane, D.D.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Knabb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Krizack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Lea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Lowry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marianne</td>
<td>metallo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanti</td>
<td>Morell-Hart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris</td>
<td>Muller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Mundstock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lia</td>
<td>Munoz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul &quot;Pablo&quot;</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Owen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Perlmuter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karma</td>
<td>Pippin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. RL</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Roden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Rosenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Sells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Sequeira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noemi</td>
<td>Sicherman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Skolnick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Slater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sally</td>
<td>sommer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoebe ANNE</td>
<td>sorgen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelma</td>
<td>Soriano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbie</td>
<td>Steinhart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Steinhart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Vaeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo</td>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Watt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Wiener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Wozniak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tse-Sung</td>
<td>Wu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>Quin Yarbro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Priven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>christopher</td>
<td>drozd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jon</td>
<td>grutman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellie</td>
<td>Leichter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Lorenzana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Taaffe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles M.</td>
<td>Weisenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Koerner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Costello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Laufer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rev. Dr. Nagy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Yelland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascencia</td>
<td>Cuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>Ewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>MacLeod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Cookston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>Jara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valerie</td>
<td>hafner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathe</td>
<td>Romano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deirdre</td>
<td>brownell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.M.</td>
<td>Carreon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Dumont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willow</td>
<td>hale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>McGougan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Rabuchin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Spina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendelin</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra</td>
<td>Baleix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Crow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Singer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Adler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Zweig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ford</td>
<td>bauman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Larson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne</td>
<td>Harkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Carrigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Athey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Fomenko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryjane</td>
<td>Genco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli</td>
<td>Hruska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Zahner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Jan</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Sanford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roxanne</td>
<td>sims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellin</td>
<td>Barret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Alenik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greg</td>
<td>chambers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Dreyfus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf</td>
<td>fleisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celine</td>
<td>Grenier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilee</td>
<td>Werhorst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCE</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynette</td>
<td>Chasen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwin</td>
<td>Chasen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Kay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sienna</td>
<td>Lea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Lewi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>Lindermuth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Mallory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHY</td>
<td>MILLER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Mallory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>Russo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Simpkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>WOODS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Girard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Rudd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim &amp; Suzi</td>
<td>Bakker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryn</td>
<td>Goldman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Conley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roni</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Tipton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Gerke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALD</td>
<td>Harper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harron</td>
<td>Kelner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Kernes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Mesenvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Sotelo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrol</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Rob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>Oles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Rippner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeeAnn</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Jean</td>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Olguin-Henson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Piedad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Radinovsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Rothhaar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Maloney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>Waxstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muriel</td>
<td>Christen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>Herron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Huie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Pirolo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Regaignon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Reilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Stahl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Whinnery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Fairchild</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominick J.</td>
<td>Di Noto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Atchison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilla</td>
<td>Bonnicksen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Copp-Phelan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>desiderio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Maier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Maior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shukla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne D</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Cannon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Coon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Coon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra</td>
<td>Gamppper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Oswald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Soash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Swan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Noller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>Parra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meghan</td>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Waters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Yeager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Clement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Markowitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Morales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saundra</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Rovegno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Sorich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Freij</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td>Kocian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Tiesch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Epstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloise</td>
<td>McTigue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Somers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Stefani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Collison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen J</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Hiestand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Kahn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Kaysen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Kirsch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Manfredi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edie</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanine</td>
<td>McElwain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Jane</td>
<td>McKendry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannie</td>
<td>McKendry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Meese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Moriarty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>O'Connor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Olson-Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Rodriguez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Sallee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Slaton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy</td>
<td>Spearow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donatella</td>
<td>Zona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Abney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Launer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Lifton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Pryor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>Caruso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Varvas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Abdullah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sabrina</td>
<td>Castro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Crosby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOEL</td>
<td>MEJIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Garner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lezlie</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Barr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Schmitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gail</td>
<td>jolie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Syler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris</td>
<td>Wascher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Waters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Waters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>Ley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Devlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>Foss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Ganz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Gilkison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody</td>
<td>Haworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Lemberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>Mayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Oerther</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jane</td>
<td>purinton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Steffen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Tarbet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Zarchin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Lovette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Sander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lila</td>
<td>Pervier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damon</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Wellemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickie</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Tallen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAMELA</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Patumanoan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>Checchia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>Dee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>Shapiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Shapiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Bianqui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saul</td>
<td>Kay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Ellen</td>
<td>Legendre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Tullius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Winokur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanna</td>
<td>McHose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Cox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Doble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Hennings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice</td>
<td>Noack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Pilgrim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Engstrom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Willey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Bender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredi</td>
<td>Bloom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Carlson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>Larsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Riley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Walters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myron</td>
<td>Walters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>Nyquist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Ashburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Karcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Macy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Mansell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Mobley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Tostevin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Futch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Zoglin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Ulmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanine</td>
<td>Borland Mann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Cohan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolli</td>
<td>Freedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>margaret</td>
<td>keane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Rechsteiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dottie</td>
<td>Schaefer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOFF</td>
<td>LEAVELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Pirch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>DuPratt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>Berman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Heath-Benjamin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Helm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Geissler</td>
<td>Lanzone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Mitsuda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Neklason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Neklason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Diane</td>
<td>Corbin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Frost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles L.</td>
<td>Krugman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rena</td>
<td>Magana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Magana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randa</td>
<td>Eaves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>LaLonde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis</td>
<td>Pivar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janine</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Rippner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Babcock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Kristine</td>
<td>Hellgren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Criss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.N.</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Neuman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Runnels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Strysik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Weisman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>Cayem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Gemon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>craig</td>
<td>helberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myrna</td>
<td>seto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Follman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Goldberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonia</td>
<td>Jauch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>florence</td>
<td>klein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty</td>
<td>Shapiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>Bunyan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Hughart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joyce</td>
<td>banzhaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Harriman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Jimerfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Malone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Zukas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann</td>
<td>Frey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Krinsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Cotner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Hines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Schultz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward L.</td>
<td>Garwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maureen</td>
<td>perron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>TROOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Zographos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Mills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VinCent</td>
<td>pruden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Cochems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>Easley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Entin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Goodrich-MacM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Kirstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Loeffler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessie</td>
<td>Kainz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joann</td>
<td>Shook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allyn</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd</td>
<td>Midyett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>Hays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila L.</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>DiPasquale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Gretsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dency</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Seifert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Kops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charles</td>
<td>robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Hammerquist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Cooper-Keil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Fray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janine</td>
<td>Josslin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therese Balle</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Maloney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mark</td>
<td>nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vern</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Whitesell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Withers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Cardella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Hutchinson-Sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Krull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clark</td>
<td>shelby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary B.</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Blyth-Cloud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marguerita</td>
<td>Lightfoot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Brast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Booth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicity</td>
<td>Figueroa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Fuelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent S.</td>
<td>Guadagnino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Holgaard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Kaufman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Knapp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>McGuire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo</td>
<td>Vassos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Vassos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elia</td>
<td>Boggia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Charren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Oechel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Oechel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lan</td>
<td>Penney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geri</td>
<td>todd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Farrocco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Goldmacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>McNally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Peticolas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrik</td>
<td>Rousselot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geraldine</td>
<td>caldarola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Huber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>Lubow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rita</td>
<td>hart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>Schulman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Silverman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Priest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Larkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cynthia</td>
<td>rutherford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Changus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celia</td>
<td>Dejong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>michelle</td>
<td>diaz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>Larsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Sussna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare</td>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATE</td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Derne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maria</td>
<td>espinosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Ferree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollis &amp; Kathy</td>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inez</td>
<td>Hiller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Cherub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Procaccini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilian</td>
<td>Reiter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Groth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY</td>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOY</td>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Eleanor</td>
<td>Finney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl</td>
<td>Sutterfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>Pill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Curry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Inada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>McKenna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Plaisance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Wohlgemuth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max and Sue</td>
<td>Aby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonna</td>
<td>Spellman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lee</td>
<td>bailey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janiece</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Babb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna</td>
<td>Harman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libbe</td>
<td>Madsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Welsch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman</td>
<td>Osorio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Droese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Cliver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>DeMoss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Dr. Iris</td>
<td>Freelander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edric</td>
<td>Guise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bev</td>
<td>kelly, ph.d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Mack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>McDargh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>McKelvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>McLean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordana</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Pukish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>Steinfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Wolfe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda</td>
<td>Schwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Abrams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff</td>
<td>ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Erickson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauri</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Kirsch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Rosenblum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill M.</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Schell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Auslander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne</td>
<td>Banta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Berliner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Biggins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylin</td>
<td>Bitner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madaline</td>
<td>blau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Bodlaender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Boling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Bougie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Brault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl</td>
<td>Brickman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Brill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Brill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Chogyoji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Cicalo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Cirle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bernadette</td>
<td>colomine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Craven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Dallmeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>Drutz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamison</td>
<td>Dufour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Edelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Eickmeier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Elkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Escarcega</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael W</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>Fainstadt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Felixson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Fies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Filer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Franceschi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Gaiennie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Galin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raul</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Gatta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robin</td>
<td>gibson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Girtten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Glickman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly J.</td>
<td>Goldrup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Graham-Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip</td>
<td>Harting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Harwitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Hogan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard H.</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Honda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvaro</td>
<td>Huerta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Huljev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Hynd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Jacobson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris</td>
<td>Jacobson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kian</td>
<td>Kaeni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY</td>
<td>Kasinowitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas</td>
<td>Kinnan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Kiabin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Kobler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chrissa</td>
<td>kobrin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kevin</td>
<td>Laffey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>LaFlanza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Lamontagne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Lapointe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Lerma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alita and Leon</td>
<td>Letwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy</td>
<td>Ling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>maker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Malsbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIANCA</td>
<td>MANNARA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Marder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Mazon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>McCready</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>McMorrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>McPhatter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Mentley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evalyn</td>
<td>Michaelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carly</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Milstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Mira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Mirell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benjamin</td>
<td>morpurgo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Moseley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.</td>
<td>Muir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sher</td>
<td>myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Nockels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Norris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Nunez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>O'Neill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPHINE</td>
<td>PARTIDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donna</td>
<td>perlmutter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Phinney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noemi</td>
<td>Pollack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charles</td>
<td>proser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Rath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhila</td>
<td>Rea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Reback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>Reiley</td>
<td>200 W. 16th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>Riggs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Rocco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joan</td>
<td>Rodman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Rosen Ziff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Roth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnie</td>
<td>Rotkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noelle</td>
<td>Royer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>Rubin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Sacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Dr. Edward</td>
<td>Salm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Saltzman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Sarley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>Scherb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy</td>
<td>Schowsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred &amp; Mary</td>
<td>Shore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Singer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td>Skybetter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Solomita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY</td>
<td>STEINER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerstin</td>
<td>Stempel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eric</td>
<td>stockel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Suthers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Szigel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethel</td>
<td>Tankenson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Tiarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anike</td>
<td>Tourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Tyron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>Van Zandweghe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Varney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Wenzlaff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindi</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALLAS</td>
<td>WRIGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Wyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Zapiec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Zhong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Biaaca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Cocheu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret E.</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine</td>
<td>Lamendola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinda</td>
<td>Lutts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Miano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherri L</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Sager</td>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Cavallaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Grimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan and Mrs.</td>
<td>Holz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Barry</td>
<td>Haldeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy R</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Barger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Graham-Gardn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hym</td>
<td>Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri</td>
<td>McCaul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>McGill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>McGill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Stroud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Holder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Gross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>kopels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Majoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Soler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joyce</td>
<td>stein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujiko</td>
<td>Yamashita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Colle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>DeFalco Lippert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>Parkinen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Correll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>Golub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ieslie</td>
<td>quinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Bloom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graile</td>
<td>dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raven</td>
<td>Deerwater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gail</td>
<td>deutsch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jovan</td>
<td>Jelic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheri</td>
<td>Langlois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>LeFevre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Jensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Smullin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Zucker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hannah</td>
<td>sownwine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Darby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaVerne</td>
<td>Uhte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Berry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Burgy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Conley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thais</td>
<td>Crowell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Devilin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Dow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Dow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Falkenrath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Galland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>Giuliani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zoe</td>
<td>goorman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Hawkins, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Heinzig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou</td>
<td>Hexter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Hoechstetter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Holt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>josh</td>
<td>knox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Knox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Lindauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anni</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Moody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Osborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl</td>
<td>Patton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>Pell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollis</td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Rubin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn</td>
<td>Shrieve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Silverman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Mark</td>
<td>Spitalny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Strodder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Usher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Zaslow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Childs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Royce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>Yorke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marylou</td>
<td>cantarella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Etana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Bermann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Brittain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Denney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Gurney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leda</td>
<td>Slattery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Dobay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan and En</td>
<td>Dobay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robert</td>
<td>Buelteman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>O'Connell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Arscott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Leah</td>
<td>Plante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlen</td>
<td>Grossman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Pizzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Reveles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian</td>
<td>Hallin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>Eason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>francis</td>
<td>glebas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Hogan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Stern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Teger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanel</td>
<td>Hargreaves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Smallen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Senuta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilly</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>Dinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Almgren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Clifford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Guss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luba</td>
<td>Kaplun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanna</td>
<td>Knickerbocker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Lovins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>MacDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>MacDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Anne</td>
<td>Martineau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Olsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Weatherby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Yost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loreen</td>
<td>Eliason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Donahower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ</td>
<td>Hagan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Parham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monty</td>
<td>Sander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Thibodaux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Weide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shera</td>
<td>Banbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Beedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Greenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith</td>
<td>Lobb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Orloff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shari</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Robinree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Hurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Blakelock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeri</td>
<td>Maly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Marsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey</td>
<td>Rickner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>Chimarusti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diane</td>
<td>nadelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorayne</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Alexander-Willis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxine</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Dee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Santoro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilene</td>
<td>Savitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOEL</td>
<td>Thames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Winston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Malley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Boshears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Pinneau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Prager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorri and Flor</td>
<td>Raskin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Freiberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce W</td>
<td>Lowry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Stockard Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm &amp; Cal</td>
<td>Faust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma</td>
<td>Armon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Barrilleaux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Bearrentine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Beaton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Brumer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Bryer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Copi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Cox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne V.</td>
<td>Diller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Dreyfuss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda</td>
<td>Dunmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Elgar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>Ferreira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Finnterty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannette</td>
<td>Fogler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chet</td>
<td>Gardiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>Georges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanna</td>
<td>Gianopoulos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayesha</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine</td>
<td>Gillespie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Gilmartin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannette</td>
<td>Glyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Golding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Gonzalez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele</td>
<td>Grunberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Hanly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathe</td>
<td>Haskell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis</td>
<td>Heft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Heinold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildur</td>
<td>Kehoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina</td>
<td>Klein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Kobren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Kukus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibeka</td>
<td>Lyman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria-Laura</td>
<td>Mancianti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td>McBroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>McFarland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve</td>
<td>Mcguffin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Michel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Norton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Olivier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Pasqua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raj</td>
<td>Patel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Riddell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Riddell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadas</td>
<td>Rin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Saks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Santer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Schwentker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenifer</td>
<td>Shields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Siddiqui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Signorino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Silber-Becknell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Spangler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Sperry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Steinhaus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumi</td>
<td>Sugihara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmin</td>
<td>Thana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Vogel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Westerhout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Wickens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candice</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Zawaski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margot</td>
<td>Geiger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doret</td>
<td>Kollerer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise</td>
<td>Sokolay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Skerness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Shore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1stSgt John</td>
<td>Farntor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim and Shar</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otto</td>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Roecker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Broidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Turbeville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY</td>
<td>VERNAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Lish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Tannar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollie</td>
<td>Bland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka</td>
<td>Higgins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique</td>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Seidler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Weinstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Koby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Harmon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Kessler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH</td>
<td>REEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Whipple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatriz</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>Hurd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>Kaphan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>Kaphan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Novack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>Archibald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Nale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Silverman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>Bromberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Burg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Escoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorea</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Colognesi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Grau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Jablow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Marlow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloise B.</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYELLEN</td>
<td>REDISH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James E.</td>
<td>Snodgrass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Blumenthal-She</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Eager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Fender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Gendzel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elfried</td>
<td>Gioumousis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Grantz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Michael</td>
<td>Harmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>HEALY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Keller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevin</td>
<td>Lantz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Matyskiela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maya</td>
<td>Moiseyev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td>Monberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Oceanlight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Roth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Rubens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Sednki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Sheats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Van Orsdol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Vesecky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Waldman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Westerfel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>zimmerman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glynnis</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Gibberman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Cooper, D.V.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marna</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale</td>
<td>Hurd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn</td>
<td>Keene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodanthi</td>
<td>Kitridou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Komoroski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>Lau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magda</td>
<td>manigque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>McAdoo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frieda</td>
<td>Stahl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Stein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>Whelan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charlie</td>
<td>lawrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Appel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle</td>
<td>Ganapoler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beni</td>
<td>Diaz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnaud</td>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charlotte</td>
<td>painter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Stanger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Stracey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Dier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Patton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Blackman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Bauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Ciacchella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilene</td>
<td>Linssen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Safran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Bolling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane J</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Maslana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Quickel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Cochran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Quinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie A.</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Kastanis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winfield</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>Gesick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin</td>
<td>Hurley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Ki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chelan</td>
<td>riebe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert M.</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Dion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Ledden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Farren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Hoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert</td>
<td>Remstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Wertheim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene</td>
<td>Zimmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Malone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen</td>
<td>Davisson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Pagni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Cahill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Affonso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Cittadino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Neiger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Squires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Webster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Barbour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Wallace</td>
<td>Esler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gary</td>
<td>fabian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Goodban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Laakso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt</td>
<td>Luck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tony</td>
<td>Mrsich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven W</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Weston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>Athan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Berta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Flanagan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorena</td>
<td>Wolfe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Asch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco</td>
<td>Diaz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Kalins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Lasahn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Mock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilia</td>
<td>Rangel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Rastegar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Shea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Sibley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudy</td>
<td>Zeller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Dalton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel</td>
<td>Beyrer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Fay Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Holley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma</td>
<td>Monge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayne</td>
<td>Munger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Morin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Flanagan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Parkhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn</td>
<td>Toumodge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles &amp;</td>
<td>Bates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Solorio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>Warenycia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Warenycia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eastwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Alderette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>david</td>
<td>anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Betro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grace</td>
<td>cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Finnegon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Glavin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gus</td>
<td>Guichard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Hamel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>Hartley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ereck</td>
<td>Johan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody</td>
<td>Klein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGB</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>MC CARTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>McEwan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sommes</td>
<td>mcgregor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>Millette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Nahigian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Neuman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Parlante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Poxon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catherine</td>
<td>ramirez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Ryall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Stultz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Sykes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terelle</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thais</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Vetranzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Wegelin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Wolf-Eshe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Merrill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Adler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brina-Rae</td>
<td>Schuchman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Alderete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>SHIMER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Lemer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlan</td>
<td>Wareham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Callen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joe</td>
<td>hayes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>bacigalupi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Osborne-Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H.</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>aries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Autote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Babcock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>barnard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Bates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darcy</td>
<td>Bergh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Bolin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karen</td>
<td>bowling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximilian</td>
<td>Carper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Cavanaugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Cerello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Childs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzan</td>
<td>Clausen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Coffey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Conlan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>DiMatteo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Downing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Dunny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Ede</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherrie</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Friis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Gaber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Garner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Ghelardi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Gracian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Darrel</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Grodner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Gutormson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Hammomns Maut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour</td>
<td>Hanan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margarita</td>
<td>Haugaard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Henning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Hurley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Beth</td>
<td>Lazzaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Lovett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Ludgeke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary-Carol</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>Maggiora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Mallory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Mayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>McElveny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>McIntosh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Mills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Modisette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>Mooney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Ogburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Primack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Quinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Robertson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>Roesser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val</td>
<td>Sanfilippo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisa</td>
<td>Shorago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Shulman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Silvera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Sims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griff</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Tessmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Tex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John (Jack)</td>
<td>Tex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Toperoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Tripp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefani</td>
<td>Walens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Wesley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta</td>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Yarberry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Zinda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Langhans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Granader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Angstman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucille</td>
<td>Arneson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Aubry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Avila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Bachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Baer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charmaine P. Bailey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Bardo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Bindernagel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Ricardo</td>
<td>Bondoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Boren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Brenneman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allen</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Browneye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Cabuco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Cheifetz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eric</td>
<td>chesmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deborah</td>
<td>clearwaters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Coliver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lan</td>
<td>Cree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Crow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valina</td>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Deevy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Deming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi-lyn</td>
<td>Depper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Donohue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Downer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Durling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Edmonson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Ellingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Falcon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>Fankboner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Formaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debbie</td>
<td>frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francia</td>
<td>Friendlich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candace</td>
<td>Gadsby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Gaffney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Gallegos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>megan</td>
<td>gilbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rado</td>
<td>Gregorich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Rosemar</td>
<td>Gross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Hass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loie</td>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Heath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Hodgson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Hsu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid</td>
<td>Huff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Hurwitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Imber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Jacques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Jaspersen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marc</td>
<td>Jordall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Jumonville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margo</td>
<td>Kieser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Kline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marjorie</td>
<td>knettle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Kom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Kramer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Kremsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>Kuo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gillian</td>
<td>Iadd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi</td>
<td>Lau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lila</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Lenzner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>michael</td>
<td>lim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paul</td>
<td>Ioper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Magee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>david</td>
<td>manley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine</td>
<td>Manuele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Maron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>michael</td>
<td>mascioli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ari</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holly</td>
<td>millar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Mirviss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michale</td>
<td>Missasi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Mary</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Mont-Eton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Munce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Mundschauf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendan</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Nordstrom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d michael</td>
<td>nowacki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayo</td>
<td>Okawa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Orson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Pederson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>Pammik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Rakay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Regan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Rockwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Romano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalind</td>
<td>Romney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg</td>
<td>Rosenfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Rudoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland</td>
<td>Salvato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Sargentini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edie</td>
<td>Schaffer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik</td>
<td>Schnabel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Sharps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Skaggs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Smidt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Soper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla</td>
<td>Spaulding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nila</td>
<td>Staudt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Stegman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayla</td>
<td>Strassfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanine</td>
<td>Strobel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anneke</td>
<td>Swinehart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Teichman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik</td>
<td>Terreri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britton</td>
<td>Trimmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinh</td>
<td>Truong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Valdiviezo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>van Soldt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demian</td>
<td>Weekley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Weiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Weinstock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa</td>
<td>Welch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Wels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Wilkinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Willacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Willis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tessa</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Wong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose-Vincent</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manny</td>
<td>Gonzalez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Bail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Barber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Brook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitzi</td>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Cavanagh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard B</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Chatman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>Chatman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronnel</td>
<td>Corre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigi Regina</td>
<td>Cox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Cressman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Crocker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra &amp; Burt</td>
<td>Epstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Fishman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan</td>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Goldman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmella</td>
<td>Granado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norbeth</td>
<td>Granado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Harper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Irwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronnie</td>
<td>Jacobson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Jeffries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>Jensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Kauffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Keltner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cathy</td>
<td>kozak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Macaulay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>McNulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jennifer</td>
<td>meegan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurence</td>
<td>Mirels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mieke</td>
<td>Pagan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doug</td>
<td>pearl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kay</td>
<td>Raftery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merralee</td>
<td>Retallick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine</td>
<td>Riordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Chris</td>
<td>Robinett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bill</td>
<td>roden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalia and Edw</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.Linda M</td>
<td>Toma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Blades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td>Riekse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie S.</td>
<td>Seymour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Bazinet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael</td>
<td>Bradshaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valerie</td>
<td>perez-ibardolasa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo</td>
<td>vega</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>Wu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joann</td>
<td>Kersten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>bilwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graydon</td>
<td>Funke MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Hodin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Jollie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Barrelier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.R.</td>
<td>Bartlett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Cappetta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Cary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siva</td>
<td>Heiman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>McDaniel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Petrosky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Rounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jennifer</td>
<td>saffo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loren</td>
<td>Szper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marge</td>
<td>Weimer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Burmester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Antrim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allene</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Finley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>JASKOSKI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Scoville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Boeschen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Ferris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenn</td>
<td>Gartner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Holeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>Mamet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>MORRISON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shannon</td>
<td>myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Osterloh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Ourston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Schriebman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilena</td>
<td>Silbey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>Sweet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne</td>
<td>Van Houten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Altmare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Alvin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vince</td>
<td>Cukrov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carolyn</td>
<td>cline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ananna</td>
<td>Forrester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisl</td>
<td>Auf der Heide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Dovgin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>george</td>
<td>eagleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nell</td>
<td>eakin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude</td>
<td>Garciaclay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve and Kris</td>
<td>Giddings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR</td>
<td>HARTHERN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugenia</td>
<td>Hoyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma</td>
<td>Kutzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Leahy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Lindemann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>macDougall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Mohr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Muhlethaler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Naftaly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian</td>
<td>Nephew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan A</td>
<td>Neufeldt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landon</td>
<td>Neustadt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Rasmussen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaris</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawley</td>
<td>Roddick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Shields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Shields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Shuman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>Toma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gil</td>
<td>Varon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>zalon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Acanfora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Kealhofer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>stahl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Wellander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen</td>
<td>Brokaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>Brunner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>Bumanglag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>Camarie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Cervine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Conner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>Duquet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryle</td>
<td>Hirshberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Holt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn T.</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Kellogg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td>Leigh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Lustgarden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Margulies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Matlock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Paganelli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Pollock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Rain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>rainbow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Rosner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Savat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Tassone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Thanas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Vittitow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Werner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Zylius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel M</td>
<td>Hervey PHN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>McMahon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Bonnett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carl</td>
<td>samuelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>george</td>
<td>madarasz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Albers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBORAH</td>
<td>FALLENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Havrilesky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roth</td>
<td>Herringer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Judson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>Kossove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>Lagerfelt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Lamb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Lemke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>michael</td>
<td>meranze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jerry</td>
<td>persky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Ramirez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Reilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Reiniger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. D.</td>
<td>Rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Shaughnessy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Sokolow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Wittert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alissa</td>
<td>Wyffels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Wyffels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Alderette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muiz</td>
<td>Brinkerhoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Cayford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Colby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anne</td>
<td>exton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Faxon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Gollub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary H.</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Jacobson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The Rev.) All</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mark</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td>Maddox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Manners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td>Mayo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan</td>
<td>McMahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>Pederson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Peterlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Sorensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlayne</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja</td>
<td>Malmuth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Bossange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Kaplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>MacMorran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Schaffer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>McClung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilena</td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Brukoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>Wilkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Butterfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berj</td>
<td>Amir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattie</td>
<td>Bosch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared</td>
<td>Dreyfus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Ferris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Lavine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine</td>
<td>Psota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>Treasurefield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey Caccav</td>
<td>Wheaton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Wheaton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Gaffney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Milsal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Seiden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Beeber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda</td>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Campanelli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Gan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Gittelston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Hathaway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>Hyland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon</td>
<td>Kadish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Dolan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Picco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Tuma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Pelekakis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Joyce</td>
<td>Coger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Lichtenberger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsy</td>
<td>Lowe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Wardzinski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Hermes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Mackey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale</td>
<td>Mead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Mosgofian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jil</td>
<td>Janes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shena</td>
<td>Kieval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne</td>
<td>meja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Rowe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Sumrall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>Lutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONi</td>
<td>Barca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Jenne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Langeder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellin</td>
<td>Lieberman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>McHugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Bergtholdt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>McAlister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>Norris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammad</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Fredrickson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hester</td>
<td>Gelber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Hultgren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe</td>
<td>Levitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>Newmeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Olin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Yanakis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Ascencio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abbe</td>
<td>blum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Dobbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camille</td>
<td>norton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Webster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>Friedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Glazer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula</td>
<td>Holloman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Knipe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Kos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deborah</td>
<td>lakeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Leifer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marc</td>
<td>norelli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donn</td>
<td>Swaby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>norman</td>
<td>toback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Ricklef</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernetta</td>
<td>Hulls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Hoppe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanjay</td>
<td>Aiyagari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bonvouloir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Gonzalez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Grover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Kaehn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonnetta</td>
<td>Kisselman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>Nickel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Pogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Richman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>Schrader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Schwartz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul S.</td>
<td>Strauss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Vanni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Webb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Dwyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Burns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrell</td>
<td>Entesari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri</td>
<td>Barmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxine</td>
<td>Ewig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen and</td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigit</td>
<td>Slind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBorah</td>
<td>Filipelli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Erany</td>
<td>Barrow-Pryor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Curtin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Herzog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarvis</td>
<td>Streeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tevelia</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>Lloyd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Barbarita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bess</td>
<td>Scher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Landman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Meckler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>Reik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Willig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James R</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Decker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanne</td>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Flottman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Skelley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Hassell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Maddix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van</td>
<td>Puckett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Serrato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Frye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Cushman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,my</td>
<td>Schutz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maree</td>
<td>Cheatham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>McGinnis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Harmon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Misseldine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Poplawski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conie</td>
<td>Remick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Benson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Leal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Orozco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Virmigle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Connelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Drake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Lieberman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Ruxton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>Gurney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Skuris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley &amp;</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maja</td>
<td>Silberberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter T.</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark A.</td>
<td>Giordani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Van Atta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Angelini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karra</td>
<td>Bikson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angeline</td>
<td>Bray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Diller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian</td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Lucks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>McGright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Royce-Wilder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Victor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Manuel</td>
<td>Beltran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gil</td>
<td>Carbajal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Dominguez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Schwabe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Marie</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David P.</td>
<td>Adalian, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Hagan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Beversdorf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Bonillo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>McGilvray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con rad</td>
<td>Nagel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Blount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Hays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ari</td>
<td>Cohn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>michelle</td>
<td>cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Di Maggio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana</td>
<td>Dorin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Friedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Friedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Hilal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Knoll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Lehmkuhl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn G.</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Scaff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Shaner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances M.</td>
<td>Tittmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Vinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Grafft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael C. &amp; Dr. Richard B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td>Marin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walt</td>
<td>Oicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel</td>
<td>Mora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Repetto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Hansel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Crosthwaite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Ercolono</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aileen</td>
<td>Feinstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTINE</td>
<td>ROWE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Stendel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrell</td>
<td>Freemont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Kory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Oh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Relkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnnMarie</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Saltzman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrick</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Sardari, CPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford</td>
<td>Stein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Wallen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helaine</td>
<td>Depp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Burden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Albrecht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Hind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marguerite</td>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Mourning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertie</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Ortiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Schultz, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Shelleda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth G. Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Earley Coen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessie</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Zeiler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Aamot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Anewich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Asnicar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Audette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Bonetti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolena</td>
<td>Brucha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Comstock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Daly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alexey</td>
<td>davies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Feland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Figel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen</td>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lon</td>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>Greenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adrienne</td>
<td>harber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michiko</td>
<td>Hester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margit</td>
<td>Johansson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin</td>
<td>Kilpatrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Klocke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Krassa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary</td>
<td>Lacklen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula</td>
<td>Lindqvist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>Longoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Lorimer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Peter</td>
<td>Macomber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian</td>
<td>Mariani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN</td>
<td>MELAMED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billie</td>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Mortimer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Mueser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Paradis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrielle</td>
<td>Parnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Pettingill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candice</td>
<td>Powers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Stehlik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Stehlik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>Stein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara</td>
<td>Stiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Strauss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Thibodeaux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Tobias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Vaughn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland</td>
<td>Waters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Abernathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grega</td>
<td>Abernathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norbert</td>
<td>Juenemann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Lightner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Mitrovic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Drabek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES</td>
<td>TERRILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Biggs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie</td>
<td>Luallen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>McMahon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maria christine angle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timandra</td>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joe</td>
<td>giacalone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giacalone</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Trestler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Bjorgum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Lutzow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Chaffant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>Fecteau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>gibbons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Hibbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn</td>
<td>Kern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Kleinsmith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peg</td>
<td>LeClair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMOTHY</td>
<td>LOVATO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Lund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Operhall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Pacheco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Pelkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>Szabo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy</td>
<td>Van Hoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Volt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Yeats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Lippert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki</td>
<td>McDonough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene</td>
<td>Mendoza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Watts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>Bammes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Erickson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Blevins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leanna</td>
<td>Bradbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Dharma</td>
<td>Kimball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Alberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Barlow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chuck</td>
<td>Bates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candace</td>
<td>Beatty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Boden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACY</td>
<td>BUCHNER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Buckles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbara</td>
<td>caley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith &amp; Linda</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>DiBattista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Emrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>FrainAguirre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velvia</td>
<td>Garner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacklon</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Grothoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>Halouska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Harper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JILL M</td>
<td>JANDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Jenner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Jervis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nita</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Kamlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Kilde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamm</td>
<td>Kilgore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUZANNE</td>
<td>KOEHLER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laurie</td>
<td>kubitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laurie</td>
<td>kubitz-maness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Letellier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rebecca</td>
<td>lewin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Malkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bjorn</td>
<td>mannsfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>McClure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>McCutcheon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>McKinnis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Patton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Rigler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celeste</td>
<td>Rossmiller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mark</td>
<td>rush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Russo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Sarche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Sarno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Simons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Snell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Truhan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Valladao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Zeilig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra M.</td>
<td>Zwingelberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>Cain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ed</td>
<td>Angus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Benson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick &amp; All</td>
<td>Herbine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Lewin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angle</td>
<td>sell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Snow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Bauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Saeger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Michael</td>
<td>Caruso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Keck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Lubofsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keith</td>
<td>boggs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Brack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>McKenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Armitage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Elliot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>DeCaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td>Lillywhite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Schiller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Atkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Aldrin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chairel</td>
<td>babby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Bradie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Brinks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Bublitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy</td>
<td>Eylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Hamrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>ImMasche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Michael</td>
<td>Jameson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad</td>
<td>Kalantari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Koster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Leatherwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Leisenring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Nemeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Rydburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>Sanborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristofer</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Veness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patti</td>
<td>Wermeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Rutstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Carren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Flueck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Gillespie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Hirshman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Sollars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Steuck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Tauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodie</td>
<td>MacTavish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Rechel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willy</td>
<td>Rensenbrink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal</td>
<td>Roesler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeptha</td>
<td>Sheene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Solawetz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Dinkmeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Conklin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Kauffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doniver</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Staub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Stella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Seastrum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>DelTurco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Kisling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Kretzmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobin</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Muniz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Wigton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Chard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Lund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Pringle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Blatto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Chung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde</td>
<td>Duran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Kochmeister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Leventhal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Mulligan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Norris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Pedersen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Plutschuck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Sparks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Waldron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julio</td>
<td>Berlingeri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Bloom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Brummett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Darden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Elmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Lauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Louden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>McGinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Meyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>Romanski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Bergman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felice</td>
<td>Sage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Bein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felice</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Custer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deb</td>
<td>federin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryann</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Karcich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Stinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye</td>
<td>Dunham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Christensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>Christensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Crowley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Domblaser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Engel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Kessner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMY</td>
<td>KOHUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnie</td>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex</td>
<td>Morriss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Perelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie</td>
<td>bullard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>Sowell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Dotson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Teman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry M</td>
<td>Granger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nance</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Bleuer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Sirotek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Granat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celeste</td>
<td>Frazier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>Bergeron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>Lauritsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Armour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allison</td>
<td>berry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Barber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glen</td>
<td>burke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John L.</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Marie</td>
<td>Gillett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felice</td>
<td>iarsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaVonna</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Beverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agustin</td>
<td>Goba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerrie</td>
<td>Moreau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Vaughan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley E.</td>
<td>Duran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Shultz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Siconolfi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Koenig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Stantejksy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann M. L.</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Fuhrman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Kramer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>Leskowitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frieda</td>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Ettele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoAnne</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Gingolaski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Nodine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>FISH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Garbus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Loughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamey</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight</td>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Whyte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mel</td>
<td>hathorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>Bibuld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Sheoran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin</td>
<td>Hilliard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>McKeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilene</td>
<td>Coman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne and</td>
<td>Golembieski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Alstrum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>john</td>
<td>bacon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bette</td>
<td>Daraskevich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Contois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>Dankanyin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>HOLLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Bednarski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen E.</td>
<td>Bepko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth (Beth)</td>
<td>Reis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patricia ann</td>
<td>iasko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Gargiulo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Giacomo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theo</td>
<td>Sable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Allore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>michael</td>
<td>richter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>william</td>
<td>russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Cave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dave and char</td>
<td>depalma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamberlaine</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford</td>
<td>Slayman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Tignor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>Stephenson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrna</td>
<td>Watanabe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Peck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Bachand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cecily</td>
<td>Baran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul R.</td>
<td>Petrie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Raff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanore</td>
<td>Kepler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Pinkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miriam</td>
<td>kurland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Kent</td>
<td>Bendall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Getty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steve</td>
<td>heitner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zazu</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>HEIDEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Farwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra C</td>
<td>Farwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Blomstrom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>DiPlacido</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxine</td>
<td>Stomber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madaline</td>
<td>winkles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Anschutz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jennifer</td>
<td>botwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priscilla</td>
<td>Dannies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Jervis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Morrissey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Morrissey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobin</td>
<td>Nellhaus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Saiano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Slaughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Strauss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Unger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaddeus</td>
<td>Watulak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Weiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen &amp;</td>
<td>Newberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Astrmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marilina</td>
<td>imperati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Dominick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Tesser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Ryder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Curotto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy.</td>
<td>qrekas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>marilina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>Memhard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Sawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Jacobson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Janes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>MacKay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda J</td>
<td>Arden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn</td>
<td>Avoglia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Galloway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Kiernan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marguerite</td>
<td>Laurent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debra</td>
<td>poliack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Rosenbaum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Rosenfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Rosenthal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul J.</td>
<td>Schulkind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>wiker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>marrin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Gilliland-McEner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Goodwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>McKenna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Olver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>fuld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Donaldson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Garvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen F</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Angelus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Guerrera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Krause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronice</td>
<td>Gilchrist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Madura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Petrillo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deirdre</td>
<td>Doran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sian</td>
<td>Nimkoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Grady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Zohar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Gottschalk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Krances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>DeLuca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Strother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal Immigrant</td>
<td>who wants to co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Anderegg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronwyn</td>
<td>Bedient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Bevilacqua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Blackwelder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Bock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Rev Cha</td>
<td>Braun DD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Bukey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenefer</td>
<td>Ellington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryl</td>
<td>Fagin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc A</td>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Feuille</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Goodspeed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Halpern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Kaufman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Lin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>margaret</td>
<td>pfeiffer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Radin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Roehm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Roney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie</td>
<td>Schatz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>Segal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H.</td>
<td>Simons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannette</td>
<td>Smyth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Teitelman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashutosh</td>
<td>Upreti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Vaughn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Vice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willie</td>
<td>davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margot</td>
<td>Friedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Bateman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ellen</td>
<td>karel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denise</td>
<td>garrett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Fogel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>Kettlewood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs. Core Marshall-Steele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Donero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AliaN</td>
<td>Carlsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gracin</td>
<td>Dorsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Fols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary-Lee</td>
<td>Lutz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Bergman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td>Frost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coralie</td>
<td>Pryde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>Satterfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elizabeth</td>
<td>siftar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennyson</td>
<td>Wellman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Youngblood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>Goldberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Glick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainah</td>
<td>Goldfeather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Rist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Cornett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Haley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon A</td>
<td>Maskin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Swoboda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mark</td>
<td>inda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Kalter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Daye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burris</td>
<td>millstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gregory</td>
<td>Wolfe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean E</td>
<td>Bauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gilbert</td>
<td>bachman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Bendell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Bendell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert R</td>
<td>Besser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andres</td>
<td>Brandi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Brandi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Brandi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Ezring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linda</td>
<td>Greenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wendy</td>
<td>gruby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Lasdon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>Loder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>Loder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne V.</td>
<td>Marks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>Perlstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYLLIS</td>
<td>ROTHMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie</td>
<td>Sattler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jody</td>
<td>sntag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Weigensberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ari</td>
<td>zisman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Looney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Aptaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irv</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERRY</td>
<td>SIMELSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Stern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Z.</td>
<td>Weiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chuck</td>
<td>chambers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>Diesing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Duda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>william</td>
<td>duda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liza</td>
<td>Gorin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman</td>
<td>Koster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sally</td>
<td>mcdonald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmett J.</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Radell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>Werner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Polefrone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Kraft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.B.</td>
<td>Slaughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Leichtling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Beth</td>
<td>Lundgren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore</td>
<td>Lundgren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Rosenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merrill</td>
<td>kramer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquelynn</td>
<td>Maruffo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>McVan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Pressoir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Ulrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kevin</td>
<td>guffey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Willis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Loftus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Mayorga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lthomas</td>
<td>hagan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Kazmerski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbara</td>
<td>trede</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leah</td>
<td>miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muriel</td>
<td>Rosenholtz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthea</td>
<td>Ver Ploeg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adriana</td>
<td>de welde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Hoyt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores</td>
<td>Longo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Albertus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel &amp; Laurie</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLOTTE</td>
<td>KAPLAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beach</td>
<td>campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harley</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Kirby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Meerow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. A.</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Woodruff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>Marsden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Discepolo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>Fleischmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour</td>
<td>Friedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marion</td>
<td>Gayle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muriel</td>
<td>Mele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Mintz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxanne</td>
<td>Nadolsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Bannister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J S</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delight</td>
<td>TePaske</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Tillis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Delgado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Finkelstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY</td>
<td>KEMPNER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSHA</td>
<td>MIRON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>Peirce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>S. TAYLOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt</td>
<td>Vainy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Vignola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Bishopric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>Richey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilma</td>
<td>Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shannon</td>
<td>martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sheila</td>
<td>franklin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>McClasky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochelle</td>
<td>Lustig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burt</td>
<td>Rand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loren</td>
<td>Wieland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Morsch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Duffley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Angorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Elise</td>
<td>Asaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce R.</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Dauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Dauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Dewsbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>margaret</td>
<td>gervais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Harman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Heavilin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Kelley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Mayfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>McCoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Scrvener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jennifer</td>
<td>wollheim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>Hilgert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence J</td>
<td>Lerner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Mirkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Sankovitch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ripka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lys</td>
<td>Burden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saroj</td>
<td>Earl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Heagney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Serenbetz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulina</td>
<td>Aguiler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria and Al</td>
<td>Eichner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby L</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carmen</td>
<td>ledesma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa L.</td>
<td>Lianzi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie</td>
<td>Michelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yvonne</td>
<td>spector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tony</td>
<td>wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Harbin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Wallis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George V.</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Kronenfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Ratcliff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Pristoo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Telesca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Packer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Dodson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Dunbar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Hamblen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard</td>
<td>Langlois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Nagle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Niskanen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scott</td>
<td>ruppert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin</td>
<td>Samuelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Teige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Weston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>Weston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis</td>
<td>Coughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrilyn</td>
<td>Karrels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR &amp; MRS JA</td>
<td>PAPANDRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Mineo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anthony</td>
<td>felix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Lazar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas C</td>
<td>Taffinder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Silvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Struwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Esteve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heather</td>
<td>brassner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Colagiocomi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Daraio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didi</td>
<td>Kelley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey</td>
<td>Locastro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alma</td>
<td>shor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL</td>
<td>DELONG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Eskenazi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>Leviten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Signer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul J</td>
<td>Weitzekorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Howes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Rosenthal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Beleck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Blankenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Bates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY</td>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Bracken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Kirby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Gorton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>kisner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>McClish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edd</td>
<td>Sinnett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Zorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Galuska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>parsons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Gillen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Lamarr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Lamarr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>Letourneau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Dolly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Bianco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Geier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Nash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria J.</td>
<td>O'Reilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Stiptchuk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Withrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>DiZefalo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Peter C. &amp; Wolff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elien</td>
<td>alien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinny</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheryl</td>
<td>adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melissa</td>
<td>hoagland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Stephan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Andree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Bernheimer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viviana</td>
<td>Bianchi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Bogardus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mel</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Bromer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coralie</td>
<td>Carnaway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kermit</td>
<td>Carnaway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Caserta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Chang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla</td>
<td>Chasse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelia</td>
<td>Correa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td>Correa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irisse</td>
<td>Couvertier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>Finkelstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imelda</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Kramer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>Marchini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>McClennen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Mcniak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coky</td>
<td>Michel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Michel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>Navarro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>O'LEARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Radney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Scarcella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Schachner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Scobell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Stetser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee</td>
<td>Tecla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Vogel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tia</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rema</td>
<td>Conras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>DiLeo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Gross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETTY</td>
<td>KING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Crutchfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shari</td>
<td>Lerer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deborah</td>
<td>cara-beebe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Mae</td>
<td>Auerhahn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>BOOKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Macaulay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria J</td>
<td>O'Reilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>Billman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Darrall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Cacchine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Cimino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTHONY</td>
<td>FLANNERY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene</td>
<td>Garlan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Nodell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Riccio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>dream</td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Folti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nellie</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Fridy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Howland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Bloom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimona</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Vann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Adornato III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles H.</td>
<td>Lowstetter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Naismith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Merkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>Petta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maribeth</td>
<td>schonberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>urell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Sims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Ricker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffry</td>
<td>Beinap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>Giroux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Jesseee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Leavy Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Lizotte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronnie and</td>
<td>Moseley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Nehr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusty</td>
<td>Okoniewski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>Salsburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dimas</td>
<td>sanchez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Shea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel J.</td>
<td>Barzak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>heyden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>lacroix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Beatric</td>
<td>Mc Keown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Carol L.</td>
<td>Nak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Leamy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginny</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorrie</td>
<td>Sears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Steinrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Werber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry B</td>
<td>Bernhard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Holder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paul</td>
<td>Iakind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Winer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Goldin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcy</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Sears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Barrera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Blaustein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurence</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lourdes</td>
<td>Donikian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Adkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Coe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillie</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arica</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elvin</td>
<td>McCorvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Beaty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>Laurent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Rumans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Brodt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>O'Mara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>Cuolahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Easler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Louttit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>mcandrews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Kerr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Blessing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>chilkott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario</td>
<td>Giaccone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Gerber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>DiSanto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William O.</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Thome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Perillo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Johns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si &amp; Cathy</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Faulds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bret</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noelle</td>
<td>Britt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leigh</td>
<td>Emerson-Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estelle</td>
<td>Denslow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Stiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malisa</td>
<td>Jernigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaron</td>
<td>proulx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Ritter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorelle</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Dier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot</td>
<td>Aronin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Blanchard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carol</td>
<td>bledsoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Boardman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD</td>
<td>CLOUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Detaranto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delores</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Gongaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Gorman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max and Han</td>
<td>HONEYMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Hryniewicz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Hupp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlyne</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie S.</td>
<td>Kelley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erwin</td>
<td>Lesser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sima</td>
<td>Lesser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilse</td>
<td>Moon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jesse</td>
<td>Mullins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Redfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanie</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggyann</td>
<td>Strmel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>thorne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bill</td>
<td>ellis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Hendrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>Van Pelt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Puzzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Grave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patti</td>
<td>Constantino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td>constantino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Earl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Ruzicka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rick</td>
<td>nale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Baird</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Cass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suanne</td>
<td>Roush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee</td>
<td>Mintz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Groom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Carole</td>
<td>Battle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Brockway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Bucca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Crane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOANNA</td>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin</td>
<td>Fiske</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lisa</td>
<td>fletcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Hinzclcy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christi</td>
<td>Palmeri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>Peabody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlaine</td>
<td>Stoor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldon</td>
<td>Wedlock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>arthur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>Chidester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERTA</td>
<td>GOLDBERG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Polsyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAURA</td>
<td>RICHMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ann</td>
<td>wactiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Meye'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Alderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea</td>
<td>Baisden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana-Lia</td>
<td>Duchowney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Floyd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>french</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville</td>
<td>McJunkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorylyne</td>
<td>Pinkerton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laureatte</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alan</td>
<td>strowd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Cay</td>
<td>Tharpe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Turnor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Goldberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle</td>
<td>Ayala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satora</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Feeney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Franks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James L</td>
<td>Heddon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBRA</td>
<td>HUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Karpay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye</td>
<td>Manning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robin</td>
<td>milcowitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>NAVARRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billie Jo</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Simons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ann</td>
<td>spillane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Starr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shirley</td>
<td>Copperman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGINA</td>
<td>WEISS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.D.</td>
<td>Frotscher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>martin</td>
<td>kutnyak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Farrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Ragsdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Capasso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Hale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Block</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Goldschmidt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Goldschmidt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Sandow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Goswicck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Hornback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daryl</td>
<td>patrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>Coyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJ</td>
<td>Sucidlo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Cowan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Daniels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>Davidow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Mesick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pasquale</td>
<td>stellato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Keim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Ferebee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Kamarer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Liptak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joline</td>
<td>Rivard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deborah</td>
<td>burbach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>McKenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Reid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Sicolo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Lahy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chris</td>
<td>helmstetter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius</td>
<td>Ophar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharyn</td>
<td>Scull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Mayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Yarling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl</td>
<td>Putnal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Langston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele</td>
<td>Kushner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Aiper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Berry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Brandis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Grossvogel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Kraft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Mosser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tony</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miles</td>
<td>alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin</td>
<td>Ashmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sara</td>
<td>bedrosian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Bertonaschi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmet</td>
<td>Bondurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth W.</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becca</td>
<td>Callum-Penso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>Carley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis M</td>
<td>Cox IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Paul</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tom</td>
<td>ferguson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Giovinazzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd</td>
<td>Hall, attorney at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Hoeflin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WeZ</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keith</td>
<td>kaylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollie</td>
<td>Lakin-Hayes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Lippe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Meares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Metzger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Millay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheniqua</td>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Myer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay</td>
<td>Oehmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Owens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priscilla</td>
<td>Padrion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>PalMER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Potter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Rush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenore</td>
<td>Satterfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>david</td>
<td>Swartwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Van Keuren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Youngkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Eilser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Lang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>Lowe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Nesbit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Bolden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Haskins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Picou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Woodel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>beardslee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>Gilmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Gilmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Yark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leza</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Blume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNEST</td>
<td>RIGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy</td>
<td>Goolsby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Halton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Hinesley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo</td>
<td>Araya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Burgess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Martell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Lamb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Von Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Armistead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Bellesilies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Bohnert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Brewington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Burdick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Duncanson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harley</td>
<td>Gould</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brannon</td>
<td>Gullatt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>LaConte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiersten</td>
<td>Lurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>MacEwen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert C.</td>
<td>Manning, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Mohalley Snedel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenton</td>
<td>Noel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonia</td>
<td>Poteat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jada</td>
<td>Tidwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monoka</td>
<td>Venters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Walters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Weigle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Henkels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
<td>Harden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Crossan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>franklin</td>
<td>dayton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>Shippy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Weissman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Flory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Howell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracie</td>
<td>Costantino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores</td>
<td>Sommers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Decker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAMELA</td>
<td>LIGON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Tuszynski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onyaka</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jim</td>
<td>randolph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>Holman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>McGhee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tairra</td>
<td>Pamplin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kjevin</td>
<td>Schilbrack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Vinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorie</td>
<td>Aselin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Berkner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Krzymuski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius</td>
<td>Martinek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>richard</td>
<td>silverstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Wakelin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briley</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Patsis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>PATSIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Hohn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Dukes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bessie</td>
<td>shavers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marguerite</td>
<td>fortino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Corry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRENT</td>
<td>JACOBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Lewinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin</td>
<td>Riall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Danneman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taryn</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Malloy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Reif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Smith, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecile</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Rago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Yelich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Rasey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Wilkes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Bullabaugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry L.</td>
<td>Homan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reba</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrest</td>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Gilbreath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>DeLeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Erbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Kohler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will &amp; Betsy</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly</td>
<td>Eigen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arthur</td>
<td>alper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Cosby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Battles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Rutledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r3</td>
<td>Roger W.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee</td>
<td>Beauvais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlyne</td>
<td>Burns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shay</td>
<td>Chan Hodges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>Nihipali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Gafford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randal</td>
<td>McEndree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shannon</td>
<td>rudolph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mietek</td>
<td>Mandelman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Boyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheri</td>
<td>Fong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Hartley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Schacht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Soares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Stoddard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Kleppin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina</td>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Ehrhom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>McGuire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>McGuire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Tizard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>von Geldern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Hankins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>Nervig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James D</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James D</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Cup Choy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Pedersen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>Schattauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Savino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Wolfshagen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Moran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Rouiller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marita</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Natalie &amp; Tyler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carissa</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>McFadden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Atta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred</td>
<td>Cort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janis</td>
<td>Todhunter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitlyn</td>
<td>McKee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Swerdlow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Macalino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Allen</td>
<td>Mann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Barfield, Ph.D., L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Richtsmeier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane</td>
<td>Richtsmeier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Lee</td>
<td>Alekel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Bowers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Hanson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James H</td>
<td>Jorgensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erwin</td>
<td>Klaas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alissa</td>
<td>Stoehr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta</td>
<td>Vann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Foley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Rubek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Schattler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Mangler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Banfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Feltz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Heuertz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Volk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Roth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Posada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Daniels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Graber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarvis</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom and Mari</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marti</td>
<td>Nerenstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Bushek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Jirus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Herbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Cavagnaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Czeck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Schulze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Gusland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana</td>
<td>Hale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Holstegge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Hunsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Jolliffe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linda</td>
<td>powers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERICH</td>
<td>RIESENBERG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Veeder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Margaret</td>
<td>Meicher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Slade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Ballou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Bettis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Bosold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Burmeister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Burmeister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colette</td>
<td>Guay-Brezner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Hallen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert D</td>
<td>Klauber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denyce</td>
<td>Rusch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen Z.</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beth</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Hidlebaugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Birnbaum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Carberry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Christiansen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Conzemius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>Fales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishi</td>
<td>Fales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed</td>
<td>flaherty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Hagen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garry</td>
<td>Klein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Kueny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>McCall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Prizler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Strampe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Adams-Cogan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Kearns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>Pralle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beryl</td>
<td>Shaham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peter</td>
<td>mcguinness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaryAnn</td>
<td>Schwering</td>
<td>5223 1st Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth E.</td>
<td>Sabers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis</td>
<td>Jolin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Graber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetty</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caro</td>
<td>Kubik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carma</td>
<td>Bisinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Huffey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedric</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylou</td>
<td>Brownson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslee</td>
<td>Doner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Walt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>Walund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren</td>
<td>Pacheco-Thear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rena</td>
<td>Pacheco-Thear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Nagle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Noble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRisti</td>
<td>Appelhans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Redden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Schonefeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen</td>
<td>Mahoney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean and Bob</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Rognas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Kimber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Glaccum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Engle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Heroldt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Shafer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Hazelton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br. Michael</td>
<td>Gosch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine</td>
<td>Synnestvedt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryellen</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Beckman-Banks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik</td>
<td>Estrada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine M</td>
<td>Thane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morissa</td>
<td>Jensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>McNamara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Reilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Ripplinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Stepp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>Bantista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Dodson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Heiden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve</td>
<td>Horan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Sims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>arti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Osada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>McCrory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Prible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Doty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette</td>
<td>Monfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Schaefer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayeeem</td>
<td>Aslam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Baechle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Sturgell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Byrne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James J</td>
<td>Hare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Laird</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisa</td>
<td>Shepko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>seigle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Arms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Atwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sijsfredo</td>
<td>aviles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yuval</td>
<td>awazu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Baiocchi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florinda</td>
<td>Bayod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harry</td>
<td>binder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Boyd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Braun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Callahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Carney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>Casadaban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene</td>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Chennault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Chudgy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>Cox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg</td>
<td>Cox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Crowley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Daniels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete</td>
<td>DRe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis</td>
<td>Dickstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>DiMucci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Engelsberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>Estes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Fiedler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Fincke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glennvester</td>
<td>garrett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Garza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacie</td>
<td>Geary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Gliva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDITH</td>
<td>Goldman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Gould</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon P</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra B</td>
<td>Grear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td>Greer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryn</td>
<td>Greeran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avi</td>
<td>Handelsman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Hanrahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Havener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>Heiman Krezios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Henkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>Herzenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theodore</td>
<td>Jackanicz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thomas</td>
<td>Jansson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis</td>
<td>Judelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Kanaan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Kanter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Kautz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>Kavanaugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Kay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Kneer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Kooy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Kordich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>LARIOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>Lindley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Malinski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Maltenfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Mastin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>McIntosh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jill</td>
<td>mclaughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>McMeel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>andy</td>
<td>mcSheffery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liz</td>
<td>medoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shari</td>
<td>Melde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josue</td>
<td>Melendez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>Mesick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Monahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Monahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Monahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Mullally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Nabong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Nelsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Neuhaus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharlene</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>O'Connell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ortega</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Oostenbrug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan S.</td>
<td>Pastin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Pawlak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Petersen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Prieve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dakota</td>
<td>prosch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cynthia</td>
<td>raskin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eice</td>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma</td>
<td>Rolfesen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Rossen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell</td>
<td>Rupiper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel</td>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Sanfratello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha</td>
<td>Santelli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zdravka</td>
<td>Schier-Brasovan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Schochet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Schulman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Schultz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alec</td>
<td>Scott-Deforest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Seabaugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenndi</td>
<td>Seay-Crump</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>Sherman, Secret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha</td>
<td>Shpiller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Shuman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Simkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Sipiora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaToya</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsahll</td>
<td>Sorkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whit</td>
<td>Spurgeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>Steck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen</td>
<td>Steele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Teichen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Trubow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbin</td>
<td>Via</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Wald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Wate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Wate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Weiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>WHITCOMB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric C</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Wing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Wolfe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Wulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therese</td>
<td>Yee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene</td>
<td>Zide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Zoltak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Zuley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>Lakota-Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Powers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucille</td>
<td>Webb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edie</td>
<td>Feiste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Armour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Deason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean &amp; Nams</td>
<td>Mindock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. Jim</td>
<td>Hoffman OFM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Barnett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michaeline</td>
<td>Hade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Habegger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Matteson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Critz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Deweese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Andrew</td>
<td>Koch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Cronin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patricia</td>
<td>matz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Minich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deb</td>
<td>klein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Grice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris</td>
<td>McGinness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roger</td>
<td>golden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve</td>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Lapetino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia</td>
<td>Meshkov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonna</td>
<td>Pence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Schulz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George S.</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Oxman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red</td>
<td>lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Matz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahnna</td>
<td>Schadt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Reese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Schlesinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Westerberg Jr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Nolan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Jedd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Jedd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>Ness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Nolan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Hays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>7801 S. Placed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Hildreth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>McFall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Bargiel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary</td>
<td>Bean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy</td>
<td>Bloomfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Kurt</td>
<td>Brandenburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Bruski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liane</td>
<td>Casten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUGLAS</td>
<td>COLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Eckhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Eide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elissa</td>
<td>Fineman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marge</td>
<td>Goldman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale</td>
<td>Grossman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Handelman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Hogan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>McClure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trudy</td>
<td>mee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Orlinsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Posner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Rooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>margo</td>
<td>scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariana</td>
<td>Strandburg-Peschke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diane</td>
<td>Ithodos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Ketterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Petrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Balkis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Brennan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Cox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Cooley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERNA</td>
<td>HAHN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Stojak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jane</td>
<td>Mclnwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Andelin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Mungen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horman</td>
<td>Hickenbottom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jean</td>
<td>Bankmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joni</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Bruun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Domont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Malkus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Lukas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rog</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>ROSENBERG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margery</td>
<td>Shurman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Trevorthen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Weinstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Goede Sr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60324-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronda</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Vaughn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Gunter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Dr. and Mrs. Drewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merle</td>
<td>Ascher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Grodner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Grodner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri</td>
<td>Weinstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay and Betty</td>
<td>Wolff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay and Mrs. B</td>
<td>Wolff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Deckert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee r</td>
<td>Wermette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Whitman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Sachtleben</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne</td>
<td>Amann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheri</td>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>MacMillan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Danielson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarice</td>
<td>Hearne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Vallee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Southard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Heydorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Surette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Farrell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Fishman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Jennetten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Kotas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Kirch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Walters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Hodge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
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<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline</td>
<td>Harding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Nolta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Latimer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Salasek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Spahn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary F.</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia D.</td>
<td>Hopklin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Villa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Goldberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vern</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Calcagno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Mueller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Gerson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Hare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Stanowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Greene-Novinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Gates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Beth</td>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Kok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Patricia</td>
<td>Riesenman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>Bangert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Berndt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalia</td>
<td>Brine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Cianciolo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Dinius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Hareman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>Hauserman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>Hawkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teri</td>
<td>Herron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Hoge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Kaczmarczyk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Linnemeier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Luerssen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>O'Connor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Rolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian</td>
<td>Shaaban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Sternberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Stoll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Sunlake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Sutherlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Torstrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anne</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Wrenn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Holden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Yudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Brian</td>
<td>Walters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Herndon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Kiley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diane</td>
<td>debartolo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JO</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolette</td>
<td>Stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Heinlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence</td>
<td>McGinnis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charleen</td>
<td>moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Powers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Saltzman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Sharkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>LaCognata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Kult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Aydevich-Akin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>Dollive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Nancarrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Seewald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhuri</td>
<td>Singh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walt</td>
<td>Vanderbush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Uecker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Maurig, Jr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dee</td>
<td>hulse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary</td>
<td>Bertsche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey</td>
<td>Yost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Darnell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Banina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>A Clark Jr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>Best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Blakesley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancie</td>
<td>Boggs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Boots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Brackett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maura</td>
<td>Buckley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Bunner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>john</td>
<td>calhoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Coughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katharina</td>
<td>duckelit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Faesi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwin</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda</td>
<td>Hartly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Luc</td>
<td>Howell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Kinsman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>LASHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan</td>
<td>Laurent-Faesi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERik</td>
<td>Malewski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name 1</td>
<td>Last Name 2</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>McCartney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Pacheco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Scholz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Suess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvin</td>
<td>Trammell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Ulrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Wardzinski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effie M.</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>dett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>beesley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Reddersdorf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>Cramer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry and Liz</td>
<td>McCloskey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Ayers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millard</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Orlh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gall</td>
<td>Ginther</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Boyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL</td>
<td>SULLIVAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthanne</td>
<td>Wolfe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wilton</td>
<td>aebersold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Cresseveur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Laun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Arndt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>Dotson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Rocca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Ticknor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Oestreich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. W.</td>
<td>DUNN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melva</td>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steven</td>
<td>patty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Epp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Christofersen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J M</td>
<td>Blankenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Elrod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara</td>
<td>Haynes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca L</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>McKibben</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Vanden Bossch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Warye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Goodall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Rams</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veanne</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Barad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekkaphol</td>
<td>Boriboune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale</td>
<td>Carmona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Geisinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Bosler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Wertz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janie</td>
<td>Fischbach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Hulen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Dalsimer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie</td>
<td>Herren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Stolfus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane</td>
<td>McCune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Kay</td>
<td>Shevling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Bidwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth G</td>
<td>Shechter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Godshall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilma</td>
<td>Lamb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Ellenstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Howald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn A.</td>
<td>Ruiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna</td>
<td>Southard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>Badger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Burress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Carmody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De</td>
<td>Christensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Crockett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katharine</td>
<td>Flannagan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Holm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinah</td>
<td>Lovitch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskell</td>
<td>Springer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer M</td>
<td>Weishaar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Eble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Keleti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Mellicker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Berggren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lester</td>
<td>Loschky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Steward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Valent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Marchin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOAN</td>
<td>BADER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Neff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>Slicer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leanna</td>
<td>Walters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Burchett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Dierks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Estrada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Minenna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Penner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore</td>
<td>Weiter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Combs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnell</td>
<td>Ruthenberg Suth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Wallbaum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IKE</td>
<td>MALLULA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reda</td>
<td>carr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Fossati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Mauler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Frances</td>
<td>Hogg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Percival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Rutkowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Strickler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Webb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara</td>
<td>Hocker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ</td>
<td>Redford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Bayouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney</td>
<td>Brush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Habkirk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Hannigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilee</td>
<td>Harper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Jacklovich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Jacklovich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Jacklovich Sr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>McClelland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>McMaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Owens Calloway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Wicks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td>Kowalsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoAnn</td>
<td>Paulsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>McKenna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney</td>
<td>Farr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerri</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R.</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>Einhaus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rene</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Dansberry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL</td>
<td>HOPWOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>McQuade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>Griendling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Dickman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbara</td>
<td>henderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Zai III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Yates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheri</td>
<td>Carlton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip</td>
<td>Woolery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Embry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Fitts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose W.</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose W.</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>goldsmith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Gott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Huey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Ingram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Kikuchi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd</td>
<td>McMillan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances H.</td>
<td>Orr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Prats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Pratt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>Quackenboss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Smyth-Pinney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Soulsis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Sweeney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Wardle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Kornstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary E.</td>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Avery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Capshaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL</td>
<td>CASSARO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>Dreyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Gwaltney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Harney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helen</td>
<td>hastings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Herndon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Hester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Houck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Hovekamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampelio</td>
<td>Isettli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Jouskey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Krakowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>Lockhart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Magruder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robin</td>
<td>moody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connel</td>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>julie</td>
<td>namkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Oxyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris</td>
<td>Philipp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Schagene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Sinai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barry</td>
<td>stickler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Westmoreland-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>wineinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>william</td>
<td>davidson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine M.</td>
<td>Holtkamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darle</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Canary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Satory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joetta</td>
<td>Venneman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christa</td>
<td>Dailey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Livingstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>adkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gregory</td>
<td>rhoads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Whalen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen A.</td>
<td>Bontsema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara</td>
<td>Spragins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Tuggle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elia</td>
<td>Mann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>McClatchey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amee</td>
<td>Schultz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lillian</td>
<td>ungaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha-H</td>
<td>Atkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Landry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristine</td>
<td>Mcmurodo-Wallis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>Miley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Mullen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hyacinth</td>
<td>siebert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Dupree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Ieger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marthe</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanie</td>
<td>Williams-West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Higginbotham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>Flugence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelly</td>
<td>Benko-Hakim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Brandao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Bronson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Cassels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Corby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Gossett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Herbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Mielke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Sands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Troyano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charles</td>
<td>webb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Killory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>McLellan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>015805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. and Mrs.</td>
<td>McCullin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>015805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Aderer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Bloch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Bushkoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Jastromb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>McGill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Vanderpoel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie</td>
<td>Bearse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna</td>
<td>Kovitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Bidwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMOTHY</td>
<td>CLEGG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Himmelstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlin</td>
<td>Horrigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maynard</td>
<td>seider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Wenk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>Fan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>LeLacheur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Skidmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Dressler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Frankel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Gorman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Grossman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Hart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.A.</td>
<td>Hopeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert</td>
<td>Kagan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Kangiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Knutson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Koenig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Rogovin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Wight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ailsa</td>
<td>Wu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Robinhold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosanie</td>
<td>Martinis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noni</td>
<td>Macleay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Macleay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Kelley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desne</td>
<td>Crossley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Hollman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Kefauver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lucille</td>
<td>magnus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Fougere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Karasic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan M</td>
<td>MacRobert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Ugelow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxine</td>
<td>Oland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adina</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Lubarr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>Address Line 2</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Rosenblum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Jacober</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John A</td>
<td>Jacques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Nangeroni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Troup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George David</td>
<td>Annas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Byers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davida</td>
<td>Carvin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICIA</td>
<td>DADMUN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>de Crescentis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLIE</td>
<td>DEUTCHMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Dimitry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markus</td>
<td>Dubrowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Fried Bliss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxane</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Garvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Leverich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Merz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>Rubin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Sargis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Stoner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emily</td>
<td>synk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda B</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>McLeod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>Miele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Gerstel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Stola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Whitworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Wilbur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Ajemian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yael</td>
<td>Bat-Shimon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devera</td>
<td>Ehrenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Nicholson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Yannis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sheilw</td>
<td>Datz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>michael</td>
<td>welch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Toner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Bassett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Bevilaqua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td>Downes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>FRank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Hindman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>Iasiello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>Kress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Orleans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enid</td>
<td>Shapiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Bourgeois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Burns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Chaffen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalind</td>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin G</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Feldman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shola</td>
<td>Friedensohn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Hiltz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofer</td>
<td>Inbar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindy</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Kirchway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Leff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>MacDougall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>MacLellan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>marotta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>merriman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Ramirez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birute</td>
<td>Regine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Rivard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Shapiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Stonewell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Teshu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Vogel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharrhan</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Leff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toby</td>
<td>Orel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugenia</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Lipponen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Telesco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Frappier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>Saltsburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Fitzhugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Gendron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Amster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Dettelbach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Ruggles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Matsuda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathryn</td>
<td>McDonough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Maioli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Maioli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulmira</td>
<td>Maioli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Schmalz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney</td>
<td>Shafran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darcie</td>
<td>Flanagan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Hodges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josella</td>
<td>Kopchak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Lamb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Sughrue-Yacino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahar</td>
<td>Aminipour</td>
<td>12 Morningside Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>46 Beddington St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorian</td>
<td>Greenbaum</td>
<td>24 Hillside Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Nollner</td>
<td>42 Main St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Linthwaite</td>
<td>42 Columbia St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Barnhart</td>
<td>42 Franklin St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Ann</td>
<td>Spear</td>
<td>42 Sandwich Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>McKenna</td>
<td>42 Goddard Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janfree</td>
<td>Harp</td>
<td>42 West St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Herwitz</td>
<td>42 West St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>42 Redwood St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Burns</td>
<td>42 Elizabeth St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>42 Harman Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>42 High St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Lewis-Thorne</td>
<td>42 North St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Bordones</td>
<td>42 Cambridge Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>42 Oak St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>42 Platinum St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Estes</td>
<td>42 Platinum St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>Fath</td>
<td>42 Fredericksburg Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alon</td>
<td>Rand</td>
<td>42 Fredericksburg Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Renick</td>
<td>42 Brookfield Tr St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Westbrock</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>Bent</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Frankel</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marnie</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Senterman</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Shapiro</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Adam</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey</td>
<td>Chiancola</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd</td>
<td>Laux</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Donaldson</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Sharpe</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricky</td>
<td>Greenwald</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Lipshires</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>42 Blackbird Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Spaulding</td>
<td>42 Congress St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>42 Massachusetts Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Brine</td>
<td>42 Massachusetts Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shel</td>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>42 Massachusetts Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>42 Massachusetts Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Barbara</td>
<td>Weldgen</td>
<td>42 Massachusetts Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>42 Massachusetts Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>SALAMON</td>
<td>42 SHORE RD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Worrell</td>
<td>42 Pleasant Lake Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Worrell</td>
<td>42 Pleasant Lake Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian</td>
<td>Newastle</td>
<td>42 Massasoit St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Gatenby Smith</td>
<td>42 Prospect St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>42-12th Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Hodgkinson</td>
<td>42 Fairfield Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>42 Fairfield Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edythe</td>
<td>Cox</td>
<td>42 Whitmarsh St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Gascon</td>
<td>42 South Boston Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Swift</td>
<td>42 South Boston Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Gelineau</td>
<td>42 Northampton St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>Kline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Lipton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Meeske</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlin</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Despres-Hutchins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Heller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony J.</td>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY</td>
<td>SULLIVAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. V.</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Jette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Camacho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>virginia</td>
<td>pepper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Bills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Casanova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suzane</td>
<td>hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonya</td>
<td>Keller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Kimball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>Knapp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Perk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>michael</td>
<td>Rival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Tilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Herstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian</td>
<td>Werner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B.</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Deily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Feurzeig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>Bruce</td>
<td>MacCullagh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Schultz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody</td>
<td>Sieben</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel</td>
<td>Bednaz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Roane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Woolley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Woolley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Berry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Chauls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Neff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Dion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arleen</td>
<td>Silverlieb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Tingle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Lou</td>
<td>Crimmins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Hanold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen</td>
<td>MacDougall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Fried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ben</td>
<td>webb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Forman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mark</td>
<td>solomon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Riddle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbeth</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Shaffner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Lemon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Bromer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>DeCosta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Durivan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Halloran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Musolino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karin</td>
<td>rosenthal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>ruskin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton/Shirley</td>
<td>Schagrin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Shepard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Herrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>McGill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Simeone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrie</td>
<td>Bergmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evan</td>
<td>eisentrager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>Ortiz Calcano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larraine</td>
<td>Feldman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Coffey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Iorio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Morrell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorna</td>
<td>Nogueira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Leary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy S.</td>
<td>Lovejoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Dines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Killam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Sadowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Scott</td>
<td>Meeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Santoro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Hartman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Nieskoski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Antul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranjit</td>
<td>Chacko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Dupree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Poulin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Stone Unger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Atkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNEST</td>
<td>DUQUET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryann</td>
<td>Loftus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Rounsvaile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen E</td>
<td>Barfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariana</td>
<td>Bock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>janet</td>
<td>bruns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brian</td>
<td>cox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>Faty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessa</td>
<td>Goldberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diane</td>
<td>gutterma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Heaphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy</td>
<td>Krieger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harry</td>
<td>jeffmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myron</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Kodjo</td>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEL</td>
<td>ROTTMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Ruetter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Ruggles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Schaechtel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Starr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Vinup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Weiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Weston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saralee</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Dehmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Eloise</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk</td>
<td>Hornbeck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Hothem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Kiraly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idil</td>
<td>Levitas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Haran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryanne</td>
<td>Burgos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Kelleher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>McNeill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Norvell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Rhea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Strauss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Kilduff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhiannon</td>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Schwartz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Sorden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Cavey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nza</td>
<td>Thorn ton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Brenner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breanna</td>
<td>Gomberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Bowen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Hickey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Shilkret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Walty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannie</td>
<td>Amado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gil</td>
<td>Leigh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba</td>
<td>Schofield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry J</td>
<td>Kalin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Meyerson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>Mottur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johari</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Mens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Goldsborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candis</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Root</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Maria</td>
<td>Strates Root</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Welms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Wojtalik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>Wojtalik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Linares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>NA PÁ Tez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Shultz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Boyd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Engles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Gallagher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Giambalvo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybil</td>
<td>Lisansky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Milstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamid</td>
<td>Musavi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol and Richard</td>
<td>Rothenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Smathers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Bloom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K B</td>
<td>Saunders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronwyn</td>
<td>Beistle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Bowler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Galindo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Hodges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora</td>
<td>Ingenhousz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tevon</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Kate Jr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sondra</td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Lambers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Luger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norris</td>
<td>Nierman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Pluhal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taimoor</td>
<td>Qureshi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Waymon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Whitham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Wicks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly</td>
<td>Winston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Wojtowicz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Esquivel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Mariotte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Mermey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Patch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley</td>
<td>Waldron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Trobridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Kraus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan and StacI Ezersky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Green-Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana</td>
<td>Plummer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>george</td>
<td>bottesch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Davidoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Lagassee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Scott</td>
<td>Dow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronni</td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Rivero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Whitehead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Jeralud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Gann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Wynne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary O'Keefe</td>
<td>Kellogg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cindy</td>
<td>curran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>//smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine</td>
<td>Belknap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles and E Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Clampitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve</td>
<td>Goltz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Pierson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Swan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Zur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Lovejoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Veilleux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Queeney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Drake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Keown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Pepin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Casey-Flavin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren</td>
<td>Kehoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Berlinghoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>Neufeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline</td>
<td>Hunneman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith K.</td>
<td>Bogdanove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josie</td>
<td>Coogan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Hinesley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Mentall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde</td>
<td>MacDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Dembska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Dembska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannie</td>
<td>Chadwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh</td>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Fritzsché</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Harte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Marlietta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patti</td>
<td>Kaselausks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Lindstrom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Ruffin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Monat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwyn</td>
<td>Kochakian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Mullin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Bottesch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>Fulcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Willie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Mac Donald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Tardiff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>berner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annika</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Cleary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Cousins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Larrivee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer</td>
<td>Pinkham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta</td>
<td>Zur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>Carrigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mark</td>
<td>mancini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Potter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kymeth-Eren</td>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Hurley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John C.</td>
<td>Ferriday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>McMillan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie J</td>
<td>Somos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Smale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Zabik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Godinez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>LeGendre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Wintle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith M.</td>
<td>Willcox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Weathers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td>Romanco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Ossiff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Ryckman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>agranoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Boyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyla</td>
<td>Boyse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Branton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Djupstrom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Drickamer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Eadie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Eridon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel</td>
<td>Federbush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Garber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Gelman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Hathaway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timothy</td>
<td>janssen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Kransdorf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudy</td>
<td>List</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Mates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td>McCarus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>McIntosh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Okun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Seldin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren</td>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suzanne</td>
<td>smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matt</td>
<td>steele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris</td>
<td>Talley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tom</td>
<td>watermulder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaddeus</td>
<td>Weakley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur &amp; Shirle</td>
<td>Wolfe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Wyman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Zeffer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Zeffer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William J.</td>
<td>Zick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Brennan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Berta</td>
<td>1000 N. Meadow Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>204 E. Kalamazoo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Rachwitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Najduk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Osmun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Mandelbaum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Marriott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td>Aragona-King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford</td>
<td>Les</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Freudigman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Goldman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Greig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Solway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodie</td>
<td>Solway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Yashinsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Radlowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Abbasse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Bunce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>Cappelletti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBORAH</td>
<td>TUCKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maja</td>
<td>Bombaugh LaF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Xenakis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Dawson Chapman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lora</td>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.JIM</td>
<td>GRIMM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Boyd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Havlena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sherry</td>
<td>krauss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Thayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Meyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Meloy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Whitehill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Steinmayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Anne</td>
<td>Wilkinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>Springer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asmara</td>
<td>Afework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Camarda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Carney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>claire</td>
<td>crabtree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>Greenia, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Anne</td>
<td>Helveston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kavanaugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rue</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Weisfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opolla</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Haas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wilbur</td>
<td>DeHart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milbrey</td>
<td>Leighton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>McShane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>Snabb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>Finifter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Geissler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Rittenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Rittenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Shepard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Stark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Suits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Funck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Kittila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>McDougal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Tredy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marti</td>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>joyrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Downie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Knittel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jeff</td>
<td>spakowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carl</td>
<td>weiler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Flinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>josh</td>
<td>Gonzalez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Petitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>Pettit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Frisbie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Harshfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Glave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Labreche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Gibbs-Halm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Gibbs-Halm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>john</td>
<td>pryor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis</td>
<td>Stanbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inie</td>
<td>Bijkerk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Eggleston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>Fong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lilly</td>
<td>melendez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Nowak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Smith-Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Snider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Van't Hof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxine</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter and Ber</td>
<td>Rynders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxine and Ly</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Kowal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerald</td>
<td>Bachman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effie</td>
<td>Ambler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Nordhof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Manore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Bastiaanse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Brake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John K</td>
<td>Erskine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Joldersma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Van Ark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Siebert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connie</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>Weideman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Schiff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERNARD</td>
<td>Schiff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Hinshaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy J.</td>
<td>Schutte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>Keppeler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cj</td>
<td>Maddison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froylan</td>
<td>Torres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethlynn</td>
<td>Dewitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Halderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Karowe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb</td>
<td>Killarney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonnie</td>
<td>Kuntzman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>McFarland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Overmyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Sowers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Stockdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineke</td>
<td>Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>susan</td>
<td>weinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Yonker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Clanton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Frith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Bice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Keune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine</td>
<td>Balcer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Callen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keren</td>
<td>Duran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Hanson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Hare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Lundine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dawn</td>
<td>mead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jerry</td>
<td>pecora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Perkins-Mizga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td>Placenti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Ruark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macie</td>
<td>Schriner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Whitmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Hanson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kirsti</td>
<td>hart-negrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Goodykoontz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>Norton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Wilber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Knudstrup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rev. Rich</td>
<td>Rowlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Downing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Timmins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Mackres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Emrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrie</td>
<td>LaPalm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>Cain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrence</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Godwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Claussen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Nemeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Archambault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Sciamanna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steven</td>
<td>mcclintock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs James</td>
<td>Bergerson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Ringler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Pitts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Zarowitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisa</td>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon</td>
<td>Ceresnie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B J</td>
<td>Kowaleski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie</td>
<td>Bissell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Workman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Kachmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>Kachmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Ryszka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Danner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Mills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Walcott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Cushman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Ann</td>
<td>McKimmy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Fokorkowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Hannan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>david</td>
<td>mcclinen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Kerene</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Howlett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Rosalik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigi</td>
<td>Colombini-Gabri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Hazen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas L</td>
<td>Haynes MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassidy</td>
<td>Boulan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Hilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Markus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faye</td>
<td>Schofield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobin</td>
<td>Sterritt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>mcoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Theilen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Brockington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Gerrish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Holstine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie</td>
<td>Dubas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy E</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy S.</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Fino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portia</td>
<td>Hamlar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Hornstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jann</td>
<td>hydruk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Munch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Kish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vikke</td>
<td>andersen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Jorgensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Chervinsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel F.</td>
<td>Mejia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael-David</td>
<td>BenDor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Shovein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisol</td>
<td>Ybarra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelred</td>
<td>Glidden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Frayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare</td>
<td>Berkowitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Salyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Hack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Feinstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise</td>
<td>Villanueva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Cuneo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Jeason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiri</td>
<td>Culik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>VanHull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Alpert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Bombard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Filar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIRLEE</td>
<td>Iden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd</td>
<td>Strausz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Furgerson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Grutta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth</td>
<td>Mueller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Tarjeff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haley</td>
<td>Kossek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>McIntosh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>DeHoog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMY</td>
<td>Abbasse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Marie</td>
<td>Bessette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chet</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Brzezinski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>Fitzpatrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YVETTE</td>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naghma</td>
<td>Husain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Lunn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland</td>
<td>Schaedig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Sitomer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Erik</td>
<td>Kingstad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Heebink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Larson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Benson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan</td>
<td>Corliss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Ashton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Frederickson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth L.</td>
<td>Kaliher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Brostrom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen</td>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Thomases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Rutter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Lineorooh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>Strohmaier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Guyton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>Rutter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Stumm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Fortuank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>Angel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Eskola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Hendrickson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Maki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Martell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Tonkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Matkovits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Dornblaser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Toia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardis</td>
<td>Wexler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Kerler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Everest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Graves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Koutavas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Geisinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Merz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linville</td>
<td>Doan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Kaufenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Laughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Salter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Meagher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Labrosse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manley</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristy</td>
<td>Harms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Connelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William &amp;</td>
<td>Walley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Kjome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Lippitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Schoener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Dvorsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Wakefield D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Armbuster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Banina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Batchelor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Bidle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen</td>
<td>Bratvold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Cady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scott</td>
<td>cady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Callanan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce D</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Chiappari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Daniels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Edelburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totno</td>
<td>emmott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Fahnoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Fangmeier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Fortin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Gartner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Goodell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Greenwald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Holst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Holzinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>Horstman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxeem</td>
<td>Konrardy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Kult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>LaBelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dustin</td>
<td>Lecander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Linnerson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Linnerson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Lohman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Magee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Mainzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>McDonough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Nafziger-White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paul</td>
<td>neimann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbara</td>
<td>portnoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Prokott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rena</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Serr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Sikkema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Skrivanek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Smallley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Sostek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Spanberger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Steigerwald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Toft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Tutewohl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vincent</td>
<td>wallander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Wellman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Wiese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Wilkinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Walling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>Wright-McGee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Berman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Haapala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Raab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>Romsdahl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Segal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mike</td>
<td>Tikkanen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn L</td>
<td>Glessing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda</td>
<td>Larson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Lavine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Schafer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayne</td>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jennifer</td>
<td>Norwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Sedivy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Meisch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>Gramstedt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>Woehrlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td>Pauling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess</td>
<td>Losinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Squires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Morem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Nees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Noerenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quillian</td>
<td>Roe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Winston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Altchuler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Brunholzi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Colville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Dorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Mayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clairvaux</td>
<td>McFarland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Alice</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Viswanatha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Carney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Hallen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Sperl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>Bethke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan L</td>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kathy</td>
<td>ekberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tess</td>
<td>Galati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Gunderson-Ga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Jonathan</td>
<td>Zielske</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Zolotukhin-Rid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Garner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary S.</td>
<td>Hogle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Brower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Bollman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Horejsi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Rose-Balamut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene</td>
<td>Drabek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Hiemenz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Kenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ronald</td>
<td>gerdes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brionna</td>
<td>Harder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Skrivanek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernice</td>
<td>Vetsch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kristin</td>
<td>warfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Bradbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Emery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lisa</td>
<td>bergerud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie</td>
<td>Berkseth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen</td>
<td>Drake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>Gingerich-Bo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>Hanle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerte</td>
<td>Heille</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Holberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittany</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Klas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kniprath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Nessa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandy</td>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Spandl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bruce</td>
<td>valen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>susan</td>
<td>warfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>ebbenga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayriel</td>
<td>Steffes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Bjorklund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelsene</td>
<td>McGinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>O'Connell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Raskin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Moss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl</td>
<td>Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Ellis</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Halligan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Humsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Hensley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William T.</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Cormer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Brumpton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Levitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev Gloria</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Gloria</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Baldauf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Inkley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floy</td>
<td>Brent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS PLUMMER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Plummer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Dedert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara</td>
<td>Beinlich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>Hirsch, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha</td>
<td>Springer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>WATSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>mruzik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Ruffalo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Twaddle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Kidder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Kelley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Housden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lora</td>
<td>Lockwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Damhorst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>BredenKoetter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Eckholdt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald E.</td>
<td>Grames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willie</td>
<td>laney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Luster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Pullam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Vogt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Mosley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faye</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Burger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Burger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvin</td>
<td>Otto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Curry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Goodwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Mackey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAREN ANSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>Buettner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paul</td>
<td>avila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Bauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallie</td>
<td>Beck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Bremer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiree</td>
<td>Brennan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Carder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>chapman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christi</td>
<td>Clemmons Hoffm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Comer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn</td>
<td>Fogel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Kiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha</td>
<td>Leighton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Lockwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>McGuire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph H.</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>Paske</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>Ratliff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Robertson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Rushing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALVIN</td>
<td>SCHNEIDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Van Horn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>VanNess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Wade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemarie</td>
<td>Woods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen</td>
<td>Peppard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeAnn</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Reschly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Sims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Spitzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Davies-Sigmund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde</td>
<td>Farris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Finch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reese</td>
<td>Forbes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>McIntosh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Saeger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Seats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Tavis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Belosi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>Messer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>vanness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Solom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Falzone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Arrigo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>McUmber-House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>McUmber-House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Avery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roger</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey</td>
<td>Payne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles A.</td>
<td>Farrell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>Wisner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Buckels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Enloe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Belle Isle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannie</td>
<td>Breeze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Dickherber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Hebron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJC</td>
<td>Lenox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahrya</td>
<td>Monson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannette</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert H.</td>
<td>Wilcox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Gancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Leriche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Leriche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu</td>
<td>Wymore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winston</td>
<td>Riley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>Ruth-Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Skidmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David J.</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky</td>
<td>Trippe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Conoyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary J</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Hamack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>margo</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Schaub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Wagaman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita</td>
<td>Dillard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ralph</td>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Clemans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Berg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Egenriether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Garhart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanell</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Jensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>McHugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Morley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Reinhart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Videen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Waugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeAnn</td>
<td>Whiteon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>Worms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Leriche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Grandberry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Huesgen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Riggs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Groff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>orr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joan</td>
<td>botwinick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Creshaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Witry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billie</td>
<td>Reitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Minchinton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlys</td>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Wienbrauck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>Umphenour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Caudell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Bischoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Clapp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brehm</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Ziemer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Butts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laird</td>
<td>bagnall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al</td>
<td>white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoseMary</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Sandberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Foshee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Goggin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanna</td>
<td>Lowrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vida</td>
<td>Gaynor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Holly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Lundemo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki</td>
<td>Slater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Wiles III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaye</td>
<td>miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Northcutt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Fletcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M.</td>
<td>Wages, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Bartin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrissaantha</td>
<td>Cramer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Cramer</td>
<td>Lees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Schultz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Julian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Kuntzelein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Staigmiller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Tuthill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Pushard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Van Sant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Stenseth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>A. Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Albery</td>
<td>249 Outrider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Herrick</td>
<td>289 Herrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanne</td>
<td>O'Connor</td>
<td>522 4th Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Ruiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Zettel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Boatner Jr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Alviar</td>
<td>5740 Montezuma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michel</td>
<td>Colville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Gazdag</td>
<td>1004 Winfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>360 Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Kidd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>MacCalman</td>
<td>3240 Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>McArthur</td>
<td>3740 Fondren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Millar</td>
<td>323 W. Rallston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Nugent</td>
<td>9998 Hiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Pritchard</td>
<td>9999 Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>99920 14th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>9999 Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>L Preston</td>
<td>955 Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Brian</td>
<td>McNaughton</td>
<td>9999 Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>9999 Montmoren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Roylance</td>
<td>9999 Verse 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Lamb</td>
<td>9999 Tyler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Baird</td>
<td>9999 Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Bloom</td>
<td>9999 Sherman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>9999 Sherman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Darnell</td>
<td>9999 Sherman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylee</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>9999 Sherman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Dye</td>
<td>9999 pupno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrest</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>9999 Logan-Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Holfielde</td>
<td>9999 Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>9999 Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Mckenzie</td>
<td>9999 Westchapel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Rawls</td>
<td>9999 Hamburger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Reeves-Brown</td>
<td>9999 Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessamyn</td>
<td>Reeves-Brown</td>
<td>9999 Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>9999 Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>9999 Montmoren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Tolleson</td>
<td>9999 Chapel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Tripp</td>
<td>9999 Cherokee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>9999 Asheville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>9999 Asheville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry</td>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>9999 Asheville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kani</td>
<td>Nicols</td>
<td>9999 Asheville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Barbee</td>
<td>9999 Asheville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>Lyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Buehler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Hawkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Eiford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammy</td>
<td>Castagna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Forno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Abelow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Buss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Elmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Gist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Kurtz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Versenyi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Wiener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Lyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>McLachlan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Stelzenmuller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Xavier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel</td>
<td>Reid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicab</td>
<td>Castaneda-Men Mendonca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Ceartas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>Crumley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Eifort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Ferster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Fogleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamus</td>
<td>Kenney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>McMichael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Paulakonis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>Schnall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Stein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Stocking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Adkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>Ashcraft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Ceccato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lief</td>
<td>Fitzpatrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelena</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emanuela</td>
<td>Goldenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Hair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Robert</td>
<td>Howell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Korzelius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Lakin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Millen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Sarinelli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestor</td>
<td>Davila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Thurston-Lighty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matilda</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl</td>
<td>Underwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Kitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Burngardner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Blum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriette</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avery</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Humes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Keul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardee</td>
<td>Kitzman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Marsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>susan</td>
<td>michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley</td>
<td>Oberhart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>Ortiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Sewell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Thetford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>Usher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>von Schonfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Weil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIRDRE</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Wissoker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Dowd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vero</td>
<td>Brentjens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Bramlett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Berg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shari</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steven</td>
<td>gohr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Blanton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kenneth</td>
<td>anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Dorsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Eason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Grover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle</td>
<td>Shargent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Taub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mary</td>
<td>wakeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Walters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Deere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Rigsby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gloria</td>
<td>mask</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gloria</td>
<td>mask</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Engle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Francia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Francia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Ruwaldt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel</td>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td>2250 N. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Hawk</td>
<td>290 N. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Hodges</td>
<td>304 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Battle</td>
<td>316 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabel</td>
<td>McElhaney</td>
<td>320 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren</td>
<td>McGlynn, JD</td>
<td>328 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Royce</td>
<td>336 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Storie</td>
<td>344 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errol</td>
<td>Genois</td>
<td>352 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Stranges</td>
<td>360 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td>Crowley</td>
<td>368 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Haresch</td>
<td>376 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>384 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Loyd</td>
<td>392 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Shanks</td>
<td>400 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>408 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Hofstetter</td>
<td>416 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>424 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Miles-Graeter</td>
<td>432 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Khoury</td>
<td>440 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>448 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Burnett and Fam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Hoffmann</td>
<td>456 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah J</td>
<td>Ingersoll</td>
<td>464 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>O'Donnell</td>
<td>472 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Leibman</td>
<td>480 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>Moose</td>
<td>488 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerwin</td>
<td>Schaefer</td>
<td>496 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>Lipscomb</td>
<td>504 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Romeo</td>
<td>512 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxine</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>520 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Jardine</td>
<td>528 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Kuharcik</td>
<td>536 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>LaTorre</td>
<td>544 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra</td>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>552 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Diliberto</td>
<td>560 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Ronken</td>
<td>Lynton</td>
<td>568 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>576 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson R</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>584 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Belknap</td>
<td>592 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherie</td>
<td>Braun</td>
<td>600 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>608 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>616 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>624 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>632 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Chagnon</td>
<td>640 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deidre</td>
<td>Crumbleley</td>
<td>648 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storme</td>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>656 S. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carol</td>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Fiedler</td>
<td>701 N. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
<td>710 N. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Glasco</td>
<td>719 N. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Hartman</td>
<td>728 N. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vonnie</td>
<td>Hicks</td>
<td>737 N. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>746 N. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>755 N. Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Moriarty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Prather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubya</td>
<td>Shabazz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claiborne</td>
<td>Smission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Kastern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Connor-McKee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Moseley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margot G</td>
<td>Wilcox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Dlugosz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Gramling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Craig</td>
<td>Amick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Keeney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Nieman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Krinkowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Anna</td>
<td>Besseljeau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Burton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha</td>
<td>Mc Kee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Purdy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Sawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Ott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Michael</td>
<td>Weaver-Robbins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>Kandel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Sailer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glennia</td>
<td>Raybell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Leigh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>Payne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwain</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Penkrot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>Neubert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Stara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Uzendosk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip</td>
<td>Menke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Lawler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Mark</td>
<td>Sheldon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Chism</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>McMullen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Sandeen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janine</td>
<td>Copple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Crane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Darling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinda</td>
<td>Dux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Ham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Howsden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>Kemerling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pippa</td>
<td>Lawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Naber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladimir</td>
<td>Pozek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Rempe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REBECCA</td>
<td>SCHULTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Shubert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayley</td>
<td>Stefkovich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Stoddard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Teet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Yohe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Housley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Bartikoski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgiann</td>
<td>Benish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connee</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauri</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Joy</td>
<td>Eberly-Romano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>Gillooly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath</td>
<td>Haftings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLAN</td>
<td>HINMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Magnuson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Marr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Menard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Mestl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.K.</td>
<td>Piper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Polson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Polson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Rourke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Trenhaile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Fager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>behm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Kurtenbach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Christensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardel</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>Grady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Tenney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Colby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Ludt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Nancy J. White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarah</td>
<td>taft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Schonwald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Souza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah-Elizabeth</td>
<td>Whitcomb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilla</td>
<td>Lockwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jock</td>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Napier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathi E.</td>
<td>Sokness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.</td>
<td>WALTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROB</td>
<td>HEENAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Ballou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Skoglund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Stiefel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Leventhal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celia</td>
<td>McGuckian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan J.</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>de Seve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherin</td>
<td>Alden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Lehner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Drysdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xantha</td>
<td>Karp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie</td>
<td>Rogalski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Sapir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilm An</td>
<td>Shattuck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Wilber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Westrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>ZUCCHI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meg</td>
<td>belcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simone-Claire</td>
<td>Delevett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa</td>
<td>H. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Butterfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Lornitzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Landshof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayme</td>
<td>Trumble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn A.</td>
<td>Calder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Cantara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Donahue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigitte</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Alden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Amidon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>Ahlgren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Bloser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Bloser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meg</td>
<td>gilman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Hilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>015839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allen</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Starkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ernst</td>
<td>ketel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>McKenney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Hodsdon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Cram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Cram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>Voyles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Neumann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Capron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvyn B.</td>
<td>Schupack, MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>VanNote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff and Kris</td>
<td>Lizotte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candace</td>
<td>Kautzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Setter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Frankel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertram</td>
<td>Levinstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Michaels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>Thanawala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Buck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen R.</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Falk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lory</td>
<td>Lazarus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian</td>
<td>Salazar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Janiger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>Ritchey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Jaworek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Manger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Readel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Raupp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concetta</td>
<td>Cantelmo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Masciangelo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>D'Ambra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary S. &amp; Dr.</td>
<td>Reader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Chasalow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Haenschken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Ciavarelaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul &amp; Johnnie</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Saidel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Schwartz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Babson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Hanson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>Cutruell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janette</td>
<td>La Vigne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Lammers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris</td>
<td>Mc Grath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Seiler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGail</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Hennessy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Louise</td>
<td>Maguire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronn</td>
<td>Kistler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Fusco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Schwartz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>F. Vota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Pinco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Lynette</td>
<td>Birkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Riley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Frankel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Lowenstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira</td>
<td>mendelsberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myrna</td>
<td>pelta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun</td>
<td>Twomey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lon</td>
<td>Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Lerner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Six</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Lytle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>D'Alessandro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn</td>
<td>Kahn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Clawans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Pellecchia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Grillo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Zdepski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stephen</td>
<td>byram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswaldo</td>
<td>Lecuona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ilia travis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>McBride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melina</td>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>Ordonez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry A</td>
<td>Raynor Jr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Ruch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruth</td>
<td>Kramer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Nejmeh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaine</td>
<td>shinbrot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madelene</td>
<td>gruber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Grimshaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Baumgardner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Donohoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>Crook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Sobanski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Fedorko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elizabeth</td>
<td>banwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Imhof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Schmit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Allburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>donoghue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Hranichny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolene</td>
<td>Lawton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Lesnak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Niel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jules</td>
<td>Owstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Shine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Assata</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>zarowin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Cosgrove, PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhikkhu</td>
<td>Bodhi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Twomey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby</td>
<td>Cohe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheta</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Piascik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Youngblood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Minter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>Stollmack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Van Sant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARVIN</td>
<td>SLATKIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>len</td>
<td>woloshin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Riordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diane</td>
<td>marie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Janz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basil</td>
<td>Harwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Dudics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ann</td>
<td>roughley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Barkan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Higham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arnold</td>
<td>young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merelyn</td>
<td>Dolins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Gale Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>McNamara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Wine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Dlugos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Hirschfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>John D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbie</td>
<td>Nagel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannine</td>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Feuer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stanley</td>
<td>tannenbaum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney</td>
<td>Kantor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>christine</td>
<td>O'connor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauretta</td>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Grele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Rea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Rohr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Vorih</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Chanon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Eron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Iorio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Goldman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myrna</td>
<td>weinstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Kozlow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Watt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>DuBois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salena</td>
<td>Gigeot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred</td>
<td>Kish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Stritter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Dilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Schafer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Wasserman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Maher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Arena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Beaty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Cox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Wasserman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Wachter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chris</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Costello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lourdes</td>
<td>Rios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>Weigel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kati</td>
<td>Thonet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidel</td>
<td>Montoya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Robb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Lapow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAREN</td>
<td>RANDOLPH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Arzt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>D'Ambrogio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Jewett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donn</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendi</td>
<td>Rottweiler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Schurger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Strauss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Wasserman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey</td>
<td>Langer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Yarock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Cannata-Nowell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAROLD</td>
<td>CARLSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Bergh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E J</td>
<td>Zipprich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Deich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>george</td>
<td>rangel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Bereczansky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Kline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Stein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyson</td>
<td>Harper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Kullmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Pereillo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Spiegel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene</td>
<td>Romoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donna</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Quick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Economou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timothy</td>
<td>stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Breidlove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Gross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robert</td>
<td>scadapane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>george</td>
<td>bolsvert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>julie</td>
<td>stern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>Lockwood-Rubu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russel</td>
<td>Like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Farber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara</td>
<td>McIver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Forste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Knight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Slater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Carini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Viggiano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Hemm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Meek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Shaub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.T.</td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen</td>
<td>Beynders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Focht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Lind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Wilten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Massenaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Stryker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Weiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>McEiwlain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>DeLeo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Ivankovic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luba</td>
<td>Shagawat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Costabile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>McDaniel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Rietz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kerry</td>
<td>Fernandez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Lakins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Stears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichole</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Martinak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shary</td>
<td>Skoloff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Tractenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Presto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Schwartz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Talarico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jam &amp; ann</td>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Turco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Witman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dannielle</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Ponisciak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheri</td>
<td>Dzubak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Kroeger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>McNally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Markman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jey</td>
<td>Gunasegaram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sybil</td>
<td>Wertheim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky</td>
<td>O'Reilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Elosua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James A</td>
<td>Reither</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Barlow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerri</td>
<td>Barnhart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Bartelstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Beason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candace</td>
<td>Brower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Cave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Dominguez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Donelan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayson</td>
<td>Duley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Farquhar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maura</td>
<td>Fitzpatrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Frear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Galloway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Gans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Gershenson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilton</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jey</td>
<td>Gunasegaram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed and Ardis</td>
<td>Hanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Hudspeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Jacobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bettemae</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shauna</td>
<td>Kapel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>Karr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeve</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredda</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith</td>
<td>Menning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>Michel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Moffatt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ananda</td>
<td>Parnell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Rivera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joni</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Rothman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Savitt-Kring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Selbin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Sheldon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla</td>
<td>Shin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camille</td>
<td>Singaraju</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Tenorio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Tibbetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert</td>
<td>Umland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dona</td>
<td>Upson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sergio</td>
<td>viscoli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>john</td>
<td>walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chrysm</td>
<td>watson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jennifer</td>
<td>white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennard</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennard</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Zeliner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda</td>
<td>Zeliner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Watts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greg</td>
<td>Sandoval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb</td>
<td>Ungar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb</td>
<td>Ungar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>Rutkaus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Leyba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecetta</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Trujillo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Graeser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Walding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Waldygo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigo</td>
<td>Flores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Steggs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Kackley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Euwer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erich</td>
<td>kuerschne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele</td>
<td>Zimmermann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharam</td>
<td>Khalsa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Noel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Steinmetz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Braun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Setters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran</td>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Araya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Elder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Neidig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Pudlewski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>Van Zee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Watts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Weir</td>
<td>Ancker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Calef</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Shankland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DyAnne</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Stacey A. Ward, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chellee</td>
<td>Chase-Saiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Viereck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Giambalvo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LORENA</td>
<td>MONDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma</td>
<td>Ruptier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaya</td>
<td>Bear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy</td>
<td>Carey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Burdeau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Haynes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>McGowan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Mele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Weismann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Lieberman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sabin</td>
<td>bailey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evalyn</td>
<td>bemis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona</td>
<td>Blaber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolly</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amy</td>
<td>bunting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>Dever-Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>didak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Farguhar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis G</td>
<td>Hoffmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Howell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nfn</td>
<td>Ishvara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Kaufmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Klezmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Lieberman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique</td>
<td>Mazeaud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>McCuan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>Address Line 2</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teri</td>
<td>Micco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Millard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Neelley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>Otis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Perrone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Reeves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Roche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha</td>
<td>Scarbrough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William M.</td>
<td>Stark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Teolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Valdez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>van Hulsteyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederik</td>
<td>Weindling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Wilkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mona</td>
<td>Yardumian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy</td>
<td>Youngblood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Chavez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Barnhart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Cockerill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J.V.</td>
<td>Connors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Dunseath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Mansbach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>Wecks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marick</td>
<td>Payton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Hatcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thos</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>Navarrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Sedgley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Tuttle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Cutts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Herne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Pennington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie</td>
<td>Duran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Devolpi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joann</td>
<td>Fischella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Goya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margarita</td>
<td>Nevel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>Roelke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>Valent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Rehm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Bear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Bentkower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kj</td>
<td>Kostoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Maloli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Still</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd and</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Beem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Burgess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY</td>
<td>CHASTAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Collatz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Curry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Dudek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodie</td>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trebor</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Healey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON</td>
<td>HENNESSEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carrol</td>
<td>kuhlow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Leavold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Leavold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Mangapit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Martini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIA I.</td>
<td>MEJIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Michie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Rendahl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cecilia lee</td>
<td>slaughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scott</td>
<td>stephensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Wilcox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky</td>
<td>Birkland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. T.</td>
<td>Lang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. T.</td>
<td>Lang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thomas</td>
<td>mills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Belasco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Collette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Franke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>Jacobowitz-Cairn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Printz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Purvis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Rieger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Franks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thomas</td>
<td>swoverland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Stocke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Karczmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td>Shapiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rema</td>
<td>Loeb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquelyn</td>
<td>Baetz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Breen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Bubnack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Hendricks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Impola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Kerr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherri</td>
<td>Salvione</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Marston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Neumann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Vlahos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Vlahos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Willett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Barski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger K</td>
<td>Comstock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randi</td>
<td>Hoffmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Lettiere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Ravick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Capner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Molloy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max-Joseph</td>
<td>Montel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Noonan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>O'Boyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Saia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamar</td>
<td>Schwartz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bruce</td>
<td>staelens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delfina</td>
<td>Torres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Torres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Vasilios</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Wills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Allen</td>
<td>Wrede</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Blish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>richard</td>
<td>libbey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aleris</td>
<td>pizarro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Russo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Pullen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Campisi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Cetron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry J</td>
<td>Posnanski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Abruzzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Crifo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Denig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rory</td>
<td>Schnurr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Binion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Gillis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOLORES</td>
<td>SACHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Zabronsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Hornik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden</td>
<td>Dockter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton</td>
<td>Baxter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fran</td>
<td>merker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Cereghino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>Address Line 2</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Crumb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>backner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Paulino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Baird</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Grattan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Baron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaurain</td>
<td>Farber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Fleischman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Fletcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Froot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Gorski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meryl</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Kornmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constance</td>
<td>mercedes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Papp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>Robertson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Schwartz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>spence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael S.</td>
<td>Wilbekin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>Yachnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Mangini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores</td>
<td>Pepe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellen</td>
<td>Quinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Abram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Stephen</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Alstrum-Aceved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>Amari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Astwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edo</td>
<td>Banach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>janelle</td>
<td>barabash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Baum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Bean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Berggren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Berlant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Bickford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Braun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisha</td>
<td>Brizz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Burstlein-Stern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalie</td>
<td>Byard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Cantarella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George M.</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM</td>
<td>CASTIMORE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meegan</td>
<td>Daley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>celia</td>
<td>deutsch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alec</td>
<td>drummond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>EISENSTARK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Eisenstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth</td>
<td>Elkind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iza</td>
<td>ezbianisky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Fink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>FINKELSTEIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Freid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy</td>
<td>Friedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Frutkoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle</td>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby</td>
<td>Gluck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL</td>
<td>GNAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reva</td>
<td>Golden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessie</td>
<td>Grenfell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Gutnick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Harbutt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Harting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukl</td>
<td>Hawley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Hazen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Heifetz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Hilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronnie</td>
<td>Himmel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Jagendorf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Jahr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>Kroon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>La Marca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Lauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Lavery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Leventhal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>IoebI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertino</td>
<td>Marro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>McAlister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simonja</td>
<td>McCray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>MCMahon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Mirer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ari</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Moynihan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Neusom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Newell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Ochs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Osborne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Owen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadine</td>
<td>Persaud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Petagna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Plybon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Podber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine</td>
<td>Pramik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Rauch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Rausher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Reeves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Reiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margit</td>
<td>Reiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marilyn</td>
<td>rock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Sadove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Sanjour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Schaem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn</td>
<td>Shafner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Sloat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melissa</td>
<td>smario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Smollens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sascha</td>
<td>stanton-craven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Statzel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennie</td>
<td>Stein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Stiefvater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Tanenbaum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imogen</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina</td>
<td>Ternes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Trilling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Tyndail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>Velez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Verges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Marie</td>
<td>Vitanza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Waldschmidt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaia</td>
<td>wheeler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitlyn</td>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Wing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff</td>
<td>Wisner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Zaltzberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Zweig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalie</td>
<td>Harman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Bucki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Delaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Dobranchin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIlyn</td>
<td>HOCHFIELD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rayna</td>
<td>Knobler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>McFadden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Mistretta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Panetski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN</td>
<td>QUaINTANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Riggie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Devone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Weissbard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Blossy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard</td>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>Atkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Pontillo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah J.</td>
<td>Rotunda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Milhoefer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH</td>
<td>dimartino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilse</td>
<td>Funk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Benzing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadine</td>
<td>Clifford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Burnett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Piekarzki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Suda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence</td>
<td>Vivlamore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Wojcik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Hamessley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mona</td>
<td>Perrotti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>michaels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Reid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nancy</td>
<td>sheehan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>O'Grady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jill</td>
<td>ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Peehl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny</td>
<td>Rodgers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geralyn</td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian</td>
<td>Slonim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Donovan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>schuster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilucie</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard L.</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Leskins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Harbeson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Salzberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Norton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paul</td>
<td>tick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William W.</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Kornreich</td>
<td></td>
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<td>Wallitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Neiman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Coffey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Curry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debi</td>
<td>Wong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Schwartz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>Bragdon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>Fruit Dweck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Bittker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myron &amp; Judith</td>
<td>Schwartzman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Weschler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Marden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Emmott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D.</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Flamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Wilensky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael J.</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Byalick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
<td>SLOCHOWER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>Taub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darin</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Heid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Mantino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Seguin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoAnne</td>
<td>Miner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Katris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>McNulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>MULLIGAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callie</td>
<td>Rabe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George L.</td>
<td>Bickel III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Lounsbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Parraga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Butera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha F.</td>
<td>Krupera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard</td>
<td>McGirr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>Staelens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Stein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Agro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanne</td>
<td>Burtis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Bergman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara</td>
<td>Schacher-Tytl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Hale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Sarfaty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>McSweeney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>GUTELIUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Moseson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Bunn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Mahoney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Grattan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Beilby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoAN</td>
<td>Shaw friedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Joffe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Pitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Bonham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Dambrosi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Seaman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Hartman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>Rego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Gliboff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry</td>
<td>Mcloryd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Mickelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Ginsberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yehuda</td>
<td>Klein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Heavey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Shea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Coppola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Flowers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu-Shih</td>
<td>Liu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>Luther</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Cassi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Levine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Shulman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Golden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Kipperman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Gorman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Westwind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Jennick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Cheng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Geiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avlyn</td>
<td>Ashterman reec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Caplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi</td>
<td>Falk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Tischler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haleh</td>
<td>Abghari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haleh</td>
<td>Abghari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Ahronheim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Elizabet</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Alleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Alpert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Althouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Altmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Angelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Apfel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Arenson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Baarda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Backstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Banov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leora</td>
<td>Barish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Barnett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Baron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Bartfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Beck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Berroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Claude</td>
<td>Berthelot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Bloch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masako</td>
<td>Bogin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gusti</td>
<td>Bogok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>Bookstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay</td>
<td>Borden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Bowie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Boyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ari</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Brandt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Lardner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbara</td>
<td>lauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nydia</td>
<td>Leaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Leavitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio</td>
<td>Leguizamo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane</td>
<td>Levens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Levitsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.K.</td>
<td>Levor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batya</td>
<td>Lewton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>LiCalsi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Lipton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Mackaman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>MacLeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Maikish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Maoz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diogenes</td>
<td>Marchena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxine</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brian</td>
<td>mattlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiree</td>
<td>Maumus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Mazer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Meister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James R</td>
<td>Mendelsohn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rekha</td>
<td>Menon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rolf</td>
<td>meyersohn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Mielke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Millard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee</td>
<td>Mittler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Molodowitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taina</td>
<td>Montalvo-Teller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon</td>
<td>Montes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrinka</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola</td>
<td>Moore-Pagano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Nazimowitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Neidich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Nocerino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathleen</td>
<td>Noland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>O'Connor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>O'Neill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angela</td>
<td>paik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Paladino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neni</td>
<td>Panourgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neni</td>
<td>Panourgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>john</td>
<td>papandreya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Parkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANNY</td>
<td>PEARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Pelavin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Pensak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>Perez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Perrin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macauley</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred J.</td>
<td>Petroski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Pezzati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Polivy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>portanova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Pottltizer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nora</td>
<td>pretice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Pricci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gregory</td>
<td>reardon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine</td>
<td>Reyes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian</td>
<td>Riffelmacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>Rincon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Ritchie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Rolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Rubin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bernice</td>
<td>rubin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Rugg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Russo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee</td>
<td>Saginaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Sander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Santisteban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carmen L.</td>
<td>Santos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriette</td>
<td>Schecter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Scher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>judith</td>
<td>schiff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Schissel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>Schmutzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Scholvin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Schrimshaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharon</td>
<td>schwartz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Scuder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Sedlock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>Seiler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Senko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Sharfman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Shepard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Shpirt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugenia</td>
<td>Shulman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robin</td>
<td>shweder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Siekevitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Silverstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Skolnick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catherine</td>
<td>Skopic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Smoke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Snow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary</td>
<td>Sobel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David N.</td>
<td>Sokol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Somkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>Spiegel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Standish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Starmack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>Stauber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert</td>
<td>Steed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Steinberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>Steinkamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Stenseth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Stern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Still</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Sucher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Sudran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Tate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francoise</td>
<td>Teitelbaum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>Thaler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Thornley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganden</td>
<td>Thurman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalind</td>
<td>Tobias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucia</td>
<td>Trimbur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florindo</td>
<td>Troncelliti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmine</td>
<td>Tronolone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Ungar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinson</td>
<td>Valega</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rayda</td>
<td>vega</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene</td>
<td>Verin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arista</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee</td>
<td>Warshaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilia</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Wickham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Wildau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katharine</td>
<td>Wolpe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>celia</td>
<td>wu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>Zaner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey</td>
<td>Abrams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Derasmo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Isbrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Levy Troy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack David</td>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>Reznick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Russo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>Sheiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Amberge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>johanna</td>
<td>cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Daugherty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>hildebrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Stamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Naumburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Mangus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Cramer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>DeWitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>du Plessis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>eisenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Enns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>Gaines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Glasser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>Zaner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey</td>
<td>Abrams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Derasmo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Isbrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Levy Troy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack David</td>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>Reznick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Russo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>Sheiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Amberge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>johanna</td>
<td>cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Daugherty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>hildebrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Stamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Naumburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Mangus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Cramer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>DeWitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>du Plessis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>eisenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Enns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>Gaines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Glasser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>Address Line 2</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Goldfarb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillien</td>
<td>Goll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawatree</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Hatry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Heller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egbert</td>
<td>Isaacs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td>Landsman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Lopato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>McKee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Pursnagen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>Quart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Senf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mim</td>
<td>Solberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam (Mim)</td>
<td>Solberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Stein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Stratton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Tobey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renzi</td>
<td>Vanbolderick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Winthrop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Friedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judi and Felix</td>
<td>Aronowitz and Fern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Barish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Beame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Brody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Eisenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Forat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teri</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>Hanellin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Howk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Klein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>Krause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL</td>
<td>Mistretta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Panken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Friedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen</td>
<td>Blacklock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Mahoney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Beal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Kestenbaum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Conklin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roselyn</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Ostrander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Wentworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Kinney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Ludlam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Sullivan-Parry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Lubell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Uleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rev Stephen</td>
<td>michie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>herman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Gunlogson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Hogancamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>DeCaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Kerner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Neal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EILEEN</td>
<td>SPENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>Fried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Makara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathleen</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingeborg</td>
<td>Sapp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Budd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou</td>
<td>Csigay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charmaine</td>
<td>Oakley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Teplin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew &amp; K</td>
<td>Wittenborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton</td>
<td>Kissner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Hartwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Learnard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>Essenburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Barbara</td>
<td>Schafer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandell</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loren</td>
<td>Unger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Fossum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Seymour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Hritz-Seifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia G.</td>
<td>Lamanna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Susser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Winn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renata</td>
<td>Schwebel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Bloesch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partricia</td>
<td>Carano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Carano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Carano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Gelfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>LeBlanc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariane</td>
<td>Orenstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara</td>
<td>Rubenfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Beren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Kahn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur L.</td>
<td>Friedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Castelluzzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>DeWan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Trachtenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Watters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Eggleston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan</td>
<td>Quigley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Eager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Asprooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Barker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Bender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Bogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Borrelli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penelope</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Connelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Cuff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nzncy</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H.</td>
<td>Dengler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Denison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Eisenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Florez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Freedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosary</td>
<td>Grande</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlene</td>
<td>Gunter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Guthrie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Jackel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Kramacyk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr and Mrs</td>
<td>LaRossa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Laties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Marie</td>
<td>Lodolini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Markowitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta</td>
<td>Moriarty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Neary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Orenstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kishan</td>
<td>Pandya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>Picciotti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippa</td>
<td>Proudfoot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Ruehle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Stringer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Switger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Esposito</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lionel</td>
<td>Brickman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>Perlmuter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Davis-Soman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. Alfred &amp;</td>
<td>Strachener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>Weinstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Hecht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Schultz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilene J.</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Polonsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Krainin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Bradshaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Brennan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecile</td>
<td>Shore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Danna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Wojcik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily R.</td>
<td>Oprea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Speer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Porosoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisca</td>
<td>Sabadie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Webster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>Carr</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Burnett</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Pritchard</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Lentz</td>
<td>140 MacKenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>Atwood</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin</td>
<td>O'Neil</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Banning</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritt</td>
<td>Rousseau</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Torrence</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>Niedner</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larke</td>
<td>Recchie</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Gunnell</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH</td>
<td>BROCKMAN</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rosemary</td>
<td>carnival</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Chiro</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Diemand</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Stuckman</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Dolcini</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>Beale</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carol</td>
<td>gottessman</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Dugar</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roslyn</td>
<td>Talercio</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronda</td>
<td>tyree</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anita</td>
<td>bixenstine</td>
<td>2345 NW 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>Bixenstine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn</td>
<td>Colville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonny</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Kaltenborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla</td>
<td>Kellenberger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Crisler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>Cogan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Cosgriff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Grenier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>HILLIARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stephanie</td>
<td>spahr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE T</td>
<td>SIDDALL JR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Stapleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thomas</td>
<td>croxall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Veerjee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britney</td>
<td>Mann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Dierig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Dryer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin</td>
<td>Noland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Potticary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARLENE</td>
<td>SCHREIBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Stallhorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>SCHREIBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robert</td>
<td>garrett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnnie</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Russo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luanne</td>
<td>Goodson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend A</td>
<td>Keiffer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey</td>
<td>Langsner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>Skees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Lungo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>Morse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Tonoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Diernbach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>Rummell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Maley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>Nameth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mary</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cate</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Conkling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL</td>
<td>HARRIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pat</td>
<td>henderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carol</td>
<td>brenner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Miller-Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thomas</td>
<td>cummons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dabrowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan H.</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Shanabarger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert J.</td>
<td>Bohland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>Roddy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Welch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Wieland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edward</td>
<td>fleischer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rachel</td>
<td>williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Ramey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Velick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard and S</td>
<td>Wengel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Fuchsman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damaris</td>
<td>davis &amp; family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma</td>
<td>Shirey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Bruhn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Lefler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen &amp; Co</td>
<td>Caruso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Engel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Nestor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Clouser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Gillette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>Harpman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maryann</td>
<td>limmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>Marino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie</td>
<td>Cowen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>DiMaggio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Hoechstetter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenore</td>
<td>Kern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>Searfos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Weingart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Feinberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Lamovskiy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynnette</td>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaTonya</td>
<td>Gibbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Gorman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Hotte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>Klein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Knox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Lefevre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kianna</td>
<td>LeVay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Maddex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Michaels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Moodie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Morrell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Nemeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJ</td>
<td>Novitski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Pitcairn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Pritchard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>Quitslund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleen</td>
<td>Reilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrrh</td>
<td>Sagrada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Scherer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jozef</td>
<td>Siekier-Zdzienick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Stahl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Verret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Andrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle</td>
<td>Archuleta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Roque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Woodward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Mount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Blasche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Cadonau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco</td>
<td>Gadea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>Webb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Winkle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Lamblin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Weitgenant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greeley</td>
<td>wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Bair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>Kiley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Berkson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woody</td>
<td>Booker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Litt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtis</td>
<td>Loren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Robb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berklee</td>
<td>Robins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ueli</td>
<td>Stadler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Tahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene</td>
<td>LaFollette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Christholf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Burgess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keith</td>
<td>shirley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barney</td>
<td>Gorter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June A.</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Kolwicz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>Gilchrist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Lilley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Mottershead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Saufley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Ferris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Marchel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Sasanoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Betteridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristi</td>
<td>Schaefer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Sellevaag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma s</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>Stonier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Seegert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Kilburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Adler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Appelhans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietrich</td>
<td>Ayala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliet</td>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Bard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur (Bill)</td>
<td>Barstad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deirdre</td>
<td>Bentley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Bentley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Bentley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Bentley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linsey</td>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethel</td>
<td>Blmbach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Bognar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>bourn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELESTE J S</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Brower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Buhl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Burris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rod</td>
<td>carlson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>cipolla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Clemans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Cooperman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Cox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Crittenden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>christopher</td>
<td>dazey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Doering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philip</td>
<td>dryer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo</td>
<td>du Coudray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Earle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn</td>
<td>Ehlis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adi</td>
<td>Fairbank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Fardig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denis</td>
<td>floyd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldine</td>
<td>Foote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Foulke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Gaarder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>James</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie</td>
<td>Hetrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Gibbon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Neylon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen</td>
<td>Mugliston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Burger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Hoffmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Dea</td>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Bedrosian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Austin</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Morotti-Meeker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL</td>
<td>MASSAFRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Swavely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Bair, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Booth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICK</td>
<td>BRESKI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayly</td>
<td>Newcomer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichole</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Shannon-Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Stickley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Torrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Vogelsang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Craighead</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary</td>
<td>Mislan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Benamy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mona</td>
<td>Cardell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Coyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Dengler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Wernick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Mende</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Webber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Hofreiter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Elwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Caine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey</td>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Dickstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>DICKSTEIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Frlander-Ulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa Russell</td>
<td>Lichtenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Wetterholt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Ahearn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>Freaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Gagliardi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Toleno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Kannerstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Schwartz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>Buxton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>Aleci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>Glick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Schrum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Wolff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Freedly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Ulkoski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>McMahon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krail</td>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Gettle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Wieczorek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delane</td>
<td>Branson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>DeSerio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Plummer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Prejean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>Casteel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>G Atterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Flinchbaugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Woerner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Silverstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Roehds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Willow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilian</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Johns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred</td>
<td>Aalvarez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydalker</td>
<td>Amaral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Ludovici</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Posmontier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Whipple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Weimer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>HARDEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheri</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>Gower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloriana</td>
<td>Sewell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Beck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Janis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Gering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Hrenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Durkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maura</td>
<td>Cowan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Ruden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie</td>
<td>Kraus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSANNA</td>
<td>REILLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Shirk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Joshua</td>
<td>Opdyke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Ludlow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek and</td>
<td>Am Stedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Munger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta</td>
<td>Dezort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Craciun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Tresnan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Stokes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erinn</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Webb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Muzzy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Bolesta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Richard</td>
<td>Feldsher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etta</td>
<td>Winigrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy S.</td>
<td>Keenan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Faigen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Moslen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Perelman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca</td>
<td>Alvarado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairlee</td>
<td>Gamble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Saunders</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy</td>
<td>Landriault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Landriault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Stratman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Cupp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>Siebert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent</td>
<td>Wasilenko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Brantlingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Milton</td>
<td>Luminais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>Payne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrie</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sissy</td>
<td>Riffen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominik</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Henninger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry R.</td>
<td>Gutshall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Wilkes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Hargis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anthony</td>
<td>nobles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Shepler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Kennamer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Newcomer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Walton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ann</td>
<td>thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Boisover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Wegner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharzad</td>
<td>Bumpus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharzad</td>
<td>Bumpus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David N</td>
<td>Cox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Ladd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Mc Crystal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Dinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>Canning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Hager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Catron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Ellison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Horvat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Ivey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda G.</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Mullins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>vanFrank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Whitlock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eric</td>
<td>collings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Dwyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janee</td>
<td>Gillette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elana</td>
<td>Maurin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alex</td>
<td>merkley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Spotts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Steiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Bostick-Ebbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jule</td>
<td>Caylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Lanzman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>Butterfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Bauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Burleson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priscilla</td>
<td>Chism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Crews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>michael</td>
<td>deninger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardith</td>
<td>Dentzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Arnold</td>
<td>Edelman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Edelmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Fina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jena</td>
<td>Gilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Hardin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.</td>
<td>Jahangeer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Mayes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>McFarlane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>McGee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>Melendez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.J.</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>O'Neal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Phillippe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>Address Line 2</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>Runyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Sammons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Slinker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne</td>
<td>Slingm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arina</td>
<td>van Breda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Witkowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl</td>
<td>Grimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Gross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>Bersani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Bolotin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Bousquet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Carabillo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowland</td>
<td>Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Detweiler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>Eckert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik</td>
<td>Ehudin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chet</td>
<td>hepburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>Kibrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Roth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo</td>
<td>Sarli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dena</td>
<td>Shoraigo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Sittner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Spaeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Steen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anu</td>
<td>Thakrar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Viggiano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathia</td>
<td>Cecarelli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>Faulkner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Goldberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey</td>
<td>Knobl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Lawless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>McVey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Plaut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Shryock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Crannage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Hartnett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamonte</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatley</td>
<td>Morison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Blodinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Chowdry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendan</td>
<td>Ferrer-Hanberry</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Deckert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffry</td>
<td>Fitzsimmons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Vince</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deja</td>
<td>Hanson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Jacobson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Larner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David &amp; Judith</td>
<td>Laws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Dale</td>
<td>McKinnon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica roth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Schuck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Somerville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Lazenby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td>Kamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Harper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Helton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>McGraw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Stetler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Winters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy H.</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Duby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Eventoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Nafziger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Pike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scot</td>
<td>Hearl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chris</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton M.</td>
<td>Whisler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen and</td>
<td>Osborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Smart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Smart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Coiteux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corinne</td>
<td>mcowilliams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Prete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Rader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Mattoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piero</td>
<td>Cantieni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Glover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert + Julia</td>
<td>Kenny + Glover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Wennstrom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>Luck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Burns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbie</td>
<td>Lobell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Schwarz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadine</td>
<td>Rankin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYLLIS</td>
<td>WILLIAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin</td>
<td>Overbeck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francie</td>
<td>Greth-Peto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Jewell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank and Jan</td>
<td>Loudin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha A.</td>
<td>Pitts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Cline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Pritchard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran</td>
<td>Christie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>DuPree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>DuPree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrna</td>
<td>Overstreet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Piele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Hedwig Backman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Hinton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Irwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakoda</td>
<td>Wendfeldt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steph</td>
<td>Farber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Longstaffe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jeffrey</td>
<td>LaGasse M.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacueline</td>
<td>Milligan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Trenshaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Doolittle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Drath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Rabinowitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>Berkowitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Lytle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thor</td>
<td>Mathiasson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Garner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Waddington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Atkinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dart and Jean</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James and Je</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathryn</td>
<td>Baillie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack &amp; Bertha</td>
<td>Crich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmett</td>
<td>Michie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>Sisolak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rik</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Deane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayne</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcella</td>
<td>Fancey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Tyra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tim</td>
<td>carlson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lory</td>
<td>Marie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Moen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suzan</td>
<td>ballsun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovina</td>
<td>Feldman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Hartman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot</td>
<td>Kaplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Noble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Senechal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ric</td>
<td>shimono</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>Starliper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Wexler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Crowell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Starling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Bynum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>DOUPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Gruenewald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Jobe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss</td>
<td>Knorpp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
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<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harolynne</td>
<td>Bobis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Bohne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E R</td>
<td>Bowden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Brenneman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathew</td>
<td>Burckley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Calcattera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Campos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Capecci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Carr-Buswell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard F.</td>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayson</td>
<td>Curry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty</td>
<td>Curry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb</td>
<td>Dahlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Dale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frank</td>
<td>danna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Das</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Doherty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Doman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Dowell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Drake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Eister-Hargrave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Faja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>Fernald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Forgey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Forman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Fosnick Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beulah</td>
<td>Frankel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Frankel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroy</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Gainey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Geiger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Gerlings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Gienapp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Gioiosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Goodwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Goodwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Gould</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Gruenewald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRISTI</td>
<td>Hagen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Hamer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Hart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abha</td>
<td>Harting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Healy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Hoagland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Hofsass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Hoening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Houlihan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Houser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denys</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. A.</td>
<td>Iverson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>Kangley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Karpf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Kechley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Keeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Kinnan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Kivlen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Knox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'vorah</td>
<td>Kost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Lahey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Lindroos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Litewka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Longenbaugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri</td>
<td>Lovins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Mabe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Mahlis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Marsolek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>McElhaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Meagher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Meinhold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen</td>
<td>Mills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Mink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dooreen</td>
<td>Mitchellum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Munson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Neering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Neitzert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Numrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>O'Brian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>O'Herlihey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvorah</td>
<td>Oppenheimer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Otto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Palasz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roni Jo</td>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Piacenti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Potter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>Prange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Pullo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nels</td>
<td>Reese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Reiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Reysner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Kay</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Richter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alena</td>
<td>Ricks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Rush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Rutsala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Schultz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri</td>
<td>Sharpe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selena</td>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Snell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Soper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Sowers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny</td>
<td>Stern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary</td>
<td>Stitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea Ann</td>
<td>Strand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Stucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Summers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Tinnea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Truax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leesa</td>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Tuley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Turgeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Turnbull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Tussing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>Tzou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Wallin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arle</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Watts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan F</td>
<td>Weisenbloom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scott</td>
<td>williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Winters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Yao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Yoder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Zorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Burres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Boatman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaryAnn</td>
<td>Clymer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Gaston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landon</td>
<td>Hendee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Homer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurence</td>
<td>Lang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Manis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Riopelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jeanine</td>
<td>dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Rubin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Joslin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Kafton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Attwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Bachman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharron</td>
<td>Crandell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>virginia</td>
<td>czechowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Farrell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lila</td>
<td>Girvin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Latton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melissa</td>
<td>LANG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Meisfjord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sally</td>
<td>Pierone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greta</td>
<td>Rizzuti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Weathers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark R</td>
<td>Wilder Sr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Stapleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyn</td>
<td>Henri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Matherly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Wartes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita</td>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Buell-Silsbee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trixanna</td>
<td>Koch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Mingo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPERANZA</td>
<td>RICO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Pearre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Bhakti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athena</td>
<td>McElrath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myra</td>
<td>Bieri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Bredeson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Dick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Berndt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Mortier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Oie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Accola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Neider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Rosenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Hessler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Conine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita B.</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Rastani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Horner-Ibler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Cranley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Dostal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Cadwallader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Hartman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Cleary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>craig</td>
<td>harrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Johnson-Marsol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela L.</td>
<td>Belcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Belcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Waltershausen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Flakas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey E.</td>
<td>Olsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Duffy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Mottl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Mary Fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery</td>
<td>Paine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Haakenson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald W.</td>
<td>Albers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Miner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Czinsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Doroug Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Moon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Drori</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Desimone Sieg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara L.</td>
<td>Samore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Harder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Salzman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Woessner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Goltz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Koller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeeAnna</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Sam</td>
<td>Salmon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Senechal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Marceille</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Bartz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Soldan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Mundahl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Hulke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Mead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Grier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane</td>
<td>Lahti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Detert-Moriarty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Bussiere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Feuling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldine</td>
<td>Brylski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Biebl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tristan</td>
<td>Brandhorst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Browneell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Champion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>Christiansen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mya</td>
<td>Cooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Dunphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Eastwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Feeny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Ferm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean A</td>
<td>Fitzsimmons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Gandolfo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Ginsburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Grittner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Haldinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Houser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki</td>
<td>Huss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Jaeger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Katt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inna</td>
<td>Larsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Mack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Malischke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Nehmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles &amp; Je</td>
<td>Pfeifer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee</td>
<td>Piraino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Rasmussen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joella</td>
<td>Roland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Scheele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Silverman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheri</td>
<td>Sinykin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIAN</td>
<td>SMOCZYNSKI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Stephens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Teren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Wyngaard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Zwiefelhofer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Bjerke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Saecker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Schweitzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen</td>
<td>Zehner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie</td>
<td>Schramm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Whitmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Lang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Lienau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Vancil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amy</td>
<td>kirkland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Zeisler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Boehme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Edelstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>knutson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Gammons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Baez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Barfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis</td>
<td>Blaise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Boen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Bowman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mila</td>
<td>caceres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Chamblish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelica</td>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Filipiak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Gagliani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Gallagher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Hanratty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Hilbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>janus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jeffery</td>
<td>johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey</td>
<td>keys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Klings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Krueger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenore</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Liebmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>McMahon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gene</td>
<td>merz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Moynihan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHMAD</td>
<td>MUHAMMAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deirdre</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Ozburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Pawelski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Redemann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Roesch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britton</td>
<td>Saunders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry C</td>
<td>Shayhorn Jr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Shutkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>Sobol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paul</td>
<td>szedziewski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marie</td>
<td>ulsberger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marianne</td>
<td>vogel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stephen</td>
<td>ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Wechter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Wiemasz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Wiesner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darice</td>
<td>Yench</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Kriofske</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Strangstad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vern and Eve</td>
<td>Rieckmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Faterioun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Otwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sally</td>
<td>pla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>Schudda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Spear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>Subach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Boone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Herbst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Moon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin</td>
<td>Kramer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>Czubin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill &amp; Judy</td>
<td>Earley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Halbe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalie</td>
<td>Mutchler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalie</td>
<td>Mutchler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanette</td>
<td>Nitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Hogan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk</td>
<td>Reese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Winograd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Wudtke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Beder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Cupery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>O'Connor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Gawronski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Dr. Bobb</td>
<td>Groth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Lugar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoAnn</td>
<td>Carlson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Kieffer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Ann</td>
<td>Bladholm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Skup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Taivalkoski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Levine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden</td>
<td>Voigt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaen</td>
<td>Voigt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Lovell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Pawlak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannie</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Wisneski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Chay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jacque</td>
<td>conarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis</td>
<td>DiGiacomo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eppelsheimer, S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Lorenz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Schuster-Macd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen</td>
<td>Budzien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Bussanich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alane</td>
<td>Arneman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Jost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marge</td>
<td>Bergman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>Rochte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Jhona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Rolnick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Jirschele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>Krug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>LEGG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Yeargan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Weis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren G</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Mings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Seivard, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Kleppe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Willis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Wysong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jim</td>
<td>gerl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niambi</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niambi</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staci</td>
<td>Weissberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Whyte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David &amp; Patricia</td>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janie</td>
<td>Poe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Klausing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shelia</td>
<td>vied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Lutz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deacon</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Detko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde</td>
<td>Pritt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce H</td>
<td>Dahlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Homan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Riley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Saugstad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Moss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>Lea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert A.</td>
<td>Mertz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Toney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Abel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Abel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Harshman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeth</td>
<td>Lobet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>McKeown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheri</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Runnels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schelley</td>
<td>Schlarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Combs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Krafczik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James L</td>
<td>Fidelholtz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ken</td>
<td>rinciari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Dowling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Pennie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>Raab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Pickens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl</td>
<td>Volov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. H. Lee</td>
<td>Gershuny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peter</td>
<td>perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td>Goehring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Schoenfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ronald</td>
<td>trojczak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Woodward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian</td>
<td>Cooley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lisa</td>
<td>MOLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>Urquidi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Gilmour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Wadsworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerion</td>
<td>Armour-Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Edelheit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Bowman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefano</td>
<td>Bovero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Iltsche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Di Stefano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greg</td>
<td>chambers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin</td>
<td>Jutila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Sackhein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Karen - I am attaching a spreadsheet providing the information you have requested (Attachment 1), but I want to highlight a few points which may not be immediately self-evident.

First, the original budget (Attachment 2) we submitted to the EAC, dated March 22nd, did not itemize personnel expenses by each person. In addition, when we actually began work two months after submitting that budget, we decided to reallocate more time to people within Eagleton and hire fewer outside hourlies.

Second, in the figures I sent you in late December we tried to account for all the expenses and projections but overlooked a few things including neglecting to include the honoraria for our peer review team. Hence, the figures we're now sending are different than what I sent in December.

Lastly, we originally discussed a no-cost extension through February, but since we don't yet have the EAC comments on our draft Provisional Voting material nor an estimate of when they are likely to be ready, I think it is prudent to extend the no-cost extension through March 31st. We would still like to conclude by the end of February, but if you can approve the extension for another month we could avoid going through this process again if everything is not complete six weeks from now.

It is my understanding that Rutgers will soon be sending our December invoice. At this time, I would also like to request that we combine January and February an invoice the EAC once for that time period.

As you can see, we are currently projecting an ending balance of approximately $10,000. If additional expenses are incurred beyond what is currently projected, we're confident they will not exceed the original budget of $560,002.

Thanks and I look forward to hearing from you.

--
John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Background

On May 24, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission awarded an eight month contract (December 30, 2005) in the amount of $560,002.00 to the Eagleton Institute of Politics (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures.

Contractor’s Request for a No-Cost Extension

On November 15, 2005, John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, requested via e-mail, a no-cost extension on this contract (E4014127). Mr. Weingart has requested an extension to complete the work of this contract to February 28, 2006.

In subsequent correspondence, Mr. Weingart notes the following as the reason for the request:

"The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October, voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting, based on Eagleton’s research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication.... The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report of that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid-January".

"If EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings...(that EAC has determined will not take place)....would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work...“The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $300,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project”.

January 9, 2005

U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Ave. NW – Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Mr. Weingart further notes:

“We anticipate reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line items and spending approximately $35,500 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,250 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants”.

Specifics of the Extension

The contractor has provided the following breakdown and explanation of the personnel and consultant costs, associated with this extension.

Original Project Personnel costs- $195,439 (May-December)
Original Project labor hours-xxxxx (May-December)

Projected Project Personnel costs -$253,915 (January-February)
Projected Project labor hours-xxxxx (January-February)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Projected Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eagleton Institute of Politics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$110,695</td>
<td>$146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Projected Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moritz School of Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$84,744</td>
<td>$107,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EAC Staff Recommendation

Karen Lynn-Dyson, the EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative assigned to this contract has reviewed this request, the rationale and authority for it (FAR 43.103(a)(3)) and finds it to be appropriate. To-date the Eagleton Institute has consistently met its deadlines for major project deliverables and stayed within the project budget. To grant the Eagleton Institute a two month extension on this contract in order to obtain the necessary feedback on major documents it has produced will be within the best interests of the Election Assistance Commission, and thus, the federal government.

EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative finds that to grant the Eagleton Institute a no-cost extension for the modification of its contract with the EAC is within the scope of the original agreement and is recommending that this modification to the contract be made.

Signed

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Contracting Officer Representative
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Gracia M. Hillman
Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
## US Election Assistance Commission Project Budget (original 3/22/05; revised 1/13/06 for no-cost extension)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Cumulative Expenses through Dec 2005 (actual and committed)</th>
<th>Post Jan 1 Projected Expenses</th>
<th>Projected Balance</th>
<th>Post Jan 1 Projected Hours</th>
<th>Post Jan 1 Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eagleton Faculty and Staff (salaried and hourly)</td>
<td>84,263.20</td>
<td>15,250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Mandel, Director and Professor</td>
<td>5,682.86</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>81.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Weinberg, Associate Director</td>
<td>7,347.00</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid Reed, Director of Eagleton NJ Project</td>
<td>19,500.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Linky, Director of Electronic Democracy Project</td>
<td>8,100.00</td>
<td>1,750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Venoellotti, Assistant Research Professor</td>
<td>9,384.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Rapp, Research Project Coordinator</td>
<td>12,844.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Vincelli, Project/Bus. Administrator</td>
<td>10,800.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Brody, Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Velaquez, Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>6,503.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Phillips, Unit Computing Specialist</td>
<td>2,100.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Pfeiffer, Secretary</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers Graduate Students (hourly)</td>
<td>15,531.60</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Andersen</td>
<td>6,060.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadia Brown</td>
<td>906.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Curtis</td>
<td>1,022.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Dubrich</td>
<td>1,635.60</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Harris</td>
<td>5,928.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe (rates vary by employee type)</td>
<td>21,323.56</td>
<td>4,567.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Personnel Expenses</td>
<td>110,698.00</td>
<td>121,127.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,317.50</td>
<td>(33,748.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria for Peer Review Group</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
<td>81,120</td>
<td>948.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>80,171.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>948.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefings/Meetings</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>1,302.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,750.00</td>
<td>2,147.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operations</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,029.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,750.00</td>
<td>(1,779.59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies, software, telephone, copying, postage</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,003.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,750.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop computers, laptop, printer</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,026.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracts</td>
<td>79,500</td>
<td>81,750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,000.00</td>
<td>(20,250.00)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director-Tom O'Neill</td>
<td>84,744</td>
<td>84,222.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,692.84</td>
<td>(23,171.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University (OSU)-Legal Analysis*</td>
<td>50,735</td>
<td>55,724.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,001.18</td>
<td>120.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Personnel (with fringe)</td>
<td>50,735</td>
<td>55,724.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,001.18</td>
<td>120.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned Foley, Professor</td>
<td>50,735</td>
<td>55,724.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,001.18</td>
<td>120.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Williams, Project Coordinator</td>
<td>3,313.65</td>
<td>1,408.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Sampson, Research Coordinator</td>
<td>7,846.00</td>
<td>2,320.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistants</td>
<td>5,229.14</td>
<td>705.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Travel</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>611.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,846.78</td>
<td>35.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Overhead</td>
<td>28,059</td>
<td>27,886.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>35.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Non Personnel Expenses</td>
<td>280,564</td>
<td>186,263.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>94,192.56</td>
<td>37,117.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Direct Costs</td>
<td>391,259</td>
<td>308,360.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>75,810.16</td>
<td>3,367.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac&amp;Admin (overhead) on Modified Total Direct Cost</td>
<td>153,743</td>
<td>117,760.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,814.45</td>
<td>16,071.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Project Budget</td>
<td>545,002</td>
<td>427,171.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>94,891.51</td>
<td>18,439.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Surveys</td>
<td>560,002</td>
<td>451,440.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>98,391.51</td>
<td>10,170.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ohio State University figures are included in the "cumulative expenses through Dec 2005" even though Rutgers has not yet received the cumulative invoices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleton faculty/senior staff</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandel, Weingart, Reed, Linky (various percentages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleton staff: logistics/administrative/clerical</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(various percentages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe (32.5%)</td>
<td>16,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hourly Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Coordinator</td>
<td>21,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250 hours at $17 per hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics/Admin Coordinator</td>
<td>12,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725 hours at $17 per hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research assistants</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 hours at $12 per hour for two researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe on Hourly (9%)</td>
<td>3,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$110,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honoraria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria for Peer Review Group</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 at $1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Hearings (3 in 3 cities)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hearings at $25K per EAC figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hearings in DC- train, ground, lodging, meals*</td>
<td>3,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attended by 3 staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hearings in St. Louis- air, ground, lodging, meals**</td>
<td>2,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attended by 3 staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Briefings/Meetings with EAC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train, ground, lodging, meals***</td>
<td>81,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies, software, telephone, copying, postage</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop computers, laptop, printer</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcontract</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director- O'Neill</td>
<td>79,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% time April – Aug., 60% Sept. – Oct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University- Legal Analysis</td>
<td>84,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner institution, Moritz College of Law, OSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Non Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$280,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal All Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>$391,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Total Direct Cost $277,015****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;A on Modified Total Direct Cost (55.5%)</td>
<td>153,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University federally approved rate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL: Project Budget</strong></td>
<td>$545,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optional Surveys</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Election Officials</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Voters</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Voting, 1st state</td>
<td>116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Political Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Voting, 1st additional state</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Political Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Voting, 2nd additional state</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Political Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Optional Surveys (no F&amp;A)</td>
<td>$291,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Travel and lodging to two hearings in DC includes $260 for train fare to DC, $200 for hotel/lodging, and $60 per day for two days for meals= $580 per person per trip for three people.
** Travel and lodging to one hearing in St. Louis includes $500 airfare to St. Louis, 2 nights hotel/lodging at $100, and $60 per day for three days for meals= $880 per person for three people.
*** Travel and lodging to five Briefings/Meetings with EAC includes $260 for train fare to DC, $200 for hotel/lodging, and $60 for meals= $520 per person per trip for two people.
**** Modified total direct cost is equivalent to total direct cost except for two items - F&A included only on first $25K of subcontract with Project Director ($79,500) and first $25K of subcontract with OSU ($84,744).
Thanks for letting me know. This may well extend all the dates in the proposed revised schedule we sent accordingly. When do you think we will hear about the no-cost extension and budget reallocations? Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> > John-
> > Just wanted to let you know that we've had to push back, by a week,
> > the review of Eagleton's Best Practices document.
> >
> > EAC staff are very focused on the release of the Voting Systems
> > Guidelines; this will be completed by mid-week next week. I'm told
> > that the Commissioners will turn their attention to the Best Practices
> > document, immediately following this.
> >
> > Regards-
> >
> > Karen Lynn-Dyson
> > Research Manager
> > U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> > Washington, DC 20005
> > tel:202-566-3123
Karen - Our request for a no-cost, reallocation of resources is based on (a) the fact that our personnel costs have already been higher than we anticipated and (b) the reality that keeping the project operating for at least nine months, instead of seven as planned, will require the participants to devote more time than anticipated. While we are not producing more product than originally promised, the time involved in our work continues to increase. Both Provisional Voting and Voter ID have proved to be very dynamic topics requiring us to continually monitor developments and update our data, analysis and evolving work products as we learn of new or revised information. As a result, despite the extension of the schedule, the staff and consultants on this project have had no "down" time. We anticipate this research, monitoring and revising to continue for the months added to the project, necessitating significantly more hours by all members of the project team than anticipated.

Our request asks for changes to three line items which I will address below on the assumption that the EAC response to our already-submitted Provisional Voting draft and to-be-submitted Voter ID draft will be sufficiently timely to enable us to complete our work on both topics by the end of February.

1. Eagleton Institute of Politics personnel: We originally budgeted $110,695 ($15,813 average per month) for Eagleton faculty, staff and graduate student assistants for the seven-month project from May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005. Our actual costs have been approximately $14,500 more than that. In addition, we are anticipating needing another $21,000 for personnel costs in January and February, calculated on the basis of 2/3 of the original monthly estimate. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $110,695 to approximately $146,000.

2. Consultant Services: We originally budgeted $79,500 ($11,357 average per month) for consultant services which we have used to engage Tom O'Neill as the project manager. We anticipate no additional cost for the original contract period of May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005, but do anticipate needing his services during January and February at a slightly reduced rate of $10,125 per month or $20,250 total additional. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $79,500 to $99,750.

3. Moritz School of Law: We originally budgeted $84,744 ($12,106 average per month) for staff and overhead for the May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005 period. We anticipate needing an additional $23,171 ($11,585 average per month) to support their time on this project in January and February. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $84,744 to $107,915.

With these revisions, approximately $22,000 of the EAC contract award to Eagleton would remain not yet allocated, primarily because the cost for the public hearings would have incurred Rutgers University overhead whereas the additional expenditures for consultants and the subcontract with Moritz do not.

I hope this provides you the information you need. While Rutgers is
shutting down until January 3rd, I will be checking email at least every day or two.

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
    Eagleton Institute of Politics
    (732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> John-
> I just had a more detailed conversation with our Deputy General
> Counsel about Eagleton's no-cost extension.
> He indicates that we need a bit more information that will accompany
> the material we will send to the Commissioners for a vote (hopefully
> next week)
> We need to know the number of labor hours, the labor costs and a brief
> description of the tasks to be performed by each of the staff who will
> be working on the EAC contract until its completion.
> Since we have eliminated the public hearing (a major contract
> deliverable) it is unclear why staff labor hours and costs will
> continue at the same level and rate.
> As always, thanks for your patience and prompt response.
>
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
Karen - At this time, we anticipate reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line item and spending approximately $35,500 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,250 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants. There are other additional variances but they are not significant (e.g. less on honoraria, less on travel, and more on general operations such as phone expenses). Let me know if you need additional detail or information.

Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> John-
> 
> Quick question-
> 
> How much money do you anticipate will be re-allocated from the original line items outlined in the contract to other project costs?
> 
> Thanks
> 
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
> 
> **"John Weingart" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>**
> 
> 11/30/2005 05:05 PM
> Please respond to
> john.weingart@rutgers.edu
> 
> To
> "Karen Lynn-Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
> cc
> "Tom O'Neill"
> Subject
ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES

1. ORDER NUMBER 3/06

5. ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>ORG CODE</th>
<th>B/A CODE</th>
<th>D/O CODE</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>VENDOR NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8035</td>
<td>TZM9110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. FINANCE DIVISION

8. TYPE OF ORDER

A. PURCHASE

Please furnish the following on the terms specified on both sides of the order and the attached sheets, if any, including delivery as indicated.

B. DELIVERY

This delivery order is subject to instructions contained on this side only of this form and is issued subject to the terms and conditions of the above referenced contract.

9. ISSUING OFFICE

Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

10. PLACE OF INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Remittance via EFT

15. REQUISITION OFFICE

Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

20. SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached for description of this no-cost extension amendment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $560,002.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. RECEIVING OFFICE

U.S. Election Assistance Commission (202) 566-3100

22. SHIPPING POINT

F.O.B. POINT

23. GROSS SHIP WT.

24. MAIL INVOICE TO: (Include zip code)

25A. FOR INQUIRIES REGARDING PAYMENT CONTACT:

25B. TELEPHONE NO.

26A. NAME OF CONTRACTING/ORDERING OFFICER (Type)

26B. TELEPHONE NO.

26C. SIGNATURE
552.227-70 FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES (APR 1984)

The contract price includes all applicable Federal, State, and local taxes. Any adjustment will be made to cover taxes which may subsequently be imposed on this transaction or changes in the rates of currently applicable taxes. However, the Government will, upon the request of the Contractor, furnish evidence appropriate to establish exemption from any tax from which the Government is exempt which was not included in the contract price.

552.210-79 PACKING LIST (DEC 1989)

(a) A packing list or other suitable shipping document shall accompany each shipment and shall indicate (1) Name and address of consignor; (2) Name and address of consignee; (3) Government order or requisition number; (4) Government bill of lading number covering the shipment (if any); and (b) Description of the material shipped, including item number, quantity, number of containers, and package number (if any).

(b) When payment will be made by Government commercial credit card, in addition to the information in (a) above, the packing list or shipping document shall include: (1) Cardholder name and telephone number and (2) the term "Credit Card".

52.232-1 PAYMENTS (APR 1984)

The Government shall pay the Contractor, upon the submission of proper invoices or vouchers, the prices stipulated in this contract for supplies delivered and accepted or services rendered and accepted, less any deductions provided in this contract. Unless otherwise specified in this contract, payment shall be made on partial deliveries accepted by the Government if: (a) The amount due on the deliveries warrants it; or (b) The Contractor requests it and the amount due on the deliveries is at least $1,000 or 50 percent of the total contract price.

52.232-2 DISCOUNTS FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (APR 1989)

(a) Discounts for prompt payment will not be considered in the evaluation of offers. However, any offered discount will form a part of the award, and will be taken if payment is made within the discount period indicated in the offer by the offeror. As an alternative to offering a prompt payment discount in conjunction with the offer, offerors awarded contracts may include prompt payment discounts in individual invoices.

(b) In connection with any discount offered for prompt payment, time shall be computed from the date of the invoice. For the purpose of computing the discount earned, payment shall be considered to have been made on the date which appears on the payment check or the date on which an electronic funds transfer was made.

52.232-8 PROMPT PAYMENT

Prompt Payment clause 52.232-25 is incorporated in this contract by reference. The clause contains information on payment due date, invoice requirements, constructive acceptance and interest penalties. Certain portions of the clause regarding payment due date, invoice requirements, and constructive acceptance are extracted for your convenience. All days referred to in the extracts below are calendar days.

(a)(2) The due date for making invoice payments by the designated payment officer shall be the later of the following two events:

(i) The 30th day after the designated billing office has received a proper invoice from the Contractor.

(ii) The 30th day after Government acceptance of supplies delivered or services performed by the Contractor...

(a)(4) An invoice shall be prepared and submitted to the designated billing office specified in the contract. A proper invoice must include the items listed in . . . (iv) through . . . (vii). If the invoice does not comply with these requirements, then the Contractor will be notified of the defect within 7 days after receipt of the invoice at the designated billing office . . . Unless notification will be taken into account in the computation of any interest penalty owed the Contractor . . .

(i) Name and address of the Contractor.

(ii) Invoice date.

(iii) Contract number or other authorization for supplies delivered or services performed by the Contractor.

(iv) Description, quantity, unit of measure, unit price, and extended price of supplies delivered or services performed.

(v) Shipping and payment terms (e.g., shipment number and date of shipment, prompt payment discount term, Bill of Lading number, and weight of shipment will be shown on Government Bills of Lading).

(vi) Name and address of the Contractor official to whom payment is to be sent (must be the same as that in the contract or in a proper notice of assignment).

(vii) Name (where practicable), title, phone number, and mailing address of person to be notified in event of a defective invoice.

NOTE: Invoices must include the ACT number (block 4) and shall be submitted in an original only, unless otherwise specified, to the billing office designated in block 24 to receive invoices. The remit to address must correspond to the remittance address in block 12.

(a)(b)(i) For the sole purpose of computing an interest penalty that might be due the Contractor, Government acceptance shall be deemed to have occurred constructively on the 7th day (unless otherwise specified in block 20) after the Contractor delivered the supplies or performed the services in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, unless there is a disagreement over quantity, quality, or contractor compliance with the purchase agreement for the contract provision...

52.222-40 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED - CONTRACTS OF $2,500 OR LESS (MAY 1989)

Except to the extent that an exception, variation, or tolerance would apply if this contract were in excess of $2,500, the Contractor and any subcontractor shall pay all employees working on the contract not less than the minimum wage specified under Section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 201-206).

52.222-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED (MAY 1985)

52.222-42 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRES (MAY 1989)

(52.222-41 and 52.222-42 apply to service contracts when the amount exceeds $2,500).

The GSA Form 2166, Service Contract Act of 1965 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (JUN 1988)

This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request the Contracting Officer will make their full text available:

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

52.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)

52.203-2 Gratuities (APR 84)

52.203-3 Covenant Against Contingent Fees (APR 84)

52.203-6 Restriction on Subcontractor Sales to the Government (JUL 86)

52.204-7 Antikickback Procedures (OCT 88)

52.212-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)

52.222-3 Convict Labor (APR 84)

52.222-36 Equal Opportunity (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000.)

52.222-35 Affirmative Action for Special Disabled and Vietnam Era Veterans (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000.)

52.222-36 Affirmative Action for Handicapped Workers (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $2,500.)

52.222-37 Employment Reports on Special Disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era (JAN 84)(Applies whenever clause 52.222-35 is included.)

52.223-6 Drug Free Workplace (JUL 90)(Applies if contract is awarded to an individual.)

52.228-3 Buy American Act - Supplies (JAN 89)

52.226-11 Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases (MAY 92)

52.226-25 Prompt Payment (SEP 92)

52.233-1 Disputes (DEC 91)

52.233-3 Protest After Award (AUG 89)

52.246-1 Contractor Inspection Requirements (APR 84)

52.249-8 Default (Fixed-Price Supply and Service)(APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 88)(Applies when amount is between $2,500 and $10,000.)

52.222-20 Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000.)

52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)

52.249-1 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Fixed Price)(Short Form)(APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 88)(Applies when amount exceeds $2,500.)

52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (APR 84) - Alt. II

52.249-1 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Services)(Short Form)(APR 84)
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Background

On May 24, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission awarded an eight month contract (December 30, 2005) in the amount of $560,002.00 to the Eagleton Institute of Politics (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures.

Contractor’s Request for a No-Cost Extension

On November 15, 2005, John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, requested via e-mail, a no-cost extension on this contract (E4014127). Mr. Weingart had requested an extension to complete the work of this contract to February 28, 2006.

In response to EAC’s requests for additional information related to the no-cost extension, in a January 13, 2006 e-mail, Mr. Weingart revised the request for the extension to March 31, 2006. Mr. Weingart did note that he would still like to conclude the project’s work by the end of February.

In various correspondences, Mr. Weingart notes the following reasons for the request:

“The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October, voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting, based on Eagleton’s research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication….. The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report of that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid-January”.

“Our request for a no-cost, reallocation of resources is based on (a) the fact that our personnel costs have already been higher than we anticipated and (b) the reality that keeping the project operating for at least nine months, instead of the seven as planned,
will require the participants to devote more time than anticipated. While we are not producing more product than originally promised, the time involved in our work continues to increase... We anticipate this research monitoring and revising to continue for the months added to the project, necessitating significantly more hours by all members of the project team than anticipated”.

The contractor anticipates reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line item ($81,120) and spending approximately $33,750 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,171 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants. The EAC elected to not hold public hearings on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification.

**Specifics of the Extension**

The contractor has provided the following breakdown and explanation of the personnel and consultant costs, associated with this extension.

1. **Eagleton Institute of Politics personnel:**

   Original budgeted project personnel costs-$110,695 (May-December)
   Revised project personnel costs- $144,444 (May-February)

2. **Consultant Services:**

   Original budgeted costs: $79,500 (May-December)
   Revised costs -$99,750 (May-February)

3. **Moritz School of Law personnel and overhead:**

   Original budgeted costs: $84,744 (May-December)
   Revised costs- $107,915 (May-February)

**Total project budget:**

Original budgeted costs: $560,002 (May-December)
Revised project cost: $549,831 (May-February)

**EAC Staff Recommendation**

Karen Lynn-Dyson, the EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative assigned to this contract has reviewed this request, the rationale and authority for it (FAR 43.103(a)(3)) and finds it to be appropriate. To date the Eagleton Institute has consistently met its deadlines for major project deliverables and stayed within the project’s overall budget.
Based upon the work products provided to the EAC, thus far, the additional personnel expenses which the contractor has incurred appear to be reasonable. To grant the Eagleton Institute a three-month extension on this contract in order to obtain the necessary feedback on major documents it has produced will be within the best interests of the Election Assistance Commission, and therefore, the federal government.

EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative finds that to grant the Eagleton Institute a no-cost extension for the modification of its contract with the EAC is within the scope of the original agreement and is recommending that this modification to the contract be made.

Signed

Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Contracting Officer Representative  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Thomas R. Wilkey  
Executive Director  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. CONTRACT ID CODE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO</th>
<th>3. EFFECTIVE DATE</th>
<th>4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.</th>
<th>5. PROJECT NO. (if applicable)</th>
<th>6. ISSUED BY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>7. ADMINISTERED BY (if other than item 6)</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/24/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (P.O. box, street, city, state and ZIP Code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rutgers Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ 08901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/24/2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☐ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended. ☐ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in this solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

- By completing Items 9A and 10A, and returning copies of the amendment.
- By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted.
- By sending a separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment number.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (if required)

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

- FIRST CHANGE CHARGE IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO (specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.

☐ FAR 43.103(a)(3)

☐ THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in place and time, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).

☐ THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:

☐ OTHER (specify type of modification and authority)

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

Pursuant to the terms of the above-referenced contract, the contractor was to present the EAC with draft reports that would form the basis for recommended best practices for provisional voting. The documents were to be published in mid-October after EAC review. The contractor did not receive EAC comments on the draft document until October 2006. As a result, additional time was required to complete the work on provisional voting and analysis of Voter identification issues. The extension will entail additional personnel time, but no additional funds to complete the work. The contractor anticipates that it will be able to complete its work during the week of March 31, 2006.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as hereafter changed, remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNATORY (type or print)

Constance S. Bornheimer
Accounting Manager

15B CONTRACTOR/PROJECT

Constance S. Bornheimer

15C DATE SIGNED

02/06/06

16B UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Thomas R. Wilkey, Executive Director

16C DATE SIGNED

8-22-06

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-03)

NSN 7540-01-152-10/0

Previous edition unsuitable

Prescribed by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 53 243
Instructions for items other than those that are self-explanatory, are as follows:

(a) Item 1 (Contract ID Code). Insert the contract type identification code that appears in the title block of the contract being modified.

(b) Item 3 (Effective date).

(1) For a solicitation amendment, change order, or administrative change, the effective date shall be the issue date of the amendment, change order, or administrative change.

(2) For a supplemental agreement, the effective date shall be the date agreed to by the contracting parties.

(3) For a modification issued as an initial or confirming notice of termination for the convenience of the Government, the effective date and the modification number of the confirming notice shall be the same as the effective date and modification number of the initial notice.

(4) For a modification converting a termination for default to a termination for the convenience of the Government, the effective date shall be the same as the effective date of the termination for default.

(5) For a modification confirming the contracting officer's determination of the amount due in settlement of a contract termination, the effective date shall be the same as the effective date of the initial decision.

(c) Item 6 (Issued By). Insert the name and address of the issuing office. If applicable, insert the appropriate issuing office code in the code block.

(d) Item 8 (Name and Address of Contractor). For modifications to a contract or order, enter the contractor's name, address, and code as shown in the original contract or order, unless changed by this or a previous modification.

(e) Item 9, Amendment of Solicitation No. - Dated), and 10, Modification of Contract/Order No. - Dated). Check the appropriate box and in the corresponding blanks insert the number and date of the original solicitation, contract, or order.

(f) Item 12 (Accounting and Appropriation Data). When appropriate, indicate the impact of the modification on each affected accounting classification by inserting one of the following entries.

(1) Accounting classification
   Net increase
   $________________
   Net decrease
   $________________

   NOTE: If there are changes to multiple accounting classifications that cannot be placed in block 12, insert an asterisk and the words "See continuation sheet".

(g) Item 13. Check the appropriate box to indicate the type of modification. Insert in the corresponding blank the authority under which the modification is issued. Check whether or not contractor must sign this document. (See FAR 43.103.)

(h) Item 14 (Description of Amendment/Modification).

(1) Organize amendments or modifications under the appropriate Uniform Contract Format (UCF) section headings from the applicable solicitation or contract. The UCF table of contents, however, shall not be set forth in this document.

(2) Indicate the impact of the modification on the overall total contract price by inserting one of the following entries:

   (i) Total contract price increased by $________
   (ii) Total contract price decreased by $________
   (iii) Total contract price unchanged.

(3) State reason for modification.

(4) When removing, reinstating, or adding funds, identify the contract items and accounting classifications.

(5) When the SF 30 is used to reflect a determination by the contracting officer of the amount due in settlement of a contract terminated for the convenience of the Government, the entry in Item 14 of the modification may be limited to --

   (i) A reference to the letter determination; and
   (ii) A statement of the net amount determined to be due in settlement of the contract.

(6) Include subject matter or short title of solicitation/order where feasible.

(i) Item 16B. The contracting officer's signature is not required on solicitation amendments. The contracting officer's signature is normally affixed last on supplemental agreements.
Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers The State University of New Jersey  
US Election Assistance Commission Project Budget (3/22/05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleton faculty/senior staff</td>
<td>35,000 Mandel, Weingart, Reed, Linky (various percentages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleton staff: logistics/administrative/clerical</td>
<td>15,000 (various percentages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe (32.5%)</td>
<td>16,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hourly Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Coordinator</td>
<td>21,250 1250 hours at $17 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics/Admin Coordinator</td>
<td>12,325 725 hours at $17 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research assistants</td>
<td>7,200 300 hours at $12 per hour for two researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe on Hourly (9%)</td>
<td>3,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honoraria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria for Peer Review Group</td>
<td>10,000 10 at $1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Hearings (3 in 3 cities)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
<td>75,000 3 hearings at $25K per EAC figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hearings in DC- train, ground, lodging, meals*</td>
<td>3,480 attended by 3 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hearings in St. Louis- air, ground, lodging, meals**</td>
<td>2,640 attended by 3 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Briefings/Meetings with EAC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train, ground, lodging, meals***</td>
<td>5,200 5 briefings in DC, attended by 2 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies, software, telephone, copying, postage</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop computers, laptop, printer</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcontract</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director- O'Neill</td>
<td>79,500 80% time April – Aug., 60% Sept. – Oct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University- Legal Analysis</td>
<td>84,744 Partner institution, Moritz College of Law, OSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
<td>280,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal All Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>391,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modified Total Direct Cost $277,015</strong>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F&amp;A on Modified Total Direct Cost (55.5%)</strong></td>
<td>153,743 Rutgers University federally approved rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Project Budget (no F&amp;A)</strong></td>
<td>$435,752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Optional Surveys                         |                 |
| State Election Officials                 | 15,000 Eagleton |
| Young Voters                            | 25,000 Eagleton |
| Provisional Voting, 1st state            | 116,000 OSU Political Science |
| Provisional Voting, 1st additional state  | 75,000 OSU Political Science |
| Provisional Voting, 2nd additional state  | 60,000 OSU Political Science |
| **Total Optional Surveys (no F&A)**      | $291,000        |

* Travel and lodging to two hearings in DC includes $260 for train fare to DC, $200 for hotel/lodging, and $60 per day for two days for meals= $580 per person per trip for three people.
** Travel and lodging to one hearing in St. Louis includes $500 airfare to St. Louis, 2 nights hotel/lodging at $100, and $60 per day for three days for meals= $880 per person for three people.
*** Travel and lodging to five Briefings/Meetings with EAC includes $260 for train fare to DC, $200 for hotel/lodging, and $60 for meals= $520 per person per trip for two people.
**** Modified total direct cost is equivalent to total direct cost except for two items - F&A included only on first $25K of subcontract with Project Director ($79,500) and first $25K of subcontract with OSU ($84,744).
### Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Cumulative Expenses through Dec 2005 (actual and committed)</th>
<th>Post Jan 1 Projected Expenses</th>
<th>Projected Balance Post Jan 1</th>
<th>Projected Balance Post Jan 1 Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eagleson Faculty and Staff (salaried and hourly)</td>
<td>84,263.20</td>
<td>16,280.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Mandel, Director and Professor</td>
<td>5,662.86</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>81.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Weinert, Associate Director</td>
<td>7,347.00</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid Reed, Director of Eagleson NJ Project</td>
<td>19,500.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Linky, Director of Electronic Democracy Project</td>
<td>8,100.00</td>
<td>1,750.00</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Vercellotti, Assistant Research Professor</td>
<td>9,384.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Rapp, Research Project Coordinator</td>
<td>12,844.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Vincelli, Project/Bus. Administrator</td>
<td>10,800.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Brody, Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>8,503.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Phillips, Unit Computing Specialist</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Pfeiffer, Secretary</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleson Graduate Students (hourly)</td>
<td>15,531.60</td>
<td>3,600.00</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Andersen</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadia Brown</td>
<td>906.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jitiam Curtis</td>
<td>1,002.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanne Dobrich</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Harris</td>
<td>9,288.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe (rates vary by employee type)</td>
<td>21,332.56</td>
<td>4,567.60</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subtotal (Non-Personnel Expenses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Cumulative Expenses through Dec 2005 (actual and committed)</th>
<th>Post Jan 1 Projected Expenses</th>
<th>Projected Balance Post Jan 1</th>
<th>Projected Balance Post Jan 1 Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
<td>81,120</td>
<td>948.74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies, software, telephone, copying, postage</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>1,302.82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop computers, laptop, printer</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,128.48</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracts</td>
<td>79,500</td>
<td>81,750.00</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Personnel (with fringe)</td>
<td>50,735</td>
<td>55,724.22</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned Foley, Professor</td>
<td>50,514.24</td>
<td>8,687.03</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>120.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Tokaji, Professor</td>
<td>3,313.65</td>
<td>1,408.62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Williams, Project Coordinator</td>
<td>7,846.00</td>
<td>2,320.00</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Sampson, Research Coordinator</td>
<td>5,229.14</td>
<td>705.30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistants</td>
<td>8,219.19</td>
<td>880.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Travel</td>
<td>5,950</td>
<td>611.89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Overhead</td>
<td>28,059</td>
<td>27,868.33</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Optional Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Cumulative Expenses through Dec 2005 (actual and committed)</th>
<th>Post Jan 1 Projected Expenses</th>
<th>Projected Balance Post Jan 1</th>
<th>Projected Balance Post Jan 1 Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Election Officials</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>24,269.04</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ohio State University figures are included in the "cumulative expenses through Dec 2005" even though Rutgers has not yet received the cumulative invoices.
The following documents are transmitted herewith:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
<th>VENDOR/SOURCE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6BCPF</td>
<td>BENJAMIN OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$31.25</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCPM</td>
<td>AIGA (AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GRAPHIC ART)</td>
<td>$51,018.20</td>
<td>RPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCPI</td>
<td>ZIMMERMAN ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>$9,564.35</td>
<td>RPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCRG</td>
<td>SNELLING PERSONNEL SERVICES</td>
<td>$1,280.59</td>
<td>RPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCRF</td>
<td>SNELLING PERSONNEL SERVICES</td>
<td>$1,212.40</td>
<td>RPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCPG</td>
<td>RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIV. OF NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>$560,002.00</td>
<td>GSA FORM 300, NO-COST CONTRACT MOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCPL</td>
<td>BOHR, DEBRA</td>
<td>$689.11</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCPK</td>
<td>NOBLE, CHARLES</td>
<td>$656.59</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCPR</td>
<td>PUMP, MARTY L.</td>
<td>$815.20</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7BCAK</td>
<td>SHIVELY, DAVID J.</td>
<td>$1,058.12</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7BCPL</td>
<td>DOWNS-COLBERT, ROBIN</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7BCPK</td>
<td>ROSE, DORA</td>
<td>$593.60</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7BCPR</td>
<td>HOKE, CANDICE</td>
<td>$771.30</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7BCRA</td>
<td>ANSNICK, JOSEPH</td>
<td>$3,330.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7BCRL</td>
<td>LA ROUCHE, ROGER</td>
<td>$1,640.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Services Administration
AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract NO.</th>
<th>PAGE OF PAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.  M. EFFECTIVE DATE  L. MODIFICATION/REQUISITION NO.  N. PROJECT NO. OF SUBCONTRACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. ISSUED BY  H. ADMINISTERED BY (if other than item b)  J. AMENDING ORIGINATING AGENCY CODE

U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

Rutgers, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
2 Rutger Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (if required)

10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.  M. MODIFICATION OF SOLICITATION NO.  N. MODIFICATION OF SOLICITATION/SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL

10A. E4014127  M. E4014127  N. E4014127

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

A. THE ABOVE MODIFIED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriate dates, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not, ☐ is required to sign this document and return ——— copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation subject matter where feasible.)

Pursuant to the terms of the above-referenced contract, the contractor was to present the EAC with draft reports that would form the basis for recommended best practices for pre-voting. The agencies began to issue October after EAC review. The contractor initially released EAC comments on the draft document until October, 2006. As a result, additional time is required to complete the work on pre-voting and analysis of Voter Identification issues. The contractor will require additional personnel time, but no additional funds to complete the work. The contractor anticipates that it will be able to complete its work during the week of March 31, 2008.

**015954**
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Background

On May 24, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission awarded an eight month contract (December 30, 2005) in the amount of $560,002.00 to the Eagleton Institute of Politics (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures.

Contractor’s Request for a No-Cost Extension

On November 15, 2005, John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, requested via e-mail, a no-cost extension on this contract (E4014127). Mr. Weingart had requested an extension to complete the work of this contract to February 28, 2006.

In response to EAC’s requests for additional information related to the no-cost extension, in a January 13, 2006 e-mail Mr Weingart revised the request for the extension to March 31, 2006. Mr. Weingart did note that he would still like to conclude the project’s work by the end of February.

In various correspondence, Mr. Weingart notes the following reasons for the request:

“The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October, voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting, based on Eagleton’s research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication..... The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report of that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid-January”.

“Our request for a no-cost, reallocation of resources is based on (a) the fact that our personnel costs have already been higher than we anticipated and (b) the reality that keeping the project operating for at least nine months, instead of the seven as planned,
will require the participants to devote more time than anticipated. While we are not producing more product than originally promised, the time involved in our work continues to increase... We anticipate this research monitoring and revising to continue for the months added to the project, necessitating significantly more hours by all members of the project team than anticipated”.

The contractor anticipates reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line item ($81,120) and spending approximately $33,750 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,171 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants. The EAC elected to not hold public hearings on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification.

**Specifics of the Extension**

The contractor has provided the following breakdown and explanation of the personnel and consultant costs, associated with this extension.

1. **Eagleton Institute of Politics personnel:**
   
   Original budgeted project personnel costs- $110,695 (May-December)
   Revised project personnel costs- $144,444 (May-February).

2. **Consultant Services:**
   
   Original budgeted costs: $79,500 (May-December)
   Revised costs - $99,750 (May-February)

3. **Moritz School of Law personnel and overhead:**
   
   Original budgeted costs: $84,744 (May-December)
   Revised costs- $107,915 (May-February)

**Total project budget:**

Original budgeted costs: $560,002 (May-December)
Revised project cost: $549,831 (May-February)

**EAC Staff Recommendation**

Karen Lynn-Dyson, the EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative assigned to this contract has reviewed this request, the rationale and authority for it (FAR 43.103(a)(3)) and finds it to be appropriate. To date the Eagleton Institute has consistently met its deadlines for major project deliverables and stayed within the project’s overall budget.
Based upon the work products provided to the EAC, thus far, the additional personnel expenses which the contractor has incurred appear to be reasonable. To grant the Eagleton Institute a three month extension on this contract in order to obtain the necessary feedback on major documents it has produced will be within the best interests of the Election Assistance Commission, and therefore, the federal government.

EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative finds that to grant the Eagleton Institute a no-cost extension for the modification of its contract with the EAC is within the scope of the original agreement and is recommending that this modification to the contract be made.

Signed

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Contracting Officer Representative
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Paul DeGregorio
Chairman
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
Karen - I am attaching a spreadsheet providing the information you have requested (Attachment 1), but I want to highlight a few points which may not be immediately self-evident.

First, the original budget (Attachment 2) we submitted to the EAC, dated March 22nd, did not itemize personnel expenses by each person. In addition, when we actually began work two months after submitting that budget, we decided to reallocate more time to people within Eagleton and hire fewer outside hourlies.

Second, in the figures I sent you in late December we tried to account for all the expenses and projections but overlooked a few things including neglecting to include the honoraria for our peer review team. Hence, the figures we're now sending are different than what I sent in December.

Lastly, we originally discussed a no-cost extension through February, but since we don't yet have the EAC comments on our draft Provisional Voting material nor an estimate of when they are likely to be ready, I think it is prudent to extend the no-cost extension through March 31st. We would still like to conclude by the end of February, but if you can approve the extension for another month we could avoid going through this process again if everything is not complete six weeks from now.

It is my understanding that Rutgers will soon be sending our December invoice. At this time, I would also like to request that we combine January and February an invoice the EAC once for that time period.

As you can see, we are currently projecting an ending balance of approximately $10,000. If additional expenses are incurred beyond what is currently projected, we're confident they will not exceed the original budget of $560,002.

Thanks and I look forward to hearing from you.

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Background

On May 24, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission awarded an eight month contract (December 30, 2005) in the amount of $560,002.00 to the Eagleton Institute of Politics (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures.

Contractor’s Request for a No-Cost Extension

On November 15, 2005, John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, requested via e-mail, a no-cost extension on this contract (E4014127). Mr. Weingart has requested an extension to complete the work of this contract to February 28, 2006.

In subsequent correspondence, Mr. Weingart notes the following as the reason for the request:

"The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October, voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting, based on Eagleton’s research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication.....The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report of that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid-January”.

"If EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings...(that EAC has determined will not take place)....would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work...“The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $300,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project".
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

BACKGROUND

On May 24, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission awarded an eight month contract (December 30, 2005) in the amount of $560,002.00 to the Eagleton Institute of Politics (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures.

CONTRACTOR'S REQUEST FOR A NO-COST EXTENSION

On November 15, 2005, John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, requested via e-mail, a no-cost extension on this contract (E4014127). Mr. Weingart has requested an extension to complete the work of this contract to February 28, 2006.

In subsequent correspondence, Mr. Weingart notes the following as the reason for the request:

"The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October, voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting, based on Eagleton's research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication..... The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report of that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid-January”.

He further notes:

"If EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work....

"The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $300,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project".

SPECIFICS OF THE EXTENSION
Karen Lynn-Dyson, the EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative assigned to this contract has reviewed this request, the rationale and authority for it (FAR 43.103(a)(3)) and finds it to be appropriate. To-date the Eagleton Institute has consistently met its deadlines for major project deliverables and stayed within the project budget. To grant the Eagleton Institute a two month extension on this contract in order to obtain the necessary feedback on major documents it has produced will be within the best interests of the Election Assistance Commission, and thus, the federal government.

EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative finds that to grant the Eagleton Institute a no-cost extension for the modification of its contract with the EAC is within the scope of the original agreement and is recommending that this modification to the contract be made.

Signed

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Contracting Officer Representative
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Gracia Hillman
Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
Karen - Our request for a no-cost, reallocation of resources is based on (a) the fact that our personnel costs have already been higher than we anticipated and (b) the reality that keeping the project operating for at least nine months, instead of seven as planned, will require the participants to devote more time than anticipated. While we are not producing more product than originally promised, the time involved in our work continues to increase. Both Provisional Voting and Voter ID have proved to be very dynamic topics requiring us to continually monitor developments and update our data, analysis and evolving work products as we learn of new or revised information. As a result, despite the extension of the schedule, the staff and consultants on this project have had no "down" time. We anticipate this research, monitoring and revising to continue for the months added to the project, necessitating significantly more hours by all members of the project team than anticipated.

Our request asks for changes to three line items which I will address below on the assumption that the EAC response to our already-submitted Provisional Voting draft and to-be-submitted Voter ID draft will be sufficiently timely to enable us to complete our work on both topics by the end of February.

1. Eagleton Institute of Politics personnel: We originally budgeted $110,695 ($15,813 average per month) for Eagleton faculty, staff and graduate student assistants for the seven-month project from May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005. Our actual costs have been approximately $14,500 more than that. In addition, we are anticipating needing another $21,000 for personnel costs in January and February, calculated on the basis of 2/3 of the original monthly estimate. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $110,695 to approximately $146,000.

2. Consultant Services: We originally budgeted $79,50 ($11,357 average per month) for consultant services which we have used to engage Tom O'Neill as the project manager. We anticipate no additional cost for the original contract period of May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005, but do anticipate needing his services during January and February at a slightly reduced rate of $10,125 per month or $20,250 total additional. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $79,500 to $99,750.

3. Moritz School of Law: We originally budgeted $84,744 ($12,106 average per month) for staff and overhead for the May 24, 2005-December 31, 2005 period. We anticipate needing an additional $23,171 ($11,585 average per month) to support their time on this project in January and February. Therefore, we are asking to raise this line item from $84,744 to $107,915.

With these revisions, approximately $22,000 of the EAC contract award to Eagleton would remain not yet allocated, primarily because the cost for the public hearings would have incurred Rutgers University overhead whereas the additional expenditures for consultants and the subcontract with Moritz do not.

I hope this provides you the information you need. While Rutgers is
Karen - At this time, we anticipate reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line item and spending approximately $35,500 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,250 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants. There are other additional variances but they are not significant (e.g. less on honoraria, less on travel, and more on general operations such as phone expenses). Let me know if you need additional detail or information.

Thanks, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> > John-
> >
> > Quick question-
> >
> > How much money do you anticipate will be re-allocated from the
> > original line items outlined in the contract to other project costs?
> >
> > Thanks
> >
> > Karen Lynn-Dyson
> > Research Manager
> > U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
> > Washington, DC 20005
> > tel:202-566-3123
> >
> > **"John Weingart" <john.weingart@rutgers.edu>*
> > 11/30/2005 05:05 PM
> > Please respond to
> > john.weingart@rutgers.edu
> >
> > To 
> > "Karen Lynn-Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
> > cc 
> > "Tom O'Neill"
> > Subject
Hi Karen - Do you think we can get approval of our no-cost extension request this week? We really need it for the Rutgers administrative processes since, from their point of view, the project concluded on December 31st. Thanks, John

--

John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290
Karen,

I have looked into the matter noted below. Bottom line is that you are looking to make a number of changes to this contract:

1. Drop two requirements (public hearings)
2. Add labor hours
3. change date the deliverables are due.

The result is a change which increases the cost of the contract but does not exceed the contractually set ceiling. My review of fiscal law in this area has led me to conclude that this modification may be made using the FY 05 funds originally obligated to the contract. (see 61 Comp. Gen. 609 (1982) & 65 Comp. Gen. 741 (1986)). However, if the labor costs exceed the original contractual ceiling, FY 06 will have to be used as the modification did not constitute an antecedent liability (i.e. once the total value of this time and materials contract was reached neither party had any further obligation or liability and therefore the modification will be a new agreement).

Given the above, your modification memo and the form must reflect the 3 changes noted above. It must contain an analysis of the additional cost specifically justifying the amount and reasons for this modification (this is required by the FAR). See the FAR and form instructions for guidance on the Mod form.

I am somewhat concerned about the limited explanation below. If he wants additional labor hours (and labor dollars) he should be able to provide the labor hours (and frankly, rates) needed to complete the task just like I presume he did for the initial contract. The general numbers he provides below are not specific enough for my taste. We need to make sure we are being charged the same rates as in the original contract and that the number of labor hours the contractor expects to expend are appropriate. Also, I am still not sure from the below why the original estimates were off. You are going to have to justify for the commission the additional payments (ultimately signed by both you and the chair). The bottom line is that you will want enough information so that you are confident in making this call. One tact would be to look at the previous labor expenditures in connection with the work done to get a sense of whether the labor amounts set for the amendment are justifiable. (I assume we have his previous invoices stating expended hours.)

Let me know if you have any questions.

GG
Gavin S. Gilmour
Associate General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
Karen - I am attaching the documentation for our request. Please let me know if you require the material in a different format and/or further information.

Thanks very much, John

-- John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> > John-
> >
> > Thanks ever so much for forwarding this message on to Connie.
> >
> > I'm awaiting your language describing why you are requiring a no-cost extension on the contract, and for what period of time you wish to extend the contract.
> >
> > I'm told this is a very simple process on this end, and I've prepared the necessary form and a memo.
> >
> > Karen Lynn-Dyson
> > Research Manager
> > U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> > Washington, DC 20005
> > tel:202-566-3123
EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS

Request to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission
for a No-Cost Extension and Reallocation of Funds

November 30, 2005

Why we need a no-cost extension

The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting based on our research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication. The draft was complete in August, but the EAC’s schedule did not permit us to brief the commissioners and staff until early September. We did not receive EAC comments until October, making it impossible to complete the work on the original schedule. Taking account of those comments and guidance from EAC required several weeks. The EAC did not receive our final draft report and recommendations for best practices until late November. We are now awaiting the EAC’s comments on that final draft, which we have been told to expect in January.

The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report on that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid January.

Because the EAC has decided to issue recommendations for best practices on these topics, rather than voluntary guidance, we will finish the work within two months of the original completion date since the adoption process will be shorter. Note that meeting this schedule is dependent on the time needed by the EAC to review our work.

This extension will entail additional personnel time but, since no public hearings on “best practices” are required, if the EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work.

When will work be completed and funds fully expended?

As shown on the attached schedule, work on this contract will be completed in three phases. The EAC will receive our final report and recommendations for best practices in provisional voting during the week of January 23, 2006 (assuming that we receive the EAC’s comments on the draft report submitted on November 28 by January 9).

We will submit our draft report, alternative approaches, and compendium of statutes, regulations, and litigation on Voter Identification Issues during the week of January 16, 2006. If the EAC is able to return comments to us no later than the week of January 30, we will have submit the final report and recommendations for best practices on Voter Identification to the EAC during the week of February 13.

The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $399,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project.
## REVISED SCHEDULE FOR
November 2005 – February 2006
November 10, 2005
Assumes no guidance document, only analysis and recommended best practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>Provisional Voting</th>
<th>Voter ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week of 10/31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review draft report to EAC (Team)</td>
<td>Voter ID Research to TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit comments on report (Team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/7</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for October tasks (all)</td>
<td>Redraft report (TON)</td>
<td>Research continues (TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and approve report (Team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final draft report (TON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/14</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Submit report to Project Team for comments (TON)</td>
<td>Research continues (TV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Week of 11/21 | Project team comments received  
Submit report to EAC for review and to PRG for information (TON, JW) | Complete data collection for Voter ID analysis. (TV) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/28</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Draft report on Voter ID analysis (TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/5</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for November tasks (all)</td>
<td>Internal review (PT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/12</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Revise draft (TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft alternatives (TON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and comment on alternatives (PT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/19</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Complete draft report and alternatives (TV, TON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/26</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Review draft report and alternatives (PT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/2/06</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for December tasks (all)</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/9/06</td>
<td>Receive comments from EAC and revise report as needed</td>
<td>PRG meets and comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/16/06</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Project team reviews and approves revised report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/23/06</td>
<td>Finalize analysis and best practices and submit to EAC for publication and further action as appropriate</td>
<td>EAC review continues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/30/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/6/06</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for January tasks (all)</td>
<td>Review and approve revised report and recommendations for best practices (PT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/13/06</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Submit report and best practices to EAC for publication and further action as appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Week of 2/20/06 | FINAL status reports to JD for all tasks (all)  
Final project and fiscal report to EAC | PROJECT ENDS |
To: File  
From: Tamar Nedzar, Law Clerk  
Date: April 21, 2006  
Re: No-Cost Extension to contract number E4014127 with the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University

Background:
Contract E4014127 with the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University ("contractor") was originally scheduled to be concluded on March 31, 2006. The contract's final products include a report on Voter Identification and a report on Provisional Voting. The contractor has vetted the reports with a Peer Review Group, pursuant to the terms of the contract.

Justification for No-Cost Extension:
The EAC wishes to supplement the contractor’s Peer Review of the reports by adding another review process with some of the EAC's key stakeholders. The EAC proposes to assemble a panel of researchers during the week of May 8th to conduct the second review.

Following the second review, the contractor will revise its draft reports based on the comments it receives. The contractor will present its draft reports on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification to the EAC Advisory Board at its May 25th meeting in Washington, DC. The contractor will revise both draft reports, taking into account the EAC’s Advisory Board’s comments and submit the final reports to the EAC toward the end of June.

Recommendation:
The EAC recommends that contract E4014127 be modified at no cost to allow the contractor to complete their work by June 30, 2006.
## AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. CONTRACT ID CODE</th>
<th>PAGE OF PAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.</th>
<th>3. EFFECTIVE DATE</th>
<th>4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.</th>
<th>5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. ISSUED BY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6)</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Election Assistance Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225 New York Avenue NW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, Office Research and Sponsored Programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rutgers Plaza</td>
<td>11/12/05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ 08901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.</th>
<th>10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
<td>05/24/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. CODE</th>
<th>FACILITY CODE</th>
<th>11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended. □ is not extended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment your desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAR 43.103(a) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. IMPORTANT: Contractor □ is not, X is required to sign this document and return —— copies to the issuing office.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

Pursuant to the terms of the above-referenced contract, the contractor was to present the EAC with draft reports that would form the basis for recommended best-practices for provisional voting. The documents were to be published in mid-October after EAC review. The contractor did not receive EAC comments on the draft document until October. As a result, additional time is required to complete the work on provisional voting and analysis of Voter Identification issues. The extension will entail additional personnel time, but not additional funds to complete the work. The contractor anticipates that it will be able to complete its work during the week of February 13, 2006.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as hereinafter changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)</th>
<th>16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR</th>
<th>16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Signature of person authorized to sign)</td>
<td>(Signature of Contracting Officer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15C. DATE SIGNED</th>
<th>16C. DATE SIGNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

On May 24, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission awarded an eight month contract (December 30, 2005) in the amount of $560,002.00 to the Eagleton Institute of Politics (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures.

On November 15, 2005, John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, requested via e-mail, a no-cost extension on this contract (E4014127). Mr. Weingart has requested an extension to complete the work of this contract to February 28, 2006.

In subsequent correspondence, Mr. Weingart notes the following as the reason for the request:

"The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October, voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting, based on Eagleton’s research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication..... The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report of that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid-January”.

He further notes:

"If EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work... “The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $300,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project”.

015974
Karen Lynn-Dyson, the EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative assigned to this contract has reviewed this request, the rationale and authority for it (FAR 43.103(a)(3)) and finds it to be appropriate. To-date the Eagleton Institute has consistently met its deadlines for major project deliverables and stayed within the project budget. To grant the Eagleton Institute a two month extension on this contract in order to obtain the necessary feedback on major documents it has produced will be within the best interests of the Election Assistance Commission, and thus, the federal government.

EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative finds that to grant the Eagleton Institute a no-cost extension for the modification of its contract with the EAC is within the scope of the original agreement and is recommending that this modification to the contract be made.

Signed

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Contracting Officer Representative
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Gracia M. Hillman
Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

On May 24, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission awarded an eight month contract (December 30, 2005) in the amount of $560,002.00 to the Eagleton Institute of Politics (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures.

On November 15, 2005, John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, requested via e-mail, a no–cost extension on this contract (E4014127). Mr. Weingart has requested an extension to complete the work of this contract to February 28, 2006.

In subsequent correspondence, Mr. Weingart notes the following as the reason for the request:

"The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October, voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting, based on Eagleton’s research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication..... The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report of that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid-January”.

He further notes:

"If EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work....

"The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $300,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project".
Karen Lynn-Dyson, the EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative assigned to this contract has reviewed this request, the rationale and authority for it (FAR 43.103(a)(3)) and finds it to be appropriate. To-date the Eagleton Institute has consistently met its deadlines for major project deliverables and stayed within the project budget. To grant the Eagleton Institute a two month extension on this contract in order to obtain the necessary feedback on major documents it has produced will be within the best interests of the Election Assistance Commission, and thus, the federal government.

EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative finds that to grant the Eagleton Institute a no-cost extension for the modification of its contract with the EAC is within the scope of the original agreement and is recommending that this modification to the contract be made.

Signed

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Contracting Officer Representative
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Gracia Hillman
Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
Karen,

I have looked into the matter noted below. Bottom line is that you are looking to make a number of changes to this contract:

1. Drop two requirements (public hearings)
2. Add labor hours
3. Change date the deliverables are due.

The result is a change which increases the cost of the contract but does not exceed the contractually set ceiling. My review of fiscal law in this area has led me to conclude that this modification may be made using the FY 05 funds originally obligated to the contract. (see 61 Comp. Gen. 609 (1982) & 65 Comp. Gen. 741 (1986)). However, if the labor costs exceed the original contractual ceiling, FY 06 will have to be used as the modification did not constitute an antecedent liability (i.e. once the total value of this time and materials contract was reached neither party had any further obligation or liability and therefore the modification will be a new agreement).

Given the above, your modification memo and the form must reflect the 3 changes noted above. It must contain an analysis of the additional cost specifically justifying the amount and reasons for this modification (this is required by the FAR). See the FAR and form instructions for guidance on the Mod form.

I am somewhat concerned about the limited explanation below. If he wants additional labor hours (and labor dollars) he should be able to provide the labor hours (and frankly, rates) needed to complete the task just like I presume he did for the initial contract. The general numbers he provides below are not specific enough for my taste. We need to make sure we are being charged the same rates as in the original contract and that the number of labor hours the contractor expects to expend are appropriate. Also, I am still not sure from the below why the original estimates were off. You are going to have to justify for the commission the additional payments (ultimately signed by both you and the chair). The bottom line is that you will want enough information so that you are confident in making this call. One tactic would be to look at the previous labor expenditures in connection with the work done to get a sense of whether the labor amounts set for the amendment are justifiable. (I assume we have his previous invoices stating expended hours.)

Let me know if you have any questions.

GG
Gavin S. Gilmour
Associate General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
The public meeting hours that he is "using." Is this a deliverable that you cancelled? What is a deliverable that was performed for less labor hours than estimated, or was it never a deliverable?

GG

Gavin S. Gilmour
Associate General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
12/19/2005 12:26 PM
To Gavin S. Gilmour/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Re: Fw: Request for No-Cost Extension-corrected

Gavin-

Just spoke with John Weingart- he explains that it will be the same work and tasks (no new or additional products) and merely work that will now extend for an additional two months rather than ending December 31.

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
John - I will send you Connie's address on Tuesday morning when both she and I are back in our offices. Thanks. Hope you get a little time off and have a great new year.

A quick request- May I get Connie Bornheimer e-mail address (again). You may recall I had an incorrect one.

I have received the invoice for November services and cannot process it until it has the breakdown of salaries for particular personnel.

This request is along the lines of that I have requested from you in order to extend the contract.

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

--

John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290

--

John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290
Karen - Turns out I could locate Connie's email though most likely she won't see mail until Tuesday: Bornhein@rci.rutgers.edu.

To clarify your phone message, do you need us to provide the number of hours for each staff person and consultant going forward from January 1st onward or going back to the start of the project?

Thanks.

> John-
> A quick request- May I get Connie Bornheimer e-mail address ( again). You may recall I had an incorrect one.
> I have received the invoice for November services and cannot process it until it has the breakdown of salaries for particular personnel.
> This request is along the lines of that I have requested from you in order to extend the contract.
> Thanks
>
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
>

John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732) 932-9384, x.290
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

On May 24, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission awarded an eight month contract (December 30, 2005) in the amount of $560,002.00 to the Eagleton Institute of Politics (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures.

On November 15, 2005, John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, requested via e-mail, a no-cost extension on this contract (E4014127). Mr. Weingart has requested an extension to complete the work of this contract to February 28, 2006.

In subsequent correspondence, Mr. Weingart notes the following as the reason for the request:

“The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October, voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting, based on Eagleton’s research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication.....

The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report of that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid-January”.

He further notes:

“If EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work... “The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $300,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project”.

015962
Karen Lynn-Dyson, the EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative assigned to this contract has reviewed this request, the rationale and authority for it (FAR 43.103(a)(3)) and finds it to be appropriate. To-date the Eagleton Institute has consistently met its deadlines for major project deliverables and stayed within the project budget. To grant the Eagleton Institute a two month extension on this contract in order to obtain the necessary feedback on major documents it has produced will be within the best interests of the Election Assistance Commission, and thus, the federal government.

EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative finds that to grant the Eagleton Institute a no-cost extension for the modification of its contract with the EAC is within the scope of the original agreement and is recommending that this modification to the contract be made.

Signed

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Contracting Officer Representative
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Gracia M. Hillman
Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. CONTRACT ID CODE</th>
<th>2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.</th>
<th>3. EFFECTIVE DATE</th>
<th>4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.</th>
<th>5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. ISSUED BY CODE

U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Codes)

Rutgers, Office Research and Sponsored Programs
3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.

9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)

10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.

10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)

05/24/05

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☐ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended, ☐ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:
(a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram, which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment your desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE

☐ A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.

☒ B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).

☒ C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:

☐ D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not, ☒ is required to sign this document and return 2 copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

Pursuant to the terms of the above-referenced contract, the contractor was to present the EAC with draft reports that would form the basis for recommended best-practices for provisional voting. The documents were to be published in mid-October after EAC review. The contractor did not receive EAC comments on the draft document until October. As a result, additional time is required to complete the work on provisional voting and analysis of Voter Identification issues. The extension will entail additional personnel time, but not additional funds to complete the work. The contractor anticipates that it will be able to complete its work during the week of February 13, 2006.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)

15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR.

15C. DATE SIGNED

16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)

16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

16C. DATE SIGNED

(Signature of person authorized to sign)

(Signature of Contracting Officer)

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-83)
Prepared by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

NSN 7540-01-192-8070
Previous edition unusable
EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS

Request to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission
for a No-Cost Extension and Reallocation of Funds

November 30, 2005

Why we need a no-cost extension

The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting based on our research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication. The draft was complete in August, but the EAC’s schedule did not permit us to brief the commissioners and staff until early September. We did not receive EAC comments until October, making it impossible to complete the work on the original schedule. Taking account of those comments and guidance from EAC required several weeks. The EAC did not receive our final draft report and recommendations for best practices until late November. We are now awaiting the EAC’s comments on that final draft, which we have been told to expect in January.

The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report on that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid January.

Because the EAC has decided to issue recommendations for best practices on these topics, rather than voluntary guidance, we will finish the work within two months of the original completion date since the adoption process will be shorter. Note that meeting this schedule is dependent on the time needed by the EAC to review our work.

This extension will entail additional personnel time but, since no public hearings on “best practices” are required, if the EAC does not object, funds originally allocated for the hearings would be available for transfer to support the additional staff and consultant time necessary to complete the work.

When will work be completed and funds fully expended?

As shown on the attached schedule, work on this contract will be completed in three phases. The EAC will receive our final report and recommendations for best practices in provisional voting during the week of January 23, 2006 (assuming that we receive the EAC’s comments on the draft report submitted on November 28 by January 9).

We will submit our draft report, alternative approaches, and compendium of statutes, regulations, and litigation on Voter Identification Issues during the week of January 16, 2006. If the EAC is able to return comments to us no later than the week of January 30, we will have submit the final report and recommendations for best practices on Voter Identification to the EAC during the week of February 13.

The total project budget is $560,002. As of October 31st, the EAC has been invoiced for $259,081.79; the balance remaining is $399,920.21. We anticipate that the project will be complete and the balance of funds fully expended by February 28, 2006. The final invoice for the contract will be submitted to the EAC within 75 days of the close of the project.
REVISED SCHEDULE FOR
November 2005 – February 2006
November 10, 2005
Assumes no guidance document, only analysis and recommended best practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>Provisional Voting</th>
<th>Voter ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week of 10/31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review draft report to EAC (Team)</td>
<td>Voter ID Research to TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit comments on report (Team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/7</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for October tasks (all)</td>
<td>Redraft report (TON)</td>
<td>Research continues (TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and approve report (Team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final draft report (TON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/14</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Submit report to Project Team for comments (TON)</td>
<td>Research continues (TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/21</td>
<td>Project team comments received</td>
<td>Complete data collection for Voter ID analysis. (TV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit report to EAC for review and to PRG for information (TON, JW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 11/28</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Draft report on Voter ID analysis (TV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/5</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for November tasks (all)</td>
<td>Internal review (PT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/12</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Revise draft (TV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Draft alternatives (TON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and comment on alternatives (PT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/19</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Complete draft report and alternatives (TV, TON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12/26</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Review draft report and alternatives (PT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/2/06</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for December tasks (all)</td>
<td>EAC review</td>
<td>Report and alternatives to PRG for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/9/06</td>
<td>Receive comments from EAC and revise report as needed</td>
<td>PRG meets and comments</td>
<td>Revise (TV &amp; TON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/16/06</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Project team reviews and approves revised report</td>
<td>Submit draft report, alternatives and compendium to EAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EAC reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/23/06</td>
<td>Finalize analysis and best practices and submit to EAC for publication and further action as appropriate</td>
<td>EAC review continues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 1/30/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments from EAC</td>
<td>Revise (TV &amp; TON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/6/06</td>
<td>Status reports to JD for January tasks (all)</td>
<td>Review and approve revised report and recommendations for best practices (PT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/13/06</td>
<td>Submit monthly progress report (JD)</td>
<td>Submit report and best practices to EAC for publication and further action as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 2/20/06</td>
<td>FINAL status reports to JD for all tasks (all) Final project and fiscal report to EAC PROJECT ENDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notification to bidders

You are hereby advised that the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has competitively awarded a contract to the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey for research assistance to support the development of guidance on the two topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. Eagleton is partnering with the Moritz College of Law of Ohio State University for this work effort. The amount of this award is $560,002.

EAC appreciates the interest you have expressed in supporting our research agenda by submitting a proposal for this work. Should you wish to receive a de-brief on this procurement, please contact Carol A. Paquette, Interim Executive Director, by email at cpaquette@eac.gov.
Notification to bidders

You are hereby advised that the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has competitively awarded a contract to the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey for research assistance to support the development of guidance on the two topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. Eagleton is partnering with the Moritz College of Law of Ohio State University for this work effort. The amount of this award is $560,002.

EAC appreciates the interest you have expressed in supporting our research agenda by submitting a proposal for this work. Should you wish to receive a de-brief on this procurement, please contact Carol A. Paquette, Interim Executive Director, by email at cpaquette@eac.gov.

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Interim Executive Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
202.566.3127 fax
Mr. Keith Osterhage, Director  
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
3 Rutgers Plaza  
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901

Dear Mr. Osterhage:

Enclosed is a signed contract in the amount of $560,002.00 for the provision of research assistance to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) for the development of voluntary guidance on provisional voting and voter identification procedures. The EAC has accepted the basic proposal submitted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics and has also elected to include the optional survey of local election officials. This proposal was evaluated as providing the best value to the government through a competitive source selection process. The proposal is incorporated by reference into the contract.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) was created by the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) and is charged with assisting the States in meeting the election reform requirements mandated by this legislation. One of the EAC's principal tasks is to provide guidance to the States on the interpretation of HAVA and its requirements. The provisional voting and voter identification effort that will be supported by this contract is a major element of EAC's Fiscal Year 2005 research agenda. The objective of this work is to develop guidance on these topics that States can utilize in the 2006 election cycle.

To acknowledge your receipt and acceptance of this contract, please countersign and date below and return one copy of this letter to the attention of Carol A. Paquette, Interim Executive Director.

We look forward to working with Rutgers University and the Eagleton Institute on this very important research effort.

Sincerely,

Gracia Hillman, Chair

Keith Osterhage  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES**

**DATE OF ORDER:** 05/24/05

**CONTRACT NUMBER:** E4014127

**ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND/ORG CODE</th>
<th>ITEM CODE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8035 TZM9110</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT:** $560,002.00

---

**UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF PUBLIC LAW 107-252,**
dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S.
Election Assistance Commission (EAC).

Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide
research assistance to support development of
guidelines on topics of provisional voting and
voter identification procedures. See attached
Eagleton proposal and EAC Statement of Work
for description and details of specifics and
requirements.

**TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT:** $560,002.00

---

**RECEIVING OFFICE**

Gracia Hillman (202) 566-3100

---

**MAIL INVOICE TO:**

General Services Administration (FUND)

Election Assistance Commission

225 New York Ave., NW, Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20005

---

**SIGNATURE**

Gracia Hillman, Chair
NOTE: Unless otherwise specified in the contract, all invoices shall be submitted in triplicate to the office designated in the contract. The number of copies of each invoice shall be the same as that in the contract or in a proper notice of assignment.

(a)(10) For the contractors that have an application for OSHA certification, the above duration of inspections will be used to determine the time to have occurred if the inspector had been on site. The deadline to be determined will be specified in block 20 after the contract terms. The supplies may be delivered prior to the determination date, except contractor compliance with an appropriate quality of contractor compliance with a contract provision.

52.224-40 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965 AS AMENDED CONTRACTS OF $2,500 OR LESS (MAY 1989)

Except to the extent that an exception, variation, or tolerance would apply if this contract were in excess of $2,500, the Contractor and any subcontractor shall pay all fringe benefits working on the contract not less than the minimum wage specified under Section 6.1 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended (29 U.S.C. 201-209). Regulations and interpretations of the Service Contract Act of 1965 are contained in 29 CFR Part 4.

52.224-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965 AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)

52.224-42 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRES (MAY 1989) (52.224-41 and 52.224-42 apply to service contracts when the amount exceeds $2,500).

The GSA Form 2166, Service Contract Act of 1965 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached here and made a part hereof.

52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (JUN 1988)

This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request the Contracting Officer will make their full text available:

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

52.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)
52.203-3 Gratuities (APR 84)
52.203-6 Covenant Against Contingent Fees (APR 84)
52.203-8 Restriction on Subcontractor Sales to the Government (JUL 88)
52.203-7 Anti-Kickback Procedures (OCT 88)
52.212-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)

In the preceding clause, the permissible variations are stated in the schedule.

52.222-25 Prompt Payment (SEP 92)

52.222-26 Equal Opportunity (APR 84) (Applicable when amount exceeds $10,000.)
52.222-28 Affirmative Action for Disabled and Vietnam Era Veterans (APR 84) (Applicable when amount exceeds $10,000.)
52.222-36 Purchase Orders for Services (Short Form) (MAY 89)
52.222-37 Employment Reports on Special Disabled Veterans and Vietnam Veterans of the Vietnam Era (JAN 89) (Applicable whenever clause 52.222-35 is included.)
52.222-38 Drug Free Workplace (JUL 90) (Applicable if contract is awarded to an officer in government)
52.222-39 Civilian Personnel Authorization Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 88) (Applicable when amount exceeds $2,500)
52.225-11 Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases (MAY 92)
52.222-35 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAY 86) (Applicable when amount is between $2,500 and $10,000)
52.222-40 Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (APR 84) (Applicable when amount exceeds $2,500)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:

52.224-45 Contract for Overtime Compensation (MAY 86)

GSA FORM 300 BACK (REV. 2-93)
TALLY VOTE MATTER

DATE & TIME OF TRANSMITTAL: May 02, 2005, 8:30AM

BALLOT DEADLINE: May 04, 2005, 8:30AM

COMMISSIONERS: DeGREGORIO, HILLMAN, MARTINEZ

SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR RFP-05-01, REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR RESEARCH ASSISTANCE FOR THE EAC TO SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOLUNTARY GUIDANCE ON PROVISIONAL VOTING AND VOTER IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES

I approve the recommendation.  
I disapprove the recommendation.  
I object to the recommendation.  
I am recused from voting.

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

DATE: _______________ SIGNATURE: ______________________

A definite vote is required. All ballots must be signed and dated. Please return ONLY THE BALLOT to the EAC Chair. Please return the ballot no later than date and time shown above.

FROM CAROL PAQUETTE, INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
MEMORANDUM

April 29, 2005

TO: EAC Commissioners

FROM: Carol A. Paquette, Interim Executive Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission


Sec. 302 (a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) requires that all states allow the casting of provisional ballots in instances where a voter declares his/her eligibility to vote but his/her names does not appear on the official list of eligible voters, or an election official asserts that a voter is not eligible to vote. In addition, Sec. 303(B) provides for provisional ballot fail-safe voting for first time voters who do not provide appropriate identification at the time of voting. The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) seeks to examine how provisional voting was implemented in the 2004 election cycle and to prepare guidance on this topic for the 2006 election.

HAVA Sec. 303 (b) mandates that first time voters who register by mail are required to show proof of identify before being allowed to cast a ballot. The EAC seeks to examine how these voter identification requirements were implemented in the 2004 election cycle and to prepare guidance on this topic for the 2006 elections.

As noted above, one of the remedies for a voter not having an acceptable proof of identity is to allow the voter to cast a provisional ballot, either at the polling place or by mail. This linkage between the rights and responsibilities of the voter provides a rationale for conducting research on these topics in parallel. However, separate guidance documents on each of these topics will be developed.

The EAC issued a Request for Proposal (RFP-05-01) to obtain research assistance to support the EAC in its development of this guidance. Six proposals were received and reviewed by a Source Selection Board (SSB) comprised of EAC staff and an election administration expert.

Three of the proposals did not conform to the proposal instructions in some significant manner and were eliminated without detailed assessment. One proposal addressed only the provisional voting portion of the work and did not discuss the voter identification portion, except for holding a public hearing. They proposed doing an analysis of only 6-
10 States rather than all States as the Statement of Work required. Another proposal was submitted by a company with no prior experience in conducting public policy research, nor did any of the proposed personnel have any experience with election administration, public policy research, or legal research. Their methodology consisted almost entirely of repeating the Statement of Work provisions and asserting they would do this work, but with no explanation of how. The third proposal discussed data collection activities very generically, but did not address how the information collected would be analyzed. There was no mention of doing legislative and litigation analysis, nor did any of the proposed personnel have appropriate qualifications or experience in this area.

The SSB assessed the remaining three proposals using the attached Technical Evaluation Criteria that were defined and assigned possible point values prior to reading any of the proposals. These proposals received average ratings of 44, 45, and 78, out of a possible 100. Cost proposals were reviewed only by the EAC members of the SSB. The associated cost proposals were respectively $708,730; $148,500; and $560,002. Reference checks on the highest rated bidder were consistently favorable regarding the excellent quality of their work and their performance on time and within budget.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the award of a contract for RFP-05-01 to the highest rated bidder, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, in the amount of $560,002. Eagleton Institute has formed a consortium with the Moritz College of Law, The Ohio State University, to perform this work in support of the EAC.

Evaluator: Date:

Bidder:

1. Demonstrated understanding of the issues of provisional voting and voter identification. (30 points)

Factors: Grasp of major issues and subtle complexities of provisional voting (15 points), grasp of major issues and subtle complexities of Voter ID requirements (15 points)

Parts of proposal that relate to this factor: 1. Project workplan, 3. P.I. qualifications, 5. & 6. Risks identified, 7. Reasons team is best. Reviewers should consider elements such as:

1) Does the bidder appear to have an in-depth comprehension of the subject matter as evidenced by specificity of discussion regarding provisional voting and voter ID requirements, rather than abstract generalities; 2) Does the proposal cite specific examples of difficulties experienced with provisional voting and voter ID requirements in the last election; 3) Does the proposal indicate an understanding of, and respect for, the differences in states’ interpretations of provisional voting and voter ID; 4) Does the proposal indicate an awareness of the practical realities of public policy implementation for these two topics?

2. Well-defined and organized research and analysis methodology. (20 points)

Factors: Demonstrated understanding of legal and legislative analysis (8 points), clearly delineated research methodology and plan for conducting analysis (12 points)
Parts of proposal that relate to this factor: 1. Project workplan – does it present a well-defined and organized research and analysis methodology; does workplan provide a reasonable and well thought out organization of work?, 2. Personnel matrix - are appropriate and qualified personnel proposed?

3. Principal Investigator's relevant experience. (20 points)

Factors: Knowledge of and experiences with the election administration process (6 points), knowledge of and experience with public administration, legal and legislative analysis (6 points), management of project work similar to this effort (e.g., national level policy-making, subject matter, work scope and level of effort) (8 points)

Parts of proposal that relate to this factor: 3. P.I.'s qualifications – Does P.I. have experience managing these types of efforts; what are his/her own research and policy analysis credentials?

4. Relevant organizational experience with this type of research. (15 points)

Parts of proposal that relate to this factor: 4. organizational qualifications – Do examples portray similar types of work (policy research, legislative and legal analysis, election administration procedures, literature review, analysis and evaluation of alternative approaches to achieve policy objectives), similar scope of effort

5. Compliance with proposal instructions. (5 points)

Factors: followed instructions (1), presented a clear proposal (2), overall quality of proposal (2)

6. Results of reference checks. (10 points)

Questions for reference checks:
1. Was work done on schedule?
2. Was work done within budget?
3. What was quality of work product?
4. Describe and characterize the working relationship.
5. Did contractor produce any unique insights, any value-added results?
May 24, 2005

CONTRACT TO PROVIDE RESEARCH ASSISTANCE TO THE EAC FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOLUNTARY GUIDANCE ON PROVISIONAL VOTING AND VOTER IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES

0.0 Background: Sec. 302(a) of HAVA requires that all States allow the casting of provisional ballots in instances where a voter declares their eligibility to vote but their name does not appear on the official list of eligible voters, or an election official asserts that a voter is not eligible to vote. This section describes several requirements for implementation of provisional voting, but the States have considerable latitude in specifying how to carry out these requirements. The EAC seeks to examine how provisional voting was implemented in the 2004 general election and to prepare guidance for the States on this topic for the 2006 Federal elections.

HAVA Sec. 303(b) mandates that first time voters who register by mail are required to show proof of identity before being allowed to cast a ballot. The law prescribes certain requirements concerning this section, but also leaves considerable discretion to the States for its implementation. The EAC seeks to examine how these voter identification requirements were implemented in the 2004 elections and to prepare guidance on this topic for the 2006 elections.

One of the remedies for a voter not having an acceptable proof of identity is to allow the voter to cast a provisional ballot, either at the polling place or by mail. This linkage between these two HAVA sections provides a rationale for conducting research on these topics in parallel. However, it is anticipated that two separate guidance documents will result.

1.0 Objective: The objective of this contract is for EAC to obtain assistance with the collection, analysis and interpretation of information regarding HAVA provisional voting and voter identification requirements for the purpose of drafting guidance on these topics in time for implementation for the 2006 Federal elections. The anticipated outcome of this activity is the generation of concrete policy recommendations to be issued as voluntary guidance for States.

2.0 Scope: In general the Contractor shall be responsible for all research and analysis activities, including the conduct of public hearings for fact finding and public comment purposes. However, in light of the need to get started on this work, the EAC conducted a public hearing on provisional voting on February 23, 2005.

An initial framework for provisional voting policy has been set by the court decisions rendered on the election procedures utilized in the 2004 election. The 6th Circuit decision, in particular, has drawn some boundaries which must be given
due regard in the course of considering future policy alternatives for provisional voting.

Notice of public meetings and hearings is required to be published in the Federal Register. The Contractor shall be responsible for preparing the notice documents, and the EAC will submit the notices and cover the cost of publication. In addition, draft guidance documents must be published in the Federal Register to obtain public comment prior to their adoption. Again, the Contractor will work with the EAC to prepare the draft documents for publication, which the EAC will submit and pay for the cost of publication. Comments received will be provided to the Contractor for analysis and incorporation into the final guidance documents, as appropriate.

3.0 Specific Tasks

For ease of reference, following task 3.3 the remaining tasks are listed separately under the headings of Provisional Voting and Voter Identification Requirements. It is anticipated that the work on these two topics will be conducted essentially concurrently.

3.1 Update the project work plan, as required. The Contractor shall update and deliver the Project Plan not later than 10 days after contract award. This plan shall describe how the Contractor will accomplish each of the project tasks, including a timeline indicating major milestones. A single document will be prepared to include both provisional voting and voter identification tasks. The updated Project Plan shall be formally briefed to the EAC Project Manager and lead Commissioner.

3.2 Submit monthly progress reports. The Contractor shall submit a monthly progress report within 2 weeks of the end of each month. This report shall provide a brief summary of activities performed and indicate progress against the timeline provided in the Project Plan. Any issues that could adversely affect schedule should be identified for resolution. Budget status shall also be provided.

3.3 Conduct periodic briefings for the EAC. The Contractor shall periodically meet with the EAC Project Manager and the lead Commissioner for this work to discuss research findings and progress. The Project Plan should make allowance for this activity. The number and frequency of briefings will be determined by the Contractor Project Manager and the EAC Project Manager as the work progresses. The Contractor may also be required to periodically brief the full Commission on their work.
Provisional Voting

3.4 Collect and analyze State legislation, administrative procedures, and court cases. An understanding of the disparities and similarities of how provisional voting was implemented around the country will provide a baseline for the consideration of future approaches. Seventeen States never had provisional voting before HAVA was enacted, while many other States did. A State-by-State compendium of the legislation, procedures, and litigation reviewed shall be delivered along with the analysis results.

Topics of particular interest include the following:
- How did States prepare for the onset of the HAVA provisional ballot requirement?
- How did this vary between States that had previously had some form of provisional ballots and those that did not?
- How did litigation affect the implementation?
- How effective was provisional voting in enfranchising qualified voters?
- Did State and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots?
- Did local election officials have a clear understanding of how to implement provisional voting?

3.5 Recommend alternative approaches for future implementation of provisional voting. The Contractor shall conduct a literature review to identify other research results and data available on this topic. The EAC Election Day Survey, for example, contained several questions on provisional voting. The EAC will make these survey data available to the Contractor. Based on their analysis of available research and the results of Task 4.5, the Contractor shall diagnose the problems and challenges of provisional voting implementation and hypothesize alternative approaches.

The Contractor shall assess the efficacy of these alternatives in relation to the following inter-related policy objectives: (1) enabling the maximum number of eligible voters to cast ballots that will be counted; (2) providing procedural simplicity for voters, poll workers, and election officials; (3) minimizing opportunity for voter fraud; and (4) maintaining a reasonable workload for election officials and poll workers. Additional policy considerations may be identified in the course of this research effort. The Contractor shall document and brief these alternatives to the Commission.

3.6 Prepare preliminary draft guidance document. Based on the feedback received from the Commission, the Contractor shall prepare a draft guidance document for review and comment by the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board. EAC will convene a meeting or teleconference of the Boards for the discussion of this document. The Contractor shall provide the document in advance and participate in the meeting to answer questions and
3.7 Revise draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register. The Contractor shall revise the guidance document as appropriate to reflect the comments of the EAC, the Board of Advisors and the Standards Board and prepare the draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register by the EAC.

3.8 Arrange one public hearing for receiving public comment on draft guidance. This hearing should be scheduled 30 days after the initial publication date. The Contractor shall select the location in consultation with the EAC. EAC will handle publicity for the meeting.

3.9 Prepare final guidance document for EAC adoption. Review all comments received in response to Federal Register publication and at public hearing and revise guidance document as appropriate. Provide final version to EAC for adoption.

Voter Identification Requirements

3.10 Collect and analyze State legislation, administrative procedures, and court cases. It is assumed that the collection of information for analysis of voter identification requirements will be performed concurrently with the research for Task 4.5. An understanding of the disparities and similarities of how voter identification requirements were implemented around the country will provide a baseline for the consideration of future approaches. A State-by-State compendium of the legislation, procedures, and litigation reviewed shall be delivered along with the analysis results.

3.11 Convene a half day public hearing on the topic of voter identification requirements. This hearing should occur early in the research process as an informational hearing where all points of view on this topic can be aired. The Contractor shall be responsible for all aspects of planning and conducting this hearing in consultation with the EAC. The Contractor shall identify three panels of three to four speakers each. The Contractor shall arrange for speaker attendance to include travel and per diem expenses. The EAC will provide publicity for the hearing. The Contractor shall prepare a document summarizing the proceedings and containing all testimony provided.

3.12 Recommend alternative approaches for future implementation of HAVA voter identification requirements. The Contractor shall conduct a literature review to identify other research results and data available on this topic. Based on their analysis of available research and the results of Task 4.11, the Contractor shall diagnose the problems and challenges of voter identification and hypothesize alternative approaches. The Contractor shall
coordinate with the EAC to identify appropriate policy objectives by which to assess these alternatives. The Contractor shall document and brief these alternatives to the Commission.

3.13 Prepare preliminary draft guidance document. Based on the feedback received from the Commission, the Contractor shall prepare a draft guidance document for review and comment by the EAC Board of Advisors and Standards Board. EAC will convene a meeting or teleconference of the Boards for the discussion of this document. The Contractor shall provide the document in advance and participate in the Board meeting to answer questions and record comments.

3.14 Revise draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register. The Contractor shall revise the guidance document as appropriate to reflect the comments of the EAC, the Board of Advisors and the Standards Board and prepare the draft guidance for publication in the Federal Register by the EAC.

3.15 Arrange a second public hearing for receiving public comment on the draft guidance. This hearing should be scheduled 30 days after the initial publication date. The Contractor shall select the location in consultation with the EAC. EAC will handle publicity for the hearing.

3.16 Prepare final guidance document for EAC adoption. Review all comments received in response to Federal Register publication and at public hearing and revise guidance document as appropriate. Provide final version to EAC for adoption.

4.0 **Contract Type.** The contract type will be Time and Materials in the amount of $560,002.00.

5.0 **Place of performance.** The principal place of performance will be the Contractor’s place of business. Meetings and occasional work efforts may be performed at the EAC offices. Some travel will be required.

6.0 **Period of Performance.** The period of performance is from date of award until December 30, 2005.

7.0 **Schedule of Deliverables:**

1. Updated project plan – 10 days after contract award
2. Progress reports – monthly
3. Briefings – as required
4. Analysis report on provisional voting, including compendium of legislation, procedures and litigation - TBD
5. Alternatives report on provisional voting – TBD
6. Preliminary draft guidance on provisional voting - TBD
7. Draft guidance on provisional voting for publication – 9/2005
8. Public hearing on draft guidance – 30 days after publication
10. Analysis report on voter identification requirements, including compendium of legislation, procedures and litigation – TBD
11. Public hearing on voter identification requirements – TBD
12. Summary of voter identification requirements hearing - TBD
13. Alternatives report on voter identification requirements - TBD
14. Preliminary draft guidance on voter identification requirements - TBD
15. Draft guidance on voter identification requirements for publication – 11/2005
16. Public hearing on draft guidance – 30 days after publication
17. Final guidance on voter identification requirements to EAC for adoption – 12/2005

8.0 Inspection and Acceptance Criteria. Final inspection and acceptance of all work performed, reports, and other deliverables will be performed at the offices of the EAC. The Contracting Officer’s Representative for this effort will be Karen Lynn-Dyson. She will review and approve all work on behalf of the Commission.

9.0 Invoicing. Invoices may be submitted monthly using Standard Form 1034, Public Voucher for Purchases and Services Other Than Personal. Invoices shall be mailed to the attention of Ms. Diana Scott, Administrative Officer, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington D.C. 20005.

10.0 Accounting and Appropriation Data: Funds in the amount of $560,002.00 are available for this task order.

11.0 General Provisions:

11.1 Proposal Incorporated. The Contractor’s proposal is incorporated by reference into the statement of work.

11.2 Inspection/Acceptance. The Contractor shall only tender for acceptance those items that conform to the requirements of this contract. The EAC reserves the right to inspect and review any products or services that have been tendered for acceptance. The EAC may require correction or re-performance of nonconforming items at no increase in contract price. The EAC must exercise its post-acceptance rights within ten (10) days after the defect was discovered or should have been discovered.

11.3 Contract Terms. Should there be a conflict between the contract clauses included in this document and the “Purchase Order Terms and Conditions” on the back of GSA Form 300, which is used to record contract financial
data, the contract clauses in this document shall take precedence.

11.4 *Changes.* Changes in the terms and conditions of this Contract may be made only by written agreement signed by authorized representatives of both parties.

11.5 *Disputes.* This Contract is subject to the Contract Disputes Act of 1978, as amended (41 U.S.C. 601-613). The Contractor shall proceed diligently with performance of this Contract, pending final resolution of any dispute arising under the Contract.

11.6 *Excusable Delays.* The Contractor shall be liable for default unless nonperformance is caused by an occurrence beyond the reasonable control of the Contractor and without its fault or negligence such as, acts of God or the public enemy, acts of the Government in either its sovereign or contractual capacity, fires, floods, epidemics, quarantine restrictions, strikes, unusually severe weather, and delays of common carriers. The Contractor shall notify the EAC, in writing, as soon as possible after the beginning of an excusable delay. The Contractor shall explain the basis for the excusable delay, and correct the problem as soon as possible. The Contractor shall notify the EAC, in writing, at the end of the delay.

11.7 *Other compliances.* The Contractor shall comply with all applicable Federal, State and local laws, executive orders, rules and regulations applicable to its performance under this contract.


11.9 *Limitation of Government Liability.* The Contractor is not authorized to make expenditures or incur obligations exceeding the total amount allocated to the contract. The Contractor is required to notify the Contracting Officer’s Representative when 75% of funding has been obligated.

11.10 *Termination for convenience.* The EAC, by written notice, may terminate this contract without fault, in whole or in part, when it is in the best interest of the government. In the event of contract termination for convenience, the rights, duties, and obligations of the parties, including compensation to the Contractor, shall be in accordance with Part 49 of the Federal Acquisition Regulations in effect on the date of this contract.
ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES - RECEIVING REPORT

1. DATE OF ORDER: 05/24/05
2. ORDER NUMBER: E4014127
3. CONTRACT NUMBER: 000000
4. ACT NUMBER: 000000

IMPORTANT:

* This form must be received in the payment office within 5 workdays of acceptance.
* Acceptance must take place within 7 calendar days of delivery or completion of work unless a different inspection/acceptance period is stated in the contract.
* Invoices received must be time stamped to indicate the date of receipt. See reverse of this form for detailed instructions.

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Contact: Keith Osterhage (732) 932-0150

MAXIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT: 62,581.46

LESS DEDUCTION(S) FOR NONPERFORMANCE, ETC.
(Explain in remarks)

MAXIMUM AMOUNT APPROVED FOR PAYMENT: 62,581.46

ITEM NO.

SUPPLIES OR SERVICES

QUANTITY ORDERED

UNIT

UNIT PRICE

AMOUNT

Total cost of contract: $560,002.00

CERTIFICATION OF RECEIPT/ACCEPTANCE

I certify that the above supplies and/or services have been:

Type of delivery (Mark "X" in appropriate box)
A. FULL
B. PARTIAL

Name and title (Type, print or stamp)
Gracia M. Hillman, Chair

Signature
Gracia M. Hillman

Date signed
9-20-05
**PUBLICATION VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voucher No.</th>
<th>0000-422-003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**U.S. DEPARTMENT, BUREAU, OR ESTABLISHMENT AND LOCATION**

Attn.: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington D.C. 20005

**DATE VOUCHER PREPARED**  
09/14/2005

**CONTRACT NUMBER AND DATE**  
SP0103-96-D-0016/0001 6/96

**REQUEST NUMBER AND DATE**  
E40414127 05/24/05

**PAYEE'S NAME**  
Rutgers, The State University  
Division of Grant and Contract Accounting  
3 Rutgers Plaza  
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559

**DATE INVOICE REC'D**  
09/14/05

**PAYEE'S ACCOUNT#**  
4-23473-4220-003

**PAYMENT**  
Approved for

**TOTAL AMOUNT**  
62,581.46

**I certify that all payments are requested for the appropriate purpose and in accordance with the agreement set forth in the application and award documents.**

Constance J. Bornheimer  
09/14/05

**ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION**

**PAID BY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CK NUMBER</th>
<th>ON TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES</th>
<th>CHECK NUMBER</th>
<th>ON (Name in the back)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAYEES ACCOUNT#**

4-23473-4220-003

**TITLE**

Constance J. Bornheimer, Accounting Manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE OF DELIVERY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rutgers, The State University Div. of Grant &amp; Contract Accounting 3 Rutgers Plaza New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559 SP0103-96-D-0016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SALARY</td>
<td>22,142.64</td>
<td>26,864.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FRINGE</td>
<td>3,977.95</td>
<td>4,219.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,120.59</td>
<td>31,084.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td>74.53</td>
<td>394.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
<td>215.53</td>
<td>8,233.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLICATIONS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPUTER SERVICES</td>
<td>809.46</td>
<td>809.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONSULT &amp; OTHER SVCS</td>
<td>14,250.00</td>
<td>27,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL MTDC</td>
<td>41,470.11</td>
<td>67,896.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RENTAL FACILITY</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQUIP RENTAL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOVING</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INSTALL/MAINT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TUITION</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REP &amp; MAINT EQUIP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REVENUE REVISIONS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</td>
<td>41,470.11</td>
<td>67,896.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIRECT COST (55.5%, 54%)</td>
<td>21,111.38</td>
<td>35,503.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>62,581.46</td>
<td>103,399.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**NEAR INPUT TRANSMITTAL**

(Prepare in triplicate. Forward original and one copy to the appropriate Finance Division)

The following documents are transmitted herewith:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6BCPG</td>
<td>6BCPF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCRG</td>
<td>6BCRF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCPM</td>
<td>6BCPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>6BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCRC</td>
<td>6BCCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCF</td>
<td>6BCEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCF</td>
<td>6BCF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7BCAX</td>
<td>7BCAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7BCAK</td>
<td>7BCAK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7BCRF</td>
<td>7BCRF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>6BCF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATE** 9/20/2005

**IBER NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS EXCLUDING SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS** 1

**ACT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Vendor/Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4019674</td>
<td>NEDZER, TAMAR</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>FORM 1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019669</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SIGN LANGUAGE INTERPRETING, INC.</td>
<td>$2,142.00</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019670</td>
<td>TECHNOLOGY RESOURCE CORPORATION</td>
<td>$21,162.70</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019671</td>
<td>RICHARD DICKERON</td>
<td>$4,730.00</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019672</td>
<td>FEDEX</td>
<td>$6.38</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4000492</td>
<td>FITNEY BOWES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>$226.76</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4000492</td>
<td>FITNEY BOWES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>$882.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
<td>RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIV. OF NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>$62,581.46</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014128</td>
<td>SNELLING PERSONNEL SERVICES</td>
<td>$1,233.80</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014128</td>
<td>SNELLING PERSONNEL SERVICES</td>
<td>$21,162.70</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019153</td>
<td>THE ADAM'S MARK HOTEL</td>
<td>$39,340.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019044</td>
<td>CALIBER ASSOCIATES, INC</td>
<td>$38,000.00</td>
<td>GSA FORM 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019045</td>
<td>CALIBER ASSOCIATES, INC</td>
<td>$4,577.00</td>
<td>GSA FORM 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019142</td>
<td>CALIBER ASSOCIATES, INC</td>
<td>$99,923.00</td>
<td>GSA FORM 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019153</td>
<td>THE ADAM'S MARK HOTEL</td>
<td>$39,340.00</td>
<td>GSA FORM 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019064</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, RAY</td>
<td>$741.88</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019149</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, RAY</td>
<td>$612.70</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019522</td>
<td>COOPER, KATHIE CHASTAIN</td>
<td>$224.32</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019570</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, RAY</td>
<td>$648.45</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019571</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, RAY</td>
<td>$350.93</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019585</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, RAY</td>
<td>$604.51</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019619</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, RAY</td>
<td>$896.30</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019649</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, RAY</td>
<td>$172.59</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE**

DIANA M. SCOTT

**SERVICE** ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

**OFFICE SYMBOL** EAC

**SIGNATURE OF RECEIVING OFFICIAL - FINANCE**

**AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE**

DIANA M. SCOTT

**TITLE** ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

**SERVICE** ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

**OFFICE SYMBOL** EAC

**SIGNATURE OF RECEIVING OFFICIAL - FINANCE**

**GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION**

**DATE RECEIVED** 016011

**TELEPHONE NUMBER** (202) 566-3119

**NUMBER DOCUMENTS RECEIVED** 1

**GSA FORM 2951 (REV. 12-94)**

Prescribed by COM P 4251.1
**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES - RECEIVING REPORT**

1. **DATE OF ORDER**
   05/24/05

## IMPORTANT:
- This form must be received in the payment office within 5 workdays of acceptance.
- Acceptance must take place within 7 calendar days of delivery or completion of work unless a different inspection/acceptance period is stated in the contract.
- Invoices received must be time stamped to indicate the date of receipt. See reverse of this form for detailed instructions.

7. **TO: CONTRACTOR**
   Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
   Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
   3 Rutgers Plaza
   New Brunswick, NJ 08901

   Contact: Keith Osterhage (732) 932-0150

### MAXIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESS DEDUCTION(S) FOR NONPERFORMANCE, ETC. (Explain in remarks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM AMOUNT APPROVED FOR PAYMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MAXIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT | $28,175.94 |

### SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO. (A)</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES (B)</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED (C)</th>
<th>UNIT (D)</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE (E)</th>
<th>AMOUNT (F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached Eagleton proposal and EAC Statement of Work for description and details of specifics and requirements.</td>
<td>01601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $560,002.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>016012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CERTIFICATION OF RECEIPT/ACCEPTANCE

I certify that the above supplies and/or services have been:

- received on **Date**: **07/01/05**
- and accepted on **Date**: **07/01/05**

**TYPE OF DELIVERY**
- [ ] A. FULL
- [ ] B. PARTIAL

**NAME AND TITLE**
**GRACIA M. HILLMAN, CHAIR**

**SIGNATURE**
**[Signature]**

**OFFICE SYMBOL**
**EAC**

**TELEPHONE NO.**
**(202) 566-3100**

**DATE SIGNED**
**8-22-05**
Certifying receipt and processing payments for procurements requiring a written purchase order
(GSA Form 300 or 300-1).

(1) When supplies or services are received, the contracting/ordering office or designated program office will certify receipt and acceptance and indicate the amount approved for payment on copy 6, Receiving Report, of GSA Form 300 or 300-1. When multiple deliveries/payments are required, additional copies of the receiving report (copy 6) may be reproduced or the GSA Form 3025 or 3025A Receiving Report, used to certify receipt and acceptance. Photocopies signatures will not be accepted on the receiving report.

NOTE: It is important that the date of receipt and the date of acceptance entered in the certification on the receiving report be accurate. Those dates are used to calculate the due date for payments and interest on overdue payments. The contracting/ordering officer or a designated representative should certify receipt and authorize payment by signing the certification on the receiving report.

(2) Invoices received by issuing offices or other designated program offices must be time stamped to indicate the date of receipt, checked to verify the arithmetic accuracy of the invoiced amount, and forwarded, within 5 workdays of receipt, to the appropriate Finance Division for payment. Copy 1 of the GSA Form 300/300-1 and a receiving report (Copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or GSA 3025/3025A, Receiving Report) should be forwarded with the invoice to finance.

(3) When invoices are submitted directly to the Finance Division, contracting/ordering or other designated program offices will certify receipt and acceptance and authorize payment for supplies or services by completing copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or the GSA Form 3025/3025A, Receiving Report, in accordance with paragraph (c) (1) above and sending it to the appropriate finance division within 5 workdays after supplies or services are received and accepted.
**PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL**

**Voucher No.** 0000-422-002

**U.S. DEPARTMENT, BUREAU, OR ESTABLISHMENT AND LOCATION**
Attn.: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer
U. S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington D. C. 20005

**DATE VOUCHER PREPARED** 8/12/2005

**CONTRACT NUMBER AND DATE** SP0103-96-D-0016/0001 6/96

**REQUISITION NUMBER AND DATE**

**PAYEE'S NAME** Rutgers, The State University
**ADDRESS** 3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559

**PAYEE'S ACCT #** 4-23473-4220-002

**SHIPPED FROM** To

**DATE INVOICE REC'D**

**PAYMENT: APPROVED FOR EXCHANGE RATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ARTICLES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>7/01/05</td>
<td>&quot;I certify that all payments are requested for the appropriate purpose and in accordance with the agreement set forth in the application and award documents.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>To</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td>7/31/05</td>
<td>Constance J. Bonheimer, Accounting Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 28,175.94

**Pursuant to authority vested in me, I certify that this voucher is correct and proper for payment**

**ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION** 016014

**PAID BY** CK NUMBER ON TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES CHECK NUMBER ON (Name in the back)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASH DATE PAYEE (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) WHEN STATED IN FOREIGN CURRENCY, INSERT NAME OF CURRENCY

(2) If the ability to certify and authority to approve are combined in one person, one signature only is necessary; otherwise the approving officer will sign in the space provided.

(3) When a voucher is receipted in the name of a company or corporation, the name of the person writing the company or corporation name, as well as the capacity in which he signs, must appear. For example: "John Doe Co., per John Smith, Secretary," or "Manager," as the case may be.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTICLES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, The State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div. of Grant &amp; Contract Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Davidson Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataway, NJ 08854-5603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP0103-96-D-0016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount (CURRENT)</th>
<th>Amount (CUMULATIVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALARY</td>
<td>4,722.00</td>
<td>4,722.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRINGE</td>
<td>241.65</td>
<td>241.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td>130.41</td>
<td>319.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>8,018.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLICATIONS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SERVICES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULT &amp; OTHER SVCS</td>
<td>13,125.00</td>
<td>13,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MTDC</td>
<td>18,296.06</td>
<td>26,426.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENTAL FACILITY</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIP RENTAL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVING</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTALL/MAINT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUITION</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP &amp; MAINT EQUIP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE REVISIONS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</td>
<td>18,296.06</td>
<td>26,426.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT COST (55.5%, 54%)</td>
<td>9,879.88</td>
<td>14,392.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>28,175.94</td>
<td>40,818.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following documents are transmitted herewith:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>VENDOR/SOURCE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4019606</td>
<td>THE CAPITOL CONNECTION</td>
<td>$595.00</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4000492</td>
<td>PITNEY BOWES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>$217.63</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014004</td>
<td>NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES</td>
<td>$22,840.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
<td>RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIV. OF NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>$12,642.41</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
<td>RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIV. OF NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>$28,175.94</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014128A</td>
<td>SNELLING PERSONNEL SERVICES</td>
<td>$1,066.40</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014200</td>
<td>INTELLIGENT DECISIONS</td>
<td>$2,648.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019105</td>
<td>AMERISYS, INC.</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019574A</td>
<td>THOMPSON, JULIET E.</td>
<td>$1,642.10</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014153</td>
<td>EDWARDS, JAMES</td>
<td>$97.50</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019006</td>
<td>SIMS, MARGARET A.</td>
<td>$427.04</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019050</td>
<td>SHERRILL, AMIE J.</td>
<td>$113.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019110</td>
<td>GILMOUR, GAVIN</td>
<td>$703.72</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019117</td>
<td>THOMPSON, JULIET E.</td>
<td>$646.27</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIANA M. SCOTT
ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
This form must be received in the payment office within 5 workdays of acceptance.

Acceptance must take place within 7 calendar days of delivery or completion of work unless a different inspection/acceptance period is stated in the contract.

Invoices received must be time stamped to indicate the date of receipt. See reverse of this form for detailed instructions.

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
Contact: Keith Osterhage (732) 932-0150

MAXIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESS DEDUCTION(S) FOR NONPERFORMANCE, ETC.</th>
<th>(Explain in remarks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

MAXIMUM AMOUNT APPROVED FOR PAYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
<td>(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached Eagleton proposal and EAC Statement of Work for description and details of specifics and requirements. TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $560,002.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I certify that the above supplies and/or services have been:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF DELIVERY</th>
<th>NAME AND TITLE (Type, print or stamp)</th>
<th>OFFICE SYMBOL</th>
<th>TELEPHONE NO.</th>
<th>DATE SIGNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. FULL</td>
<td>GRACIA M. HILMAN, CHAIR</td>
<td>1AC</td>
<td>(202) 566-3100</td>
<td>8-22-05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

05/24/2005

05/24/2005
Certifying receipt and processing payments for procurements requiring a written purchase order
(GSA Form 300 or 300-1).

(1) When supplies or services are received, the contracting/ordering office or designated program office will certify receipt and acceptance and indicate the amount approved for payment on copy 6, Receiving Report, of GSA Form 300 or 300-1. When multiple deliveries/payments are required, additional copies of the receiving report (copy 6) may be reproduced or the GSA Form 3025 or 3025A Receiving Report, used to certify receipt and acceptance. Photocopies signatures will not be accepted on the receiving report.

NOTE: It is important that the date of receipt and the date of acceptance entered in the certification on the receiving report be accurate. Those dates are used to calculate the due date for payments and interest on overdue payments. The contracting/ordering officer or a designated representative should certify receipt and authorize payment by signing the certification on the receiving report.

(2) Invoices received by issuing offices or other designated program offices must be time stamped to indicate the date of receipt, checked to verify the arithmetic accuracy of the invoiced amount, and forwarded, within 5 workdays of receipt, to the appropriate Finance Division for payment. Copy 1 of the GSA Form 300/300-1 and a receiving report (Copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or GSA 3025/3025A, Receiving Report) should be forwarded with the invoice to finance.

(3) When invoices are submitted directly to the Finance Division, contracting/ordering or other designated program offices will certify receipt and acceptance and authorize payment for supplies or services by completing copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or the GSA Form 3025/3025A, Receiving Report, in accordance with paragraph (c) (1) above and sending it to the appropriate finance division within 5 workdays after supplies or services are received and accepted.
**Standard Form 1034 September 1973**

**PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voucher No.</th>
<th>0000-422-001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. DEPARTMENT, BUREAU, OR ESTABLISHMENT AND LOCATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attn.: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Election Assistance Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington D.C. 20005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAYEE'S NAME</th>
<th>Rutgers, The State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AND LOCATION</td>
<td>Division of Grant and Contract Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHIPPED FROM</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEIGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER AND DATE OF ORDER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTICLES OR SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT PRICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cost |  |
| Delivered: 5/24/05 |  |
| ARTICLES OR SERVICES |  |
| QUANTITY |  |
| UNIT PRICE |  |
| AMOUNT |  |

| Contract |  |
| Delivered: 6/30/05 |  |
| ARTICLES OR SERVICES |  |
| QUANTITY |  |
| UNIT PRICE |  |
| AMOUNT |  |

| Voucher |  |
| Delivered: 6/30/05 |  |
| ARTICLES OR SERVICES |  |
| QUANTITY |  |
| UNIT PRICE |  |
| AMOUNT |  |

**AMOUNT OF THIS CLAIM**

12,642.41

**PAYMENT:**

[ ] COMPLETE

[ ] PARTIAL

[ ] PROGRESS

[ ] ADVANCE

Pursuant to authority vested in me, I certify that this voucher is correct and proper for payment.

**ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION**

016019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAID BY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHECK NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHECK NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON (Name in the back)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH DATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYEE (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1974 D-548-986**
### Articles or Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>189.17</td>
<td>189.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>7,941.00</td>
<td>7,941.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult &amp; Other Svcs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MTDC</td>
<td>8,130.17</td>
<td>8,130.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Facility</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip Rental</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install/Maint</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep &amp; Maint Equip</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Revisions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Costs</td>
<td>8,130.17</td>
<td>8,130.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost (26%)</td>
<td>4,512.24</td>
<td>4,512.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>12,642.41</td>
<td>12,642.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB CODE</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>VENDOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>SALARIES REGULAR EMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>SALARIES REGULAR EMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>WAGES OF LABOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>FRINGE BENEFITS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2160</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPL-DGCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2180</td>
<td>SOFTWARE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2180</td>
<td>SOFTWARE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>PERM EQP-DGCA &lt;$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3210</td>
<td>POSTAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3040</td>
<td>TELEPHONE-TOLL CHARG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3100</td>
<td>OTHER SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRANT AND CONTRACT ACCOUNTING / BUDGET REPORT**

**ACCOUNTANT**: GB DANIELA PRELIPCEANU  

**RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY**

**PROJECT START**: 05/24/05  
**END**: 12/30/05  
**CONTRACT #**: E40414127

**SUB CODE DESCRIPTION VENDOR**  
**RPO/ XREF NO.**  
**DATE**  
**REF CODE/ RELEASE NO.**  
**ORIGINAL BUDGET**  
**BUDGET ADJUSTMENT**  
**AMOUNTS TO DATE**  
**AMOUNT COMMITTED**  
**BALANCE (DEFICIT)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VENDOR</th>
<th>RPD/XREF NO</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REF CODE/RELEASE NO</th>
<th>ORIGINAL BUDGET</th>
<th>BUDGET ADJUSTMENT</th>
<th>AMOUNTS TO DATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT COMMITTED</th>
<th>BALANCE (DEFICIT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET ALLOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/20/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB CODE TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/30/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3110 PROF SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/01/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>79,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>79,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET ALLOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/20/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>79,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB CODE TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/30/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>79,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3120 HONORARIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/01/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET ALLOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/20/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB CODE TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/30/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3200 COPYING COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/01/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET ALLOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/20/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB CODE TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/30/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OTHER SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>79,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3250 CONFERENCE EXP-DGCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/01/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,120</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,120.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET ALLOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/20/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,120</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,120.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB CODE TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/30/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CONFERENCE/BUSINESS EXP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81,120</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,120.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3520 TRAVEL-DOMESTIC-DGCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/01/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>189.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,010.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL ENTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/20/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>189.17</td>
<td>5,010.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB CODE TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/30/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,010.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TRAVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>189.17</td>
<td>5,010.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3700 SUB CONTRACT&lt;$25000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/01/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET ALLOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/20/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB CODE TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/30/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SUB-CONTRACT &lt;$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3710 SUB CONTRACT&gt;$25000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/01/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>59,744</td>
<td></td>
<td>59,744.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET ALLOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/20/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>59,744</td>
<td></td>
<td>59,744.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB CODE TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/30/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>59,744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SUB-CONTRACT &gt;$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59,744</td>
<td></td>
<td>59,744.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8800 FAC. &amp; ADMIN COSTS (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/01/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,512.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET ALLOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>000853</td>
<td>06/30/05</td>
<td>000142</td>
<td>153,743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,512.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/20/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

016022
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB CODE</th>
<th>VENDOR</th>
<th>RPO/ XREF NO</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REF CODE/ RELEASE NO</th>
<th>ORIGINAL BUDGET</th>
<th>BUDGET ADJUSTMENT</th>
<th>AMOUNTS TO DATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT COMMITTED</th>
<th>BALANCE (DEFICIT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUB CODE TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/30/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>153,743</td>
<td>4,512.24</td>
<td>149,230.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>153,743</td>
<td>4,512.24</td>
<td>149,230.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNT TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>560,002</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>12,642.41</td>
<td>79,500.00</td>
<td>467,859.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

016023
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VENDOR</th>
<th>RPO</th>
<th>RELEASE NUMBER</th>
<th>LAST ACTIVITY</th>
<th>AMOUNT COMMITTED</th>
<th>AMOUNT EXPENDED</th>
<th>OVER (UNDER) EXPENDED</th>
<th>COMMITMENT BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2180 SOFTWARE</td>
<td>IPO: OIT CCS SITE LICEN</td>
<td>000011</td>
<td>005045</td>
<td>06/23/05</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEIP, DAVID</td>
<td>P-608684</td>
<td>06/28/05</td>
<td>118.00</td>
<td>118.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUB CODE TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>193.00</td>
<td>193.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240 PERM EQP-DGCA</td>
<td>IPO: OIT RU COMPUTER ST</td>
<td>000009</td>
<td>004132</td>
<td>06/27/05</td>
<td>1,698.00</td>
<td>1,698.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPO: OIT RU COMPUTER ST</td>
<td>000009</td>
<td>004106</td>
<td>06/27/05</td>
<td>5,792.00</td>
<td>5,792.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPO: OIT RU COMPUTER ST</td>
<td>000009</td>
<td>004138</td>
<td>06/28/05</td>
<td>258.00</td>
<td>258.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CARROLL PUBLISHING</td>
<td>P-607882</td>
<td>06/29/05</td>
<td>7,748.00</td>
<td>7,748.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUB CODE TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,748.00</td>
<td>7,748.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3110 PROF SERVICES</td>
<td>O'NEILL, THOMAS M</td>
<td>P-594376</td>
<td>06/24/05</td>
<td>79,500.00</td>
<td>79,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL COMMITMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87,441.00</td>
<td>7,841.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>79,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following documents are transmitted herewith:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SERIAL NUMBER</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS EXCLUDING SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/29/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>VENDOR/SOURCE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4019606</td>
<td>THE CAPITOL CONNECTION</td>
<td>$595.00</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4000492</td>
<td>PITNEY BOWES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>$217.63</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014004</td>
<td>NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES</td>
<td>$22,840.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
<td>RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIV. OF NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>$12,642.41</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
<td>RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIV. OF NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>$28,175.94</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014128A</td>
<td>SNELLING PERSONNEL SERVICES</td>
<td>$1,066.40</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014200</td>
<td>INTELLIGENT DECISIONS</td>
<td>$2,648.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019105</td>
<td>AMERISYS, INC.</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019574A</td>
<td>THOMPSON, JULIET E.</td>
<td>$1,642.10</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014153</td>
<td>EDWARDS, JAMES</td>
<td>$97.50</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019006</td>
<td>SIMS, MARGARET A.</td>
<td>$427.04</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019050</td>
<td>SHERRILL, AMIE J.</td>
<td>$113.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019110</td>
<td>GILMOUR, GAVIN</td>
<td>$703.72</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019117</td>
<td>THOMPSON, JULIET E.</td>
<td>$646.27</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Prepared by COM P 4261.1
Karen - We are requesting a no-cost extension on the EAC contract to the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University to have the contract's concluding date move from March 31, 2006 to June 30, 2006. As I indicated earlier, it would be very helpful if we could receive approval of this request no later than April 28th.

This extension is necessary to enable the following activities:

1. The EAC has informed us that it will assemble a panel of researchers the week of May 8th to review the Eagleton/Moritz draft background report on Voter Identification. The EAC wishes to supplement the review of this draft already conducted by the Peer Review Group called for in the contract. The Eagleton/Moritz research team, as well as at least some of the Peer Review Group will participate in the conference call or meeting of the EAC's reviewers;

2. Eagleton/Moritz will revise the draft Voter Identification report based upon comments made by the two sets of reviewers, and distribute the revised report to the EAC and its Advisory Board in mid-May.

3. Eagleton/Moritz will present its draft reports on Provisional Voting and Voter Identification to the EAC Advisory Board at its May 25th meeting in Washington, D.C.;

4. Eagleton/Moritz will revise both draft reports to take into account comments made by the EAC Advisory Board, and submit printed final reports to the EAC before June 23rd. Eagleton/Moritz will also prepare a PowerPoint presentation for both reports.

5. Eagleton/Moritz will present both reports at the EAC public meeting in Washington, D.C. on June 23rd, thus concluding its work under this contract.

Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Thanks,

John

--
John Weingart, Associate Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(732)932-9384, x.290
Glad to help. I don't want to step on toes, but I'd recommend that you think about some sort of single-blind peer review, of the sort that is employed by many research journals and other organizations (like the NSF or National Academies of Science). I think that if you offer them a modest honoraria (perhaps $100) I think you'll find that the folks on that list would be likely to provide quick and thorough feedback to you.

Again, let me know if there is more that I can do to help.

I'm also willing to do a review for you myself. The issue is that I feel somewhat conflicted, given that I'm on their "peer review" panel. But on the other hand that does mean that I'm very well aware of the background of this project. I'd leave it up to you as to whether you think that a review from me would be appropriate or not.

Mike

On Thu, 6 Apr 2006 klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Mike- Nice to finally meet you in person, as well. Indeed ,as discussed,
> I am likely to confer with your peers on a number of matters related to
> research methodology and statistical analyses,
> 
> Thanks again for providing these names.
>
> K
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
> 
> "Mike Alvarez" <rma@hss.caltech.edu>
> 04/05/2006 07:39 PM
> 
> To
> klynndyson@eac.gov
> cc
> 
> Subject
Hi -- nice to meet you in person, finally!

And thanks for inviting me to your gathering, I enjoyed it and hope I was helpful. Of course, anytime you want anything, you do know where to track me down.

As to the potential reviewers of the Eagleton Voter ID study, here are my suggestions, in order:

- Jonathan Nagler, New York University
- Jan Leighley, University of Arizona
- Ben Highton, UC-Davis
- Adam Berinsky, MIT
- Bernard Grofman, UC-Irvine

All have worked with the CPS turnout/registration data, and are very familiar with this research literature.

If these don't work, or you want more recommendations, let me know.

R. Michael Alvarez
626-395-4089
Professor of Political Science
626-405-9841
Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, CA 91125
rma@hss.caltech.edu
Contributor to Election Updates,
http://electionupdates.caltech.edu/blog.html

---

Margaret Croft
UNC Charlotte

Jonathan.Nagler@nyu.edu
Jan.Leeleigh@email.arizona.edu
Adam.Berinsky@mit.edu
Bernard.Grofman@uci.edu
Ben.Highton@ucdavis.edu

016028
**PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voucher No.</th>
<th>0000-422-008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT, BUREAU, OR ESTABLISHMENT AND LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn.: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Election Assistance Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington D.C. 20005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAYEE:** Rutgers, The State University

**NAME:** Division of Grant and Contract Accounting

**ADDRESS:** New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559

**SHIPPED FROM TO WEIGHT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ARTICLES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATE INVOICE REC'D:** 05/24/05

**CONTRACT NUMBER AND DATE PAID NO.**

**PAYEE'S ACCT #:** 4-23473-4220-008

**GOVERNMENT B/L #:**

**DATE VOUCHER PREPARED:** 03/21/2006

**SCHEDULE NO.:**

**CONTRACT NUMBER AND DATE:** E40414127 05/24/05

**REQUISITION NUMBER AND DATE:**

**PAYEE'S [**Rutgers, The State University**]**

**ADDRESS:** New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559

**AMOUNT OF THIS CLAIM:**

113,249.99

**PAYMENT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAYMENT:</th>
<th>APPROVED FOR</th>
<th>EXCHANGE RATE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROVED FOR:** Constance J. Bornheimer, Accounting Manager

**TOTAL:** 113,249.99

**PAID BY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CK NUMBER</th>
<th>ON TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES</th>
<th>CHECK NUMBER</th>
<th>ON (Name in the back)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAYEE:**

1. **PER:**

2. **TITLE:**

---

**Notes:**

1. When stated in foreign currency, insert name of currency.
2. If the ability to verify and authorize approves are combined in one person, one signature only is necessary; otherwise the approving officer will sign in the space provided, even if official title.
3. When a treasurer or comptroller in the name of a company or corporation, the name of the person writing the company or corporation name, as well as the capacity in which he signs, must appear. For example, "John Doe Co., per John Smith, Secretary," or "Treasurer," or the case may be.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE OF</th>
<th>DELIVERY OR ORDER</th>
<th>ARTICLES OR SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rutgers, The State University Div. of Grant &amp; Contract Accounting 3 Rutgers Plaza New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559</td>
<td>(Enter description, item number of contract of Federal supply schedule, and other information deemed necessary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>CURRENT 01/01/06-02/28/06</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE 05/24/05-02/28/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALARY</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,311.00</td>
<td>114,105.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRINGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,640.84</td>
<td>24,973.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,951.84</td>
<td>139,079.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,302.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
<td></td>
<td>588.66</td>
<td>16,405.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td></td>
<td>534.61</td>
<td>4,747.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONTRACT &lt;$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFERENCE &amp; BUSINESS EXPENSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>948.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>809.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULT &amp; OTHER SVCS</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,750.00</td>
<td>112,769.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MTDC</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,825.11</td>
<td>301,061.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONTRACT &gt;$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>38,624.32</td>
<td>38,624.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE REVISIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>89,449.43</td>
<td>339,686.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT COST (55.5%, 54%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,800.56</td>
<td>128,527.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td></td>
<td>113,249.99</td>
<td>468,214.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Names of Individuals who receive salary, wages and payments under the consultant and other services line items.

**Salaried Faculty and Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Mandel</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Pfeiffer</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Phillips</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Vercellotti</td>
<td>2,922.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Weingart</td>
<td>3,200.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Brody</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10,247.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hourly Staff and Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Dobrich</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Linky</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid Reed</td>
<td>2,600.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,064.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Salary/Wage total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14,311.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom O'Neill - January Invoice</td>
<td>6,750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultants/Other service Subtotal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6,760.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no conference and business expenses this report period.
ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES - RECEIVING REPORT

1. DATE OF ORDER: 05/24/05
2. ORDER NUMBER: 
3. CONTRACT NUMBER: 
4. ACT NUMBER: E4014127

IMPORTANT:

- This form must be received in the payment office within 5 workdays of acceptance.
- Acceptance must take place within 7 calendar days of delivery or completion of work unless a different inspection/acceptance period is stated in the contract.
- Invoices received must be time stamped to indicate the date of receipt. See reverse of this form for detailed instructions.

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Contact: Keith Osterhage (732) 932-0150

A. PURCHASE
Please furnish the following on the terms specified on both aides of the order and the attached sheets, if any, including

B. DELIVERY
This delivery order is subject to instructions contained on this side only of this form and is issued subject to the terms and conditions of the above numbered contract.

MAXIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT $59,952.94

LESS DEDUCTION(S) FOR NONPERFORMANCE, ETC. (Explain in remarks)

MAXIMUM AMOUNT APPROVED FOR PAYMENT $59,952.94

TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $560,002.00

Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached Eagleton proposal and EAC Statement of Work for description and details of specifics and requirements.

CERTIFICATION OF RECEIPT/ACCEPTANCE
I certify that the above supplies and/or services have been:

received on (Date) 2-3-06
and accepted on (Date) 2-3-06

THOMAS R. WILKEY, Executive Director

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

6. RECEIVING REPORT - PAYING OFFICE

GSA FORM 300 (REV. 2-93)
Certifying receipt and processing payments for procurements requiring a written purchase order
(GSA Form 300 or 300-1).

(1) When supplies or services are received, the contracting/ordering office or designated program office will certify receipt and acceptance and indicate the amount approved for payment on copy 6, Receiving Report, of GSA Form 300 or 300-1. When multiple deliveries/payments are required, additional copies of the receiving report (copy 6) may be reproduced or the GSA Form 3025 or 3025A Receiving Report, used to certify receipt and acceptance. Photocopies signatures will not be accepted on the receiving report.

NOTE: It is important that the date of receipt and the date of acceptance entered in the certification on the receiving report be accurate. Those dates are used to calculate the due date for payments and interest on overdue payments. The contracting/ordering officer or a designated representative should certify receipt and authorize payment by signing the certification on the receiving report.

(2) Invoices received by issuing offices or other designated program offices must be time stamped to indicate the date of receipt, checked to verify the arithmetic accuracy of the invoiced amount, and forwarded, within 5 workdays of receipt, to the appropriate Finance Division for payment. Copy 1 of the GSA Form 300/300-1 and a receiving report (Copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or GSA 3025/3025A, Receiving Report) should be forwarded with the invoice to finance.

(3) When invoices are submitted directly to the Finance Division, contracting/ordering or other designated program offices will certify receipt and acceptance and authorize payment for supplies or services by completing copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or the GSA Form 3025/3025A, Receiving Report, in accordance with paragraph (c) (1) above and sending it to the appropriate finance division within 5 workdays after supplies or services are received and accepted.
**PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT, BUREAU, OR ESTABLISHMENT AND LOCATION**
Att.: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington D.C. 20005

**DATE VOUCHER PREPARED**
01/19/2006

**SCHEDULE NO.**

**CONTRACT NUMBER AND DATE**

**PAID NO.**

**REQUISITION NUMBER AND DATE**
E40414127 05/24/05

**PAYEE**
Rutgers, The State University
Division of Grant and Contract Accounting
3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559

**PAYEE'S NAME**
Division of Grant and Contract Accounting

**PAYEE'S ACCT #**

**ADDRESS**
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559

**SHIPPIED FROM**

**TO**

**WEIGHT**

**NUMBER**

**DATE**

**ARTICLES OR SERVICES**
(Enter description, item number of contract or Federal supply schedule, and other information deemed necessary)

**QUANTITY**

**UNIT PRICE**

**AMOUNT**

**AMOUNT OF THIS CLAIM**

Cost 12/01/05 "I certify that all payments are requested for the appropriate purpose and in accordance with the agreement set forth in the application and award documents."
59,952.94

**PAYMENT:**

**APPROVED FOR**

**EXCHANGE RATE**

**DIFERENCE**

**TOTAL**

59,952.94

**PAID BY**

**CHECK NUMBER**

ON TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

**CHECK NUMBER**

ON (Name in the back)

**CASH**

**DATE**

**PAYEE**

**NUMBER**

**ON TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES**

**CHECK NUMBER**

**ON (Name in the back)**

**CASH**

**DATE**

**PAYEE**

**PER**

**TITLE**

**U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1976 0-06-084-865**

016034
### ARTICLES OR SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE OF ORDER</th>
<th>DELIVERY DATE</th>
<th>DATE OF SERVICE</th>
<th>ENTER DESCRIPTION, ITEM NUMBER OF CONTRACT OR FEDERAL SUPPLY SCHEDULE, AND OTHER INFORMATION DEEMED NECESSARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Rutgers, The State University
  - Div. of Grant & Contract Accounting
  - 3 Rutgers Plaza
  - New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559

- Req. E40414127 dated 5/24/05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/1/05-12/30/05</td>
<td>5/24/05-12/30/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **SALARY**: 20,091.00 99,794.80
- **FRINGE**: 5,599.29 21,332.55

**TOTAL MTDC**: 25,690.29 121,127.35

- **TRAVEL**: 139.64 1,302.82
- **SUPPLIES**: 733.53 15,816.37
- **TELEPHONE**: 435.00 4,213.09
- **SUBCONTRACT < $25,000**: 0.00 0.00
- **CONFERENCE & BUSINESS EXPENSE**: 0.00 948.74
- **COMPUTER SERVICES**: 0.00 809.46
- **CONSULT & OTHER SVCS**: 18,375.00 106,019.04

**TOTAL DIRECT COSTS**: 45,373.66 250,236.87

- **SUBCONTRACT >$25,000**: 0.00 0.00
- **EQUIPMENT**: 0.00 0.00
- **REVENUE REVISIONS**: 0.00 0.00

**TOTAL DIRECT COSTS**: 45,373.66 250,236.87

- **INDIRECT COST (55.5%, 54%)**: 14,579.28 104,727.23

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES**: 59,952.94 354,964.10

- **NOT A FINAL**
Names of individuals who receive salary, wages and payments under the consultant and other services line items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salaried Faculty and Staff</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Mandel</td>
<td>3,900.48</td>
<td>9/15/05-12/30/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Pfeiffer</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>9/26/05-12/30/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Phillips</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>9/26/05-12/30/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Velasquez</td>
<td>1,740.00</td>
<td>9/26/05-12/30/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Vercellotti</td>
<td>3,608.20</td>
<td>9/26/05-12/30/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Weingart</td>
<td>6,207.32</td>
<td>9/15/05-12/30/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16,557.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hourly Staff and Students</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Anderson</td>
<td>278.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Dobrich</td>
<td>360.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>498.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Linky</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid Reed</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,534.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Salary/Wage total                           | 20,091.00|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultants</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom O'Neill -November hours</td>
<td>10,125.00</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom O'Neill -December hours</td>
<td>8,250.00</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultants/Other service Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>18,375.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no conference and business expenses this report period.
NEAR INPUT TRANSMITTAL
(Prepare in triplicate. Forward original and one copy to the appropriate Finance Division)

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TRANSMITTED HEREWITH:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SERIAL NUMBER</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS EXCLUDING SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>VENDOR/SOURCE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4019874</td>
<td>BANCS, SHEILA A.</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>FORM 1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019875</td>
<td>XEROX CAPITAL SERVICES, LLC</td>
<td>$54.60</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019876</td>
<td>FEDEX</td>
<td>$29.66</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019877</td>
<td>WASHINGTON EXPRESS</td>
<td>$58.50</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019878</td>
<td>T-MOBILE</td>
<td>$1,679.31</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
<td>RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIV. OF NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>$59,952.94</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019847</td>
<td>DeGREGORIO, PAUL S.</td>
<td>$1,014.82</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

DIANA M. SCOTT
ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

SERVICE OFFICE SYMBOL TELEPHONE NUMBER
ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION EAC (202) 566-3119

SIGNATURE OF RECEIVING OFFICIAL - FINANCE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

GSA FORM 2951 (REV. 12-94)
Prescribed by COM P 4251.1
**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES - RECEIVING REPORT**

1. **DATE OF ORDER**  
   05/24/05

2. **ORDER NUMBER**  
   E4014127

3. **CONTRACT NUMBER**  
   RT001050

4. **ACT NUMBER**  
   120-06

**IMPORTANT:**

- This form must be received in the payment office within 5 workdays of acceptance.
- Acceptance must take place within 7 calendar days of delivery or completion of work unless a different inspection/acceptance period is stated in the contract.
- Invoices received must be time stamped to indicate the date of receipt. See reverse of this form for detailed instructions.

5. **TO: CONTRACTOR**  
   (Name, address and zip code)
   Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
   Office of Research and Sponsored Programs  
   3 Rutgers Plaza  
   New Brunswick, NJ 08901

   Contact: Keith Osterhage  
   (732) 932-0150

6. **TYPE OF ORDER**  
   [ ] A. PURCHASE  
   [ ] B. DELIVERY  
   [ ] C. MODIFICATION NO.  
   [ ] AUTHORITY FOR ISSUING

7. **MAXIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT**  
   $35,929.36

8. **LESS DEDUCTION(S) FOR NONPERFORMANCE, ETC.**  
   (Explain in remarks)

9. **MAXIMUM AMOUNT APPROVED FOR PAYMENT**  
   $35,929.36

20. **SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached Eagleton proposal and EAC Statement of Work for description and details of specifics and requirements.  
TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $560,002.00 |

**CERTIFICATION OF RECEIPT/ACCEPTANCE**

I certify that the above supplies and/or services have been:  
[ ] A. FULL  
[ ] B. PARTIAL  
[ ] C. FINAL PARTIAL

**REMARKS**

- Maximum payment amount: $35,929.36
- Less deduction(s) for nonperformance, etc.
- Maximum amount approved for payment: $35,929.36
- Total cost of contract: $560,002.00

**SIGNATURE**

Thomas R. Wilkey, Executive Director

**DATE SIGNED**

1-16-06

**GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION**

1-12-2006
Certifying receipt and processing payments for procurements requiring a written purchase order
(GSA Form 300 or 300-1).

(1) When supplies or services are received, the contracting/ordering office or designated program office will certify receipt and acceptance and indicate the amount approved for payment on copy 6, Receiving Report, of GSA Form 300 or 300-1. When multiple deliveries/payments are required, additional copies of the receiving report (copy 6) may be reproduced or the GSA Form 3025 or 3025A Receiving Report, used to certify receipt and acceptance. Photocopies signatures will not be accepted on the receiving report.

NOTE: It is important that the date of receipt and the date of acceptance entered in the certification on the receiving report be accurate. Those dates are used to calculate the due date for payments and interest on overdue payments. The contracting/ordering officer or a designated representative should certify receipt and authorize payment by signing the certification on the receiving report.

(2) Invoices received by issuing offices or other designated program offices must be time stamped to indicate the date of receipt, checked to verify the arithmetic accuracy of the invoiced amount, and forwarded, within 5 workdays of receipt, to the appropriate Finance Division for payment. Copy 1 of the GSA Form 300/300-1 and a receiving report (Copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or GSA 3025/3025A, Receiving Report) should be forwarded with the invoice to finance.

(3) When invoices are submitted directly to the Finance Division, contracting/ordering or other designated program offices will certify receipt and acceptance and authorize payment for supplies or services by completing copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or the GSA Form 3025/3025A, Receiving Report, in accordance with paragraph (c) (1) above and sending it to the appropriate finance division within 5 workdays after supplies or services are received and accepted.
# PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL

**Voucher No.** 0000-422-006

**DATE VOUCHER PREPARED** 12/14/2005  
**SCHEDULE NO.** [Blank]  
**PAID NO.** [Blank]  
**REQUISITION NUMBER AND DATE** E40414127 05/24/05  
**DATE INVOICE REC'D** [Blank]  
**DISCOUNT TERMS** [Blank]  
**PAYER'S ACCT #** 4-23473-4220-006  
**GOVERNMENT INV. #** [Blank]

**PAYER'S **  | **Name**  | **Address**  
---|---|---
Rutgers, The State University | 3 Rutgers Plaza | New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559  
**ATTN.** Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer  
U. S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington D. C. 20005

**SHIPPED FROM**  | **TO**  
---|---
[Blank]  | [Blank]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NUMBER</strong></th>
<th><strong>DATE</strong></th>
<th><strong>ARTICLES OR SERVICES</strong></th>
<th><strong>QUANTITY</strong></th>
<th><strong>UNIT PRICE</strong></th>
<th><strong>AMOUNT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>11/01/05</td>
<td>&quot;I certify that all payments are requested for the appropriate purpose and in accordance with the agreement set forth in the application and award documents.&quot;</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
<td>35,929.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>To</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td>11/30/05</td>
<td>Constance J. Bornheimer, 12/6/05</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use continuation sheet(s) if necessary.**  
(Payer must NOT use the space below)

**PAYMENT:**  
[ ] COMPLETE  
[ ] PARTIAL  
[ ] FINAL  
[ ] PROGRESS  
[ ] ADVANCE

**PAYEE:**  
[Blank]

**APPROVED FOR**  
[Blank]

**EXCHANGE RATE**  
[Blank]

**DINERENCE**  
[Blank]

**CASH DATE**  
[Blank]

**PAYEE (S)**  
[Blank]

**PER**  
[Blank]

**TITLE**  
[Blank]

**AMOUNT VERIFIED/CORRECT FOR**  
[Blank]

**SIGNATURE OR DETAIL**  
[Blank]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTICLES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, The State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div. of Grant &amp; Contract Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rutgers Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Req. E40414127 dated 5/24/05.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARY</td>
<td>8,905.22</td>
<td>79,703.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRINGE</td>
<td>1,354.65</td>
<td>15,733.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td>64.48</td>
<td>1,162.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
<td>4,787.68</td>
<td>15,082.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>1,400.54</td>
<td>3,778.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONTRACT &lt;$25,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFERENCE &amp; BUSINESS EXPENSE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>948.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SERVICES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>609.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULT &amp; OTHER SVCS</td>
<td>10,500.00</td>
<td>87,644.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MTDC</td>
<td>27,012.57</td>
<td>204,863.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONTRACT &gt;$25,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE REVISIONS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</td>
<td>27,012.57</td>
<td>204,863.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT COST (55.5%, 54%)</td>
<td>8,916.79</td>
<td>90,147.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>35,929.36</td>
<td>295,011.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Title: EAC-Prov'l Voting/Voter ID
EAC Contract No. E40414127

EAC-Prov'l Voting/Voter ID
Project Period: 5/24/05-12/30/2005
Rutgers' Ref No. 423473

Reporting Period: 11/01/05-11/30/05
PI: Ruth Mandel

---

Names of Individuals who receive salary, wages and payments under the consultant and other services line items.

**Salaried Faculty and Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Mandel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Pfeiffer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Phillips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Rapp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Velasquez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Vercellotti</td>
<td>1,443.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Vincelli</td>
<td>1,065.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Weingart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hourly Staff and Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Anderson</td>
<td>480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadia Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Curtis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Dobrich</td>
<td>636.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Linky</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid Reed</td>
<td>3,600.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salary/Wage Subtotal: 8,905.22

**Consultants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom O'Neill</td>
<td>10,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom O'Neill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schulman Ronca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultants/Other service Subtotal: 10,500.00

Period total: 19,405.22

There were no conference and business expenses this report period.
Dear Karen Lynn-Dyson,

I am mailing out a copy of the invoice and breakdown of staff costs for November 2005 as you requested in your 1/3/06 email to John Weingart. The same address, to the attention of Ms. Dianna Scott, US EAC, Washington DC is being used. Thank you for clarifying this matter.

Isabelle Amarhanow
Accounting Specialist
Division of Grant & Contract Accounting
**PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT, BUREAU, OR ESTABLISHMENT AND LOCATION**
Atttn.: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington D.C. 20005

**PAYEE**
Rutgers, The State University
Division of Grant and Contract Accounting
3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559

**PAYEE'S ACCT #**
4-23473-4220-006
**GOVERNMENT B/L #**

---

**NUMBER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>11/01/05</td>
<td>35,929.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>To</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td>11/30/05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMOUNT OF THIS CLAIM**

Cost, 11/01/05 "I certify that all payments are requested for the appropriate purpose and in accordance with the agreement set forth in the application and award documents."

**CONSTANCE J. BORNEHEIM 12/1/05**
Constance J. Bornheimer, Accounting Manager

---

**PAYMENT:**

- APPROVED FOR: EXCHANGE RATE = 1.00
- COMPLETE
- PAYABLE BY
- FINAL
- PROGRESS
- ADVANCE

---

**CERTIFIED PAYEE:**
Constance J. Bornheimer, Accounting Manager

---

**SIGNATURE OR INITIALS:**

---

**AUTHORIZED:**

---

**AUTHORIZED BY:**

---

**PER:**

---

**SIGNATURE:**

---

**U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1974 O-065-594**

---
**ARTICLES OR SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, The State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div. of Grant &amp; Contract Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rutgers Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Req. E40414127 dated 5/24/05.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVENUE REVISIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL MTDC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SUBCONTRACT ﹥$25,000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL DIRECT COSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**INDIRECT COST (55.5%, 54%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL**

**Voucher No.** 0000-422-006

**U.S. DEPARTMENT, BUREAU, OR ESTABLISHMENT AND LOCATION**

Attn.: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer  
U. S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington D.C. 20005

**DATE VOUCHER PREPARED** 12/14/2005  
**SCHEDULE NO.** [ ]  
**PAY NO.** [ ]  
**REQUESTION NUMBER AND DATE** E40414127 05/24/05

**PAYEE’S NAME** Rutgers, The State University  
**ADDRESS** 3 Rutgers Plaza  
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559

**CONTRACT NUMBER AND DATE** 4-23473-4220-006

**DATE INVOICE RECEIVED** [ ]

**PAYEE'S ACCOUNT NUMBER** [ ]

**REQUISITION NUMBER AND DATE**  
**E40414127** 05/24/05

**SHIPPED FROM** [ ]

**TO** [ ]

**WEIGHT** [ ]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ARTICLES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>11/01/05</td>
<td>&quot;I certify that all payments are requested for the appropriate purpose and in accordance with the agreement set forth in the application and award documents.&quot;</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>35,929.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td>11/30/05</td>
<td>Constance J. Bornheimer, [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMOUNT OF THIS CLAIM** 35,929.36

**PAYMENT:**  
APPROVED FOR [ ] COMPLETE  
[ ] PARTIAL  
[ ] FINAL  
[ ] PROGRESS  
[ ] ADVANCE

**EXCHANGE RATE** $1.00

**DIFFERENCE** [ ]

**AMOUNT VERIFIED/CONTRACT FOR [ ]**

**PAID BY** [ ]

**ON TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES CHECK NUMBER** [ ]

**CASH DATE** [ ]

**PAYEE** [ ]

**SIGNATURE OR D I N T I G A L S**

**U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1974 O-344-446**

**COPY**

**SIGNATURE OR D I N T I G A L S**

**SIGNATURE OR D I N T I G A L S**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTICLES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, The State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div. of Grant &amp; Contract Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rutgers Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Req. E40414127 dated 5/24/05.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARY</td>
<td>8,905.22</td>
<td>79,703.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRINGE</td>
<td>1,354.65</td>
<td>15,733.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,259.87</td>
<td>95,437.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td>64.48</td>
<td>1,162.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
<td>4,787.68</td>
<td>15,082.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>1,400.54</td>
<td>3,778.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONTRACT &lt;$25,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFERENCE &amp; BUSINESS EXPENSE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>948.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SERVICES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>809.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULT &amp; OTHER SVCS</td>
<td>10,500.00</td>
<td>87,644.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MTDC</td>
<td>27,012.57</td>
<td>204,863.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONTRACT &gt;$25,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE REVISIONS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</td>
<td>27,012.57</td>
<td>204,863.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT COST (55.5%, 54%)</td>
<td>8,916.79</td>
<td>90,147.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>35,929.36</td>
<td>295,011.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEAR INPUT TRANSMITTAL
(Prepare in triplicate. Forward original and one copy to the appropriate Finance Division)

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TRANSMITTED HEREWITH:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
<th>VENDOR/SOURCE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4019837</td>
<td>THOMPSON, JULIET E.</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>FORM 1164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019839</td>
<td>SHERILL, AMIE J.</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>FORM 1164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019835</td>
<td>CAROL J. THOMAS REPORTING</td>
<td>$1,239.00</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019836</td>
<td>CAROL J. THOMAS REPORTING</td>
<td>$1,143.00</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019838</td>
<td>FEDEX</td>
<td>$11.42</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019742A</td>
<td>CANON BUSINESS SOLUTIONS EAST INC.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>GSA FORM 300 NO-COST CONTRACT MOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
<td>RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIV. OF NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>$35,929.36</td>
<td>RPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019687</td>
<td>CONNIE SCHMIDT</td>
<td>$3,120.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019687</td>
<td>CONNIE SCHMIDT</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019687</td>
<td>CONNIE SCHMIDT</td>
<td>$4,440.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019687</td>
<td>CONNIE SCHMIDT</td>
<td>$4,200.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014199A</td>
<td>HANCOCK, BRIAN</td>
<td>$1,113.45</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019775A</td>
<td>DEGREGORIO, PAUL S.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION STATE DEPT. PAID ALL EXPENSE FOR THIS TRIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019790A</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, RAY</td>
<td>$1,170.41</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019833</td>
<td>WANG, TOYA A.</td>
<td>$979.20</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014199A</td>
<td>HANCOCK, BRIAN</td>
<td>$592.86</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019776</td>
<td>WILKEY, THOMAS R.</td>
<td>$1,119.45</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019790A</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, RAY</td>
<td>$434.02</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019804</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, RAY</td>
<td>$314.13</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE
DIANA M. SCOTT
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
SERVICE
OFFICE SYMBOL
EAC
TELEPHONE NUMBER
(202) 566-3119
SIGNED OF RECEIVING OFFICIAL - FINANCE
NUMBER DOCUMENTS RECEIVED
DATE RECEIVED

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES - RECEIVING REPORT**

1. **DATE OF ORDER:** 05/24/05
2. **ORDER NUMBER:**
3. **CONTRACT NUMBER:**
4. **ACT NUMBER:**

**IMPORTANT:**
- This form must be received in the payment office within 5 workdays of acceptance.
- Acceptance must take place within 7 calendar days of delivery or completion of work unless a different inspection/acceptance period is stated in the contract.
- Invoices received must be time stamped to indicate the date of receipt. See reverse of this form for detailed instructions.

**TO:** Contractor
- Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
- Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
- 3 Rutgers Plaza
- New Brunswick, NJ 08901

**Contact:** Keith Osterhage (732) 932-0150

**MAXIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Supplies or Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. SCHEDULE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached Eagleton proposal and EAC Statement of Work for description and details of specifics and requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT:** $560,002.00

**CERTIFICATION OF RECEIPT/ACCEPTANCE**

[Signature] Gracia M. Hillman, Chair

09/01/2005

[Signature] 11-30-05

**6. RECEIVING REPORT - PAYING OFFICE**

GSA FORM 300 (REV. 2-93)
Certifying receipt and processing payments for procurements requiring a written purchase order
(GSA Form 300 or 300-1).

(1) When supplies or services are received, the contracting/ordering office or designated program office will
certify receipt and acceptance and indicate the amount approved for payment on copy 6, Receiving Report, of
GSA Form 300 or 300-1. When multiple deliveries/payments are required, additional copies of the receiving
report (copy 6) may be reproduced or the GSA Form 3025 or 3025A Receiving Report, used to certify receipt and
acceptance. Photocopies signatures will not be accepted on the receiving report.

NOTE: It is important that the date of receipt and the date of acceptance entered in the certification on the
receiving report be accurate. Those dates are used to calculate the due date for payments and interest on
overdue payments. The contracting/ordering officer or a designated representative should certify receipt and
authorize payment by signing the certification on the receiving report.

(2) Invoices received by issuing offices or other designated program offices must be time stamped to indicate
the date of receipt, checked to verify the arithmetic accuracy of the invoiced amount, and forwarded, within 5
workdays of receipt, to the appropriate Finance Division for payment. Copy 1 of the GSA Form 300/300-1 and a
receiving report (Copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or GSA 3025/3025A, Receiving Report) should be forwarded
with the invoice to finance.

(3) When invoices are submitted directly to the Finance Division, contracting/ordering or other designated
program offices will certify receipt and acceptance and authorize payment for supplies or services by completing
copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or the GSA Form 3025/3025A, Receiving Report, in accordance with paragraph
(c) (1) above and sending it to the appropriate finance division within 5 workdays after supplies or services are
received and accepted.
**PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL**

**Voucher No.** 0000-422-005

**U. S. DEPARTMENT, BUREAU, OR ESTABLISHMENT AND LOCATION**
Attn.: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer
U. S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington D.C. 20005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAYEE [ ]</th>
<th>Rutgers, The State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME AND ADDRESS</td>
<td>Division of Grant and Contract Accounting, 3 Rutgers Plaza, New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SHIPPED FROM** 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington D.C. 20005 **TO** New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559

**NUMBER OF ORDER OR SERVICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ARTICLES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/05</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52,474.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/05</td>
<td>Contract Voucher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMOUNT OF THIS CLAIM**

"I certify that all payments are requested for the appropriate purpose and in accordance with the agreement set forth in the application and award documents."

Constance J. Bohnheimer, Accounting Manager

**PAYMENT:**

- **APPROVED FOR:** EAC Research Manager 11/29/05
- **EXCHANGE RATE:** 1.00
- **DIFFERENCE:**

**PAID BY**

- **CK NUMBER:**
- **ON (Name in the back):**

**SIGNATURE OR DESIGNATION:**

**SIGNATURE:**

**TITLE:**

Constance Bohnheimer - 732-932-0165

[Signature]

Constance Bohnheimer, Accounting Manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE OF ORDER</th>
<th>ARTICLES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rutgers, The State University</td>
<td>Div. of Grant &amp; Contract Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Rutgers Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Req. E40414127 dated 5/24/05.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>20,422.46</td>
<td>70,798.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>4,991.66</td>
<td>14,378.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,414.12</td>
<td>85,177.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>64.48</td>
<td>1,098.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>442.18</td>
<td>10,295.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>848.48</td>
<td>2,377.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subcontract &lt; $25,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conference &amp; Business Expense</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>948.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>809.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consult &amp; Other SVCS</td>
<td>11,250.00</td>
<td>77,144.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total MTDC</td>
<td>38,019.26</td>
<td>177,850.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subcontract &gt;$25,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue Revisions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Direct Costs</td>
<td>38,019.26</td>
<td>177,850.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Cost (55.5%, 54%)</td>
<td>14,455.40</td>
<td>81,231.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>52,474.65</td>
<td>259,081.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The voucher is for public vouchers for purchases and services other than personal.
- The schedule number is 2.
- The voucher number is 0000-422-005.
- The voucher is for purchases and services other than personal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAYEE</th>
<th>Rutgers, The State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Division of Grant and Contract Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>3 Rutgers Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**U.S. DEPARTMENT, BUREAU, OR ESTABLISHMENT AND LOCATION**

Attln.: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer
U. S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington D.C. 20005

**PAYMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAYMENT</th>
<th>APPROVED FOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Voucher**

9/30/05

**REQUISITION NUMBER AND DATE**

E40414127 05/24/05

**DATE INVOICE RECD**

**PAYEE'S ACCT #**

4-23473-4220-005

**AMOUNT OF THIS CLAIM**

52,474.65

**AMOUNT VERIFIED, CORRECT FOR**

**SIGNATURE OR INITIALS**

**CASH**

Dated 01/05/05

**CHECK NUMBER**

01/05/05

**PAYEE (3)**

**SIGNATURE OR INITIALS**

**CERTIFICATION**

I certify that all payments are requested for the appropriate purpose and in accordance with the agreement set forth in the application and award documents.

Constance J. Bonnheir, Accounting Manager

11/05/05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTICLES OR SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, The State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div. of Grant &amp; Contract Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rutgers Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Req. E40414127 dated 5/24/05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALARY</td>
<td>20,422.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRINGE</td>
<td>4,991.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,414.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td>64.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
<td>442.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>848.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONTRACT &lt;$25,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFERENCE &amp; BUSINESS EXPENSE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SERVICES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULT &amp; OTHER SVCS</td>
<td>11,250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL MTDC | 38,019.26 | 177,850.64 |
| SUBCONTRACT >$25,000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| EQUIPMENT | 0.00 | 0.00  |
| REVENUE REVISIONS | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| TOTAL DIRECT COSTS | 38,019.26 | 177,850.64 |
| INDIRECT COST (55.5%, 54%) | 14,455.40 | 81,231.16 |

| TOTAL EXPENDITURES | 52,474.65 | 259,081.81 |

016054
NEAR INPUT TRANSMITTAL
(Prepare in triplicate. Forward original and one copy to the appropriate Finance Division)

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TRANSMITTED HEREWITH:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>VENDOR/SOURCE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONNIE SCHMIDT</td>
<td></td>
<td>EFT FORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRITAIN J. WILLIAMS III</td>
<td></td>
<td>EFT FORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019795</td>
<td>BANKS, SHEILA A.</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>FORM 1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019791</td>
<td>ELECTION DATA SERVICES</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019792</td>
<td>CAROL J. THOMAS REPORTING</td>
<td>$943.00</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019793</td>
<td>BENJAMIN OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$561.50</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019794</td>
<td>STAPLES</td>
<td>$793.86</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
<td>RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIV. OF NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>$21,474.65</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019090</td>
<td>MURPHY, DANIEL M.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019090</td>
<td>MURPHY, DANIEL M.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019090</td>
<td>MURPHY, DANIEL M.</td>
<td>$800.62</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019698</td>
<td>SEREBROV, JOB</td>
<td>$7,215.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019721A</td>
<td>HIRE ONE</td>
<td>$730.88</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019743</td>
<td>S&amp;W CONTROLS, INC.</td>
<td>$743.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019749</td>
<td>SNELLING PERSONNEL SERVICES</td>
<td>$1,166.94</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019688</td>
<td>BRITAIN J. WILLIAMS III</td>
<td>$126,000.00</td>
<td>GSA FORM 300 OBLIGATED FY05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019687</td>
<td>CONNIE SCHMIDT</td>
<td>$126,000.00</td>
<td>GSA FORM 300 OBLIGATED FY05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019788</td>
<td>HILLMAN, GRACIA M.</td>
<td>$310.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019790</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, RAY</td>
<td>$1,006.39</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019654</td>
<td>JANIS, WOMACK</td>
<td>$548.12</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

DIANA M. SCOTT

TITLE

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

SERVICE

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

SIGNATURE OF RECEIVING OFFICIAL - FINANCE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES - RECEIVING REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached Eagleton proposal and EAC Statement of Work for description and details of specifics and requirements. TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $560,002.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CERTIFICATION OF RECEIPT/ACCEPTANCE**

I certify that the above supplies and/or services have been:

- **DATE OF ORDER**: 05/24/05
- **ORDER NUMBER**: (Blank)
- **CONTRACT NUMBER**: (Blank)
- **ACT NUMBER**: (Blank)

**MAXIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT**

- LESS DEDUCTION(S) FOR NONPERFORMANCE, ETC. (Explain in remarks)

**MAXIMUM AMOUNT APPROVED FOR PAYMENT**

**REMARKS**

- MAXIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT: 103,207.33
- LESS DEDUCTION(S) FOR NONPERFORMANCE, ETC. (Explain in remarks)
- MAXIMUM AMOUNT APPROVED FOR PAYMENT: 103,207.33

**CONTACT**

- Contact: Keith Osterhage (732) 932-0150

**C. FINAL PARTIAL**

- OFFICE SYMBOL: EAC
- TELEPHONE NO.: (732) 566-3100
- DATE SIGNED: 11-03-05

**GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION**

**6. RECEIVING REPORT - PAYING OFFICE**

**GSA FORM 300 (REV. 2-93)**
Certifying receipt and processing payments for procurements requiring a written purchase order
(GSA Form 300 or 300-1).

(1) When supplies or services are received, the contracting/ordering office or designated program office will
certify receipt and acceptance and indicate the amount approved for payment on copy 6, Receiving Report, of
GSA Form 300 or 300-1. When multiple deliveries/payments are required, additional copies of the receiving
report (copy 6) may be reproduced or the GSA Form 3025 or 3025A Receiving Report, used to certify receipt and
acceptance. Photocopies signatures will not be accepted on the receiving report.

NOTE: It is important that the date of receipt and the date of acceptance entered in the certification on the
receiving report be accurate. Those dates are used to calculate the due date for payments and interest on
overdue payments. The contracting/ordering officer or a designated representative should certify receipt and
authorize payment by signing the certification on the receiving report.

(2) Invoices received by issuing offices or other designated program offices must be time stamped to indicate
the date of receipt, checked to verify the arithmetic accuracy of the invoiced amount, and forwarded, within 5
workdays of receipt, to the appropriate Finance Division for payment. Copy 1 of the GSA Form 300/300-1 and a
receiving report (Copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or GSA 3025/3025A, Receiving Report) should be forwarded
with the invoice to finance.

(3) When invoices are submitted directly to the Finance Division, contracting/ordering or other designated
program offices will certify receipt and acceptance and authorize payment for supplies or services by completing
copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or the GSA Form 3025/3025A, Receiving Report, in accordance with paragraph
(c) (1) above and sending it to the appropriate finance division within 5 workdays after supplies or services are
received and accepted.
**PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL**

**Attn.**: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer  
**U. S. Election Assistance Commission**  
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington D. C. 20005

**PAYEE**:

**Rutgers, The State University**  
**Division of Grant and Contract Accounting**  
**3 Rutgers Plaza**  
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559

**PAYMENT**:

- **APPROVED FOR**: [Signature]
- **EXCHANGE RATE**: $1.00
- **DIFFERENCE**: [Signature or Details]
- **AMOUNT VERIFIED/CURRENCY FOR**: [Signature or Additional Information]
- **PER**: [Signature or Additional Information]
- **TITLE**: [Signature or Additional Information]

**Purchased From**

**Shipped From**

**Weight**

**Articles or Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number and Date of Order/Service</th>
<th>Articles or Services</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Cost Per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost 9/01/05</td>
<td>&quot;I certify that all payments are requested for the appropriate purpose and in accordance with the agreement set forth in the application and award documents.&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103,207.33</td>
<td>103,207.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract To</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher 9/30/05</td>
<td>Constance J. Böthheimer, Accounting Manager</td>
<td>10/31/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date of Invoice Recd**: 05/24/05

**Date Voucher Prepared**: 10/21/2005

**Contract Number and Date**: 0000-422-004

**Schedule No.**: E40414127 05/24/05

**Request No. and Date**: 11/25 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington D. C. 20005

**Requisition Number and Date**: 05/24/05

**Payee's Acct #**: 4-23473-4220-004

**Government BI. #**: [Signature or Additional Information]

**Date**: 10/21/2005

**Payee**: [Signature or Additional Information]

**Certify**: [Signature or Additional Information]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTICLES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, The State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div. of Grant &amp; Contract Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rutgers Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Req. E40414127 dated 5/24/05.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARY</td>
<td>23,511.48</td>
<td>50,376.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRINGE</td>
<td>5,167.36</td>
<td>9,386.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td>639.91</td>
<td>1,034.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
<td>1,619.45</td>
<td>9,852.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>1,529.07</td>
<td>1,529.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONTRACT &lt;$25,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFERENCE &amp; BUSINESS EXPENSE</td>
<td>948.74</td>
<td>948.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SERVICES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>809.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULT &amp; OTHER SVCS</td>
<td>38,519.04</td>
<td>65,894.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MTDC</td>
<td>71,935.05</td>
<td>139,831.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONTRACT &gt;$25,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE REVISIONS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</td>
<td>71,935.05</td>
<td>139,831.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT COST (55.5%, 54%)</td>
<td>31,272.29</td>
<td>66,775.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>103,207.33</td>
<td>206,607.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES - RECEIVING REPORT

**JRTA7:***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. DATE OF ORDER</th>
<th>2. ORDER NUMBER</th>
<th>3. CONTRACT NUMBER</th>
<th>4. ACT NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/24/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E4014127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPORTANT:**

* This form must be received in the payment office within 5 workdays of acceptance.
* Acceptance must take place within 7 calendar days of delivery or completion of work unless a different inspection/acceptance period is stated in the contract.
* Invoices received must be time stamped to indicate the date of receipt. See reverse of this form for detailed instructions.

**Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey**
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Contact: Keith Osterhage (732) 932-0150

---

**A. PURCHASE**

Please furnish the following on the terms specified on both sides of the order and the attached sheets, if any, including...

**B. DELIVERY**

The delivery order is subject to instructions contained on this side only of this form and is issued subject to the terms and conditions of the above numbered contract.

**C. MODIFICATION NO.**

**AUTHORITY FOR ISSUING**

---

**MAXIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT**

$39,362 63

**LESS DEDUCTION(S) FOR NONPERFORMANCE, ETC.**

(Explain in remarks)

**MAXIMUM AMOUNT APPROVED FOR PAYMENT**

$39,362 63

---

**ITEM NO.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached Eagleton proposal and EAC Statement of Work for description and details of specifics and requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>016060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $560,002.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**CERTIFICATION OF RECEIPT/ACCEPTANCE**

I certify that the above supplies and/or services have been received on [Date] and accepted on [Date].

[Signature]

**DATE SIGNED**

6-7-06

---

**CERTIFICATION OF RECEIPT/ACCEPTANCE**

I certify that the above supplies and/or services have been:

[Signature]

**DATE SIGNED**

6-7-06

---

**CERTIFICATION OF RECEIPT/ACCEPTANCE**

I certify that the above supplies and/or services have been:

[Signature]

**DATE SIGNED**

6-7-06
Certifying receipt and processing payments for procurements requiring a written purchase order
(GSA Form 300 or 300-1).

(1) When supplies or services are received, the contracting/ordering office or designated program office will
certify receipt and acceptance and indicate the amount approved for payment on copy 6, Receiving Report, of
GSA Form 300 or 300-1. When multiple deliveries/payments are required, additional copies of the receiving
report (copy 6) may be reproduced or the GSA Form 3025 or 3025A Receiving Report, used to certify receipt and
acceptance. Photocopies signatures will not be accepted on the receiving report.

NOTE: It is important that the date of receipt and the date of acceptance entered in the certification on the
receiving report be accurate. Those dates are used to calculate the due date for payments and interest on
overdue payments. The contracting/ordering officer or a designated representative should certify receipt and
authorize payment by signing the certification on the receiving report.

(2) Invoices received by issuing offices or other designated program offices must be time stamped to indicate
the date of receipt, checked to verify the arithmetic accuracy of the invoiced amount, and forwarded, within 5
workdays of receipt, to the appropriate Finance Division for payment. Copy 1 of the GSA Form 300/300-1 and a
receiving report (Copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or GSA 3025/3025A, Receiving Report) should be forwarded
with the invoice to finance.

(3) When invoices are submitted directly to the Finance Division, contracting/ordering or other designated
program offices will certify receipt and acceptance and authorize payment for supplies or services by completing
copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or the GSA Form 3025/3025A, Receiving Report, in accordance with paragraph
(c) (1) above and sending it to the appropriate finance division within 5 workdays after supplies or services are
received and accepted.
PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL

U.S. DEPARTMENT, BUREAU, OR ESTABLISHMENT AND LOCATION
Attn.: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer
U. S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington D. C. 20005

VOUCHER No.

PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL

DATE VOUCHER PREPARED
05/23/2006

SCHEDULE NO.

Voucher No.

CONTRACT NUMBER AND DATE
E40414127

PAID NO.

05/24/05

REQUESTION NUMBER AND DATE

DATE INVOICE REC'D

PAYEE'S NAME
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

PAYEE'S ADDRESS
3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559

PAYEE'S ACCT #
4-23473-4220-009

DISCOUNT TERMS

GOVERNMENT B/L #

SHIPED FROM	 TO	 WEIGHT

NUMBER	 DATE	 ARTICLES OR SERVICES
AND DATE	 DELIVERY	 (Enter description, item number of contract or Federal supply schedule, and other information deemed necessary)
OF ORDER	 OR SERVICE

QUANTITY	 UNIT PRICE	 AMOUNT

AMOUNT OF THIS CLAIM

"I certify that all payments are requested for the appropriate purpose and in accordance with the agreement set forth in the application and award documents."

Isabelie Amarhanow, Accounting Specialist

PAYMENT:

[ ] COMPLETE
[ ] TOTAL

03/01/06 Cost
04/30/06 Voucher
To Contract

PAYMENT: APPROVED FOR

EXCHANGE RATE

$1.00

DIFFERENCE

PAYED BY

CK NUMBER	 ON TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

CASH DATE

ON (Name in the back)

CHECK NUMBER

CASH

PAYER (3)

PER

016062

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1974-0-56-000
### Standard Form 1035

**PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL**

**CONTINUATION SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE OF DELIVERY</th>
<th>ORDER OR SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Enter description, item number of contract of Federal supply schedule, and other information deemed necessary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey Div. of Grant &amp; Contract Accounting. 3 Rutgers Plaza New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Req. E40414127 dated 5/24/05.</td>
<td>03/01/06-04/30/06</td>
<td>5/24/05-04/30/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARY</td>
<td>4,254.00</td>
<td>118,359.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRINGE</td>
<td>1,048.44</td>
<td>26,021.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONORARIA</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td>940.33</td>
<td>2,243.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLIES, COPYING, POSTAGE</td>
<td>493.55</td>
<td>16,898.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>556.43</td>
<td>5,304.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONTRACT &lt; $25,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFERENCE &amp; BUSINESS EXPENSE</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>884.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SERVICES</td>
<td>556.43</td>
<td>5,304.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULT &amp; OTHER SVCS</td>
<td>-7,815.91</td>
<td>104,953.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MTDC</td>
<td>2,551.84</td>
<td>303,613.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONTRACT &gt;$25,000</td>
<td>20,048.45</td>
<td>68,072.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTIONAL SURVEY</td>
<td>24,269.04</td>
<td>24,269.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE REVISIONS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</td>
<td>46,869.33</td>
<td>386,555.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT COST (55.5%, 54%)</td>
<td>(7,506.70)</td>
<td>121,021.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>39,362.63</td>
<td>507,576.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Title:
EAC-Prov'l Voting
Voter ID

### Project Period:
5/24/05-6/30/2006

### Reporting Period:
03/01/06-04/30/06

---

**Names of Individuals who receive salary, wages and payments under the consultant and other services line items.**

**Salaried Faculty and Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Vercellotti</td>
<td>2,922.00</td>
<td>2/25/06-4/21/06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hourly Staff and Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Anderson</td>
<td>432.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,332.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Salary/Wage total**

4,254.00

**Consultants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom O’Neill - February</td>
<td>6,562.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- March</td>
<td>6,562.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- April</td>
<td>3,328.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants/Other Services Subtotal</td>
<td>16,453.13</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

There were no conference and business expenses this report period.

---

**Adjustment**

Optional Survey cost moved from "Consult & Other Srvs" line item to new Optional Survey line item.

Optional survey expense of $24,269.04 dated 9/8/05 removed from F&A calculation at 54.0% rate.

$24,269.04 (.54) = $13,105.28. One time adjustment since F&A for Optional survey expense not included in approved budget.
### Near Input Transmittal

(Prepare in triplicate. Forward original and one copy to the appropriate Finance Division)

The following documents are transmitted herewith:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>SERIAL NUMBER</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS EXCLUDING SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06/07/2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Vendor/Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4028515</td>
<td>DAVIDSON, DONETTA</td>
<td>$53.00</td>
<td>FORM 1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4018506</td>
<td>CAROL J. THOMAS REPORTING</td>
<td>$1,041.00</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028507</td>
<td>T-MOBILE</td>
<td>$1,535.95</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028516</td>
<td>WASHINGTON EXPRESS</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028517</td>
<td>GRAHAM STAFFING SERVICES, INC.</td>
<td>$1,320.00</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028518</td>
<td>CITIBANK #7662</td>
<td>$24,016.64</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014127</td>
<td>RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIV OF NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>$39,362.63</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019743</td>
<td>S&amp;W CONTROLS, INC.</td>
<td>$743.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019591</td>
<td>IFES</td>
<td>$49,148.39</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019999</td>
<td>IOWA SECRETARY OF STATE</td>
<td>$3,243.04</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028508</td>
<td>DELL MARKETING L.P.</td>
<td>$535.88</td>
<td>GSA FORM 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028509</td>
<td>H.R. COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>$5,330.00</td>
<td>GSA FORM 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028510</td>
<td>H.R. COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>$12,610.00</td>
<td>GSA FORM 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019558A</td>
<td>McGREGOR, KATHLEEN</td>
<td>$811.40</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019983B</td>
<td>DeGREGORIO, PAUL S.</td>
<td>$2,660.60</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028301A</td>
<td>HANCOCK, BRIAN J.</td>
<td>$1,640.48</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028303A</td>
<td>KWAN, COLLEEN S.</td>
<td>$1,462.20</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028441A</td>
<td>DAVIDSON, DONETTA</td>
<td>$1,362.70</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028503A</td>
<td>DeGREGORIO, PAUL S.</td>
<td>$975.90</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028511</td>
<td>DeGREGORIO, PAUL S.</td>
<td>$801.39</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028512</td>
<td>SCHMIDT, CONNIE</td>
<td>$774.21</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028513</td>
<td>LE, TUYET</td>
<td>$396.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028514</td>
<td>HER, LY LIEAN HER</td>
<td>$396.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019958A</td>
<td>McGREGOR, KATHLEEN</td>
<td>$811.40</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019981</td>
<td>AMBROGLI ADAM</td>
<td>$307.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028336</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, RAY</td>
<td>$816.40</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028399</td>
<td>SCHMIDT, CONNIE</td>
<td>$284.26</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4028418</td>
<td>ROGERS, KATHY A.</td>
<td>$218.26</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Authorized Signature**

DIANA M. SCOTT

**Title**

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

**Election Assistance Commission**

EAC

**Signature of Receiving Official - Finance**

GSA FORM 2951 (REV. 12-94)

Prescribed by COM P 4251.1
**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES - RECEIVING REPORT**

**1. DATE OF ORDER** 02/23/06
**2. ORDER NUMBER**

**3. CONTRACT NUMBER**
**4. ACT NUMBER** E4014127A

**IMPORTANT:**

- This form must be received in the payment office within 5 workdays of acceptance.
- Acceptance must take place within 7 calendar days of delivery or completion of work unless a different inspection/acceptance period is stated in the contract.
- Invoices received must be time stamped to indicate the date of receipt. See reverse of this form for detailed instructions.

7. TO: CONTRACTOR  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs  
3 Rutgers Plaza  
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Contact: Keith Osterhage (732) 932-0150

---

**MAXIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT** $113,249.99

**LESS DEDUCTION(S) FOR NONPERFORMANCE, ETC.** (Explain in remarks)

**MAXIMUM AMOUNT APPROVED FOR PAYMENT** $113,249.99

---

**ITEM NO.**  | **SUPPLIES OR SERVICES**  | **QUANTITY ORDERED**  | **UNIT**  | **UNIT PRICE**  | **AMOUNT**  
---|---|---|---|---|---

Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached for description of this no-cost extension amendment.

**TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT:** $560,002.00

---

**CERTIFICATION OF RECEIPT/Acceptance**

I certify that the above supplies and/or services have been:

- **RECEIVED on (Date)** 3/28/06
- **ACCEPTED on (Date)** 3/28/06

**TYPE OF DELIVERY** (Mark "X" in appropriate box)

- **A. FULL**
- **B. PARTIAL**
- **C. FINAL PARTIAL**

**SIGNATURE**

**NAME AND TITLE** (Type, print or stamp)

**DATE SIGNED** 3/28/06

---

**GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION**

6. RECEIVING REPORT - PAYING OFFICE

GSA FORM 300 (REV. 2-93)
Certifying receipt and processing payments for procurements requiring a written purchase order
(GSA Form 300 or 300-1).

(1) When supplies or services are received, the contracting/ordering office or designated program office will certify receipt and acceptance and indicate the amount approved for payment on copy 6, Receiving Report, of GSA Form 300 or 300-1. When multiple deliveries/payments are required, additional copies of the receiving report (copy 6) may be reproduced or the GSA Form 3025 or 3025A, Receiving Report, used to certify receipt and acceptance. Photocopies signatures will not be accepted on the receiving report.

NOTE: It is important that the date of receipt and the date of acceptance entered in the certification on the receiving report be accurate. Those dates are used to calculate the due date for payments and interest on overdue payments. The contracting/ordering officer or a designated representative should certify receipt and authorize payment by signing the certification on the receiving report.

(2) Invoices received by issuing offices or other designated program offices must be time stamped to indicate the date of receipt, checked to verify the arithmetic accuracy of the invoiced amount, and forwarded, within 5 workdays of receipt, to the appropriate Finance Division for payment. Copy 1 of the GSA Form 300/300-1 and a receiving report (Copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or GSA 3025/3025A, Receiving Report) should be forwarded with the invoice to finance.

(3) When invoices are submitted directly to the Finance Division, contracting/ordering or other designated program offices will certify receipt and acceptance and authorize payment for supplies or services by completing copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or the GSA Form 3025/3025A, Receiving Report, in accordance with paragraph (c) (1) above and sending it to the appropriate finance division within 5 workdays after supplies or services are received and accepted.
**PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL**

**Voucher No.** 0000-422-008

**U.S. DEPARTMENT, BUREAU, OR ESTABLISHMENT AND LOCATION**

Attn.: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington D.C. 20005

**PAYEE'S** Rutgers, The State University

**NAME** Division of Grant and Contract Accounting

**ADDRESS** New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559

**DATE VOUCHER PREPARED** 03/21/2006

**CONTRACT NUMBER AND DATE**

**REQUESTION NUMBER AND DATE** E40414127 05/24/05

**DATE INVOICE REC'D**

**PAYEE'S ACC#**

**GOVERNMENT B/L #**

**SHIPPED FROM** To

**NUMBER** Date

**OF ORDER** Delivery

**ARTICLES OR SERVICES**

**QUANTITY** Unit Price

**UNIT PRICE** Amount

**AMOUNT OF THIS CLAIM** Cost 01/01/06

"I certify that all payments are requested for the appropriate purpose and in accordance with the agreement set forth in the application and award documents."

Voucher 02/28/06

Constance J. Bohnheimer, Accounting Manager

**PAYMENT:**

**APPROVED FOR**

**EXCHANGE RATE** $1.00

**DEx divergence**

**AMOUNT VERIFIED/CORRECT FOR**

**SIGNATURE OR INITIALS**

**PAID BY**

**CK NUMBER**

**ON TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES**

**CHECK NUMBER**

**ON (Name in the back)**

**CASH DATE**

**PAYEE (3)**

**PER TITLE**

---

**RECEIVED**

U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

**2006 MAR 28 AM 9:35**
**ARTICLES OR SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Description</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/06-02/28/06</td>
<td>5/24/05-02/28/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, The State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div. of Grant &amp; Contract Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rutgers Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Req. E40414127 dated 5/24/05.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALARY</strong></td>
<td>14,311.00</td>
<td>114,105.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRINGE</strong></td>
<td>3,640.84</td>
<td>24,973.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAVEL</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,302.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPLIES</strong></td>
<td>588.66</td>
<td>16,405.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TELEPHONE</strong></td>
<td>534.61</td>
<td>4,747.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBCONTRACT &lt; $25,000</strong></td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONFERENCE &amp; BUSINESS EXPENSE</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>948.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPUTER SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>809.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSULT &amp; OTHER SVCS</strong></td>
<td>6,750.00</td>
<td>112,769.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MTDC</strong></td>
<td>50,825.11</td>
<td>301,061.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBCONTRACT &gt;$25,000</strong></td>
<td>38,624.32</td>
<td>38,624.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQUIPMENT</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE REVISIONS</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</strong></td>
<td>89,449.43</td>
<td>339,686.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIRECT COST (55.5%, 54%)</strong></td>
<td>23,800.56</td>
<td>128,527.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>113,249.99</td>
<td>468,214.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name of Individuals who receive salary, wages and payments under the consultant and other services line items.

**Salaried Faculty and Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Mandel</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Pfeiffer</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Phillips</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Vercellotti</td>
<td>2,922.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Weingart</td>
<td>3,200.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Brody</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10,247.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hourly Staff and Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Dobrich</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Linky</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid Reed</td>
<td>2,600.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,064.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Salary/Wage total**

14,311.00

**Consultants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom O'Neill - January Invoice</td>
<td>6,750.00</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultants/Other service Subtotal**

6,750.00

There were no conference and business expenses this report period.
NEAR INPUT TRANSMITTAL
(Prepare in triplicate. Forward original and one copy to the appropriate Finance Division)

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TRANSMITTED HEREWITH:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6BCPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCPF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BCCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7BCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7BCPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7BCPK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SERIAL NUMBER</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS EXCLUDING SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/29/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
<th>VENDOR/SOURCE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019963</td>
<td>WILKEY, THOMAS R.</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>FORM 1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019960</td>
<td>FEDEX</td>
<td>$178.38</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019961</td>
<td>STAPLES</td>
<td>$1,306.06</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4014127A</td>
<td>RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIV. OF NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>$113,249.99</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019858</td>
<td>AIGA</td>
<td>$28,817.85</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019830D</td>
<td>HR COMMUNICATIONS, LTD</td>
<td>$5,995.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019910A</td>
<td>HILLMAN, GRACIA M.</td>
<td>$2,071.77</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019951</td>
<td>CHAPIN, DOUG</td>
<td>$1,231.95</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019952</td>
<td>PEREZ, J. R.</td>
<td>$1,062.70</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019953</td>
<td>HOLLARN, PATRICIA M.</td>
<td>$1,330.19</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019954</td>
<td>LUPIA, ARTHUR W.</td>
<td>$911.61</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019955</td>
<td>WITTMAN, BRADLEY S.</td>
<td>$1,074.19</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019956</td>
<td>CRAFT, PAUL</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019957</td>
<td>FREEMAN, STEVEN V.</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019958</td>
<td>McGREGOR, KATHLEEN</td>
<td>$652.20</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019959</td>
<td>WILLIAMS III, BRITAIN JOEL</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019910A</td>
<td>HILLMAN, GRACIA M.</td>
<td>$1,282.57</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4019911</td>
<td>DeGREGORIO, PAUL S.</td>
<td>$577.88</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE
DIANA M. SCOTT
SERVICE
LECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
GNATURE OF RECEIVING OFFICIAL - FINANCE
OFFICE SYMBOL
EAC
TYPE
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
TITLE
GSA FORM 2951 (REV. 12-94)
Prepared by COM P 4251.1
**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES - RECEIVING REPORT**

1. **DATE OF ORDER**
   02/23/06

2. **ORDER NUMBER**

3. **CONTRACT NUMBER**

4. **ACT NUMBER**
   E4014127A

**IMPORTANT:**
- This form must be received in the payment office within 5 workdays of acceptance.
- Acceptance must take place within 7 calendar days of delivery or completion of work unless a different inspection/acceptance period is stated in the contract.
- Invoices received must be time stamped to indicate the date of receipt. See reverse of this form for detailed instructions.

7. **CONTRACTOR** (Name, address and zip code)
   Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
   Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
   3 Rutgers Plaza
   New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Contact: Keith Osterhage (732) 932-0150

**MAXIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT**

$113,249.99

**MAXIMUM AMOUNT APPROVED FOR PAYMENT**

$113,249.99

**SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached for description of this no-cost extension amendment.</td>
<td>016072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT:** $560,002.00

**CERTIFICATION OF RECEIPT/ACCEPTANCE**

I certify that the above supplies and/or services have been:

- received on (Date) 2-28-06
- accepted on (Date) 3-28-06

**SIGNATURE**

Thomas R. Wilkey, Executive Director

**DATE SIGNED**

3-28-06
Certifying receipt and processing payments for procurements requiring a written purchase order
(GSA Form 300 or 300-1).

(1) When supplies or services are received, the contracting/ordering office or designated program office will
certify receipt and acceptance and indicate the amount approved for payment on copy 6, Receiving Report, of
GSA Form 300 or 300-1. When multiple deliveries/payments are required, additional copies of the receiving
report (copy 6) may be reproduced or the GSA Form 3025 or 3025A Receiving Report, used to certify receipt and
acceptance. Photocopies signatures will not be accepted on the receiving report.

NOTE: It is important that the date of receipt and the date of acceptance entered in the certification on the
receiving report be accurate. Those dates are used to calculate the due date for payments and interest on
overdue payments. The contracting/ordering officer or a designated representative should certify receipt and
authorize payment by signing the certification on the receiving report.

(2) Invoices received by issuing offices or other designated program offices must be time stamped to indicate
the date of receipt, checked to verify the arithmetic accuracy of the invoiced amount, and forwarded, within 5
workdays of receipt, to the appropriate Finance Division for payment. Copy 1 of the GSA Form 300/300-1 and a
receiving report (Copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or GSA 3025/3025A, Receiving Report) should be forwarded
with the invoice to finance.

(3) When invoices are submitted directly to the Finance Division, contracting/ordering or other designated
program offices will certify receipt and acceptance and authorize payment for supplies or services by completing
copy 6 of GSA Form 300/300-1 or the GSA Form 3025/3025A, Receiving Report, in accordance with paragraph
(c) (1) above and sending it to the appropriate finance division within 5 workdays after supplies or services are
received and accepted.
## Standard Form 1034

### PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL

**Voucher No.** 0000-422-008

| Attn.: Ms. Dianna Scott, Administrative Officer |
| U. S. Election Assistance Commission |
| 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100 |
| Washington D. C. 20005 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE VOUCHEPREPARED</th>
<th>SCHEDULE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/21/2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT NUMBER AND DATE</th>
<th>PAID NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUISITION NUMBER AND DATE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4041412</td>
<td>05/24/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PAYEE'S |

| Rutgers, The State University |
| Division of Grant and Contract Accounting |
| 3 Rutgers Plaza |
| New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559 |

### GOVERNMENT B/L # | SHIPPED FROM TO WEIGHT |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NUMBER AND DATE DELIVERY ARTICLES OR SERVICES |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER AND DATE OF ORDER OR SERVICE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMOUNT OF THIS CLAIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I certify that all payments are requested for the appropriate purpose and in accordance with the agreement set forth in the application and award documents.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Contract Voucher 01/01/06 02/28/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constance J. Bornheimer, Accounting Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL |

| TOTAL 113,249.99 |

### PAYMENT: APPROVED FOR EXCHANGE RATE DIFFERENCE |

| [ ] COMPLETE |
| [ ] PARTIAL |
| [ ] FINAL |
| [ ] PROGRESS |
| [ ] ADVANCE |

### PAID BY |

| CASH NUMBER ON TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES CHECK NUMBER ON NAME IN THIS BOOK |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|                                |                                   |

### NOTES:

1. When stated in foreign currency, insert name of currency.
2. If the check and endorsement appear in one person, one signature only is necessary; otherwise the approving officer will sign in the space provided, over his official title.
3. On a voucher or receipted in the name of a company or corporation, the name of the person writing the company or corporation name, as well as the capacity in which he signs, must appear. For example, "John Doe Co., per John Smith, Secretary," or " Treasurer," or the case may be.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1974-0-044-096
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTICLES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>CURRENT 01/01/06-02/28/06</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE 05/24/05-02/28/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALARY</td>
<td>14,311.00</td>
<td>114,105.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRINGE</td>
<td>3,640.84</td>
<td>24,973.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,951.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,302.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
<td>588.66</td>
<td>16,405.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>534.61</td>
<td>4,747.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONTRACT &lt; $25,000</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFERENCE &amp; BUSINESS EXPENSE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>948.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SERVICES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>809.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULT &amp; OTHER SVCS</td>
<td>6,750.00</td>
<td>112,789.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,825.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MTDC</td>
<td>50,825.11</td>
<td>301,061.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONTRACT &gt;$25,000</td>
<td>38,624.32</td>
<td>38,624.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE REVISIONS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89,449.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</td>
<td>89,449.43</td>
<td>339,686.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT COST (55.5%, 54%)</td>
<td>23,800.56</td>
<td>128,527.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>113,249.99</td>
<td>468,214.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Title: EAC-Prov'l Voting
Noter ID:
Project Period: 5/24/05-03/31/2006
Reporting Period: 01/01/06-02/28/06

EAC Contract No. E40414127
Rutgers' Ref No. 423473
PI: Ruth Mandel

Names of Individuals who receive salary, wages and payments under the consultant and other services line items.

**Salaried Faculty and Staff**
- Ruth Mandel
- Joanne Pfeiffer
- Linda Phillips
- Tim Vercellotti
- John Weingart
- Michele Brody

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Mandel</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Pfeiffer</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Phillips</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Vercellotti</td>
<td>2,922.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Weingart</td>
<td>3,200.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Brody</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>1/3/06-2/24/06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 10,247.00

**Hourly Staff and Students**
- Johanna Dobrich
- John Harris
- Don Linky
- Ingrid Reed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Dobrich</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Linky</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid Reed</td>
<td>2,600.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 4,064.00

**Salary/Wage total**: 14,311.00

**Consultants**
- Tom O'Neill - January Invoice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom O'Neill</td>
<td>6,750.00</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultants/Other service Subtotal**: 6,750.00

There were no conference and business expenses this report period.
**NEAR INPUT TRANSMITTAL**

(Prepare in triplicate. Forward original and one copy to the appropriate Finance Division)

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TRANSMITTED HEREWITH:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
<th>VENDOR/SOURCE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4019963</td>
<td>WILKEY, THOMAS R.</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>FORM 1164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019960</td>
<td>FEDEX</td>
<td>$178.38</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019961</td>
<td>STAPLES</td>
<td>$1,306.06</td>
<td>CERTIFIED INVOICE STAMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4014127A</td>
<td>RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIV. OF NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>$113,249.99</td>
<td>RPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019965</td>
<td>AIGA</td>
<td>$28,817.85</td>
<td>RPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019830D</td>
<td>HR COMMUNICATIONS, LTD</td>
<td>$5,595.00</td>
<td>RPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019910A</td>
<td>HILLMAN, GRACIA M.</td>
<td>$2,071.77</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019951</td>
<td>CHAPIN, DOUG</td>
<td>$1,231.95</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019952</td>
<td>PEREZ, J. R.</td>
<td>$1,062.70</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019953</td>
<td>HOLLARN, PATRICIA M.</td>
<td>$1,330.19</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019954</td>
<td>LUPIA, ARTHUR W.</td>
<td>$911.61</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019955</td>
<td>WITTMAN, BRADLEY S.</td>
<td>$1,074.19</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019956</td>
<td>CRAFT, PAUL</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019957</td>
<td>FREEMAN, STEVEN V.</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019958</td>
<td>McGregor, Kathleen</td>
<td>$652.20</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019959</td>
<td>WILLIAMS III, BRITAIN JOEL</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019910A</td>
<td>HILLMAN, GRACIA M.</td>
<td>$1,282.57</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4019911</td>
<td>DeGREGORIO, PAUL S.</td>
<td>$577.88</td>
<td>TRAVEL VOUCHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

016077

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

DIANA M. SCOTT

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

SERVICE

OFFICE SYMBOL:

EAC

TELEPHONE NUMBER:

(202) 566-3119

NUMBER DOCUMENTS RECEIVED

DATE RECEIVED

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Contact: Keith Osterhage (732) 932-0150

Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached for description of this no-cost extension amendment.

TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $560,002.00

TOTAL FROM 300-A(s) 560,002.00
GRAND TOTAL 560,002.00

U.S. Election Assistance Commission (202) 566-3100

22. MAIL INVOICE TO: (Include zip code)
General Services Administration (FUND)
25 New York Ave., NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

25A. FOR INQUIRIES REGARDING PAYMENT CONTACT:
Diana Scott (202) 566-3100
25B. TELEPHONE NO.

25A. NAME OF CONTRACTING/ORDERING OFFICER (Type)
Thomas R. Wilkey, Executive Director
25B. TELEPHONE NO. (202) 566-3100

25C. SIGNATURE

21. RECEIVING OFFICE (Name, symbol and telephone no.)

U.S. Election Assistance Commission (202) 566-3100

22. SHIPPING POINT

23. GROSS SHIP WT.

24. PAYING OFFICE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

1. PAYING OFFICE

GSA FORM 300 (REV. 2-93)
52.229-70 FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES (APR 1984)

The contract price includes all applicable Federal, State, and local taxes. No adjustment will be made to cover taxes which may subsequently be imposed on this transaction or changes in the rates of currently applicable taxes. However, the Government will, upon the request of the Contractor, furnish evidence to establish exemption from any tax from which the Government is exempt and which was not included in the contract price.

52.210-79 PACKING LIST (DEC 1989)

(a)(4) An invoice shall be prepared and submitted to the designated billing office specified in the contract. A proper packing list or other suitable shipping documentation shall accompany each shipment and shall indicate (1) Name and address of consignor; (2) Name and address of consignee; (3) Government order or requisition number; (4) Government lot or lading number covering the shipment (if any); and (5) Description of the material shipped, including item number, quantity, number of containers, and package number (if any).

(b) When payment will be made by Government commercial credit card, in addition to the information in (a) above, the packing list or shipping document shall include: (1) Cardholder name and telephone number and (2) the term "Credit Card".

52.232-1 PAYMENTS (APR 1984)

The Government shall pay the Contractor, upon the submission of proper invoices or vouchers, the prices stipulated in this contract for supplies delivered and accepted or services rendered and accepted, less any adjustment in the contract. Unless otherwise specified in this contract, payment shall be made on partial deliveries accepted by the Government if: (a) The amount due on the deliveries warrants it and the amount due on the deliveries is at least $1,000 or 50 percent of the total contract price.

52.232-8 DISCOUNTS FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (APR 1989)

(a) Discounts for prompt payment will not be considered in the evaluation of offers. However, any offered discount will form a part of the award, and will be taken if payment is made within the discount period indicated in the offer by the offeror. As an alternative to offering a prompt payment discount in conjunction with the offer, offerors awarded contracts may include prompt payment discounts on individual invoices.

(b) In connection with any discount offered for prompt payment, time shall be computed from the date of the invoice. For the purpose of computing the discount earned, payment shall be considered to have been made on the date of the payment check or the date on which an electronic funds transfer was made.

PROMPT PAYMENT

Prompt Payment clause 52.232-26 is incorporated in this contract by reference. The clause contains information on payment due date, invoice requirements, constructive acceptance and interest penalties. Certain portions of the clause regarding payment date, invoice requirements and constructive acceptance have been extracted for your convenience. All dates referred to in the extracts below are calendar days.

(a)(2) ... The due date for making invoice payments by the designated billing office shall be the later of the following two events:

(i) The 30th day after the designated billing office has received a proper invoice from the Contractor.

(ii) The 30th day after Government acceptance of supplies delivered or services performed by the Contractor.

(a)(4) ... An invoice shall be prepared and submitted to the designated billing office specified in the contract. A proper invoice must include the items listed in . . . (i) through . . . (vii). If the invoice does not comply with these requirements, then the Contractor will be notified of the defect within 7 days after receipt of the invoice at the designated billing office. . . . Unilateral notification will be taken into account in the computation of any interest penalty owed the Contractor.

(i) Name and address of the Contractor.

(ii) Invoice date.

(iii) Contract number or other authorization for supplies delivered or services performed (including order number and contract line item number).

(iv) Description, quantity, unit of measure, unit price, and extended price of supplies delivered or services performed.

(v) Shipping and payment terms (e.g., shipment number and date of shipment, prompt payment discount terms). Bill of lading number and weight of shipment will be shown for shipments on Government bills of lading.

(vi) Name and address of Contractor official to whom payment is to be sent (must be the same as that in the contract or in a proper notice of assignment). (vii) Name (where practicable), title, phone number, and mailing address of person to be notified in event of a defective invoice.

NOTE: Invoices must include the ACT number (block 4) and shall be submitted in an original or as a carbon copy and mailed to the billing office designated in block 24 to receive invoices. The "remittance address" must correspond to the remittance address in block 12.

(a)(b)(ii) For the sole purpose of computing an interest penalty that might be due the Contractor, Government acceptance shall be deemed to have occurred constructively on the 7th day (unless otherwise specified in block 20) after the Contractor delivered the supplies or performed the services in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, unless there is a disagreement over interest, quantity, quality or contractor compliance with a contract provision.

52.222-40 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED - CONTRACTS OF $2,500 OR LESS (MAY 1989)

Except to the extent that an exception, variation, or tolerance would apply if this contract were in excess of $2,500, the Contractor and any subcontractor shall pay all employees working on the contract not less than the minimum wage specified under Section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 201-206). Regulations and interpretations of the Service Contract Act of 1965 are contained in 29 CFR Part 7.

52.222-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)

52.222-42 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRES (MAY 1989)

52.222-41 and 52.222-42 apply to service contracts when the amount exceeds $2,500.

The GSA Form 2166, Service Contract Act of 1965 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (JUN 1988)

This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request the Contracting Officer will make their full text available:

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

52.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)

52.203-3 Gratuities (APR 84)

52.203-6 Covenant Against Contingent Fees (APR 84)

52.203-8 Restriction on Subcontractor Sales to the Government (JUL 86)

52.203-7 Anti-Kickback Procedures (OCT 88)

52.212-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)

In the preceding clause, the permissible variations are stated in the schedule.

52.222-6 Convict Labor (APR 84)

52.222-36 Central Eastern Opportunity (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000.)

52.222-35 Affirmative Action for Special Disabled and Vietnam Era Veterans (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000.)

52.222-36 Affirmative Action for Handicapped Workers (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $5,000.)

52.222-37 Employment Reports on Special Disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era (JAN 88)(Applies whenever clause 52.222-35 is included.)

52.222-6 Drug Free Workplace (JUL 90)(Applies if contract is awarded to an individual.

52.222-25 Prompt Payment (SEP 92)

52.223-1 Disputes (DEC 91)

52.223-3 Protest After Award (AUG 89)

52.223-6 Contract Inspection Requirements (APR 84)

52.249-8 Default (Fixed-Price Supply and Service)(APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies:

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 86)(Applies when amount is between $2,500 and $10,000.)

52.222-20 Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000.)

52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)

52.249-1 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Fixed Price) (Short Form)(APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:

52.222-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation - (MAR 86)(Applies when amount is between $2,500 and $10,000.)

52.222-20 Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000.)

52.243-1 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)

52.249-1 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Fixed Price)(Short Form)(APR 84)

GSA FORM 300 BACK (REV. 2-93)
**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES**

**NOTE:** MARK ALL PACKAGES WITH ORDER NUMBER/CONTRACT NUMBER

**PAGE OF 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. DATE OF ORDER</th>
<th>2. ORDER NUMBER</th>
<th>3. CONTRACT NUMBER</th>
<th>4. ACT NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/23/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E4014127A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PORTANT:**
- This form is not to be used as an invoice. See reverse for invoice requirements and payment information.
- The invoice remit to address must be the same as Block 12. Notify the contracting/ordering officer if the information in Block 12 is incorrect.
- Failure to show the ACT number (Block 4) on invoice will delay payment and render the invoice improper.
- Failure to mail invoice to address in Block 24 will delay payment.
- Failure of service contractors to provide information in Block 9A will result in 20% of payment being withheld (26 U.S.C. 3406(a)).

7. **TO:** CUNTRACTOR
   (Name, address and zip code)
   Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
   Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
   3 Rutgers Plaza
   New Brunswick, NJ 08901
   Contact: Keith Osterhage (732) 932-0150

9A. EMPLOYER'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
22-600-1086 (NAICS 61131-Not for Profit Public Institution)

8A. TYPE OF ORDER
X A. PURCHASE

11. ISSUING OFFICE (Address, zip code and telephone no.)
Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

16. F.O.B. POINT Destination
Washington, DC 20005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under the authority of Public Law 107-252, dated October 29, 2002, establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). Eagleton Institute of Politics proposal to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures. See attached for description of this no-cost extension amendment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT: $560,002.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. **REQUISITION OFFICE**
   (Name, symbol and telephone no.)
   Election Assistance Commission
   1225 New York Ave., NW, Suite 1100
   Washington, DC 20005
   (202) 566-3100

**SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SUPPLIES OR SERVICES</th>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL FROM 300-A(s)</th>
<th>560,002.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>560,002.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
2. CONTRACTOR'S ORIGINAL

[Signature]

GSA FORM 300 (REV. 2-93)
PURCHASE ORDER TERMS AND CONDITIONS

52.229-70 FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES (APR 1984)

The contract price includes all applicable Federal, State, and local taxes. No adjustment will be made to cover taxes which may subsequently be imposed on this transaction or changes in the rates of currently applicable taxes. However, the Government will, upon the request of the Contractor and upon evidence appropriate to establish exemption from any tax from which the Government is exempt and which was not included in the contract price.

52.210-79 PACKING LIST (DEC 1989)

(a) A packing list or other suitable shipping document shall accompany each shipment and shall indicate (1) Name and address of consignor; (2) Name and address of consignee; (3) Government order or requisition number; (4) Government bill of lading number covering the shipment (if any); and (5) Description of the material shipped, including item number, quantity, number of containers, and package number (if any).

(b) When payment will be made by Government commercial credit card, in addition to the information in (a) above, the packing list or shipping document shall include: (1) Cardholder name and telephone number and (2) the term "Credit Card".

52.232-1 PAYMENTS (APR 1984)

The Government shall pay the Contractor, upon the submission of proper invoices or vouchers, the prices stipulated in this contract for supplies delivered and accepted or services rendered and accepted, less any amounts charged to the Contractor in this contract. Unless otherwise specified in this contract, payment shall be made on partial deliveries accepted by the Government if: (a) The amount due on the deliveries warrants it; (b) The contractor requests it; and the amount due on the deliveries is at least $1,000 or 50 percent of the total contract price.

52.232-8 DISCOUNTS FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (APR 1989)

(a) Discounts for prompt payment will not be considered in the evaluation of offers. However, any offered discount will form a part of the award, and will be taken if payment is made within the discount period indicated in the offer by the offeror. As an alternative to offering a prompt payment discount in conjunction with the offer, offerors awarded contracts may include prompt payment discounts on individual invoices.

(b) In connection with any discount offered for prompt payment, time shall be computed from the date of the invoice. For the purpose of computing the discount earned, payment shall be considered to have been made on the date on which the funds transfer was made.

PROMPT PAYMENT

Prompt Payment clause 52.222-25 is incorporated in this contract by reference. The clause contains information on payment due date, invoice requirements, constructive acceptance and interest penalties. Certain portions of the clause regarding payment due date, invoice requirements, and constructive acceptance have been extracted for your convenience. All days referred to in the extracts below are calendar days.

(a)(2) The due date for making invoice payments by the designated payment office shall be the later of the following two events:

(i) The 30th day after the designated billing office has received a proper invoice from the Contractor.

(ii) The 30th day after Government acceptance of supplies delivered or services performed by the Contractor.

(a)(4) An invoice shall be prepared and submitted to the designated billing office specified in the contract. A proper invoice must include the items listed in (i) through (vii) if the invoice does not comply with these requirements, then the Contractor will be notified of the defect within 7 days after receipt of the invoice at the designated billing office. Untimely notification will be taken into account in determining penalty.

(i) Name and address of the Contractor.

(ii) Invoice date.

(iii) Contract number or other authorization for supplies delivered or services performed including order number and contract line item number.

(iv) Description, quantity, unit of measure, unit price, and extended price of supplies delivered or services performed.

(v) Shipping and payment terms (e.g., shipment number and date of shipment, prompt payment discount terms), Bill of lading number and "ship to" address of shipment for Government bills of lading.

(vi) Name and address of Contractor official to whom payment is to be sent (must be the same as that in the contract or in a proper notice of assignment).

(vii) Name where practicable, title, phone number, and mailing address of person to be notified in event of a defective invoice.

NOTE: Invoices must include the ACT number (block 4) and shall be submitted in an original only unless otherwise specified to the billing office designated in block 24 to receive invoices. The "remit to" address must correspond to the remittance address in block 12.

(a)(6)(i) For the sole purpose of computing an interest penalty that might be due the Contractor, Government acceptance shall be deemed to have occurred constructively on the 7th day (unless otherwise specified in block 20) after the Contractor delivered the supplies or performed the services in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, unless there is a disagreement over quantity, quality or contractor compliance with a contract provision.

52.222-40 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED - - CONTRACTS OF $2,500 OR LESS (MAY 1989)

Except to the extent that an exception, variation, or tolerance would apply if the contract were in excess of $2,500, the Contractor and any subcontractor shall pay all employees working on the contract not less than the minimum wage specified under Section 6 of (1) the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 201-206), and (2) the Service Contract Act of 1965, as amended in 29 CFR Part 4.

52.222-41 SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED (MAY 1989)

52.222-42 STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENT RATES FOR FEDERAL HIRES (MAY 1989)

52.22-41 and 52.22-42 apply to service contracts when the amount exceeds $2,500.

The GSA Form 2166, Service Contract Act of 1965 and Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (JUN 1988)

This contract incorporates the following clauses by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request the Contracting Officer will make their full text available:

FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies or services:

52.203-1 Officials Not to Benefit (APR 84)

52.203-3 Gratuities (APR 84)

52.203-5 Covenant Against Contingent Fees (APR 84)

52.203-6 Restriction on Subcontractor Sales to the Government (APR 85)

52.203-7 Anti-Kickback Procedures (OCT 88)

52.212-9 Variation in Quantity (APR 84)

52.223-1 Convict Labor (APR 84)

52.223-28 Equal Opportunity (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000.)

52.223-35 Affirmative Action for Special Disabled and Vietnam Era Veterans (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000.)

52.223-36 Affirmative Action for Handicapped Workers (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $2,500.)

52.223-37 Employment Reports on Special Disabled Veterans and Vietnam Era Veterans (JAN 89)(Applies whenever clause 52.22-25 is included.)

52.223-6 Drug Free Workplace (JUL 89)(Applies if contract is awarded to an individual.)

52.223-8 Buy American Act - Supplies (JAN 89)

52.223-11 Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases (MAY 92)

52.223-28 Prompt Payment (SEP 92)

52.223-3 Disputes (DEC 91)

52.223-33 For Sale Award (AUG 89)

52.224-1 Contractors' Instruction Requirements (APR 84)

52.224-8 Default (Fixed-Price Supply and Service) (APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for supplies:

52.224-4 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation (MAR 89)(Applies when amount is between $2,500 and $10,000.)

52.224-20 Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (APR 84)(Applies when amount exceeds $10,000.)

52.243-3 Changes - Fixed Price (AUG 87)

52.249-4 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Services) (APR 84)

Applicable to purchase orders for services:

52.224-2 Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act - Overtime Compensation (MAR 89)(Applies when amount is between $2,500 and $10,000.)

52.243-3 Changes - Fixed Price (APR 84) - Alt. II

52.249-4 Termination for Convenience of the Government (Services)(APR 84)

016081
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Background

On May 24, 2005 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission awarded an eight month contract (December 30, 2005) in the amount of $560,002.00 to the Eagleton Institute of Politics (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) to provide research assistance to support development of guidelines on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification procedures.

Contractor's Request for a No-Cost Extension

On November 15, 2005, John Weingart, Associate Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, requested via e-mail, a no-cost extension on this contract (E4014127). Mr. Weingart had requested an extension to complete the work of this contract to February 28, 2006.

In response to EAC's requests for additional information related to the no-cost extension, in a January 13, 2006 e-mail, Mr. Weingart revised the request for the extension to March 31, 2006. Mr. Weingart did note that he would still like to conclude the project's work by the end of February.

In various correspondences, Mr. Weingart notes the following reasons for the request:

"The original work schedule called for EAC to publish in mid-October, voluntary guidance and/or recommended best practices for provisional voting, based on Eagleton's research. In making that time estimate, we did not provide sufficient time for the EAC to review and consider the draft reports that would form the basis for that publication.....The additional time required to complete the work on provisional voting has delayed the completion of our analysis of Voter Identification issues. The draft report of that topic will be submitted to the EAC in mid-January".

"Our request for a no-cost, reallocation of resources is based on (a) the fact that our personnel costs have already been higher than we anticipated and (b) the reality that keeping the project operating for at least nine months, instead of the seven as planned,
will require the participants to devote more time than anticipated. While we are not producing more product than originally promised, the time involved in our work continues to increase... We anticipate this research monitoring and revising to continue for the months added to the project, necessitating significantly more hours by all members of the project team than anticipated”.

The contractor anticipates reallocating funds primarily from the public hearings line item ($81,120) and spending approximately $33,750 more than originally budgeted on personnel, $23,171 more on the subcontract with Ohio State and $20,250 more on consultants. The EAC elected to not hold public hearings on the topics of provisional voting and voter identification.

**Specifics of the Extension**

The contractor has provided the following breakdown and explanation of the personnel and consultant costs, associated with this extension.

1. *Eagleton Institute of Politics personnel:*

   Original budgeted project personnel costs- $110,695 (May-December)
   Revised project personnel costs- $144,444 (May-February)

2. *Consultant Services:*

   Original budgeted costs: $79,500 (May-December)
   Revised costs -$99,750 (May-February)

3. *Moritz School of Law personnel and overhead:*

   Original budgeted costs: $84,744 (May-December)
   Revised costs- $107,915 (May-February)

**Total project budget:**

Original budgeted costs: $560,002 (May-December)
Revised project cost: $549,831 (May-February)

**EAC Staff Recommendation**

Karen Lynn-Dyson, the EAC’s Contracting Officer Representative assigned to this contract has reviewed this request, the rationale and authority for it (FAR 43.103(a)(3)) and finds it to be appropriate. To date the Eagleton Institute has consistently met its deadlines for major project deliverables and stayed within the project’s overall budget.
Based upon the work products provided to the EAC, thus far, the additional personnel expenses which the contractor has incurred appear to be reasonable. To grant the Eagleton Institute a three-month extension on this contract in order to obtain the necessary feedback on major documents it has produced will be within the best interests of the Election Assistance Commission, and therefore, the federal government.

EAC's Contracting Officer Representative finds that to grant the Eagleton Institute a no-cost extension for the modification of its contract with the EAC is within the scope of the original agreement and is recommending that this modification to the contract be made.

Signed

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Contracting Officer Representative
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Thomas R. Wilkey
Executive Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. CONTRACT ID CODE</th>
<th>E0014127</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO</td>
<td>Pago E4014127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. EFFECTIVE DATE</td>
<td>01/24/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.</td>
<td>3 /3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PROJECT NO. (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ISSUED BY</td>
<td>U.S. Election Assistance Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ADMINISTERED BY (if other than item 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (incl. street, county, State and ZIP Code)</td>
<td>Rutgers, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. NAME AND ADDRESS OF Contractor (incl. street, county, State and ZIP Code)</td>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ 08901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☐ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended, ☐ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

- By completing Items 8 and 10, and returning _______ copies of the amendment, or
- By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted;
- Or by separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. EAC will rely upon acknowledgment to be received at the place designated for the receipt of offers prior to the hour and date specified. If by virtue of this amendment your desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter. Provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

- FAR 43.103(a)(3)
- The above numbered Contract/Order No. is modified to reflect the administrative changes (such as changes in payee or appropriation date, etc.) set forth in Item 14, pursuant to the authority of FAR 43.103(a).

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not, ☑ is required to sign this document and return _______ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.

Pursuant to the terms of the above-referenced contract, the contractor was to present the EAC with draft reports that would form the basis for recommended best practices for provisional voting. The documents were to be published in mid-October after EAC review. The contractor did not receive EAC comments on the draft document until October, 2005. As a result, additional time is required to complete the work on provisional voting and analysis of Voter Identification issues. This extension will entail additional personnel time, but no additional funds to complete the work. The contractor anticipates that it will be able to complete its work during the week of March 31, 2006.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as hereafter changed, remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNATORY (Type or print):

Constance S. Gorenbach
Accounting Manager

15B. CONTRACTOR SIGNATURE:

Constance S. Gorenbach
(Original)
INSTRUCTIONS

Instructions for items other than those that are self-explanatory, are as follows:

(a) Item 1 (Contract ID Code). Insert the contract type identification code that appears in the title block of the contract being modified.

(b) Item 3 (Effective date).

(1) For a solicitation amendment, change order, or administrative change, the effective date shall be the issue date of the amendment, change order, or administrative change.

(2) For a supplemental agreement, the effective date shall be the date agreed to by the contracting parties.

(3) For a modification issued as an initial or confirming notice of termination for the convenience of the Government, the effective date and the modification number of the confirming notice shall be the same as the effective date and modification number of the initial notice.

(4) For a modification converting a termination for default to a termination for the convenience of the Government, the effective date shall be the same as the effective date of the termination for default.

(5) For a modification confirming the contacting officer's determination of the amount due in settlement of a contract termination, the effective date shall be the same as the effective date of the initial decision.

(c) Item 6 (Issued By). Insert the name and address of the issuing office. If applicable, insert the appropriate issuing office code in the code block.

(d) Item 8 (Name and Address of Contractor). For modifications to a contract or order, enter the contractor's name, address, and code as shown in the original contract or order, unless changed by this or a previous modification.

(e) Item 9, (Amendment of Solicitation No. - Dated), and 10, (Modification of Contract/Order No. - Dated). Check the appropriate box and in the corresponding blanks insert the number and date of the original solicitation, contract, or order.

(f) Item 12 (Accounting and Appropriation Data). When appropriate, indicate the impact of the modification on each affected accounting classification by inserting one of the following entries.

(1) Accounting classification
Net increase $  
Net decrease $  

NOTE: If there are changes to multiple accounting classifications that cannot be placed in block 12, insert an asterisk and the words "See continuation sheet".

(g) Item 13. Check the appropriate box to indicate the type of modification. Insert in the corresponding blank the authority under which the modification is issued. Check whether or not contractor must sign this document. (See FAR 43.103.)

(h) Item 14 (Description of Amendment/Modification).

(1) Organize amendments or modifications under the appropriate Uniform Contract Format (UCF) section headings from the applicable solicitation or contract. The UCF table of contents, however, shall not be set forth in this document.

(2) Indicate the impact of the modification on the overall total contract price by inserting one of the following entries:

(i) Total contract price increased by $  
(ii) Total contract price decreased by $  
(iii) Total contract price unchanged.

(3) State reason for modification.

(4) When removing, reinstating, or adding funds, identify the contract items and accounting classifications.

(5) When the SF 30 is used to reflect a determination by the contracting officer of the amount due in settlement of a contract terminated for the convenience of the Government, the entry in Item 14 of the modification may be limited to --

(i) A reference to the letter determination; and

(ii) A statement of the net amount determined to be due in settlement of the contract.

(6) Include subject matter or short title of solicitation/contract where feasible.

(i) Item 16B. The contracting officer's signature is not required on solicitation amendments. The contracting officer's signature is normally affixed last on supplemental agreements.
### Description | Budget
---|---
#### Personnel
- Eagleton faculty/senior staff | 35,000 (Mandel, Weingart, Reed, Linky (various percentages))
- Eagleton staff: logistics/administrative/clerical | 15,000 (various percentages)
- Fringe (32.5%) | 16,250
- Mandel, Weingart, Reed, Linky (various percentages) | 66,250

#### Hourly Personnel
- Research Coordinator | 21,250 (1250 hours at $17 per hour)
- Logistics/Admin Coordinator | 12,325 (725 hours at $17 per hour)
- Research assistants | 7,200 (300 hours at $12 per hour for two researchers)
- Fringe on Hourly (9%) | 3,670

#### Subtotal Personnel Expenses | $44,445

#### Honoraria
- Honoraria for Peer Review Group | 10,000 (10 at $1,000)

#### Public Hearings (3 in 3 cities)
- Public Hearings | 75,000 (3 hearings at $25K per EAC figures)
- 2 Hearings in DC - train, ground, lodging, meals* | 3,480 (attended by 3 staff)
- 1 Hearings in St. Louis - air, ground, lodging, meals** | 2,640 (attended by 3 staff)

#### Briefings/Meetings with EAC
- Train, ground, lodging, meals*** | 5,200 (5 briefings in DC, attended by 2 staff)

#### General Operations
- Office supplies, software, telephone, copying, postage | 10,000
- Desktop computers, laptop, printer | 20,000

#### Subcontract
- Project Director - O’Neill | 79,500 (80% time April - Aug., 60% Sept. - Oct.)
- Ohio State University - Legal Analysis | 84,744 (Partner institution, Moritz College of Law, OSU)

#### Subtotal Non-Personnel Expenses | $280,564

#### Subtotal All Direct Cost | $391,259

#### Modified Total Direct Cost $277,015****
- F&A on Modified Total Direct Cost (55.5%) | 153,743 (Rutgers University federally approved rate)

#### TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET | $544,502

### Optional Surveys
- State Election Officials | 15,000 (Eagleton)
- Young Voters | 25,000 (Eagleton)
- Provisional Voting, 1st state | 116,000 (OSU Political Science)
- Provisional Voting, 1st additional state | 75,000 (OSU Political Science)
- Provisional Voting, 2nd additional state | 60,000 (OSU Political Science)

#### Total Optional Surveys (no F&A) | $291,000

---

* Travel and lodging to two hearings in DC includes $250 for train fare to DC, $200 for hotel/lodging, and $60 per day for two days of meals = $580 per person per trip for three people.

** Travel and lodging to one hearing in St. Louis includes $500 airfare to St. Louis, 2 nights hotel/lodging at $100, and $60 per day for three days of meals = $880 per person for three people.

*** Travel and lodging to five Briefings/Meetings with EAC includes $250 for train fare to DC, $200 for hotel/odging, and $60 for meals = $520 per person per trip for two people.

**** Modified total direct cost is equivalent to total direct cost except for two items - F&A included only on first $25K of subcontract with Project Director ($79,500) and first $25K of subcontract with OSU ($84,744).
### US Election Assistance Commission Project Budget (original 3/22/05; revised 1/13/06 for no-cost extension)

#### Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Cumulative Expenses through Dec 2005 (actual and committed)</th>
<th>Post Jan 1 Projected Expenses</th>
<th>Projected Balance Post Jan 1</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eagleton Faculty and Staff (salaried and hourly)</td>
<td>84,263.20</td>
<td>84,263.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Mandel, Director and Professor</td>
<td>5,682.86</td>
<td>5,682.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Weingart, Associate Director</td>
<td>7,347.00</td>
<td>7,347.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid Reed, Director of Eagleton NJ Project</td>
<td>19,500.00</td>
<td>19,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Linky, Director of Electronic Democracy Project</td>
<td>8,100.00</td>
<td>8,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Vercellotti, Assistant Research Professor</td>
<td>9,340.00</td>
<td>9,340.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Rapp, Research Project Coordinator</td>
<td>12,844.55</td>
<td>12,844.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Vincelli, Project/Bus. Administrator</td>
<td>10,800.00</td>
<td>10,800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Brody, Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Velasquez, Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>8,503.89</td>
<td>8,503.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Philips, Unit Computing Specialist</td>
<td>2,100.00</td>
<td>2,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Pfeiffer, Secretary</td>
<td>2,020.00</td>
<td>2,020.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers Graduate Students (hourly)</td>
<td>16,531.60</td>
<td>16,531.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Andersen</td>
<td>6,060.00</td>
<td>6,060.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadia Brown</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Curtis</td>
<td>1,002.00</td>
<td>1,002.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Dornich</td>
<td>1,635.60</td>
<td>1,635.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Harris</td>
<td>5,928.00</td>
<td>5,928.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe (rates vary by employee type)</td>
<td>21,332.66</td>
<td>21,332.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
<td>81,120</td>
<td>948.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>948.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefings/Meetings</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>1,302.82</td>
<td>1,750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operations</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,029.69</td>
<td>1,750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies, software, telephone, copying, postage</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,003.11</td>
<td>1,750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop computers, laptop, printer</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,026.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracts</td>
<td>78,500</td>
<td>81,760.00</td>
<td>18,000.00</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University (OSU)-Legal Analysis*</td>
<td>84,744</td>
<td>84,222.35</td>
<td>23,892.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Personnel (with fringe)</td>
<td>50,735</td>
<td>55,724.22</td>
<td>14,001.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned Foley, Professor</td>
<td>30,514.24</td>
<td>8,587.03</td>
<td>120.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Tokaji, Professor</td>
<td>3,313.65</td>
<td>1,408.82</td>
<td>88.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Williams, Project Coordinator</td>
<td>7,646.00</td>
<td>2,320.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Sampson, Research Coordinator</td>
<td>5,229.14</td>
<td>705.30</td>
<td>35.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistants</td>
<td>8,821.19</td>
<td>880.00</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Travel</td>
<td>5,950</td>
<td>611.80</td>
<td>1,846.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Overhead</td>
<td>28,006</td>
<td>27,886.33</td>
<td>7,844.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>153,743</strong></td>
<td><strong>181,760.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>153,743</strong></td>
<td><strong>181,760.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio State University (OSU) - Legal Analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>84,744</strong></td>
<td><strong>84,222.35</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Ohio State University figures are included in the "cumulative expenses through Dec 2005" even though Rutgers has not yet received the cumulative invoices.**

*Ohio State University figures are included in the "cumulative expenses through Dec 2005" even though Rutgers has not yet received the cumulative invoices.*
Karen:

When do you actually expect to have completed contracts for us?

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Job-
> >
> > EAC staff is recommending that you and Tova serve as the project consultants on this project.
> > Academic perspectives and balance on the issues will/should be achieved through the voting fraud and intimidation working group the two of you will manage.
> >
> > EAC staff is recommending $120,000 be allotted for this project at the it run from September 26- February 28, 2006.
> >
> > Will have a final figure for you and Tova tomorrow afternoon, once the final budget figures have been negotiated.
> >
> > Karen Lynn-Dyson
> > Research Manager
> > U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> > Washington, DC 20005
> > tel: 202-566-3123
> >
> >
Karen:

Do you still believe that everything will be finalized today and if so, when will we get to review our contracts?

Job
Great -- thanks so much for the update, and I'll look forward to hearing from Gavin soon. Tova
-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2005 3:58 PM
To: wang@tcf.org
Cc: twilkey@eac.gov; ggilmour@eac.gov; cpaquette@eac.gov
Subject: Re: Voting Fraud and Intimidation contract

Tova-

The contracts are completed, although not formally signed by the Chair of the Commission (a formality)

As discussed, the contract will be for six months-September 26- February 28 for a fixed contract fee of $50,000 plus additional $5,000 for expenses.

$10,000 has been set aside in the FY 05 EAC budget to cover working group costs.

Gavin Gilmour will be the EAC staff project manager, to whom you and Job will be reporting.

Gavin should be in touch in the next day or so, with more details and specifics related to getting the project started.

Thanks

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Hi Karen and Nicole,

I know you guys have been swamped, but I wanted to check in because I haven't heard from you and I am getting all sorts of information from Job, second hand. I would rather not operate that way. Is it the case that the contracts have been finalized? Can you give me a hint about the terms? When might I be seeing a copy? Thanks so much.

Best wishes,

Tova

Tova Andrea Wang
Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow
The Century Foundation
41 East 70th Street - New York, NY 10021
phone: 212-452-7704  fax: 212-535-7534

Visit our Web site, www.tcf.org, for the latest news, analysis, opinions, and events.

Click here to receive our weekly e-mail updates.
Karen:

I remained in this afternoon. However, I will have to leave for a time at around 6:00 pm your time. Do you think you will be communicating with us regarding our finished contracts before that time?

Job
Karen:

What time will you be getting with us today on our contracts. I do not want to be out when you do.

Job
Steve, Tova and Job,

We at the EAC are sorry to hear that Steve will need to withdraw from the Voter Fraud project but understand that he is doing what he feels is in the best interest of himself and his colleague.

Karen has asked me to let you know that she and Tom will meet at some juncture today to discuss further strategy of this project. They have asked me to ensure both Tova and Job that this change in the team will in no way change the EAC's commitment to this project or to the two of you. We will be back in touch with you in the next two days with further information on contracting and pay as well as other aspects of the project.

Thanks so much.

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Executive Director - Thomas R. Wilkey
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
202.566.3127 fax
Karen:

I tried to call you and will try again but Peg did not call today. If I don't hear from her first thing in the morning, I will call.

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> You and Tova will be hearing from Peg Sims today.
> > Peg will be managing your project.
> >
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
> >
> > "Job Serebrov"  
> > 09/26/2005 11:38 AM
> > To
> > klynndyson@eac.gov
> > cc
> > Subject
> > Gavin
> >
> Karen:
> > Still no work from Gavin. Can you remind him to contact us. We are holding up travel plans as well as project plans while we wait.
> > Regards,
Deliberative Process
Privilege

Diana Scott/EAC/GOV
10/03/2005 03:18 PM
To Carol A. Paquette/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc klynndyson@eac.gov, Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
bcc
Subject Re: The $10,000 for the Voting Fraud/Intimidation Working Group

Carol,

There is a mechanism in place which could have obligated the $10,000. Since the end of August, I have been sending out to all personnel those "End of Fiscal Year 05" reminder emails which spell out that folks should advise me of any "expected expenditures" to be paid from FY05 funds. It cannot be obligated if I am not advise of it.

Diana M. Scott
Administrative Officer
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202) 566-3100 (office)
(202) 566-3127 (fax)
dscott@eac.gov

Carol A.
Paquette/EAC/GOV
10/03/2005 02:51 PM
To klynndyson@eac.gov@EAC
Diana Scott/EAC/GOV@EAC, Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R.
cc Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject Re: The $10,000 for the Voting Fraud/Intimidation Working Group

Karen, Peg -

This is to confirm that the $10,000 for the meeting was not obligated because there was no mechanism to do so (e.g., no contract vehicle). However, it is my understanding from Julie and Tom that OMB said we could go ahead with contracting that needs to get underway before final budget is passed, so I would assume we could devote some funding to this. We will have to look at the dollar level that we're receiving
nder the CR and see how that has to be allocated to on-going expenses versus new items.

Carol A. Paquette  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
(202)566-3125  cpaquette@eac.gov

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

10/03/2005 01:52 PM

To Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC, Diana Scott/EAC/GOV@EAC  
cc Carol A. Paquette/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC  
Subject The $10,000 for the Voting Fraud/Intimidation Working Group

Peg and Diana-

It's very likely that the $10,000 that was to be set aside for the Voting Fraud and Intimidation Working Group's expenses did not get obligated, and that only funds to pay the consultants were obligated.

The amount to be obligated for this project was to be $120,000. $55,000 was to be given to Tova Wang and $55,000 to Job Sereborv.

It's likely that Tova and Job will have to wait until 2006 funds are available, to hold their working group meeting. Alternatively, Peg, perhaps you'll want to have a series of conference calls with their working group until there is money for them to meet in-person?

Karen

Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Research Manager  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
tel:202-566-3123

016099
Peggy -

I understand this is an issue. This is the reason we include the task to revise the project plan, so deliverable dates can get adjusted, if needed, based on when the work was actually begun.

Carol A. Paquette  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
(202)566-3125  
cpaquette@eac.gov

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

Carol:

This updated version is helpful to me but may be problematic for our contractors, who do not have a final contract and (I think) are unaware of the deliverable dates listed in this version. Of course, I did not inform them of these deadlines because I did not have them until today.

Unfortunately, the delay in getting the signed contracts out to our selected contractors has already adversely impacted deliverable dates for the contracts to which I have been assigned. Most contractors cannot hire researchers or commit funds without having a contract in hand, so they have had to delay their work.

--- Peggy

The SOWs that Karen provides below were revised for these contracts. I have attached one of these for your information, since they are identical.
Gavin-

A few answers to your questions:

They have not received contracts but did receive a Statement of Work about a month ago.

That Statement of Work does not reference use of Westlaw or a law clerk. I have no recollection of offering such services. I have, however, had many conversations with Tova and Job. At some point I may have said that because the EAC has Westlaw and legal interns, there may or may not be a way from Job and Tova to avail them of these services.

The Statements of Work developed (see draft attached) were used in place of an RFP. Tova and Job are to serve as consultants on a project that may or may not result in their developing an RFP on voting fraud and intimidation for the EAC.
Karen/Tom,

Peggy held a meeting with voting fraud/intimidation contractors. In this meeting they noted that despite the fact that the contract requires them to perform legal research, they do not have the means to do so (no access to Westlaw, etc.). They noted that in discussions with the two of you, they were told that the EAC would provide them access to West Law and, possibly, a law clerk with office space. None of this is noted in the contract. They claim to have never seen the contract? Do we have their response to our RFP? We will all need to meet to clarify this.

GG

Gavin S. Gilmour
Associate General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Thanks!!

Amie J. Sherrill
Special Assistant to Vice Chairman Paul S. DeGregorio
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566 3106
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Aimee-

In case you couldn't open up the document which describes Job's elections background

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 10/17/2005 04:36 PM -----

"Job Serebrov" To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc
Subject Re: Requested Documents

Karen:

I enjoyed the discussion too. I really think that this project will be of national importance and can positively affect elections administration while providing an answer to the handling of the vote fraud problem for the future.
On another note, why don't you leave an evening free while I am there for dinner. I am trying to bring my wife along. If you can bring your husband it could make for an interesting evening.

Regards,

Job

Summary of Election Activities of Job Serebrov

Background to Election Problems in Arkansas

Ever since Reconstruction, Arkansas has had a history of election problems. The election fraud that gave rise to the Brooks-Baxter War in Arkansas in the 1870s involved people from both sides of the aisle voting more than once, the dead rising to cast a ballot or two, destroying ballots, creating ballots and making ballot boxes disappear. A strong one-party system perpetuated this tradition into modern times.

In 1995, I met with Arkansas Supreme Court Justice Tom Glaze to discuss voting issues and my efforts to clean up the electoral process. Although supportive, Justice Glaze encouraged me to proceed with caution. Before being elected to the Supreme Court, Justice Glaze had been employed in the 1960s by Gov. Win Rockefeller to clean up ballot fraud throughout Arkansas. He was nearly disbarred in the process by those involved in ballot fraud in a small, rural county.

Shortly after my discussion with Justice Glaze, I discovered how pervasive the election problems were in the state. For instance, ballot boxes were stuffed or disappeared into the night only to return altered. Contrary to state law, county sheriffs running in contested elections maintained custody of the ballot boxes. In one instance, 20 voted ballot boxes were found in the attic of a sheriff’s deputy after he died.


In my private practice as an attorney, I represented numerous clients in county election contests throughout Arkansas. I also represented clients in matters before the Federal Election Commission. I have never lost an election case. Finally, I was hired as a consultant to a major nonprofit legal organization to review and summarize the 2002 amendments to federal election laws and apply the new law to 10 scenarios.

Member, Washington County Board of Election Commissioners, Fayetteville, Arkansas (1990-1996)

This board consisted of three commissioners; I was the lone Republican. We were charged with supervising the
training of poll workers, evaluating voting systems and then purchasing an optical scan system to be used countywide, preparing and justifying our annual budget before the Washington County Quorum Court, hiring and supervising staff and sitting as an administrative tribunal.

When I first came on the board, Washington County was primarily a one-party county and the Democrats were used to running elections according to tradition rather than the law. I had to battle with the two Democrats on the board to enforce election laws within the county. As I started to force the issue in the courts, the Republican Party gained strength. Four years later and after outlasting eight Democrat commissioners, I was able to work with new Democrat commissioners who recognized the need to enforce the law. At this point, the commission requested that I draft administrative regulations for the board. These remain in place today.

Founder, President, General Counsel; Arkansans for Fair Elections (1994-1999)

In 1994, Gov. Mike Huckabee (R), then a candidate for lieutenant governor, asked me to serve as his general counsel for ballot fraud protection. Thinking it best to act independently of any candidate, I formed Arkansans for Fair Elections. I served as the organization’s president and, later, general counsel. This group launched a statewide educational campaign to train poll watchers to recognize irregular or fraudulent electoral procedures; this included the creation of literature and a video. Our extensive public relations campaign brought media attention to the issue. We also organized a statewide team of citizen poll watchers and attorneys to ensure that the election laws were fairly enforced. We were so successful in the lieutenant governor’s race that Arkansans for Fair Elections was asked to continue the effort until 1999 when I moved to Louisiana.

General Counsel - Ballot Fraud Protection Committee, Republican Party of Arkansas (1995-1999)

In late 1995, Asa Hutchinson, chairman of the Republican Party of Arkansas, appointed me as general counsel for the newly formed Ballot Fraud Protection Committee of the state party. I retained this position until 1999. I was responsible for coordinating statewide enforcement efforts and directing a legal team to respond to problematic situations prior to and on election day.

(Through my role with Arkansans for Fair Elections and the Ballot Fraud Protection Committee, I successfully sued or negotiated a settlement in more than two-thirds of the 75 counties in Arkansas over electoral irregularities.)
Republicans in the General Assembly requested that I review and draft suggested changes to Arkansas election law. Based on my personal experience as an election commissioner and as an election attorney, I identified a number of areas of concern and drafted new statutes modeled on the best examples that I could find from other states. My proposal was not passed by the Democrat-controlled General Assembly as a package, however, several of its components were passed into law.

I drafted five redistricting bills and maps for the constitutionally required redistricting of the Arkansas Court of Appeals. These bills were based on current U.S. Supreme Court precedent regarding gerrymandering. I had to present each bill and give supporting testimony to the commission.

Part of my duties as director was to develop international cooperative projects. The theme of several of these proposals was democratization. In each case, I required review of the national election code of the country involved.

My activities in Namibia led to a request by the director of the Namibian Election Commission, Joram Rukambe and the Speaker of the Namibian National Assembly, Dr. Mose Tjitendero to review and suggest changes to the Namibian election code. This review took three months and resulted in proposed alterations a number of code sections. These suggestions were considered by the Namibian National Assembly and a number were incorporated into the code revisions. Additionally, I drafted legislation for the Speaker to guarantee voting rights to agricultural workers that were being denied by the owners of the farms. This legislation also was passed into law.

During this time, I was qualified as an election expert and placed on an election consultant list by the United Nations, IFES and the Electoral Institute of Southern Africa.

Related Memberships

- Republican Party of Arkansas (1990-1999)
- Benton County, Arkansas, Republican Committee
(1996-1999)
• Washington County, Arkansas, Republican Committee
(1990-1996)
(When we moved to Louisiana in 1999, the party was in such turmoil that it was difficult to get involved. This past year, I have been prohibited by the Hatch Act from participating in partisan politics. This prohibition ends August 19 when my judicial clerkship ends.)

Related Education
• Graduate certificate in electoral governance, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia (2003)
Karen and Dan:

The reporter got it wrong. The Academy applied on its own for a Help America Vote College Program grant in 2004 and did not get one. The reporter found evidence of EAC's decision to reconsider the Academy's application and interpreted that to mean that EAC changed its mind about giving the program a grant. We didn't. Jeannie Layson set the reporter straight, confirming that the organization had received no grant from EAC. Furthermore, we have received nothing either from the Academy or the University to indicate that these two entities are jointly participating in any activities funded under the Help America Vote College program.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW - Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 866-747-1471 (toll free) or 202-566-3120 (direct)
Fax: 202-566-3127
e-mail: psims@eac.gov

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
10/18/2005 03:35 PM
To daniel.murphy@charter.net@GSAEXTERNAL
cc Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject Re: advisory group

Thanks for keeping me in the loop on this

Also, about two months ago there was the controversy in Michigan about the person who falsely claimed she had gotten a HAVA college poll worker grant and somehow she was attempting to align herself with Eastern Michigan. Please investigate - I may be presenting the story very inaccurately.

Thanks

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen:
Due to the workload this week, I won't have the comments for Thad Hall together by COB today. I should have something to send out by COB Tuesday (10/11). --- Peggy
Must say that were awarded not to be awarded unless there are subsequent communications after Tally Vote. If the latter, then I need to know what those are.

Feel like crap still running a fever.

--------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 11/01/2005 12:44 PM
To: Juliet Thompson
Cc: Gavin Gilmour
Subject: Edits to the Tova/Job chron memo

Julie-

Here are my suggested edits to the memo.

Feeling any better?

K

chron for tova and job.doc

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

016110
Can you take a look at this and tell me if it accurately reflects the work that has been done and the communication of the award? Please let me know as soon as possible if this is accurate or needs revision.
I need a few minutes with you Monday morning to discuss how this was communicated to Job and Tova. Unfortunately, I have an appointment out of the office at 10:30 and I will be out until after noon. Will you be in before that or can you call me on my Blackberry before that time? I would like to get this moving quickly.

Juliet E. Thompson  
General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC  20005  
(202) 566-3100
Who has the contract electronically for these two people? I need to make some minor changes to the final version. If you have it, please email it to me immediately.

Juliet E. Thompson
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC  20005
(202) 566-3100
Thanks so much Karen.

Edgardo, is there a time we might talk by phone in the next day or two? I can be reached at 212-452-7704. Thanks so much. Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2005 11:56 AM
To: wang@tcf.org
Cc: ecortes@eac.gov
Subject: Re: a different topic

Tova-

Good to see you, as well.
My colleague, Edgardo Cortes is the EAC staff person who has taken the lead on this work.

Edgardo-

Tova Wang is one of consultants who is working with Peg Sims on the voting fraud and intimidation project.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen:

Gavin has not yet contacted us. Do you know if he will do so on Monday?

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Job and Tova-
> > As I think you both know, Gavin Gilmour, EAC's Deputy General Counsel, will be providing agency oversight for your project.
> >
> > Gavin will be in touch in the next day or so, to go over next steps on this project. Also, I believe your contracts will be in the mail later today.
> >
> > Regards-
> >
> > Karen Lynn-Dyson
> > Research Manager
> > U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> > Washington, DC 20005
> > tel:202-566-3123
> >
This issue will be discussed on Monday. The problem is that lawyers generally should not take on this role... Such mixing of roles creates problems. But, again this will be discussed next week.

Next week promises to be quite busy... To the extent we can avoid last minute action I would appreciate it.

Thanks

Gg

All this can wait until next week.

At that time I will of course bring you up to speed on the project. The overriding concern Tom Wilkey and the Commissioners have is that this project really needs close management and supervision. It really should be overseen by a lawyer and by an EAC staff person with an understanding of the political sensitivities and issues that will surround the topic.

Hopefully this management/oversight issue can be successfully resolved.

Thanks

K
Karen,

I will not be in until next week. Presently I do not know a thing about this program. Further, there are some concerns regarding counsel taking this role. Julie and I will be addressing them on my return.

Also, use of the term salary concerns me... These are contractors, correct? As such that term is most likely inappropriate.

Finally, if this is a question that needs to be answered in the short term (as your response suggest) please respond. I am sure carol and diane will assist you.

Thanks
Gg

--- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 09/21/2005 12:35 PM ----

Ok. I hope to hear from him either today or tomorrow. Hopefully, I will see you in DC in the next few weeks.

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Job-
> > I haven't, as yet, been able to get an answer for
I'm going to ask Gavin to pursue this for you.

Thanks

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

Karen:

Were you able to get any answers as to my questions on salary? Specifically, when will we receive our first check and do we have to invoice for it or only for expenses, and if we need to invoice for salary, when do we need to mail, fax or e-mail the invoice so we are paid on time?

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Job and Tova-
> 
> As I think you both know, Gavin Gilmour, EAC's Deputy General Counsel, will be providing agency oversight for your project.
> 
> Gavin will be in touch in the next day or so, to go over next steps on this project. Also, I believe your contracts will be in the mail later today.
Regards-
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
Karen:

I am in the process of scheduling the first meeting for DC. Tova and I have settled on Friday Oct 7. Is there a room available at the EAC and when will we be receiving our contracts? I assume you are mailing them. Do we need to sign them?

Job
Hi Karen,

Sounds like progress is being made. Here you go:

119701137  
201 West 74th Street, Apt. 11F  
NY, NY 10023

Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2005 2:50 PM
To: 
Cc: tova Wang
Subject: Re: Article

Job and Tova-

Please send to me, ASAP, your social security numbers and the address to which your consulting checks should be sent.

Thanks

K

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Research Manager  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
tel:202-566-3123
I'm afraid my haste and the happy juice they gave me at yesterday morning's session caused be to double the labor costs expected for the Serebrov and Wang personal services contracts. The costs should be as follows:

**Labor Cost (FY06):**
If the consultants are paid $111 per hour and each is expected to work 230 more hours, then we will need to set aside $25,530 each for Tova Wang and Job Serebrov (or a total of $51,060 for both).

(Please note that Gavin suggested that I put in a four month period (top of page 2), although we have budgeted only for 230 hours for each consultant. He thought that would take care of us if we need a few more days out of them and don't want to have to modify the contract.)

I had estimated that we would need $50,000 in FY06 Research Funds (in addition to the $5,000 per consultant in FY06 Research funds to cover travel) to bring this project to a logical stopping point. (I had also requested $250,000 in research funds for any follow up RFP stage, but I know that Tom had to postpone any such RFP until FY07.)

As we would like the new contract period to begin this Sunday, February 26, I need to know what you need from me to help expedite this matter.
Diana:

OK. Here are the contracts for Tova Wang and Job Serebrov, revised per our discussion. The costs for each should be as follows:

**Tova Wang**
- Labor Cost - $24,975 (which is $111 per hour X 225 hours maximum)
- Travel Cost - $6,500 maximum for FY06 (she has already spent or obligated $3,037.09 of this.)

**Job Serebrov**
- Labor Cost - $24,975 (which is $111 per hour X 225 hours maximum)
- Travel Cost - $3,500 maximum for FY06 (he has spent no travel funds so far this FY)

Total Costs for the Two Consultants: Labor Under these Contracts=$49,950; Travel in FY06=$10,000

--- Peggy
All,

Per our meeting this afternoon, the consensus was that Peggy needed a total of $60,000 to fund the contracts for Tova Wang and Job Serebrov ($50,000 for labor and $10,000 for travel expenses). Since only $25,000 was budgeted for both these 2 contractors, an additional $35,000 is needed. Tom directed that the additional required funds be taken from the $150,000 budgeted for the Improving Election Data Collection project. According to Tom, this project will be now be done in-house and so the budgeted funds far exceeds projected expenditures. Therefore, revised budgeted (maximum) amounts are as follows:

- Improving Election Data Collection: $115,000
- Tova Wang: $30,000
- Job Serebrov: $30,000

Plz let me know if the above differs in any way with your understanding. Thanks.

Diana M. Scott
Administrative Officer
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202) 566-3100 (office)
(202) 566-3127 (fax)
dscott@eac.gov
The money was on the list of items that I submitted to you in hard copy earlier this year (estimated at $50,000 each), because we knew in December 2005 that we would need to pay for approximately three more months of personal services for these folks in order to get to a logical stopping point. Is it just that we do not have confirmation that the request for the additional amount for personal services was approved and included in the Research Budget? --- Peggy

All-

Indeed, to my knowledge this money hasn't been set aside - at least not in the research budget. I await guidance from Diana and Tom.
You cannot go ahead with a contract if you do not have the money in the budget for it. Gavin cannot determine a fiscal decision such as this.

Tom: Can we talk.

Diana M. Scott
Administrative Officer
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202) 566-3100 (office)
(202) 566-3127 (fax)
dscott@eac.gov

Diana:

Attached are the new contracts for the continuation of personal services from Tova Wang and Job Serebrov on the Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation research project. They each need an ACT #. (Julie gave me the EAC Contract #s.)

As we would like the new contract period to begin this Sunday, February 26, I need to know what you need from me to help expedite this matter.

Labor Cost (FY06):
If the consultants are paid $111 per hour and each is expected to work 230 more hours, then we will need to set aside $51,060 each for Tova Wang and Job Serebrov.

(Please note that Gavin suggested that I put in a four month period (top of page 2), although we have budgeted only for a three month period. He thought that would take care of us if we need a few more days out of them and don't want to have to modify the contract.)

Travel Cost (FY06):
Tova Wang has used/obligated all but about $1,962.91 of the $5,000 allocated from the FY06 budget. Job Serebrov still should have all of the $5,000 allocated to him from the FY06 budget.

--- Peg
Peg:

Following is the guidance that the commissioners are providing with respect to the composition of the working group for the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation project and the selection process.

**8 Member Working Group**

Participants to be chosen by the two consultants in consultation with you. There are two slots that will require consensus. If consensus can't be reached, then you should make the decision. If there is real disagreement among the three of you, then the commissioners will make the selection.

The participation process prescribed below provides for political balance. As always, we ask that the group be diverse with respect to participation of men, women and minorities.

4 people from the Academic, Legal and Advocacy sectors - 2 to be chosen by Tova and 2 to be chosen by Job. We support your recommendation that there be at least one academic in the working group to help advise and comment on the construct of the database and you should provide that guidance to Tova and Job.

2 State Level Election Officials - 1 selected by Tova and 1 selected by Job

1 Nonpartisan local election official (selected by you or by consensus among the 3 of you)

1 Representative from DOJ - you had recommended a man who was retired from the Voting Section or perhaps someone else with similar credentials to be selected by you or by consensus among the three of you. We assume that Craig Dosantos (?sp) will participate in this project as an "advisor" and therefore would not take up a slot on the working group.

I will be on travel on Friday (tomorrow), however please feel free to call me on my cell should you have questions or need additional clarification.

Many thanks for your terrific work.

Gracia M. Hillman
Chair
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-566-3100
Fax: 202-566-1392
Plz. provide info requested below. Thanks.

Diana M. Scott
Administrative Officer
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202) 566-3100 (office)
(202) 566-3127 (fax)
dscott@eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Diana Scott/EAC/GOV on 01/19/2006 02:33 PM -----
Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
01/19/2006 02:29 PM
To Diana Scott/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject Re: Tova Wang

The travel expenses for the research contracts I oversee are included in Karen's budget for Research, not under Programs and Services. --- Peggy

Diana Scott/EAC/GOV

Diana Scott/EAC/GOV
01/19/2006 02:05 PM
To Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Bola Olu/EAC/GOV@EAC
Subject Tova Wang

Peggy,

Can you indicate where in the Programs & Services budget are the following expenditures for travel for Tova Wang to be deducted from. Plz. advise. Thanks.

E4019833 Jan. 12-14 NY/WDC $979.20
E4019844 Jan. 23-25 NY/AR $1274.46

(You have indicated twice to me that these expenses are to be taken from FY06 funds and not the existing FY05 contract funds).

Diana M. Scott
Administrative Officer
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202) 566-3100 (office)
(202) 566-3127 (fax)
dscott@eac.gov
The estimated additional hours needed to bring the Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Project to a logical stopping point (without requiring a draft statement of work for any future RFPs on the topic) are:

**Expert Interviews:**
- 3 hours of scheduling
- 17 hours conducting the interviews
- 15 hours summarizing and analyzing the interviews

Subtotal: 35 hours

Nexis research, organization of research, summary of research (Tova): 180 hours
Lexis research, organization of research, summary of research (Job): 180 hours

Subtotal: 360 hours

**Working Group preparation and meeting time:** 20 hours

**Final Report:** 45 hours

**Grand Total:** 460 hours

The sooner we find out if the Commissioners will accept this extension, the better. If the extension (or new contract for 3 additional months) is not accepted, we have to figure out what can be done in the limited time remaining. --- Peggy
Peggy:

Please note that the balance on Serebrov and Wang's contract are $14,451.68 and $16,116.68 respectively.

Bola Olu
Financial Administrative Specialist
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100
Washington, DC 20005
P:202-566-3124
F:202/566-3127
http://www.eac.gov/

"There is a world of difference between planning and worrying"
Peggy:

Wang's travel so far, is coming out of FY06. I am only responding to the comment you had in your respond "It does not reflect travel costs incurred against Wang's contract (see attached).

[Attachment: Wang Travel Cost Tracking.xls]

If Wang's travel is coming out of FY06, then why are you deducting it from FY05? Does Wang have a travel fund in FY06?

Bola Olu
Financial Administrative Specialist
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100
Washington, DC 20005
P:202-566-3124
F:202/566-3127
http://www.eac.gov/

"There is a world of difference between planning and worrying"

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bola Olu/EAC/GOV</th>
<th>To Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/15/2006 02:09 PM</td>
<td>cc <a href="mailto:DScott@eac.gov">DScott@eac.gov</a>, Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bola:

Our attorneys have said that the travel expenses for these consultants have to come out of FY06 funds, so we bill their travel expenses against the FY06 Research budget and use the travel authorization/travel voucher process (at least for non-local travel). The pay for the consultants' personal services still comes from the FY05 Research budget. --- Peggy
All,

Plz be reminded that your travel authorization requests are to be sent to this mailbox: travelauthorizations@eac.gov which is listed as TravelAuthorizations in the EAC Directory. Plz. do not send requests to EAC Travel Authorizations Team; requests erroneously sent to EAC Travel Authorizations Team will not be processed. Thanks.

Diana M. Scott
Administrative Officer
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202) 566-3100 (office)
(202) 566-3127 (fax)
dscott@eac.gov
Hello everyone,
I'm sure you have read the article in today's NYT about the voter fraud report this agency issued. Today, Congressman Hinchey and Serrano have issued the following statement. Very shortly, EAC will post and distribute the attached statement to articulate our role and approach to conducting research and the steps we will take to improve our process. Please let me know if you have any questions about this, as I am sure we will all receive phone calls today about this issue. You may also direct people with questions to the statement that will be on the website. I will keep everyone informed as this situation evolves.

April 11, 2007

Hinchey, Serrano Urge Non-Partisanship, Greater Transparency at Election Assistance Commission

Washington, DC - Today, Congressmen Maurice Hinchey (NY-22) and José E Serrano (NY-16) urged the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to act with greater transparency and without partisanship. The comments from the congressmen came as the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government released a draft version of an EAC report on voter fraud and intimidation that shows significant changes were made to the findings of outside experts before the final report was released.

"The EAC has an obligation to be forthright with the American people and operate transparently and in a non-partisan manner," said Congressman Hinchey, who requested the draft report from EAC Commissioner Donetta L. Davidson during subcommittee hearing last month. "The draft report was commissioned with taxpayer dollars upon a mandate from Congress so that we could learn more about voter fraud and intimidation. The need for this report is even more clear when we see the way in which the Bush administration is carrying out the electoral process and how this system is sliding towards corruption. In hiding a draft report from the public that is significantly different from the final version, the EAC has created a lot more questions than it has answered while stunting debate on the issue. In order for our democracy to function properly it is essential that our elections are free of any corruption and that includes ensuring that the EAC does not work to benefit one political party over the other. To achieve that goal we must have all the facts and opinions on the table, not just some of them. The EAC must never limit discussion and debate."
"The EAC is charged with helping to ensure our elections are trustworthy and administered fairly," said Congressman Serrano, who is Chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee that oversees the EAC budget. "I'm concerned it changes were made to the report on voter fraud because of partisan bias rather than impartial analysis. When you read the draft report side-by-side with the final version, it is clear that important conclusions of the experts who wrote the draft report were excluded from the final product. Among the excluded information—an analysis that undermines the notion that voter fraud is rampant.

"I am concerned that the EAC did not publicly release the taxpayer-funded draft report, and I worry that political considerations may have played a role. We cannot have a politicized EAC, or one that yields to outside pressure. Our democracy, and the American people's faith in it, is far more important than a short-term political advantage."

The draft report was written by outside experts under contract with the EAC. The final report was entitled "Election Crimes: An Initial Review and Recommendations for Future Study" and was issued on December 7, 2006.

The EAC is an independent bipartisan commission created by the 2002 Help America Vote Act in order to disburse funds to the states for the purchase of voting systems, certify voting technologies, develop guidelines and serve as an information resource for election administration.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov
In an article in USA Today (10/10/2006), is this quote: "Advocates of registration and photo identification laws say they are needed to prevent fraud."

Another quote in the same article is: "Paul DeGregorio, chairman of the Election Assistance Commission, says the laws should not discourage citizens from voting. Far worse, he says, would be for states to ignore problems that cause Americans to distrust the process."

In my opinion as an American citizen who carries all the required papers, DeGregorio is right.

It doesn't matter who votes, since our votes don't count anyway. Politicians do as they please no matter what the people want. As we have seen in the past eight years, the past four years in particular, politicians will do or say anything that will further their personal agendas.

I don't believe enough voting fraud happens to make any kind of difference. And since what the voters want doesn't count anyway, it doesn't actually matter. But what a convenient thing it is on which to focus attention and argument for the very people who don't want their own fraud and dishonesty to be remembered come voting day.

I am an example of exactly what DeGregario spoke of: a citizen who carries all the now-required paperwork, and has finally realized that the system is completely bogus.

Heather Greyvelle
All,  

Per our meeting this afternoon, the consensus was that Peggy needed a total of $60,000 to fund the contracts for Tova Wang and Job Serebrov ($50,000 for labor and $10,000 for travel expenses). Since only $25,000 was budgeted for both these 2 contractors, an additional $35,000 is needed. Tom directed that the additional required funds be taken from the $150,000 budgeted for the Improving Election Data Collection project. According to Tom, this project will be now be done in-house and so the budgeted funds far exceeds projected expenditures. Therefore, revised budgeted (maximum) amounts are as follows:

- Improving Election Data Collection: $115,000
- Tova Wang: $30,000
- Job Serebrov: $30,000

Plz let me know if the above differs in any way with your understanding. Thanks.

Diana M. Scott  
Administrative Officer  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
(202) 566-3100 (office)  
(202) 566-3127 (fax)  
dscott@eac.gov
Jeannie:

Karen asked me to provide a response to the following question you received from Roy Saltman:

(2) On p. 27 of the 2005 Annual Report, it states that EAC contracted with two consultants to conduct preliminary research on the issues of voting fraud and voter intimidation. Can you tell me who these organizations or individuals are, and when their reports might be available? If they are available now, how can I obtain them?

The two consultants are Tova Wang and Job Serebrov. We expect the consultants to file a report with the EAC in May. EAC Commissioners will have to review and accept the report before it can be released.

Hope this works for you. --- Peggy
Peggy:

I was just processing your email properly - light bulb moment! The 2 trips of Wang is not coming out of this contract because the 2 trips were processed like any regular travel and they were assigned new/different Act numbers. For Wang's travel to come out of this contract, her travel cannot be processed as a regular travel. If memory serves me correctly, I believe this was the reason why Diana was asking you where these funds was coming out from and I believe she was told - Research.

To date, Wang's travel has been expensed or charged against Research (Survey/Surveys - Contractual services). For Wang's travel to come out of the allocated $5,000, she will have to provide an invoice with all her travel expense. She could either submit this separately or she can add her travel expense with her monthly invoice.

The same applies to Serebrov. So long as they get a different Act number for their travel, their travel expense will not be coming out of the allocated travel fund.

I will be more than happy to answer any questions.

Bola Olu
Financial Administrative Specialist
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100
Washington, DC 20005
P:202-566-3124
F:202/566-3127
http://www.eac.gov/

"There is a world of difference between planning and worrying"

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV

That pretty much matches what I have for Serebrov (see attached). Serebrov has used none of his travel money. It does not reflect travel costs incurred against Wang's contract (see attached). --- Peggy

Bola Olu/EAC/GOV

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
02/08/2006 05:03 PM
To Bola Olu/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Re: FYI:FUND BALANCE FOR WANG & SEREBROV

That pretty much matches what I have for Serebrov (see attached). Serebrov has used none of his travel money. It does not reflect travel costs incurred against Wang's contract (see attached). --- Peggy

Bola Olu/EAC/GOV

Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV
02/08/2006 04:04 PM
To Margaret Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Diana Scott/EAC/GOV@EAC

016141
Dear Commissioners:

This is to let you know that the Working Group for our Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation preliminary research project is scheduled to meet in EAC's large conference room the afternoon of Thursday, May 18. I will provide more information about this meeting to you later.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
In terms of travel cost etc.

THANK YOU!

Bola Olu
Financial Administrative Specialist
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100
Washington, DC 20005
P:202-566-3124
F:202/566-3127
http://www.eac.gov/

"In business, really in all of life, it is impossible to say “thank you” too many times"

----- Forwarded by Bola Olu/EAC/GOV on 05/17/2006 11:51 AM -----

Bola Olu/EAC/GOV
05/17/2006 11:33 AM
To Devon E. Romig/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Re: WHOSE MEETING IS VFVI Working Group Meeting on May 18th. BRIAN OR KAREN?

It is Peggy's meeting.

Devon Romig
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.566.2377 phone
202.566.3128 fax
www.eac.gov

----- Forwarded by Bola Olu/EAC/GOV on 05/17/2006 11:51 AM -----
Bola Olu
Financial Administrative Specialist
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue N.W., Suite - 1100
Washington, DC 20005
P: 202-566-3124
F: 202/566-3127
http://www.eac.gov/

"In business, really in all of life, it is impossible to say "thank you" too many times"
Diana:

The following members of the Working Group for our Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation research project will need to make travel arrangements in order to attend an afternoon meeting of the group on May 18 in Washington, DC:

Mark "Thor" Hearne - St Louis, MO
J.R. Perez - Seguin, TX
The Honorable Todd Rokita - Indianapolis, IN
Kathy Rogers - Atlanta, GA

I may have one additional member from Albuquerque, NM confirmed early next week.

May these people use Adventure Travel to make these arrangements in the same manner as the Asian Language Working Group? I understand the members of that group made hotel and flight arrangements through Adventure Travel and that these costs were billed directly to EAC. We did plan for EAC to pay for the travel of the Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Working Group (budgeted under Research). Devon will prepare their travel authorizations.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist
Karen:

That entire week is good for me. However, I really need to know as far in advance as possible as I am deciding whether to fly or drive.

Regards,

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Greetings-
> > Tom Wilkey and I have just completed a series of very informative and productive conversations with each of you and are anxious to move to the next step of this process.
> > We hope to assemble our consultant team on this project, within the next three weeks and are presently awaiting final approval of your contracts from our Commissioners. We anticipate this will take place in the next week to ten days.
> > We would like to assemble the team- Steve Ansolabehere of MIT, Tova Wang from The New Century Foundation and Job Serebrov, who has worked extensively on these issues for the State of Arkansas, during the week of September 11. Please get back to us with some tentative dates during that week that might work with your schedule.
> > We look forward to working with all of you and appreciate your efforts on behalf of the EAC.
> > Regards-
> > Karen Lynn-Dyson
> > Research Manager
> > U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> > Washington, DC 20005
> > tel: 202-566-3123
Karen:

I wanted to toss in my vote for the week of our first working meeting. The week of Sept 12 works best for me as far as scheduling things. I don't image that right before or right after Labor Day will really be good for everyone as that is the final vacation time of the summer.

What are your thoughts? I have been writing down various ideas, problems, and possible solutions that I thought of regarding vote fraud potentially for discussion at this meeting. It would be good if the three of us who were hired had a short backgrounder on the other two.

Regards,

Job
Hi Karen,

Here is the one page vita describing my relevant expertise for the fraud study, as well as a brief letter on my availability and consulting rates.

I will be away from Thursday through Monday, and will be in DC August 31 and September 1 and 2. I will swing by the EAC when I'm there. I look forward to meeting you in person.
I'm going to talk to Bert Benevides this morning about her possibly helping me work on some of these contracts on an ongoing basis.

Will keep you informed.

P.S. Are you going to bring me a present??? I'm about the only staff person here today. (sigh)

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV
08/22/2005 06:42 PM
To: Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject: Re: Employment Contracts for RFP Consultants

What happened to Ms Gilley

--------------------------

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 08/22/2005 04:44 PM
To: Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Diana Scott; Margaret Sims
Subject: Re: Employment Contracts for RFP Consultants

FYI-

Diana, Peg and Tom-

Given the backgrounds and levels of experience of these consultants, I anticipate offering each of them $75 an hour or $600 a day, plus expenses. These contracts would be for six weeks.

Please let me know your thoughts about this, as well.

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Tamar Nedzar/EAC/GOV
Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Executive Director - Thomas R. Wilkey
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
202.566.3127 fax

Nicole-

Attached please find the Statement of Work which should be sent to each of the three candidates who are being considered for the consulting position:

Steve A.
Tova W.
Job S.

Please be certain they are sent separately and not collectively to all three and that it is sent by COB today.

Thanks so much for your help.

K

voterfraud project consultants.doc

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Thanks and if you could add any information of work already approved to Donetta’s packet I will review it with her.
Also please work with Nicole to get the packet out this afternoon.
We will be meeting Friday morning at 8 AM rather than 10 so that will be 10 your time. I should have a call in number for you later today.
Thanks again for all your hard work I know how much has been placed on your shoulders.
Tom

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

Hi!!
Nicole and I will send you one of our infamous grids summarizing all this, first thing in the AM.

Briefly-
1. Need formal 4C’s approval to tell Widmeyer go ahead on editing EDS piece and approve $6000 in additional costs
2. Need 4C’s to approve EDS$36,000 expenditures to complete NVRA and UOCAVA reports
3. Absentee Ballot postage advertised and assigned to Gwenn Hofmann
4. VR database refresh- Carol Paquette knows
5. On-line learning forums- 4 C’s will get SOW on Friday- assigned to Marta Casper
6. Effective Designs for Election Administration- sole sourced to Design for Democracy and assigned to Gwenn Hoffmann
7. Provisional Voting/Voter ID- Eagleton/Moritiz team to meet with EAC on Sept 6 at 1:30 PM
8. Improving Election Data Collection- 4 C’s will get SOW on Friday- Assigned to Marta Casper
9. Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation- 3 consultants identified, kick-off meeting week of Sept 11
10. Vote Count/Vote Recount- reviewed and approved by Commissioners, assigned to Gaylin Vogel, Adam Ambroigi, Bert Benevides. To be advertised ASAP.
11. Poll worker recruitment, training and retention- 4C’s to review Dan Murphy’s SOW on Friday

13. Voter Hotline- 4C's to review SOW on Friday. Assigned to Richard Dickerson.


Hope this helps in the meantime.

(Marta Casper, Gwenn Hoffmann, Richard Dickerson and Bert Benavides are the consultants who will be assisting us between now and October 1) *** Their contracts have been prepared but need to be signed when you or the Chair returns.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV

To: Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject: Re: Employment Contracts for RFP Consultants

Thanks any chance you could fax me a current quickie run down on where we are. What's done etc. Seems to be some confusion over what they have and what their getting.
Yes I will bring you a present

-----------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 08/23/2005 09:52 AM
To: Thomas Wilkey
Subject: Re: Employment Contracts for RFP Consultants

Ms. Gilley isn't available and won't be until at least the first of next year.

She sent me the name of another individual who looks quite experienced, but in the world of international affairs and workforce development. He's a Brit.
Barring any outright objection the conference call to Kick off activities for the EAC Voting Fraud/voter intimidation project will take place from 2:30 and 3:00pm on Wednesday, September 7th.

Conference call dial in numbers are 202-708-9998 or 866-222-9044

Password is [REDACTED]

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Executive Director - Thomas R. Wilkey
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
202.566.3127 fa
FYI I called Tova Wang and left her the timeslot information re: next week's proposed times for voter fraud/intimidation conf. call.

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Executive Director - Thomas R. Wilkey
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
202.566.3127 fax
To all:

I have spoken with Tom Wilkey and he has proposed that we hold this conference call either:

4-4:30pm on Tuesday, Sept. 6th
or
2:30 and 3:00pm on Wednesday, September 7th

Please advise as to your preference. I would like to make this meeting a concrete entry into our calendar by COB today as next week’s schedule is becoming very very full. Thank you.

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Executive Director - Thomas R. Wilkey
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
202.566.3127 fax
Karen et al:

I would suggest that we talk early in the week. That way everything will be set for the meeting on the 12th (I assume this is still a go). My wife and I will be driving from Arkansas so we really need everything to work out before we have to leave on Saturday, August 10th.

Regards,

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> All-
> 
> I'm in the midst of trying to get many end-of-year research contracts awarded so am inundated with various meetings and activities.
> 
> I'm going to ask our Executive Director's Special Assistant, Nicole Mortellito, to work with each of you to find a time early next week when we can conduct this conference call.
> 
> It would seem that folks are in various places around the country this week, so that a conference call this week is probably not very feasible.
> 
> It is very important that we have at least a 30 minute conversation next week, so that we can agree on a division of labor, duties and responsibilities among the three of you. Once this is done, I can complete the contracts (and fee schedules) for each of you.
> 
> Thanks for your patience on this.
> 
> Look to hear from Nicole in the next day or so.
> 
> Regards-
> 

Dear Karen:

Can we start our meeting on the 12th around 10:00 am? I have an early breakfast meeting that morning.

Regards,

Job
August 31 and September 1 I will be in DC. Both days at 1 are good. The 31st is somewhat better.

Steve

At 03:32 PM 8/26/2005, you wrote:

All-

Although Tom Wilkey and I are still working to process each of your contracts on this project, we would like to tentatively schedule an in-person meeting on September 12, here in Washington

In the meantime, I'd like to propose that we all have a short teleconference call next Wednesday or Thursday at 1:00 PM to begin to talk through the scope of this project and the respective roles and responsibilities each of you might take on

Could you let me know your availability for a 45 minute call on August 31 or September 1 at 1:00?

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Hi Karen,

I'm just back from Vermont.

I cannot make it to DC on a Monday or Wednesday between now and December 11th because of teaching responsibilities. If possible, I would join a via phone if the meeting is after 11 (when my Monday class ends).

Steve

At 03:32 PM 8/26/2005, you wrote:

All-

Although Tom Wilkey and I are still working to process each of your contracts on this project, we would like to tentatively schedule an in-person meeting on September 12, here in Washington

In the meantime, I'd like to propose that we all have a short teleconference call next Wednesday or Thursday at 1:00 PM to begin to talk through the scope of this project and the respective roles and responsibilities each of you might take on

Could you let me know your availability for a 45 minute call on August 31 or September 1 at 1:00?

Thanks

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Meeting Invitation  Nicole Mortellito has invited you to a meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Kick off activities for the EAC Voting fraud/voter intimidation project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Nicole Mortellito/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Tuesday 09/06/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>04:00 PM - 04:45 PM (0 hours 45 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>small conference room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitees</td>
<td>Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/GOV@EAC, Karen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting with Tova Wang, Job Serebrov and Steve Ansolabehere
Nicole Mortellito/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV

Please note that it is necessary to move this meeting to 4-4:30pm on Tuesday, Sept. 6th

The previously scheduled time slot of 2:30 and 3:00pm on Wednesday, September 7th is not workable for Steve who will be in class.

Please acknowledge that you have received this time change. Thank you.

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Executive Director - Thomas R. Wilkey
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
202.566.3127 fax
Karen:

With Tuesday’s telephone conference fast approaching and Monday being a holiday, I believe that we have a potential problem unless you can get a tentative discussion topic list out by this afternoon so we have time to make suggestions about it. Without this, our conversation will not be very effective. While I realize that you need to finish the contracts and I wanted to reserve the division of labor conversation for our first meeting, we need guidance for Tuesday.

What do you think?

Regards,

Job
As a reminder the conference call scheduled for 4pm today will require you use the following Dial In information.

**Conference call dial in numbers are**
202-708-9998 or 866-222-9044

**Password is -**

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Executive Director - Thomas R. Wilkey
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
202.566.3127 fax
Nicole Mortellito/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV
Karen:

In response to Commissioner Davidson's question on present methods of vote fraud, please tell her that in any state (like Arkansas) that uses an optical scan system there are paper ballots from which the scan is made. These paper ballots must still be delivered from the voting area to the counting room and are subject to fraud in the transport.

Job
As I was not in this meeting... I'm punting this request to you. Ha ha ha!!!

----- Forwarded by Nicole Mortellito/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV on 09/06/2005 05:52 PM -----
"Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org> To nmortellito@eac.gov
09/06/2005 05:45 PM cc sda@mit.edu
Subject RE: EAC

Hi again Nicole,

Thanks so much for setting up the call today. If possible, could you please send us some kind of sample work plan/division of labor/timeline as we discussed today? Thanks so much.

Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: Tova Wang
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2005 4:10 PM
To: sda@mit.edu;
Subject: EAC

Hi Steve and Job,

Steve, below is the bulk of our exchange of emails from the weekend.

With respect to setting up a time to talk in the next day or two, let me throw out two possibilities and see if they work for you: tomorrow, Wednesday at 4 or Thursday at 10:30. Do either of you have conference call capability? Let me know. If necessary, I can do it. And if you have any thoughts in between feel free to email. Thanks.

Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: wang@tcf.org [mailto:wang@tcf.org]
Sent: Sunday, September 04, 2005 9:09 AM
To: Job Serebrov
Subject: Re: Topics

Hi Job,

These are all good ideas and I would just sort of add to and expand upon them.
First, at the outset, I think we need to be clear about how we are defining fraud. I actually was pleased that the project was called fraud and intimidation because I believe that acts of intimidation -- as well as deceptive practices, eg willfully and knowingly providing false information to voters about the voting process -- are also election fraud. Illegally keeping certain voters from voting has the same distorting impact on election outcomes as ineligible voters casting ballots or some form of modern ballot box stuffing.

Second, we need to research and to the extent possible quantify (here is where Steve may be helpful) what kinds of fraud are -- and are not -- really being committed before we assess the legal system's handling of such cases or make recommendations for how the states and the justice system can better address the problem. In other words we need to break down specifically how much fraud is actually taking place by type of activity, such as:

- absentee/mail ballot fraud
- ex-felons knowingly casting illegal ballots
- voting more than once
- noncitizen voting
- false registration
- intimidating practices (perhaps including legal grey areas like inappropriate challenges at the polls)
- deceptive practices
- fraud by election administrators in the handling or counting of ballots
- machine tampering

This is obviously a tall order, but to me it is only then that we will be in a position to evaluate whether states are treating and remedying the fraud issue appropriately and effectively. We could then, perhaps simultaneously or subsequently, undertake your excellent idea of analyzing the performance of all 50 states and their legal systems in this regard. In addition to nexis or westlaw searches, I suggest it might also be necessary to interview attorneys general, prosecutors, and attorneys to get the information we will require. My concern is that not every case will show up in these databases.

I also strongly recommend we also analyze how the federal system, ie the Department of Justice, both the criminal and civil rights divisions, is handling these issues. It is unclear to me that DOJ is effectively pursuing fraud cases as I defined the term above.

With respect to the working group, I don't know what Karen and Tom have in mind, but I would just add that I think we should have at least one academic, a couple of members of third party organizations, and at a couple of local election officials.

That's all I can think of for now. Let me know what you think. Hope you are enjoying the weekend.

Tova

----- Original Message -----
To: <wang@tcf.org>
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2005 10:18 PM
Subject: Re: Topics

> Tova:
> I just got in from dinner. Glad you could get back
> with me. You are correct---the scope of this project
> is unclear. I indicated to Karen that our first face
> to face meeting should be to discuss how this all will
> be accomplished. She agreed but needs a division of
> labor so she can finalize our contracts. It is my understanding that
> Steve will be doing very little because of his class schedule.
> Let me briefly outline what I know the EAC wants:
> 1. Background research on vote fraud and voter
> intimidation. In my interview, I suggested that a law
> clerk be employed to perform Lexis or Westlaw case
> research in all fifty states on these issues based on
> a list of word searches that the three (or two) of us
> come up with. We would analyze the cases and come up
> with a chart of how each state treats the issue. Karen
> and Tom liked the idea. We would need to address
> differences in state election statutes and differences
> in how the state supreme courts remedy problems.
> 2. Identifying and convening a working group. Karen
> and Tom have definite ideas of who should be in this
> group. From my experience I believe it should also
> include general counsels in the election division of
> a number of secretary of states offices or from state
> board of election commissioners offices; state
> legislators who deal with electoral issues from both politically
> divided states and from the minority party in states with a dominant
> party and judges (retired or
> sitting) who have experience with election cases.
> Here I think we need to take testimony from these
> folks and from others in the field and include it in
> the final report.
> 3. From 1 and 2 we need to better define the problem.
> The EAC wants a project scope and project work plan. I
> don't know exactly what is meant here.
> 4. A summary report describing key findings. This is
> our chance to propose some solutions.
> The EAC wants this to be a preliminary work. At first,
> they did not understand that fact finding would take
> more than just preliminary studies. I told them at my interview that
> asking lawyers to do half a job is like being a little pregnant. Karen
> agreed. I think they envision a second project where we would draft an
> rfp for a major organization. I know that the EAC will
> decide whether they want to move ahead after reviewing
> our findings. They already know the issue of vote
> fraud is a political hot potato. Historically, people
> do not want to admit vote fraud occurs until they
> become victims.
I have been involved in vote fraud prevention in the southern US for fifteen years and I know there are no easy answers. Enough from me. I hope that I answered some of your questions. Please give me your thoughts.

Regards,

Job

PS Some background-I was born in Newark, NJ and lived a little less than half my life in Newark, Millburn-Short Hills and New York City. My 87 year old uncle from Poland still lives in the City.

--- wang@tcf.org wrote:

Hi Job,

Thats a good idea, especially given Karen's most recent email. The only problem I have is that the scope of the project is a little unclear to me still. I can come up with lots of topics I'd like to look at, but don't really have a sense of what is feasible in this first stage. I also am unsure whether they would like us to work together or actually split up duties. Do you have a better understanding of this?

I did not know Patricia Young, but I really only worked for Jackson during that one election cycle. I'd love to know more about your work at some point too. And I likewise look forward to meeting you soon!

---

Tova

--- Original Message ---
From: "Job Serebrov" <Job Serebrov>
To: <wang@tcf.org>
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2005 2:06 PM
Subject: Topics

Dear Tova:

Since we will be doing the lion's share of work on the vote fraud project and in the interest of efficiency, I think it would be a good idea if we could create a topic list for the work division discussion on Tuesday. What do you think? I am looking forward to meeting you.
in the later part of September. Did you know Patricia Young who worked for Jesse Jackson some time ago? We were friends while I was getting my LLM and she was getting her JD at University of Arkansas School of Law. Regards, Job Serebrov
Hi all,

Sorry to have bolted from our phone meeting at 5 today. My wife sang the national anthem at Fenway Park this evening, and I had to take her to the stadium.

Steve
Hi Karen and Tom,

As we discussed yesterday, attached is a preliminary work plan/division of labor for your review. Please let us know if this is sufficient for the present and if you have any comments or questions.

In terms of hours dedicated to the project, Job and Tova are able to commit to 15-20 hours per week assuming that includes reimbursed periodic travel. Steve can do approximately 2 hours per week. We have tentatively scheduled to meet at your offices in DC, if that is convenient for you, on September 20. We will be able to confirm that within the next day or so.

All of us are very eager to get started on this important work as soon as possible. However, because we also have other work related responsibilities, we are a bit reluctant to do so before having an opportunity to review our contracts. We look forward to receiving them so we can get going right away.

Thanks so much. Speak to you soon.

Tova, Job and Steve

-----Original Message-----
From: klynndyson@eac.gov
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2005 3:19 PM
To: klynndyson@eac.gov; nmortellito@eac.gov
Cc: jthompson@eac.gov; nmortellito@eac.gov; sda@mit.edu; Job Serebrov; twilkey@eac.gov; wang@tcf.org
Subject: Re: Kick off activities for the EAC Voting fraud/voter intimidation project

All-

In anticipation of our 45-minute conference call scheduled for Tuesday, September 6 at 4:00 PM, I would ask the three consultants (Steve, Job and Tova) to come prepared to talk about the following:

The major topics and issues which you see as needing immediate attention, definition, delineation, etc.
Rough timelines and timeframes for addressing these major issues and topics
Your major roles and responsibilities and the timelines you envision for meeting your major deliverables

We all realize that this conversation is just a start; I look forward to this beginning and to framing the tasks that lie ahead of us between now and September 30.

Have a wonderful holiday!!
Tova, Job and Steve,

Tom and Karen would like to schedule a conference call with the three of you on Monday, September 12 at 9:30 a.m. for about 20 minutes to discuss the following:

- Finalize contracts
- Finalize consulting hours
- Define Individual roles and responsibilities
- Begin review of Working Group members

Please let me know by COB today if you can do this. Feel free to call if you don't have time to e-mail.

Many thanks.

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Executive Director - Thomas R. Wilkey
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
202.566.3127 fax
Hi Karen,

I haven't heard back from you about consulting fees and contracts for the fraud project.

Things seem to be moving ahead. Does that mean that the EAC has approved hiring me at my consulting rate of $250/hour, $2500/day?

Steve
Karen,

The national anthem was great. She described it as "an out of body experience."

I won't be able to make the conference call. I teach M and W 9 to 11 and W 1 to 4. I'll catch up with you after the call.

Thanks,

Steve

At 03:04 PM 9/9/2005, you wrote:

Steve-

Excuse my delay in responding. I've had several personal emergencies this week - they come in threes so I'm awaiting the third (smile)

Am working on your fee this afternoon. I don't think the EAC can offer a fee nearly the rate you quote but I will have a firm figure to you in time for our conference call on Monday morning at 9:30.

Also, how was your wife's singing!!! What an honor! One day I'll have to bore you with my Fenway Park stories

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Nicole:

9:30 is bad for me. It would have to be after 9:45.

Tova and Steve--I just talked with Karen and she does not see a reason why our first meeting has to be in DC. As long as the travel payment is worked out, how do you two feel about coming to Little Rock? Tova, I know you were looking for a reason to come here. I think I could arrange for a meeting room for us, perhaps in the Clinton School of Public Service.

The Monday telephone meeting is essential to contract completion.

Regards,

Job

--- nmortellito@eac.gov wrote:

> Tova, Job and Steve,
> > Tom and Karen would like to schedule a conference call with the three of you on Monday, September 12 at 9:30 a.m. for about 20 minutes to discuss the following:
> > Finalize contracts
> > Finalize consulting hours
> > Define Individual roles and responsibilities
> > Begin review of Working Group members
> >
> > Please let me know by COB today if you can do this. Feel free to call if you don't have time to e-mail. Many thanks.
> >
> > Regards,
> > Nicole K. Mortellito
> > Assistant to the Executive Director - Thomas R. Wilkey
> > U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
> > Washington, DC
> > 202.566.3114 phone
> > 202.566.3127 fax
Nicole:

Tom and Karen have my resume. I don't know if Diana has it but it would be easier for me if Tom or Karen could make a copy for Diana. This is because I sent Karen, who made Tom a copy of both my resume and a separate document called Election Activities. Can you look into this?

The number of hours we will work on this depends on the funds available for a potential law clerk and most of all travel. Both Tova and I agreed that we will have to interview others, not to mention travel for a potential working group. Tova and I envisioned working 15-20 hours per week with Steve working 2 hours per week. The reason we gave for 15 instead of 20 is to leave room for a law clerk and travel in the budget.

I don't know if you will have much success staying within the budget Karen is talking about ($60,000-$75,000) with hourly consulting rates either. For instance, before serving as a federal judicial law clerk my consulting fees were $175 per hour and now I would charge $200. If you figure that at 20 hours for 4 months you get $64,000 or $48,000 at 15 hours for 4 months. While I do believe that $75,000 may be too low for this project, hourly rates may never get you where you want to go.

What do you think?

Job

--- nmortellito@eac.gov wrote:

> To all:
> > Karen asked me to type this, she is operating with
Please, each of you, send to Karen (klynndyson@eac.gov), Tom Wilkey (twilkey@eac.gov) and Diana Scott (dscott@eac.gov):

- your resume
- your consulting fees or rates
- the number of hours per week you anticipate working on this project

The EAC staff will finalize your contracts on Monday and need this information to complete the process.

Regarding a conference call: Please advise as to whether 1pm on Tuesday or 9:30 am on Tuesday September 13 are feasible. Thank you.

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Executive Director - Thomas R. Wilkey
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3127 fax
202.566.3114 phone
Karen, what happened to you???

In any case, my resume and bio are attached. I do not have a set rate, but my understanding is that project will be $500 per 8 hour day. I anticipate working an average of 15 - 20 hours per week.

Either of those times on Tuesday work for me. FYI, Steve is unable to do a meeting on the 20th, and since he teaches Tuesday and Thursday, I'm not sure he'll be around for a call Tuesday.

Let me know if you need anything else. Have a great weekend.

Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: nmortellito@eac.gov [mailto:nmortellito@eac.gov]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2005 3:20 PM
To: nmortellito@eac.gov
Cc: klynndyson@eac.gov; Stephen Ansolabehere; 'Job Serebrov'; twilkey@eac.gov; Tova Wang
Subject: updated Conference call request

To all:

Karen asked me to type this, she is operating with one hand right now:

Please, each of you, send to Karen (klynndyson@eac.gov), Tom Wilkey (twilkey@eac.gov) and Diana Scott ( dscott@eac.gov):
  - your resume
  - your consulting fees or rates
  - the number of hours per week you anticipate working on this project

The EAC staff will finalize your contracts on Monday and need this information to complete the process.

Regarding a conference call: Please advise as to whether 1pm on Tuesday or 9:30 am on Tuesday September 13 are feasible. Thank you.

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Executive Director - Thomas R. Wilkey
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
Hi everyone,

This is disappointing because Steve is so qualified and respected. For what its worth, I would strongly support his suggestion of Mike Alvarez. I have actually spoken to Mike about doing a similar study in the past, and he already has ideas about some possible methodologies. Also, he knows everyone in the academic community and is similarly widely respected in the field. His being in LA is an obstacle, but I think not an insurmountable one by any means.

Let us know if we will be speaking tomorrow.

Thanks.

Tova

-----Original Message-----
From: Stephen Ansolabehere [mailto:sda@MIT.EDU]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2005 4:58 PM
To: klynndyson@eac.gov; wang@tcf.org;
Cc: twilkey@eac.gov
Subject: EAC Fraud Study

Karen, Tova, and Job,

I'm going to have to withdraw from the Fraud study. I found out this past week that one of my colleagues is very ill and I have agreed with my department head to take over some of his teaching and administrative responsibilities. This will effectively squeeze out any of my remaining free time over the remainder of the Fall semester.

I am disappointed to not be able to continue, but I feel that this is a time when I need to pitch in a little extra at home.

Let me recommend several alternative academic voices whom you might bring in.

Michael Alvarez at Caltech (my counterpart on the Caltech/MIT project) Thad Hall at University of Utah (he was one of the administrative/research assistants on the Ford-Carter commission and has been very active on this subject)
Richard Niemi at Rochester University
Paul Herrnson at Maryland
James Gimpel at Maryland
David Leal at American University
Jonathan Katz at Caltech

Steve Ansolabehere
Thanks Karen. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Job

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

Job-

Thanks ever so much for following up. Indeed, the Commissioners have reviewed the issue and have agreed in principle, to an approach that would entail hiring a consultant or consultants to help the EAC study and frame the issues of voter fraud and intimidation.

The idea would be that after a period of time, the consultants, and, perhaps, a working group of the EAC, would make a series of recommendations on next steps for the agency to take regarding voter fraud and intimidation.

Thanks for your patience; I hope to have a definitive answer for you by mid-July at the latest.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen:

Has there been any further discussion of the vote fraud project?

Regards,

Job
Adam did give it to me before he left...can we sit down this afternoon to discuss? Anytime after 3PM works for me.

Thanks.

RAY MARTINEZ III
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 566-3100 (W)
(202) 566-3127 (FAX)
www.eac.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message and all attachments, if any, are intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete it from your computer.
Karen:

Are we still on track to have something on paper for the vote fraud project by this Friday?

Regards,

Job
Tom/Karen:

Here is an email from Dan Lowenstein (presentor in LaJolla and co-editor of Election Law Journal) who made some suggestions on names for the voter fraud work we are trying to do. Perhaps a call to Bruce Cain at Berkeley would be appropriate.

Karen, what do you think?

RAY MARTINEZ III
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 566-3100 (W)
(202) 566-3127 (FAX)
www.eac.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message and all attachments, if any, are intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete it from your computer.

----- Forwarded by Raymundo Martinez/EAC/GOV on 07/12/2005 05:19 PM -----

"Lowenstein, Daniel"
<law@law.ucla.edu>
06/21/2005 03:28 PM

To  "Rick Hasen" <Rick.Hasen@lls.edu>, rmartinez@eac.gov
cc  "Lowenstein, Daniel" <law@law.ucla.edu>

Subject  RE: Follow-up

Ray,

Before I read Rick’s message, Steve Ansolabehere was the first name that came to my mind. This assumes you are looking for part-time, not full-time consultants. I would categorize Steve as very moderate left. I am not certain he is Democrat but would be very surprised to learn he is not. But the main thing about him is that he calls things as he sees them. So if you found a Republican with the same characteristics, that would be ideal. Charles Bullock of the University of Georgia would be a possibility. (Actually, I am not sure of his party either, but I think he may be a Republican.)
I would also suggest you talk to Bruce Cain in the Institute of Governmental Studies at Berkeley. He is very savvy and knows more political scientists than Rick and I do. When I have questions about the political science profession, he's usually the person I go to. His phone number is 510-642-1739. He is also going to be running a UC office in Washington, so he will be more or less living there for the indefinite future. He is someone you ought to get to know.

Best,

Daniel Lowenstein
UCLA Law School
405 Hilgard
Los Angeles, California 90095-1476
310-825-5148

-----Original Message-----
From: Rick Hasen [mailto:Rick.Hasen@lls.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2005 11:56 AM
To: rmartinez@eac.gov
Cc: Lowenstein, Daniel
Subject: Re: Follow-up

We are now editing articles for our next issue, which is due out in October. We need to get everything to the printer for this issue in mid-July. So we'd need something from you by early July if it were to make it into that issue. Our deadlines after that are about three months later for each issue.

As far as researchers, I give my highest recommendation to Steve Ansolabehere of MIT, who has already done a bit of research on this issue. He is truly one of the top political scientists in the country working in this field, and he is careful and very fair (I don't know whether I'd count him as "left" or "right").

Dan may have other ideas.

Rick

rmartinez@eac.gov wrote:

Rick / Dan:

Thanks for the follow-up. As I mentioned to Dan in La Jolla, I do want to commit to doing a paper for ELJ. Aside from my own interest in election law and election administration, I think it is important for your readers to gain a better understanding of the role of the EAC and all that we are
doing, particularly in the area of voting system standards and certification. Please tell me what the new deadline is and I will make sure to get you an outline of my intended submission, and of course, a timely draft for your consideration. Thanks again to both of you for the continued opportunity.

On a related note, in Section 241 of HAVA, Congress gives the EAC a laundry list of possible research topics related to improving the process of election administration. Among the suggested topics are the following:

"(6) Nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal office;
(7) Identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation."

In order to get this research project started, the EAC would like to engage two research consultants who could bring some level of knowledge and expertise to the table and help the commissioners to come to an agreement on the framework and/or scope of such a research project. Rather than sending something out on the listserv, I thought I would directly solicit your opinions about any names in the academic field that you think we ought to consider. The reason we are looking to employ two consultants is because we would like to achieve a political balance -- one from the left, and one from the right, so to speak. Any thoughts you have on this would be greatly appreciated.

Regards,

RAY MARTINEZ III
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 566-3100 (W)
(202) 566-3127 (FAX)
www.eac.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message and all attachments, if any, are intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete it from your computer.

Rick Hasen
William H. Hannon Distinguished Professor of Law
Loyola Law School
919 Albany Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-1211
(213) 736-1466
(213) 380-3769 – fax
rick.hasen@lls.edu
http://electionlawblog.org
http://www.lls.edu/academics/faculty(hasen.html)
Is the consultant going to work with the organization or will they be working on two aspects of the same issue?

Job

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

Six months.

Amounts of contracts have not been determined but are likely to be substantial, given the topic/s and its importance.

There are likely to be several contracts- one to consultants and one to an organization.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen:

Do you know yet how long the project will last (will it be a three or six month project) and what the total amount allocated for the project is?

Regards,

Job

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

Job-

I'll be in touch on Thursday or Friday with next steps on how the EAC would like to proceed on this voter fraud/intimidation project.

Thanks for your patience.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Good Approach
Ok. Glad your e-mail is working again.

Regards,

Job

*klynndyson@eac.gov* wrote:

Greetings, Job-

To be on the safe side let's say early next week.

I just got the feedback I have needed to move forward on this project and I need to do a little further research to finish up the project description.

Thanks for your patience-

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
Karen:

Are we still on track to have something on paper for the vote fraud project by this Friday?

Regards,

Job
Juliet E. Thompson
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
----- Forwarded by Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/GOV on 07/22/2005 11:51 AM -----

"Job Serebrov"

Julie:

It was good talking with you today. Congrats on the wedding. Please give me your address so I can send a card.

My resume is attached. I would be eternally grateful if you could talk the new director into hiring another attorney. I would really enjoy working with you and getting back into Election law. It would not bother me if the job lasted from September 2005 for one or two years. Once I was in DC I would be able to make a lateral move.

Best Regards,

Job ResumeInternational.doc
Hi,

I got your phone messages, but missed you when I've called back. I've been in the office intermittently this month (family vacations), but I'm regularly on email. My email address is sda@mit.edu.

I would very much like to work with the EAC as you develop procedures for detecting fraud. Could you give me a sense of what you seek to do and what time commitments and research would be involved?

I will be in DC at the end of August for the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. I am personally very committed to helping the EAC succeed.

Steve Ansolabehere
Karen:

I will call you tomorrow to discuss this.

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Thanks for getting back to me with your August time
> schedule and availability. We have several candidates we are
> considering for this position and plan to interview them in the next 2-3
> weeks.
> Perhaps we will able to arrange a date and time in
> late August, when you might be available to come to Washington to meet
> with the EAC staff and Commissioners. Let me know what dates and times
> work for you.

> Regards-

> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123

> "Job Serebrov"
> 07/21/2005 02:24 PM
> To
> klynndyson@eac.gov
> cc
> bcc
> Subject Re: project
Karen:

Getting to DC before the second week in August is not possible. First, there is no way that I could get a ticket in any acceptable price range that quick. More importantly, I am in the last month of my judicial clerkship and committed to the judge that I would be here until August 15th to finish all of my cases and anything else for this court term. My official last day is August 19th.

I think it may be a good idea for us to talk about this.

Regards,

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Job-

> I write to see if you might be available to come to Washington on Monday, August 1 to meet with several EAC staff and Commissioners to discuss the voter fraud/voter intimidation project and your possible work as a consultant on the project.

> I'd like to schedule this 1-2 hour meeting for sometime between 1 and 3 in the afternoon.

> Might you be available to come to Washington for this?

> Regards-

> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123

016199
Karen:

Getting to DC before the second week in August is not possible. First, there is no way that I could get a ticket in any acceptable price range that quick. More importantly, I am in the last month of my judicial clerkship and committed to the judge that I would be here until August 15th to finish all of my cases and anything else for this court term. My official last day is August 19th.

I think it may be a good idea for us to talk about this.

Regards,

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Job-
> 
> I write to see if you might be available to come to Washington on Monday, August 1 to meet with several EAC staff and Commissioners to discuss the voter fraud/voter intimidation project and your possible work as a consultant on the project.
>
> I'd like to schedule this 1-2 hour meeting for sometime between 1 and 3 in the afternoon.
>
> Might you be available to come to Washington for this?
>
> Regards-
> 
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
I finally was able to get my voice mail messages and had one from Tova and she is exited about doing this project. Give her a call on Monday amnd I will see her over the weekend.

Tom

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Karen Lynn-Dyson

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 07/21/2005 05:54 PM
To: Job Serebrov*/@GSAEXTERNAL
Subject: Re: project

Job-

Thanks for getting back to me with your August time schedule and availability. We have several candidates we are considering for this position and plan to interview them in the next 2-3 weeks.

Perhaps we will able to arrange a date and time in late August, when you might be available to come to Washington to meet with the EAC staff and Commissioners. Let me know what dates and times work for you.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Job Serebrov" /*

Karen:

Getting to DC before the second week in August is not possible. First, there is no way that I could get a ticket in any acceptable price range that quick. More
importantly, I am in the last month of my judicial clerkship and committed to the judge that I would be here until August 15th to finish all of my cases and anything else for this court term. My official last day is August 19th.

I think it may be a good idea for us to talk about this.

Regards,

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Job-
> 
> I write to see if you might be available to come to Washington on Monday, August 1 to meet with several EAC staff and Commissioners to discuss the voter fraud/voter intimidation project and your possible work as a consultant on the project.
> 
> I'd like to schedule this 1-2 hour meeting for sometime between 1 and 3 in the afternoon.
> 
> Might you be available to come to Washington for this ?
> 
> Regards-
> 
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
> 
>
Carol and Karen,

Please find attached my memo concerning areas of study the EAC may wish to pursue and trends in voter fraud concerns. In the summary, I have made recommendations for three possible areas of study.

If I can help in any other way on this project, please let me know. I will be in the office Monday and Tuesday of next week.

Also, the stack of papers on which my recommendations are based is on my desk should you need it before I see you again.

Have a great weekend.

Tamar Nedzar
Law Clerk
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-2256
http://www.eac.gov
TNedzar@eac.gov
Both days are free at that time.

At 04:16 PM 8/2/2005, you wrote:

Steve-

I write to see if you would be available on August 16 or August 17 at 10:00 AM to speak for about an hour, with Tom Wilkey, EAC's Executive Director, and me, about the consulting work related to our voter fraud and intimidation project.

Thanks for letting me know your availability.

I will be certain to get you a Statement of Work before the end of this week

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen:

It could take me until Friday to give you an answer. I am waiting for a response to know whether and when I will be in Wisconsin. If I go, it will be by car. I will let you know as soon as I can.

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Job-
> I write to see if you would be available on August 16 or August 17 at 10:30 AM to speak, for about one hour, with Tom Wilkey, EAC's Executive Director, and me, about the consulting work related to our voter fraud and intimidation project.
> Thanks for letting me know your availability.
> I will be certain to get you a Statement of Work before the end of this week.
> Regards-
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
Karen:

I may be in Wisconsin that week but if I am I will give you the phone number of the place where I am staying. Additionally, I am contemplating getting a cell phone. If I do, you can call me on it.

Regards,
Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Yes, Tom Wilkey and I will be interviewing folks via telephone week after next.
> Regards-
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel:202-566-3123
> 
> 
> "Job Serebrov" 07/31/2005 05:05 PM
> 
> To
> klynndyson@eac.gov
> cc
> 
> Subject
> Commission
> 
> Karen:
> Did the Commission decide how to proceed?
> Job
Monday is fine. When are good times?

As for an in person meeting, I will be in DC over the Labor Day weekend, from Wed. Aug. 31 through Sat. Sept. 3 for the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. We can meet then or I can come to DC for a day trip before then if necessary.

Steve

At 05:07 PM 7/26/2005, you wrote:

Hi Steve-

Unfortunately, I'm in the air most of tomorrow- out to Pasadena for one of our public meetings.

Any chance we could talk on Monday morning when I return?

I would also like to set up formal time that you, Tom Wilkey and I can chat about this project and learn more about your interest in working as one of three consultants on this project for the next six months (part-time, of course)

Let me know a time when we can talk next week

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Re: fraud consultation

Karen,

Would it be possible to speak on the phone tomorrow between 11 and 12 or after 2? My office phone number is 617-253-5236.

Steve

At 01:02 PM 7/22/2005, you wrote:

Hi Steve-

In the absence of being able to touch base via telephone-

The EAC is currently seeking several consultants who could work parttime for a six month period (Sept-Feb) to help the agency development a work plan and statement of work around a project the agency might do related to voter fraud and voter intimidation.

For a number of reasons the EAC is interested in involving several consultants in this initial look at the topic. This initial exploration will help the Agency determine how, if at all, it would want to put together a larger project that would be given to an institution or organization to conduct.

I am putting the finishing touches on a consultant statement of work and will send it out to you in the next week to ten days.

It is important for the EAC to contract with these consultants by early September so that they can begin work on this initial work plan before the end of the Federal fiscal year, which is September 30.

Do let me know a particular time and date when we might be able to speak to one another.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Stephen Ansolabehere" <sda@MIT.EDU>
Hi,

I got your phone messages, but missed you when I've called back. I've been in the office intermittently this month (family vacations), but I'm regularly on email. My email address is sda@mit.edu.

I would very much like to work with the EAC as you develop procedures for detecting fraud. Could you give me a sense of what you seek to do and what time commitments and research would be involved?

I will be in DC at the end of August for the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. I am personally very committed to helping the EAC succeed.

Steve Ansolabehere
Great -- I can be reached at 212-362-5223. I look forward to it. Tova

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <klynndyson@eac.gov>
To: <wang@tcf.org>
Cc: <nmortellito@eac.gov>; <twilkey@eac.gov>
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2005 10:44 AM
Subject: Re: meeting

Hi Karen, That sounds perfect. Should I call you? Thanks so much. Tova

----- Original Message ----- 
From: klynndyson@eac.gov
To: wang@tcf.org
Cc: twilkey@eac.gov, nmortellito@eac.gov
Re: meeting
Subject: RE: meeting
We would like to tentatively schedule our conversation for August 19 at 10:30 AM.

We will work diligently to get a description of the consulting assignment to you by mid-week next week.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

Hi Karen,

I will actually be in Seattle speaking at the National Conference on State Legislatures those days. I could call in to you by cellphone on the 17th (although it will be 6:30 am my time!) Alternatively, I can speak by phone or come down to DC the 19th or any day the following week. Tom and I will also both be at NASED in LA at the end of next week I believe.

Let me know what you would prefer. Thanks, and I look forward to talking to you.

Tova

---Original Message---
From: klynndyson@eac.gov [mailto:klynndyson@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2005 3:20 PM
To: wang@tcf.org
Subject: Re: meeting
I write to see if you would be available on August 16 or August 17 at 9:30 AM to speak, for about one hour, with Tom Wilkey, and me, about the consulting work related to our voter fraud and intimidation project.

Thanks for letting me know your availability.

I will be certain to get you a Statement of Work before the end of this week.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>

07/25/2005 02:55 PM
To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc
Subject meeting

Hi Karen,

I am still in St. Paul but I got your message. The best date for me to come down would be August 23 with August 25 as my second choice. Let me know if either of these works for you. I very much look forward to seeing you and talking to you more about this project.

I’ll be back in the office tomorrow if you would like to talk.

Thanks so much.

Tova
I will put Aug. 17 in my calendar.

At 05:04 PM 8/4/2005, you wrote:

Steve-

We would like to tentative schedule our conversation for August 17 at 10:00 am

We will work diligently to get a description of the consulting assignment to you by midweek next week.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Both days are free at that time.

At 04:16 PM 8/2/2005, you wrote:

Steve-

I write to see if you would be available on August 16 or August 17 at 10:00 AM to speak for about an hour,
with Tom Wilkey, EAC's Executive Director, and me, about the consulting work related to our voter fraud and intimidation project.

Thanks for letting me know your availability.

I will be certain to get you a Statement of Work before the end of this week.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
captured and inserted.

Regards,

Nicole K. Mortellito
Assistant to the Executive Director - Thomas R. Wilkey
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue - Suite 1100
Washington, DC
202.566.3114 phone
202.566.3127 fax
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
08/16/2005 03:09 PM
To Nicole Mortellito/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Fw: Finishing touches on the Statement of Work for the Voter Fraud/Intimidation consultants

Hey-

Could you insert this in the Voter Fraud/Intimidation SOW?

Thanks

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Text of the Work for Hire Clause -- may need to be edited to reflect the deliverables of this contract

1. **Work for Hire.** The services performed under the terms of this agreement are considered "work for hire," and any intellectual property or deliverables, including but not limited to, research, policies, procedures, manuals, and other works submitted; or which are specified to be delivered; or which are developed or produced and paid for by EAC, shall be owned exclusively by EAC, including copyright. EAC or its assignees have the exclusive right to reproduce all work products from this agreement without further payment to the Contractor.

Juliet E. Thompson  
General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3100
Text of the Work for Hire Clause -- may need to be edited to reflect the deliverables of this contract

1. Work for Hire. The services performed under the terms of this agreement are considered “work for hire,” and any intellectual property or deliverables, including but not limited to, research, policies, procedures, manuals, and other works submitted; or which are specified to be delivered; or which are developed or produced and paid for by EAC, shall be owned exclusively by EAC, including copyright. EAC or its assignees have the exclusive right to reproduce all work products from this agreement without further payment to the Contractor.

Juliet E. Thompson
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

08/16/2005 02:52 PM

Subject: Re: Finishing touches on the Statement of Work for the Voter Fraud/Intimidation consultants

All-

This morning the Commissioners approved the Statement of Work for the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation project consultants, with the caveat that some additional language would be added and the SOW polished up.

Tom, Peg and I are scheduled to interview the first candidate tomorrow morning at 10:00 am and will need your edits to this SOW by COB today.

I am attaching the item again, just in case you don't have a copy. Since I have an appointment out of the office and will be leaving at 4:00 today, I ask that you get your changes and edits to Nicole so that she may enter them and get the revised copy to the candidate first thing in the morning.

Thanks for your input on this.
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
Karen,

I have purposely not directed this response to Nicole. The GSA contact is out of the office until tomorrow, 8,17. Based on how Dan's compensation was derived at, he receives $52.083/hour. Perhaps it would be comparable for this individual to get $50/hour. If that is the case, then the total contract amount would be $10,000. Since we haven't spoken, how does that compare to what you had in mind?

Diana M. Scott
Administrative Officer
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202) 566-3100 (office)
(202) 566-3127 (fax)
dscott@eac.gov

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
08/16/2005 02:52 PM

All-

This morning the Commissioners approved the Statement of Work for the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation project consultants, with the caveat that some additional language would be added and the SOW polished up.

Tom, Peg and I are scheduled to interview the first candidate tomorrow morning at 10:00 am and will need your edits to this SOW by COB today.

I am attaching the item again, just in case you don't have a copy. Since I have an appointment out of the office and will be leaving at 4:00 today, I ask that you get your changes and edits to Nicole so that she may enter them and get the revised copy to the candidate first thing in the morning.

Thanks for your input on this.

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
08/16/2005 02:52 PM
Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Research Manager  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
tel:202-566-3123
Any luck on producing the Statement of Work? Has the EAC HR Office decided on fees yet?

Regards,

Job
Karen:

I do not know what federal government attorney consultants are paid--can you give me any idea? I know that we discussed a couple of figures.

Job

klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

Job-

We'll be sending you the Statement of Work momentarily. Fees are still being worked on, but will be competitive with what Federal Government Attorney consultants are paid.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen:

I enjoyed the discussion too. I really think that this project will be of national importance and can positively affect elections administration while providing an answer to the handling of the vote fraud problem for the future.

On another note, why don't you leave an evening free while I am there for dinner. I am trying to bring my wife along. If you can bring your husband it could make for an interesting evening.

Regards,

Job

Summary of Election Activities of Job Serebrov

Background to Election Problems in Arkansas

Ever since Reconstruction, Arkansas has had a history of election problems. The election fraud that gave rise to the Brooks-Baxter War in Arkansas in the 1870s involved people from both sides of the aisle voting more than once, the dead rising to cast a ballot or two, destroying ballots, creating ballots and making ballot boxes disappear. A strong one-party system perpetuated this tradition into modern times.

In 1995, I met with Arkansas Supreme Court Justice Tom Glaze to discuss voting issues and my efforts to clean up the electoral process. Although supportive, Justice Glaze encouraged me to proceed with caution. Before being elected to the Supreme Court, Justice Glaze had been employed in the 1960s by Gov. Win Rockefeller to clean up ballot fraud throughout Arkansas. He was nearly disbarred in the process by those involved in ballot fraud in a small, rural county.

Shortly after my discussion with Justice Glaze, I discovered how pervasive the election problems were in the state. For instance, ballot boxes were stuffed or disappeared into the night only to return altered. Contrary to state law, county sheriffs running in contested elections maintained custody of the ballot boxes. In one instance, 20 voted ballot boxes were found in the attic of a sheriff's deputy after he died.

In my private practice as an attorney, I represented numerous clients in county election contests throughout Arkansas. I also represented clients in matters before the Federal Election Commission. I have never lost an election case. Finally, I was hired as a consultant to a major nonprofit legal organization to review and summarize the 2002 amendments to federal election laws and apply the new law to 10 scenarios.

Member, Washington County Board of Election Commissioners, Fayetteville, Arkansas (1990-1996)

This board consisted of three commissioners; I was the lone Republican. We were charged with supervising the training of poll workers, evaluating voting systems and then purchasing an optical scan system to be used countywide, preparing and justifying our annual budget before the Washington County Quorum Court, hiring and supervising staff and sitting as an administrative tribunal.

When I first came on the board, Washington County was primarily a one-party county and the Democrats were used to running elections according to tradition rather than the law. I had to battle with the two Democrats on the board to enforce election laws within the county. As I started to force the issue in the courts, the Republican Party gained strength. Four years later and after outlasting eight Democrat commissioners, I was able to work with new Democrat commissioners who recognized the need to enforce the law. At this point, the commission requested that I draft administrative regulations for the board. These remain in place today.

Founder, President, General Counsel; Arkansans for Fair Elections (1994-1999)

In 1994, Gov. Mike Huckabee (R), then a candidate for lieutenant governor, asked me to serve as his general counsel for ballot fraud protection. Thinking it best to act independently of any candidate, I formed Arkansans for Fair Elections. I served as the organization's president and, later, general counsel. This group launched a statewide educational campaign to train poll watchers to recognize irregular or fraudulent electoral procedures; this included the creation of literature and a video. Our extensive public relations campaign brought media attention to the issue. We also organized a statewide team of citizen poll watchers and attorneys to ensure that the election laws were fairly enforced. We were so successful in the lieutenant governor's race that Arkansans for Fair Elections was asked to continue the effort until 1999 when I moved to Louisiana.
General Counsel - Ballot Fraud Protection Committee, Republican Party of Arkansas (1995-1999)

In late 1995, Asa Hutchinson, chairman of the Republican Party of Arkansas, appointed me as general counsel for the newly formed Ballot Fraud Protection Committee of the state party. I retained this position until 1999. I was responsible for coordinating statewide enforcement efforts and directing a legal team to respond to problematic situations prior to and on election day.

(Through my role with Arkansans for Fair Elections and the Ballot Fraud Protection Committee, I successfully sued or negotiated a settlement in more than two-thirds of the 75 counties in Arkansas over electoral irregularities.)

Legal Consultant to Republican Members of the Arkansas General Assembly (1994-1996)

Republicans in the General Assembly requested that I review and draft suggested changes to Arkansas election law. Based on my personal experience as an election commissioner and as an election attorney, I identified a number of areas of concern and drafted new statutes modeled on the best examples that I could find from other states. My proposal was not passed by the Democrat-controlled General Assembly as a package, however, several of its components were passed into law.

Consultant to the Arkansas Court of Appeals Redistricting Commission (1996-1999)

I drafted five redistricting bills and maps for the constitutionally required redistricting of the Arkansas Court of Appeals. These bills were based on current U.S. Supreme Court precedent regarding gerrymandering. I had to present each bill and give supporting testimony to the commission.

Director of International Development - Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana (2000-2003)

Part of my duties as director was to develop international cooperative projects. The theme of several of these proposals was democratization. In each case, I required review of the national election code of the country involved.

My activities in Namibia led to a request by the director of the Namibian Election Commission, Joram Rukambe and the Speaker of the Namibian National Assembly, Dr. Mose Tjitendero to review and suggest changes to the Namibian election code. This review
took three months and resulted in proposed alterations to a number of code sections. These suggestions were considered by the Namibian National Assembly and a number were incorporated into the code revisions. Additionally, I drafted legislation for the Speaker to guarantee voting rights to agricultural workers that were being denied by the owners of the farms. This legislation also was passed into law.

During this time, I was qualified as an election expert and placed on an election consultant list by the United Nations, IFES and the Electoral Institute of Southern Africa.

Related Memberships

- Republican Party of Arkansas (1990-1999)
- Benton County, Arkansas, Republican Committee (1996-1999)
- Washington County, Arkansas, Republican Committee (1990-1996)

(When we moved to Louisiana in 1999, the party was in such turmoil that it was difficult to get involved. This past year, I have been prohibited by the Hatch Act from participating in partisan politics. This prohibition ends August 19 when my judicial clerkship ends.)

Related Education

- Graduate certificate in electoral governance, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia (2003)
Thanks.

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Job-
> > I've proposed your questions/suggestions on to our
> > Finance Director.
> > She and I will be back in touch with a suggested
> > rate and payment schedule
> > Regards-
> > Karen Lynn-Dyson
> > Research Manager
> > U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> > 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> > Washington, DC 20005
> > tel:202-566-3123
> >
> > "Job Serebrov"  
> > 08/19/2005 02:15 PM
> >
> > To
> > "Karen Lynn Dyson" <klynndyson@eac.gov>
> > cc
> >
> > Subject
> > Fees Issue
> >
> >
> > Karen:
> > I know that we discussed this before and I did not
> > feel that it was a good idea to bring up at the
> > interview but I find that with projects such as this
> > one and attorney's fees it is best if there is a
> > total
> > sum for each attorney hired for the project. We
> > discussed several amounts. That figure can be paid
> > monthly, quarterly, or whatever the Commission likes
> > best. Time or hourly billing for something like this
> > is generally not done and I think is a bad idea.
Thoughts?

Regards,

Job
Hi Steve-

Unfortunately, I'm in the air most of tomorrow- out to Pasadena for one of our public meetings.

Any chance we could talk on Monday morning, when I return?

I would also like to set up formal time that you, Tom Wilkey and I can chat about this project and learn more about your interest in working as one of three consultants on this project for the next six months (part-time, of course)

Let me know a time when we can talk next week.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen,  

Would it be possible to speak on the phone tomorrow between 11 and 12 or after 2? My office phone number is 617-253-5236.

Steve

At 01:02 PM 7/22/2005, you wrote:

Hi Steve-

In the absence of being able to touch base via telephone-
The EAC is currently seeking several consultants who could work parttime for a six month period (Sept-Feb) to help the agency develop a work plan and statement of work around a project the agency might do related to voter fraud and voter intimidation.

For a number of reasons the EAC is interested in involving several consultants in this initial look at the topic. This initial exploration will help the Agency determine how, if at all, it would want to put together a larger project that would be given to an institution or organization to conduct.

I am putting the finishing touches on a consultant statement of work and will send it out to you in the next week to ten days.

It is important for the EAC to contract with these consultants by early September so that they can begin work on this initial work plan before the end of the Federal fiscal year, which is September 30.

Do let me know a particular time and date when we might be able to speak to one another.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

"Stephen Ansolabehere" <sda@MIT.EDU>

07/22/2005 08:25 AM
klyndyson@eac.gov
fraud consultation

Hi,

I got your phone messages, but missed you when I’ve called back. I’ve been in the office intermittently this month (family vacations), but I’m regularly on email. My email address is sda@mit.edu.

I would very much like to work with the EAC as you develop
procedures for detecting fraud. Could you give me a sense of what you seek to do and what time commitments and research would be involved?

I will be in DC at the end of August for the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. I am personally very committed to helping the EAC succeed.

Steve Ansolabehere
Yes, Tom Wilkey and I will be interviewing folks via telephone week after next.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Job Serebrov" @GSAEXTERNAL

Karen:

Did the Commission decide how to proceed?

Job
Job-

I write to see if you would be available on August 16 or August 17 at 10:30 AM to speak, for about one hour, with Tom Wilkey, EAC's Executive Director, and me, about the consulting work related to our voter fraud and intimidation project.

Thanks for letting me know your availability.

I will be certain to get you a Statement of Work before the end of this week.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Steve-

I write to see if you would be available on August 16 or August 17 at 10:00 AM to speak, for about an hour, with Tom Wilkey, EAC's Executive Director, and me, about the consulting work related to our voter fraud and intimidation project.

Thanks for letting me know your availability.

I will be certain to get you a Statement of Work before the end of this week.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
08/02/2005 04:19 PM

To "Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
bcc

Subject Re: meeting

Tova-

I write to see if you would be available on August 16 or August 17 at 9:30 AM to speak, for about one hour, with Tom Wilkey, and me, about the consulting work related to our voter fraud and intimidation project.

Thanks for letting me know your availability.

I will be certain to get you a Statement of Work before the end of this week.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Tova Wang" <wang@tcf.org>

Hi Karen,

I am still in St. Paul but I got your message. The best date for me to come down would be August 23 with August 25 as my second choice. Let me know if either of these works for you. I very much look forward to seeing you and talking to you more about this project.

I'll be back in the office tomorrow if you would like to talk.

Thanks so much.

Tova
You'll notice from the e-mails to Tova, Job and Steve, that I've staggered the calls within 30 minutes of one another.

I did this, because it occurred to me that we may want to interview them all at once or in succession, one after another.

Once they tell us a date, then you can decide how best to conduct the interviews. And, once that's decided I'll go back to them and give them a precise time when we'll be talking to them.

Thanks

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
Greetings-

Tom Wilkey and I are working to schedule a series of conference calls with three consultants we have identified to work with us to help us develop the voter fraud and voter intimidation project.

We have tentatively scheduled a series of telephone interviews with these three consultants (all of whom would be hired to work on this project) for August 17, 18 and 19.

Attached you will find a draft of a Statement of Work that has been developed for these consultants. Dan Murphy's contract was used as a template for this.

I've sent this document to you all because I need your edits and corrections to this document, based on your expertise either in contracting, human resources or the subject area.

Since Tom and I will be interviewing the candidates in two weeks, I'm hoping you can react to the document and get to Tom and Nicole your changes by mid-week next week.

I will then ask Nicole to send the draft statement of work to the three candidates, so they might refer to it, prior to our interviews.

Thanks for your input and assistance.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Job-

I write to see if you might be available to come to Washington on Monday, August 1 to meet with several EAC staff and Commissioners to discuss the voter fraud/voter intimidation project and your possible work as a consultant on the project.

I'd like to schedule this 1-2 hour meeting for sometime between 1 and 3 in the afternoon.

Might you be available to come to Washington for this?

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
Thanks for getting back to me with your August time schedule and availability. We have several candidates we are considering for this position and plan to interview them in the next 2-3 weeks.

Perhaps we will be able to arrange a date and time in late August, when you might be available to come to Washington to meet with the EAC staff and Commissioners. Let me know what dates and times work for you.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

Karen:

Getting to DC before the second week in August is not possible. First, there is no way that I could get a ticket in any acceptable price range that quick. More importantly, I am in the last month of my judicial clerkship and committed to the judge that I would be here until August 15th to finish all of my cases and anything else for this court term. My official last day is August 19th.

I think it may be a good idea for us to talk about this.

Regards,

Job
--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Job-

> I write to see if you might be available to come to
> Washington on Monday,
> August 1 to meet with several EAC staff and
> Commissioners to discuss the
> voter fraud/voter intimidation project and your
> possible work as a
> consultant on the project.

> I'd like to schedule this 1-2 hour meeting for
> sometime between 1 and 3 in
> the afternoon.

> Might you be available to come to Washington for
> this?

> Regards-

> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel: 202-566-3123
Hi Steve-

In the absence of being able to touch base via telephone-

The EAC is currently seeking several consultants who could work part-time for a six month period (Sept-Feb) to help the agency develop a work plan and statement of work around a project the agency might do related to voter fraud and voter intimidation.

For a number of reasons the EAC is interested in involving several consultants in this initial look at the topic. This initial exploration will help the Agency determine how, if at all, it would want to put together a larger project that would be given to an institution or organization to conduct.

I am putting the finishing touches on a consultant statement of work and will send it out to you in the next week to ten days.

It is important for the EAC to contract with these consultants by early September so that they can begin work on this initial work plan before the end of the Federal fiscal year, which is September 30.

Do let me know a particular time and date when we might be able to speak to one another.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Stephen Ansolabehere" <sda@mit.edu>
time commitments and research would be involved?

I will be in DC at the end of August for the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. I am personally very committed to helping the EAC succeed.

Steve Ansolabehere
Thanks Tova-

As I mentioned in my message, I'm putting the finishing touches on the Statement of Work and will get that to you shortly.

At the moment, we have several other consultant candidates for this project. Ideally, you all could/would work as a team on the project.

One of the candidates has suggested that we might be able to set up a series of conference calls in lieu of in-person interviews, that may prove very difficult to schedule in August.

I'm working on this as a possibility for that third week in August, as well.

Will be in touch.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Hi All-

Well, I have the unhappy task of trying to identify a date and time when we might schedule a series of conference calls with the consultants we've identified as possible candidates to work on the voter fraud/intimidation project.

Since August is impossible and horrible in terms of everyone being in the same place, I thought it might be easier to try and schedule three calls—one hour each in duration—in which the Commissioners could talk to these candidates.

I'd like to "start the bidding" for the week of August 15.

Actually, I happen to know that all of the candidates could be available August 22 or 23 at some point in the day.

Let me know if your folks could be available by phone at any of these days and times.

Thanks

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
07/26/2005 04:49 PM
To Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
bcc
Subject Re: Conference call to "interview" potential voter fraud/intimidation consultants

Oh- great. Sorry, I misunderstood. I'll let the Special Assistants know this.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV

07/26/2005 04:25 PM
To Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Re: Conference call to "interview" potential voter fraud/intimidation consultants

Really I think it should be just the two of us.
I think I should follow up and get resumes/cv for several of them and then we'll make a decision.

I'm not certain how well known or well respected our Republican pick is- but Julie seems to think well of him.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Raymundo Martinez/EAC/GOV

Raymundo
Martinez/EAC/GOV
07/12/2005 05:24 PM

To Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC, Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Fw: Follow-up

Tom/Karen:

Here is an email from Dan Lowenstein (presentor in LaJolla and co-editor of Election Law Journal) who made some suggestions on names for the voter fraud work we are trying to do. Perhaps a call to Bruce Cain at Berkeley would be appropriate.

Karen, what do you think?
Greetings, Job-

To be on the safe side let's say early next week.

I just got the feedback I have needed to move forward on this project and I need to do a little further research to finish up the project description.

Thanks for your patience-

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

Karen:

Are we still on track to have something on paper for the vote fraud project by this Friday?

Regards,

Job
I've placed another call to Dr. Steve and still have not touched base with him.

I'd like to propose that, should I not hear from him by Wednesday of this week, we go ahead with the idea of a Job Sebarov/ Tova Wang consulting team to develop a project scope of work for the EAC around voter fraud and intimidation.

I'd like to further suggest that we bring them in for interviews with Ray, Paul and other key EAC staff on Monday August 1.

If we are able to line up Dr. Steve as a consultant on this project, I would suggest he also be brought in for an interview on this day.

Thoughts?

Thanks

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Dr. Steve is out until the later part of this week. I think we should go ahead and schedule interviews for Job S. and Tova W. for August 1 in the afternoon.

Tom-

Could you contact Tova about this project, verify her interest and availability to serve as a 6 month part-time consultant on the project?

Tom and Carol-

Who should do the interviewing? Paul, Ray, Tom, Julie, others? Is this a panel interview or interviews with individual EAC staff? Shall we have them interview separately or together?

I will then check the schedules of the EAC interviewers to determine if August 1, say 2:00-4:00, works for them.

Thanks,

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Job-

I'll be in touch on Thursday or Friday with next steps on how the EAC would like to proceed on this voter fraud/intimidation project.

Thanks for your patience.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Six months.

Amounts of contracts have not been determined but are likely to be substantial, given the topic/s and its importance.

There are likely to be several contracts- one to consultants and one to an organization.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Subject: Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation Job Description

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
Ray-

As was discussed yesterday- you will get me the names of consultants and organizations who you think will be good for us to consider employing as consultants to help us frame our work around voter fraud and intimidation.

Once I have a list of names and resumes, I will work with Tom Wilkey to come up with a recommendation of a consultant or consultants to use on this project.

Thanks for your input.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Thanks, Ray. Paul said he would take a look at it over the weekend and get back to me. I would think he concurs that he wants to take the lead on this effort.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123
Commissioners-

Attached please find a first draft of a short job description outlining EAC's expectations for a project consultant on voter fraud.

As you are aware, Julie has shared with me the resume of someone with an interest in the position. Ray has indicated that he participates in a legal list-serve group that has recently focused on voter fraud issues. This list-serve is probably a good place to "advertise" the consultant opportunity.

Let me know you thoughts on next steps. I look forward to getting this project up and running.

Regards-

K
Job Description
U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voter Fraud Project Consultant

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) seeks to identify a senior-level project consultant to assist with the oversight and development of a study and possible project examining U.S. election voter fraud.

The consultant must have a knowledge of voter fraud and an understanding of the complexities, nuances and challenges which surround the topic. The EAC is particularly interested in candidates with experience in elections, with public policy and the law. The consultant must be able to demonstrate an ability to approach the issue of voter fraud in a balanced, nonpartisan fashion.

This consultant, whose contract would run for the period June-November, 2005, would be responsible for conceptualizing a project scope of work around the issue and from that, developing a statement of work for a research project around the topic.

In consultation with EAC staff, EAC Commissioners, and other key EAC stakeholders, the consultant will develop a project plan around voter fraud. The consultant will recommend certain EAC project activities related to voter fraud and will develop a scope of work for an EAC research study on voter fraud. The consultant will oversee and manage various processes related to EAC contracts awarded for work related to voter fraud.

EAC’s consultant fees are competitive and are awarded based on the candidates’ relevant background and experience.
Karen:

I do have some changes to suggest to the language of this job description... I may not get to it this morning, but should get to it by early afternoon. Has Paul given you any comments on this?? Since Paul is the one pushing for this study to be conducted, it seems to me that he should do the "heavy lifting" on moving this forward. Just a thought.

I'll get back to you this afternoon.

Thanks.

RAY MARTINEZ III
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 566-3100 (W)
(202) 566-3127 (FAX)
www.eac.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message and all attachments, if any, are intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete it from your computer.
Dear Karen:

Thanks for calling about the potential voter fraud project. I spoke to Julie this morning and indicated that I had done some voter fraud research in the late 90s while proposing revisions in statutory language and criminal penalties for criminal election violations in Arkansas. I would be interested in the contract for this project.

I am looking forward to discussing the with you in the next few weeks.

Regards,

Job
Karen:

Per our discussion, I should have some names later today of possible academic researchers for the voter fraud/voter intimidation study. I assume you are collecting names from the other commissioners as well. Additionally, I ran across the article below in today's Seattle Times...

Wednesday, June 22, 2005, 12:00 A.M. Pacific

6 accused of casting multiple votes

By Keith Ervin
Seattle Times staff reporter

Criminal charges have been filed against six more King County voters for allegedly casting more than one ballot under a variety of circumstances in last November's election, prosecutors said yesterday.

Two defendants, William A. Davis of Federal Way and Grace E. Martin of Enumclaw, were accused of casting absentee ballots in the names of their recently deceased spouses, Sonoko Davis and Lawrence Martin, respectively.

A mother and daughter were also charged with casting a ballot in the name of the mother's dead husband. The mother, Harline H.L. Ng, and her daughter, Winnie W.Y. Ng, both of Seattle, signed their names as witnesses to the "X" marked on the ballot of Jacob Ng, who had died in February 2004.

Jared R. Hoadley of Seattle was accused of casting a ballot in the name of Hans Pitzen, who had lived at the same Seattle address as Hoadley and who died last May.

Dustin S. Collings, identified as a homeless Seattle resident, was charged with casting two ballots, both using the alias of Dustin Ocoilain, a name that was listed twice on the voter-registration rolls.

The defendants are charged with repeat voting, a gross misdemeanor that carries possible jail time of up to one year and a fine of up to $5,000.
Election officials asked prosecutors to investigate the voters after news reporters and a blogger reported that they may have voted twice. The voters will be arraigned July 5 in King County District Court.

Two other voters previously received deferred sentences — and avoided jail time — after they pleaded guilty to charges of repeat voting.

The King County Sheriff's Office is investigating several other cases, prosecutors reported yesterday. The investigations resulted from the intense scrutiny surrounding the governor's election in which Democrat Christine Gregoire defeated Republican Dino Rossi by 129 votes after he narrowly won two earlier vote counts.

After the November election, prosecutors also successfully challenged the voter registrations of 648 felons whose right to vote had not been restored.

Keith Ervin: 206-464-2105 or kervin@seattletimes.com

Copyright © 2005 The Seattle Times Company

RAY MARTINEZ III
Commissioner
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 566-3100 (W)
(202) 566-3127 (FAX)
www.eac.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message and all attachments, if any, are intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete it from your computer.
I assume you saw this in the post.

washingtonpost.com

Vote Buying a Way of Life in W.Va. County

By LAWRENCE MESSINA
The Associated Press
Monday, June 20, 2005; 5:09 PM

HAMLIN, W.Va. -- According to political lore, just before John F. Kennedy's momentous win in the 1960 West Virginia primary, the Democratic boss of Logan County asked the Kennedy campaign for "35"—meaning $3,500—to buy votes for the presidential candidate. In an apparent misunderstanding, Kennedy's people delivered $35,000 in cash in two briefcases.

West Virginia's coal country has a long and rich history of vote-buying—which explains why many folks in Lincoln County all but shrugged over the indictment last month of five people on federal charges they secured votes for liquor or a $20 bill or two.

Sharrell Lovejoy, 83, said he has heard rumors of vote-buying since he opened his Bobcat Restaurant on Hamlin's main drag, in 1948.

"It's gone on for ages," said Lovejoy, behind his diner's hand-cranked register. "I'm sure they're still doing it. They're just more careful about it."

As with past election fraud probes, the latest case targets solely Democrats, who dominate the voter rolls and local governments through the region. In Lincoln County, population 22,100, Democrats outnumber Republicans 4-to-1; the indictment focuses largely on the party's primary elections, going back to 1990.

Not that the GOP has clean hands. Republican former Gov. Arch Moore pleaded guilty to five corruption-related charges in 1990, including one that alleged he spent $100,000 in unreported campaign cash during his successful 1984 campaign.

"This seems to be something that is just in the blood of people in southern West Virginia. They're always looking for ways to get away with this," said Ken Hechler, who fielded election fraud complaints as West Virginia's secretary of state from 1985 to 2000.

With Hechler's help, a state-federal task force secured more than two dozen election-related
convictions in Mingo County in the 1980s. Ensnared officials included a former sheriff, a county commissioner, a school board president and a Democratic Party chairman.

In the 1990s, politicians in neighboring Logan County found themselves on the defensive. Two state legislators, the county assessor and a Circuit Court judge, among others, went to jail on corruption charges that included vote-buying.

Federal investigators revisited Logan County last year. The sheriff and a city police chief resigned and pleaded guilty to exchanging money for votes. Three other people were convicted on related charges.

The current case targets Circuit Court clerk Greg Stowers, 48, the son of Lincoln County’s longtime Democratic Party chairman; his deputy, Clifford Odell "Groundhog" Vance, 49; Jackie David Adkins, 36, a state highway worker; Wandell "Rocky" Adkins, 49, no relation; and Toney "Zeke" Dingess, 34.

All five have pleaded not guilty. The defense alleges that two convicted felons used by the government as informants lied to investigators to avoid stiff sentences on weapons charges.

The defense also says the government used illegal tactics during its investigation, intimidating voters by filming at polling places and trailing voters home. Prosecutors countered that the U.S. Justice Department's Public Integrity Section approved the investigators' techniques.

Prosecutors allege the defendants enlisted precinct captains to pay off voters and hand out slates listing the preferred candidates. Most votes were bought for $20 apiece, prosecutors said. The indictment also said Stowers drove to Kentucky and filled his pickup truck with booze for distribution to voters during the 1994 primary.

The indictment cites 16 voters who were allegedly paid off. Prosecutors have not said just how many voters, all told, were supposedly bought or how much was spent, but said the conspirators assembled $25,000 for one election alone to bribe voters.

The evidence includes footage from a hidden camera and microphone that informant Wayne Watts wore during the 2004 primary as he tried to get people to talk about buying votes.

"Man," Watts is heard muttering as he walks away from one group of locals who professed to know nothing about money and candidate lists changing hands, "this ain't no way to run an election."

© 2005 The Associated Press
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MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Date: November 1, 2005

From: Karen Lynn Dyson

Re: Communication of Award of Contracts EAC 05-66 and EAC 05-67, Personal Services Contracts with Tova Wang and Job Serebrov

In late August and early September 2005 a series of emails and phone calls were exchanged with Job Serebrov and Tova Wang in order to communicate the details of personal services contracts that were awarded to them. The substance of these e-mails and phone calls related to Mr. Serebrov and Ms. Wang’s contracts, described the various services they would perform for EAC related to researching and possibly developing a future project that would study and analyze voting fraud and intimidation. These emails included transmitting a statement of work that would govern their work as well as emails and phone calls to establish a kick-off meeting that would provide information to them so that Mr. Serebrov and Ms. Wang could begin work.

Since that time, Ms. Wang and Mr. Serebrov have engaged in substantial work on this project. This has included developing, outlining and providing to EAC staff, a work plan for the project, meeting and conversing with one another to discuss the focus and work of the project, interviewing prospective persons who would serve on the project’s review panel and presenting this initial list of persons to the EAC to be considered as members of this project review panel who would assess and review the project’s work.
Deliberative Process
Privilege

Statement of Work
Assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

(Job Serebrov)

Background

Section 241 of HAVA enumerates a number of periodic studies of election administration issues in which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to engage. In general “On such periodic basis as the Commission may determine, the Commission shall conduct and make available to the public studies regarding the election administration issues described in subsection (b)”

Sections 241(b) (6) and (7) list the following election administration issues:

(6) Nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in election for Federal offices.

(7) Identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation.

Building on this HAVA reference to studies of voting fraud and voter intimidation, the EAC Board of Advisors has indicated that further study of these issues to determine how the EAC might respond to them is a high priority.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) seeks to identify one or more senior-level project consultants to develop various project activities and studies related to voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections.

The consultant(s) must of have knowledge of voting fraud and voter intimidation along with an understanding of the complexities, nuances and challenges which surround the topics. The EAC is particularly interested in candidates with experience in elections, with public policy and with the law. The consultant(s) must be able to demonstrate an ability to approach the issues of voting fraud and voter intimidation in a balanced, nonpartisan fashion.
Duties

The consultant(s), whose contract would run for the period September-February, 2005, would be responsible for the following.

1. Identifying what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections.

2. Performing background research, including Federal and state-by-state administrative and case law review related to voting fraud and voter intimidation, and a review of current voting fraud and voter intimidation activities taking place with key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations. A written summary of this research, and a copy of any source documentation used, will be presented to EAC.

3. Identifying, in consultation with EAC, and convening a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The working group's goals and objectives and meeting agendas will be vetted with key EAC staff.

4. Developing a project scope of work and a project work plan related to voting fraud and voter intimidation. The consultants (s) will develop a draft scope of work and project work plan for EAC's consideration based on research into the topics, the deliberations and findings of the working group, and the consultants' understanding of EAC's mission and agency objectives.

5. Authoring a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The report will also include suggestions for specific activities that EAC may undertake to address these topics.

From this initial research and exploration of these topics the consultant (s) may be retained to help oversee follow-on research projects and contracts EAC may pursue on the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Special Considerations

Work for Hire. The services performed under the terms of this agreement are considered "work for hire," and any intellectual property or deliverables, including but not limited to, research, policies, procedures, manuals, and other works submitted; or which are specified to be delivered; or which are developed or produced and paid for by EAC, shall be owned exclusively by EAC, including copyright. EAC or its assignees have the exclusive right to reproduce all work products from this agreement without further payment to the Contractor.
Terms and Conditions

The period of performance for this consulting contract is six months, with a fixed price ceiling of $XXXXX for labor. The consultant(s) is expected to work at least 200 hours in performing this work. The EAC estimates that the most efficient distribution of these hours would be as follows: XXXXX. The period of performance and level of effort can be revised in writing by mutual agreement of the EAC and the consultant, as required.

The Consultant is required to travel to the EAC Washington, D.C. offices on a periodic, as needed basis, throughout the duration of the contract. The Consultant will be reimbursed, at the Federal government rates, for hotel and ground transportation costs, other approved incidental expenses, and per diem costs while working on-site at the EAC offices. An estimated $XXXXX has been allocated for reimbursement for travel and other allowable expenses.

Invoicing

Invoices may be submitted monthly in equal payments for labor. Expenses claimed for reimbursement shall be itemized with appropriate receipts provided. Invoices shall be delivered to Ms. Diana Scott, Administrative Officer, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington DC 20005.

Deliverables and Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft project work plan (Phase I)</td>
<td>ASAP after award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Reports to Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR)</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A written summary of background research on voting fraud and voter intimidation.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and convening a working group knowledgeable about voting fraud and voter intimidation.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a project scope of work and project work plan (Phase II)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary report describing key findings of this preliminary study of voting fraud and</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tova-

The contracts are completed, although not formally signed by the Chair of the Commission (a formality).

As discussed, the contract will be for six months-September 26-February 28 for a fixed contract fee of $50,000 plus additional $5,000 for expenses.

$10,000 has been set aside in the FY 05 EAC budget to cover working group costs.

Gavin Gilmour will be the EAC staff project manager, to whom you and Job will be reporting.

Gavin should be in touch in the next day or so, with more details and specifics related to getting the project started.

Thanks

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Hi Karen and Nicole,

I know you guys have been swamped, but I wanted to check in because I haven't heard from you and I am getting all sorts of information from Job, second hand. I would rather not operate that way. Is it the case that the contracts have been finalized? Can you give me a hint about the terms? When might I be seeing a copy? Thanks so much.

Best wishes,

Tova
Deliberative Process
Privilege

Statement of Work
Assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

(Tova Wang)

Background

Section 241 of HAVA enumerates a number of periodic studies of election administration issues in which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to engage. In general “On such periodic basis as the Commission may determine, the Commission shall conduct and make available to the public studies regarding the election administration issues described in subsection (b)”

Sections 241(b) (6) and (7) list the following election administration issues:

(6) Nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in election for Federal offices.

(7) Identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation.

Building on this HAVA reference to studies of voting fraud and voter intimidation, the EAC Board of Advisors has indicated that further study of these issues to determine how the EAC might respond to them is a high priority.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) seeks to identify one or more senior-level project consultants to develop various project activities and studies related to voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections.

The consultant(s) must of have knowledge of voting fraud and voter intimidation along with an understanding of the complexities, nuances and challenges which surround the topics. The EAC is particularly interested in candidates with experience in elections, with public policy and with the law. The consultant (s) must be able to demonstrate an ability to approach the issues of voting fraud and voter intimidation in a balanced, nonpartisan fashion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>voter intimidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

016271
Duties

The consultant(s), whose contract would run for the period September-February, 2005, would be responsible for the following.

1. Identifying what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections.

2. Performing background research, including Federal and state-by-state administrative and case law review related to voting fraud and voter intimidation, and a review of current voting fraud and voter intimidation activities taking place with key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations. A written summary of this research, and a copy of any source documentation used, will be presented to EAC.

3. Identifying, in consultation with EAC, and convening a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The working group’s goals and objectives and meeting agendas will be vetted with key EAC staff.

4. Developing a project scope of work and a project work plan related to voting fraud and voter intimidation. The consultants (s) will develop a draft scope of work and project work plan for EAC’s consideration based on research into the topics, the deliberations and findings of the working group, and the consultants’ understanding of EAC’s mission and agency objectives.

5. Authoring a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The report will also include suggestions for specific activities that EAC may undertake to address these topics.

From this initial research and exploration of these topics the consultant (s) may be retained to help oversee follow-on research projects and contracts EAC may pursue on the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Special Considerations

Work for Hire. The services performed under the terms of this agreement are considered “work for hire,” and any intellectual property or deliverables, including but not limited to, research, policies, procedures, manuals, and other works submitted; or which are specified to be delivered; or which are developed or produced and paid for by EAC, shall be owned exclusively by EAC, including copyright. EAC or its assignees have the exclusive right to reproduce all work products from this agreement without further payment to the Contractor.
Terms and Conditions

The period of performance for this consulting contract is six months, with a fixed price ceiling of $XXXXX for labor. The consultant(s) is expected to work at least 200 hours in performing this work. The EAC estimates that the most efficient distribution of these hours would be as follows: XXXXX. The period of performance and level of effort can be revised in writing by mutual agreement of the EAC and the consultant, as required.

The Consultant is required to travel to the EAC Washington, D.C. offices on a periodic, as needed basis, throughout the duration of the contract. The Consultant will be reimbursed, at the Federal government rates, for hotel and ground transportation costs, other approved incidental expenses, and per diem costs while working on-site at the EAC offices. An estimated $XXXXX has been allocated for reimbursement for travel and other allowable expenses.

Invoicing

Invoices may be submitted monthly in equal payments for labor. Expenses claimed for reimbursement shall be itemized with appropriate receipts provided. Invoices shall be delivered to Ms. Diana Scott, Administrative Officer, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington DC 20005.

Deliverables and Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft project work plan (Phase I)</td>
<td>ASAP after award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Reports to Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR)</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A written summary of background research on voting fraud and voter intimidation.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and convening a working group knowledgeable about voting fraud and voter intimidation.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a project scope of work and project work plan (Phase II)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary report describing key findings of this preliminary study of voting fraud and</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
voter intimidation
MEMORANDUM

TO: EAC Commissioners Hillman, DeGregorio, Martinez, Davidson
FROM: Thomas Wilkey, EAC Executive Director
DATE: September 16, 2005
RE: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

"On such periodic basis as the Commission may determine, the Commission shall conduct and make available to the public studies regarding the election administration issues described in subsection (b)" Sections 241(b) (6) and (7) list the following election administration issues:

(6) Nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in election for Federal offices.

(7) Identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation.

Building on this HAVA reference to studies of voting fraud and voter intimidation, the EAC Board of Advisors has indicated that further study of these issues, to determine how the EAC might respond to them, is a high priority.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has identified two senior-level project consultants to develop various project activities and studies related to voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections. The consultants, whose contracts would run for the period September-February, 2005, would be responsible for helping the EAC identify what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections.

To accomplish this the consultants will: perform background research, including Federal and state-by-state administrative and case law review related to voting fraud and voter intimidation, along with a review of current voting fraud and voter intimidation activities taking place with key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations; in consultation with EAC, identify and convene, a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation; develop an EAC project scope of work and a project work plan related to...
voting fraud and voter intimidation and; author a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Recommendation

Attached is the Statement of Work for the voting fraud and voter intimidation project consultants. The consultant contract fees total $110,000 ($55,000 per person). An additional $10,000 is allotted for the voting fraud and intimidation project working group. The total project amount is $120,000.
Statement of Work
Assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

Section 241 of HAVA enumerates a number of periodic studies of election administration issues in which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to engage. In general “On such periodic basis as the Commission may determine, the Commission shall conduct and make available to the public studies regarding the election administration issues described in subsection (b)”

Sections 241(b) (6) and (7) list the following election administration issues:

(6) Nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in election for Federal offices.

(7) Identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation.

Building on this HAVA reference to studies of voting fraud and voter intimidation, the EAC Board of Advisors has indicated that further study of these issues to determine how the EAC might respond to them is a high priority.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) seeks to identify one or more senior-level project consultants to develop various project activities and studies related to voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections.

The consultant(s) must of have knowledge of voting fraud and voter intimidation along with an understanding of the complexities, nuances and challenges which surround the topics. The EAC is particularly interested in candidates with experience in elections, with public policy and with the law. The consultant (s) must be able to demonstrate an ability to approach the issues of voting fraud and voter intimidation in a balanced, nonpartisan fashion.
Duties

The consultant(s), whose contract would run for the period September-February, 2005, would be responsible for the following.

1. Identifying what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections.

2. Performing background research, including Federal and state-by-state administrative and case law review related to voting fraud and voter intimidation, and a review of current voting fraud and voter intimidation activities taking place with key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations. A written summary of this research, and a copy of any source documentation used, will be presented to EAC.

3. Identifying, in consultation with EAC, and convening a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The working group’s goals and objectives and meeting agendas will be vetted with key EAC staff.

4. Developing a project scope of work and a project work plan related to voting fraud and voter intimidation. The consultants (s) will develop a draft scope of work and project work plan for EAC’s consideration based on research into the topics, the deliberations and findings of the working group, and the consultants’ understanding of EAC’s mission and agency objectives.

5. Authoring a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The report will also include suggestions for specific activities that EAC may undertake to address these topics.

From this initial research and exploration of these topics the consultant (s) may be retained to help oversee follow-on research projects and contracts EAC may pursue on the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Special Considerations

Work for Hire. The services performed under the terms of this agreement are considered “work for hire,” and any intellectual property or deliverables, including but not limited to, research, policies, procedures, manuals, and other works submitted; or which are specified to be delivered; or which are developed or produced and paid for by EAC, shall be owned exclusively by EAC, including copyright. EAC or its assignees have the exclusive right to reproduce all work products from this agreement without further payment to the Contractor.
Terms and Conditions

The period of performance for this consulting contract is six months, with a fixed price ceiling of $50,000 for labor. The consultant(s) is expected to work at least 450 hours in performing this work. The EAC estimates that the most efficient distribution of these hours would be for the consultant to work 20 hours per week. The period of performance and level of effort can be revised in writing by mutual agreement of the EAC and the consultant, as required.

The Consultant is required to travel to the EAC Washington, D.C. offices on a periodic, as needed basis, throughout the duration of the contract. The Consultant will be reimbursed, at the Federal government rates, for hotel and ground transportation costs, other approved incidental expenses, and per diem costs while working on-site at the EAC offices. A fixed price ceiling of $5,000 has been allocated for reimbursement for travel and other allowable expenses.

Invoicing

Invoices may be submitted monthly in equal payments for labor. Expenses claimed for reimbursement shall be itemized with appropriate receipts provided. Invoices shall be delivered to Ms. Diana Scott, Administrative Officer, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington DC 20005.

Deliverables and Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft project work plan (Phase I)</td>
<td>ASAP after award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Reports to Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR)</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A written summary of background research on voting fraud and voter intimidation.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and convening a working group knowledgeable about voting fraud and voter intimidation.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a project scope of work and project work plan (Phase II)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary report describing key findings of this preliminary study of voting fraud and voter intimidation</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Job -

I haven't, as yet, been able to get an answer for you.

I'm going to ask Gavin to pursue this for you.

Thanks

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

Karen:

Were you able to get any answers as to my questions on salary? Specifically, when will we receive our first check and do we have to invoice for it or only for expenses, and if we need to invoice for salary, when do we need to mail, fax or e-mail the invoice so we are paid on time?

Job

--- klynndyson@eac.gov wrote:

> Job and Tova-
> > As I think you both know, Gavin Gilmour, EAC's Deputy General Counsel, > will be providing agency oversight for your project.
> > > Gavin will be in touch in the next day or so, to go
> over next steps on
> this project. Also, I believe your contracts will
> be in the mail later
> today.
>
> Regards-
>
> Karen Lynn-Dyson
> Research Manager
> U.S. Election Assistance Commission
> 1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
> Washington, DC 20005
> tel: 202-566-3123
>
You and Tova will be hearing from Peg Sims today.

Peg will be managing your project.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202-566-3123

Karen:

Still no work from Gavin. Can you remind him to contact us. We are holding up travel plans as well as project plans while we wait.

Regards,

Job
Here is the material for the voting fraud and intimidation project tally vote

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Job-

EAC staff is recommending that you and Tova serve as the project consultants on this project. Academic perspectives and balance on the issues will/should be achieved through the voting fraud and intimidation working group the two of you will manage.

EAC staff is recommending $120,000 be allotted for this project at the it run from September 26- February 28, 2006.

Will have a final figure for you and Tova tomorrow afternoon, once the final budget figures have been negotiated.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Steve-

Excuse my delay in responding. I've had several personal emergencies this week- they come in threes so I'm awaiting the third (smile)
Am working on your fee this afternoon. I don't think the EAC can offer a fee a nearly the rate you quote but I will have a firm figure to you in time for our conference call on Monday morning at 9:30.

Also, how was your wife's singing!!! What an honor! One day I'll have to bore you with my Fenway Park stories

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Stephen Ansolabehere" <sda@MIT.EDU>

Hi Karen,

I haven't heard back from you about consulting fees and contracts for the fraud project.

Things seem to be moving ahead. Does that mean that the EAC has approved hiring me at my consulting rate of $250/hour, $2500/day?

Steve
Job-

Tell me again, what your normal compensation rates are (hourly, weekly or monthly). I thought you had sent me an e-mail on this but can't locate one.

Tom Wilkey and I must wrap this up by Thursday (so that we can commit the necessary funds).

You and Tova will know, by then, how we will be proceeding with the voting fraud consulting team and what your compensation will be.

Thanks for your patience.

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Hi-

Tom and I just met on this. Will have a final answer to you and Tova by the end of today.

FYI- we are looking at a fixed price contract figure closer to the costs/fees you normally charge and to having you and Tova manage the project.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

"Job Serebrov"

Karen:

What time will you be getting with us today on our contracts. I do not want to be out when you do.

Job
Statement of Work
Assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voter Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

Section 241 of HAVA enumerates a number of periodic studies of Election Administrations issues in which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to engage. Specifically, Section 241b 6 and 7 describe Election administration issues such as:

6. Nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in election for Federal offices and

7. Identifying, deterring and investigation methods of voter intimidation.

Building on this reference to studies of voter fraud and voter intimidation, the EAC Board of Advisors has indicated a priority interest in further study of this issue to determine how the EAC might respond to it.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) seeks to identify senior-level project consultants to develop various project activities and studies related to U.S. election voter fraud and voter intimidation.

The consultant(s) must of have knowledge of voter fraud and intimidation along with an understanding of the complexities, nuances and challenges which surround the topics. The EAC is particularly interested in candidates with experience in elections, with public policy and the law. The consultant(s) must be able to demonstrate an ability to approach the issues of voter fraud and intimidation in a balanced, nonpartisan fashion.

Duties

The consultant(s), whose contract would run for the period September-February, 2005, would be responsible for the following.

1. Performing background research, including a state-by-state administrative and case law review related to voter fraud and intimidation, and a review of current voter fraud and intimidation activities taking place with key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations. This review will be summarized and presented to the EAC.
2. Identifying and convening a working group of key individuals and organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voter fraud and intimidation. The list of working group members and the methods used to identify the groups members will be shared with EAC staff prior to the confirmation of the working group. The working group’s goals and objectives and meeting agendas will be vetted with key EAC staff.

3. Developing a project scope of work and a project work plan related to voter fraud and intimidation. Based on research into the topics, the deliberations and findings of the working group, and the consultants’ understanding of the EAC’s mission and agency objectives, develop a draft scope of work and project work plan for the EAC’s consideration.

4. Authoring a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voter fraud and intimidation. The report will also include suggestions for specific activities the EAC may undertake around these topics.

From this initial research and exploration of these topics the consultant (s) may be retained to help oversee follow-on research projects and contracts EAC may develop on the topics of voter fraud and intimidation.

Special Considerations

The Consultants will be required to sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement???

The Consultants are also required to sign a Conflict of Interest declaration???

Terms and Conditions

The period of performance for this consulting contract is six months, with a fixed price ceiling of $XXXXXX for labor. The consultant (s) is expected to work at least 200 hours in performing this work. The EAC estimates that the most efficient distribution of these hours would be as follows: XXXXX. The period of performance and level of effort can be revised in writing by mutual agreement of the EAC and the consultant, as required.
Job Description

U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voter Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project Consultant

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) seeks to identify a senior-level project consultant to develop various project activities and studies related to U.S. election voter fraud and voter intimidation.

The consultant must of have knowledge of voter fraud and intimidation along with an understanding of the complexities, nuances and challenges which surround the topics. The EAC is particularly interested in candidates with experience in elections, with public policy and the law. The consultant must be able to demonstrate an ability to approach the issues of voter fraud and intimidation in a balanced, nonpartisan fashion.

This consultant, whose contract would run for the period June-November, 2005, would be responsible for:

- Identifying and convening a working group of key individuals and organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voter fraud and intimidation;

- Developing a project scope of work and a project work plan related to voter fraud and intimidation;

- Authoring a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voter fraud and intimidation. The report will also include suggestions for specific activities the EAC may undertake around these topics.

From this initial research and exploration of these topics the consultant may be retained to help oversee research projects and contracts EAC may develop on the topics of voter fraud and intimidation.

EAC's consultant fees are competitive and are awarded based on the candidate's relevant background and experience.
Here is the revised memo.

Checked the files- Tally Vote was initiated September 16 and was due back on September 20.

Job and Tova asked about the status of their signed contract on September 20. A series of e-mails were exchanged around September 22 regarding who would be overseeing their contract-(Gavin, Peg, etc.)

Carol Paquette sent several internal e-mails with the altered Statement of Work on the voting fraud and intimidation project, starting on September 21.

Sorry you feel awful- this place just about does you in every October 1

:-)

Hang in there

K
All-

This morning the Commissioners approved the Statement of Work for the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation project consultants, with the caveat that some additional language would be added and the SOW polished up.

Tom, Peg and I are scheduled to interview the first candidate tomorrow morning at 10:00 am and will need your edits to this SOW by COB today.

I am attaching the item again, just in case you don't have a copy. Since I have an appointment out of the office and will be leaving at 4:00 today, I ask that you get your changes and edits to Nicole so that she may enter them and get the revised copy to the candidate first thing in the morning.

Thanks for your input on this.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Statement of Work
Assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voter Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

Section 241 of HAVA enumerates a number of periodic studies of Election Administrations issues in which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to engage. In general "On such periodic basis as the Commission may determine, the Commission shall conduct and make available to the public studies regarding the election administration issues described in subsection (b), with the goal of promoting methods of voting and administering elections...”

Specifically, Section 241b 6 and 7 describes Election administration issues such as:

6. Nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal offices and

7. Identifying, deterring and investigation methods of voter intimidation.

Building on this HAVA reference to studies of voter fraud and voter intimidation, the EAC Board of Advisors has indicated a priority interest in further study of these issues to determine how the EAC might respond to them.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) seeks to identify senior-level project consultants to develop various project activities and studies related to U.S. election voter fraud and voter intimidation.

The consultant(s) must of have knowledge of voter fraud and intimidation along with an understanding of the complexities, nuances and challenges which surround the topics. The EAC is particularly interested in candidates with experience in elections, with public policy and the law. The consultant(s) must be able to demonstrate an ability to approach the issues of voter fraud and intimidation in a balanced, nonpartisan fashion.
Duties

The consultant(s), whose contract would run for the period September-February, 2005, would be responsible for the following.

1. Performing background research, including a state-by-state administrative and case law review related to voter fraud and intimidation, and a review of current voter fraud and intimidation activities taking place with key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations. This review will be summarized and presented to the EAC.

2. Identifying and convening a working group of key individuals and organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voter fraud and intimidation. The list of working group members and the methods used to identify the groups members will be shared with EAC staff prior to the confirmation of the working group. The working group’s goals and objectives and meeting agendas will be vetted with key EAC staff.

3. Developing a project scope of work and a project work plan related to voter fraud and intimidation. Based on research into the topics, the deliberations and findings of the working group, and the consultants’ understanding of the EAC’s mission and agency objectives, the consultants will develop a draft scope of work and project work plan for the EAC’s consideration.

4. Authoring a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voter fraud and intimidation. The report will also include suggestions for specific activities the EAC may undertake around these topics.

From this initial research and exploration of these topics the consultant(s) may be retained to help oversee follow-on research projects and contracts EAC may develop on the topics of voter fraud and intimidation.

Special Considerations

Work for Hire Agreement (insert language)

Terms and Conditions

The period of performance for this consulting contract is six months, with a fixed price ceiling of $XXXXX for labor. The consultant(s) is expected to work at least 200 hours in performing this work. The EAC estimates that the most efficient distribution of these hours would be as follows: XXXXX. The period of performance and level of effort can be revised in writing by mutual agreement of the EAC and the consultant, as required.
Statement of Work
Assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voter Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

Section 241 of HAVA enumerates a number of periodic studies of Election Administrations issues in which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to engage. In general “On such periodic basis as the Commission may determine, the Commission shall conduct and make available to the public studies regarding the election administration issues described in subsection (b), with the goal of promoting methods of voting and administering elections....”

Specifically, Section 241b 6 and 7 describes Election administration issues such as:

6. Nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in election for Federal offices and

7. Identifying, deterring and investigation methods of voter intimidation.

Building on this HAVA reference to studies of voter fraud and voter intimidation, the EAC Board of Advisors has indicated a priority interest in further study of these issues to determine how the EAC might respond to them.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) seeks to identify senior-level project consultants to develop various project activities and studies related to U.S. election voter fraud and voter intimidation.

The consultant(s) must of have knowledge of voter fraud and intimidation along with an understanding of the complexities, nuances and challenges which surround the topics. The EAC is particularly interested in candidates with experience in elections, with public policy and the law. The consultant (s) must be able to demonstrate an ability to approach the issues of voter fraud and intimidation in a balanced, nonpartisan fashion.
Duties

The consultant (s), whose contract would run for the period September-February, 2005, would be responsible for the following.

1. Performing background research, including a state-by-state administrative and case law review related to voter fraud and intimidation, and a review of current voter fraud and intimidation activities taking place with key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations. This review will be summarized and presented to the EAC.

2. Identifying and convening a working group of key individuals and organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voter fraud and intimidation. The list of working group members and the methods used to identify the groups members will be shared with EAC staff prior to the confirmation of the working group. The working group’s goals and objectives and meeting agendas will be vetted with key EAC staff.

3. Developing a project scope of work and a project work plan related to voter fraud and intimidation. Based on research into the topics, the deliberations and findings of the working group, and the consultants’ understanding of the EAC’s mission and agency objectives, the consultants will develop a draft scope of work and project work plan for the EAC’s consideration.

4. Authoring a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voter fraud and intimidation. The report will also include suggestions for specific activities the EAC may undertake around these topics.

From this initial research and exploration of these topics the consultant (s) may be retained to help oversee follow-on research projects and contracts EAC may develop on the topics of voter fraud and intimidation.

Special Considerations

Work for Hire Agreement (insert language)

Terms and Conditions

The period of performance for this consulting contract is six months, with a fixed price ceiling of $XXXXX for labor. The consultant(s) is expected to work at least 200 hours in performing this work. The EAC estimates that the most efficient distribution of these hours would be as follows: XXXXX. The period of performance and level of effort can be revised in writing by mutual agreement of the EAC and the consultant, as required.
To "Job Serebrov"

cc Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/GOV@EAC, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC

bcc Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV@EAC; Raymundo Martinez/EAC/GOV@EAC

Subject Re: project

Job-

Thanks ever so much for following up. Indeed, the Commissioners have reviewed the issue and have agreed in principle, to an approach that would entail hiring a consultant or consultants to help the EAC study and frame the issues of voter fraud and intimidation.

The idea would be that after a period of time, the consultants, and, perhaps, a working group of the EAC, would make a series of recommendations on next steps for the agency to take regarding voter fraud and intimidation.

Thanks for your patience; I hope to have a definitive answer for you by mid-July at the latest.

Regards-

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Tom and Jeannie-

At yesterday's research briefing, the Commissioners approved the concept of a series of scholarly articles that would cover various "Trends in Election Administration"

There was general agreement that the EAC would produce, by the end of this year, two of these articles that might be on topics such as early voting, restoration of felon rights, vote centers, etc.

I'd like to have a brief meeting the end of this week or the beginning of next with you, Jeannie and myself to go over some of the finer points of this idea and to put in place a process to get this project moving.

Shall we meet Friday morning at 11:00?

I'd like for us to identify the writers we want to use and the process we will use to determine the selection of topics for articles. As the Chair suggested, we should also discuss in some detail, the editorial guidelines we will use that will guide the work that our writers will do for us.

Thanks
K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
I know that People For the American Way delivered petitions to EAC about release of the Fraud report but I need to know what other communications EAC has had with People For about the study.

Was it represented on the study's working group? If so, by whom? Did they write to us and did we answer? Did anybody from there talk with anybody at EAC about the study and our work? Thanks.
Please print for Paul to take on the trip.

Chair Davidson and Tom-

You may recall that during your last Commissioner's meeting you requested that a draft of the EAC Voter ID report be ready by January 5. Attached please find the first draft of such a report that I have prepared, based on the Eagleton Voter ID report and study.

There are several points in the document where I raise questions about the data or Eagleton's findings from their analysis. Certainly, before we would publish this report, we would need Eagleton to review it and to verify that we have accurately represented their findings and conclusions.

Hopefully, this is a first good step towards publishing something on voter identification. I look forward to your suggestions for next steps.
EAC Report on Voter Identification

Executive Summary

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) authorizes the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to conduct periodic studies of election administration issues. HAVA Section 303 (b) mandates that first time voters who register by mail are required to show proof of identity before being allowed to cast a ballot. The law prescribes certain requirements concerning this section, but also leaves considerable discretion to the States for its implementation. The EAC sought to examine how these voter identification requirements were implemented in the 2004 general elections and to prepare guidance for the states on this topic.

In May 2005 EAC entered into a contract with the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey and the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University to perform a review and legal analysis of state legislation, administrative procedures and court cases, and to perform a literature review on other research and data available on the topic of voter identification requirements. Further, the contractor was to analyze the problems and challenges of voter identification, to hypothesize alternative approaches and recommend various policies that could be applied to these approaches.

The contractor also performed a statistical analysis of the relationship of various requirements for voter identification to voter turnout in the 2004 election. Using two sets of data, aggregate turnout data at the county level for each state, and reports of individual voters collected in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau, the contractor found the overall relationship between the stringency of ID requirements and turnout to be fairly small, but statistically significant.

Based on The Eagleton Institute year-long inquiry into voter identification requirements EAC will implement one or more of the following recommendations:

- Further research into the connection between voter ID requirements and the number of ballots cast and counted;

- A state-by-state review of the impact that voter ID requirements are having on voter’s participation;

- A state-by-state review of the relationship between ballot access and ballot security and the number of voters whose ballot is counted;

- A state-by-state review of time periods between voters casting of provisional ballots and the time allowed to return with an ID as well as a review of acceptable forms of identification other than photo ID.
Introduction

This study was conducted at a time in which considerable attention is being paid to the issue of voter identification. Proponents of stricter identification requirements base their case on improving the security of the ballot by reducing opportunities for multiple voting or voting by those who are not eligible. The goal is to ensure that only those legally entitled to vote do so, and do so only once at each election. Opponents of stricter ID requirements seek to ensure board access to a regular ballot. There is a fear that some voters -- racial and ethnic minorities, young and elderly voters-- lack convenient access to required ID documents, or that these voters may be fearful of submitting their ID documents for official scrutiny.

This report considers policy issues associated with the voter ID debate. It examines the relationships between voter ID requirements and voter turnout along with the various policy implications of the issue.

Methodology of the Study

In May 2005, under contract with the EAC, the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University undertook a review and legal analysis of state statutes, regulations and litigation concerning voter identification and provisional voting as well as a statistical analysis of the relationship of various requirements for voter identification to turnout in the 2004 election. The contract also included research and study related to provisional voting requirements. These research findings were submitted and reviewed by the EAC as a separate study.

The Eagleton Institute of Politics gathered information on the voter identification requirements in 50 states and the District of Columbia for 2004. Based on interpretations of state statutes and supplemental information provided through conversations with state election officials, state ID requirements were divided into five categories, with each category of identification more rigorous than the one preceding: stating name, signing name, signature match, presenting an ID, and the most rigorous, presenting a government photo ID. The Eagleton Institute also categorized and identified each state according to maximum and minimum identification requirements. Maximum requirements refer to the most that voters may be asked to do or show at the polling place. Minimum requirements refer to the most that voters can be required to do or show in order to cast a regular ballot. These definitions and the subsequent state-by-state analysis of voter identification requirements omitted those cases in which a particular voter's eligibility might be questioned using a state's voter ballot challenge process.

Two data sets were used to apply the criteria (variables) that were developed above: aggregate voter turnout data at the county level which was gathered from the EAC's 2004 Election Day Survey and; reports of individual voters collected through the November 2004 Current Population Survey administered by the U.S. Census Bureau. Use of EAC
survey data and Census Bureau CPS data provided a way to cross-check the validity of the analysis and conclusions that would be drawn regarding the effect of voter ID requirements on voter turnout.

**Study Oversight and Methodological Review**

A draft of the Eagleton Institute report and findings on voter identification requirements was critiqued by a peer review group convened by the Eagleton Institute. A second review of the study's research and statistical methodologies was conducted using a group of research and statistical experts independently convened by the EAC. Comments and insights of the peer review group members were taken into account in the drafting of a study report although there was not unanimous agreement among the individual reviewers regarding the study findings and recommendations.

**The Eagleton Institute of Politics Peer Review Group**

R Michael Alvarez, California Institute of Technology  
John C. Harrison, University of Virginia School of Law  
Martha E. Kropf, University of Missouri-Kansas City  
Daniel H. Lowenstein, University of California at Los Angeles  
Timothy G. O'Rourke, Salisbury University  
Bradley Smith, Capital University Law School  
Tim Storey, National Conference of State Legislatures  
Peter G. Verniero, former Attorney General, State of New Jersey

**The EAC Peer Review Group**

Jonathan Nagler, New York University  
Jan Leighley, University of Arizona  
Adam Berninsky, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

**Summary of the Research**

**Maximum and Minimum Voter Identification Requirements**

In order to analyze what, if any, correlation may exist between a State’s voter identification requirements and voter turnout, the Eagleton Institute first coded a state according to how demanding its voter ID requirement was. The voter ID requirement, ranked from lowest to highest was as follows: stating one’s name, signing one’s name, matching one’s signature to a signature on file, providing a form of identification and, providing a form of photo identification. Several possible caveats to this ranking system were noted. For all states which had photo identification requirements in 2004, voters
without a photo ID were permitted to cast a regular ballot after signing an affidavit regarding his or her identity and eligibility. These voters were also allowed to provide other forms of ID. The researchers also noted that while each state may be assigned to a category, that categorization may not reflect the actual practice related to voter identification that may or may not have taken place at many polling places.

Research performed for this study by the Moritz College of Law found that states had five different types of **maximum** identification requirements in place on Election Day 2004. For the purposes of this study a requirement that called for a signed affidavit or the provision of other forms of ID was considered the most rigorous or the “maximum” requirement. At the polling place voters were asked to:

- State his or her name (10 states)
- Sign his or her name (13 states and the District of Columbia)
- Sign his or her name, which would be matched to a signature on file (seven states)
- Provide a form of identification that did not necessarily include a photo (15 states)
- Provide a photo identification (five states)

Using the same criteria, but applying them as **minimum** rather than maximum criteria for voting the research showed: *(check this section- it doesn’t really make sense)*

- State his or her name (12 states)
- Sign his or her name (14 states and the District of Columbia)
- Matching the voter’s signature to the signature on file (6 states)
- Provide a non-photo identification (14 states)
- Swear by an affidavit (4 states)

The results of the research are summarized in Table 1.

Election laws in several states offer exceptions to these ID requirements if potential voters lack the necessary form of identification. Laws in these states set a minimum requirement that a voter may be required to satisfy in order to vote using a regular ballot. In 2004 none of the states required photo identification as a minimum standard for voting with a regular ballot. That is, voters who lacked photo ID were allowed to vote in all states, if he or she was able to meet another ID requirement.

**The Relationship of Voter Identification Requirements to Voter Turnout**

A statistical analysis examining the variation in turnout rates based on the type of voter ID required by each state in the 2004 election was conducted using two sets of data: 1) aggregate turnout data at the county level for each state (compiled by the Eagleton Institute of Politics—footnote about how they collected the data) and 2) individual level survey data included in the November 2004 Current Population Survey (CPS), conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau.
The analysis looked at the voter identification requirements as a continuous variable and as a series of discrete variables. As a continuous variable the maximum voter identification requirements were ranked according to how demanding they were judged to be, with photo identification considered to be the most demanding requirement (what about affidavit?????). Used as discrete variable, the statistical analysis considered stating the name as the least demanding ID requirement; the other ID requirements were then compared to that requirement.

**Aggregate-level statistical analysis**

The statistical analysis performed by the Eagleton Institute of Politics found that when averaging across counties in each state, statewide turnout is negatively correlated to maximum voter identification requirements \((r = -0.30, p \text{ less than } .05)\). When a statistical analysis is performed on the other minimum voter ID requirements (with affidavit being the most demanding requirement), the correlation between voter identification and turnout is negative, but not statistically significant \((r = -0.20, p = .16)\). These findings would suggest that the relationship between turnout rates and minimum requirements may not be linear.

The aggregate data show that 60.9 percent of the estimated citizen voting age population voted in 2004. Taking into account the maximum requirements, an average of 64.6 percent of the voting age population turned out in states that required voters to state their names, compared to 58.1 percent in states that required photo identification. A similar trend was found when analyzing minimum ID requirements. Sixty-three percent of the voting age population turned out in states requiring voters to state their name, compared to 60.1 percent in states that required an affidavit from voters. This analysis showed there was not a clear, consistent linear relationship between turnout and minimum identification requirements.

(insert table 2- Variation in 2004 State Turnout Based on Voter Identification Requirements)

**Multivariate models of analysis using aggregate-level data**

The Eagleton Institute of Politics performed an additional analysis that would estimate the effects of voter identification requirements, that took into account the electoral context in 2004 and, the demographic characteristics of the population in each county. The model also considers such variables as whether or not the county was 1) in a presidential battleground state, 2) if the county was in a state with a competitive race for government and/or the U.S. Senate, 3) the percentage of voting-age population in each county that was Hispanic or African-American 4) the percentage of county residents age 65 and older, 5) the percent of county residents below the poverty line, and 6) the number of days between each state's registration deadline and the election.
The results of this statistical modeling and subsequent analysis indicated that the stricter voter ID requirements of matching a voter’s signature to a signature on file or with presenting a non-photo identification are associated with lower voter turnout when compared to voter turnout in states that required voters to simply state his or her name. These conclusions were reached when variables 1-5 listed above were held constant.

Other results from the Eagleton Institute analysis of stricter voter identification requirements showed that:

- Increased voter turnout was associated with whether the county was in a battleground state or whether that state have a competitive race for governor and/or U.S. Senate.
- A slight negative effect on turnout was correlated with those state’s with a longer time between the closing date for registration and the election.
- Voter turnout declined as the percentage of Hispanics in a county’s population increased.
- Higher turnout (and a positive correlation) was associated with a higher percentage of senior citizens and household median income.
- The percentage of African-Americans in the county did not have a significant effect on turnout.

The Eagleton Institute analysis of minimum voter identification requirements showed that:

- A relationship between minimum voter ID requirements and turnout was not demonstrated.
- Battleground states and those with competitive state races had a significant and positive correlation to turnout.
- A higher percentage of senior citizens in the county and higher household median income were associated with higher turnout and showed a positive correlation to turnout.
- The percentage of Hispanics in the county was associated with reduced turnout.
- The increased number of days between the closing date for registration was associated with reduced turnout.

The analysis of these aggregate, county-level data showed a significant correlation, between maximum voter identification requirements (a signature match and non-photo
identification, but not a photo identification) and lower turnout in the 2004 election. This correlation was also significant when compared to the minimum voter ID requirement of the voter simply having to state his or her name.

Multivariate analysis using individual level turnout data

This analysis which used November 2004 Current Population Survey data conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau is based on reports from self-described registered voters. Not included in the analysis are persons who said they are not registered to vote, those who said they cast absentee ballots and those who said they were not U.S. citizens. The CPS' Voting and Registration Supplement consisted of interviews, either by telephone or in person, with 96,452 respondents. (why is the N is Table 3 54,973?)

In addition to the five maximum voter identification requirements (enumerated on page XX) the analysis performed included other socioeconomic, demographic and political factors that could have influenced turnout in the 2004 election. These independent variables were analyzed against the dependent variable of whether or not the respondent said he or she voted in the November 2004 election.

In this analysis three of the voter identification requirements were shown to have a statistically significant correlation with whether or not the survey respondents said they have voted in 2004. Lower voter turnout was associated with:

- those states with maximum voter requirements to sign one’s name,
- those states with maximum voter requirements to provide a non-photo ID or photo ID, or
- those states with the minimum voter requirement to swear by an affidavit in order to cast a ballot without the state-required identification

Increased voter turnout showed:

- A significant correlation with the competitiveness of the Presidential race (explain).
- African-American voters were more likely than white or other voters to say they have voted.
- Income and marital status were positive predictors of voting (high income or low income, single, married?),
- Women were more likely to say they voted than men.
- Those ages 45 to 64 and 65 and older were more likely to say they voted than those ages 18 to 24.
- Those who earned a high school diploma, attended some college, graduated from college or attended graduate school were more likely to say they have voted than those who had not finished high school.
Analysis of the predicted probability of voter turnout using the individual data

Using this Census Bureau Current Population Survey data the Eagleton Institute of Politics performed an additional statistical analysis in which they calculated the effect of various independent variables on the probability that a respondent said he or she voted. This analysis, involving 54,973 voters cross-tabulated the maximum and minimum voter identification requirements in each state with the five levels of voting requirements: stating name, signing name, matching the signature, a non-photo ID, photo-ID signing an affidavit. The results of these Predicted Probability of Voter Turnout for all Voter tabulations are summarized in Table 3 below:

From this analysis, the Eagleton Institute of Politics found that three of the voter identification requirements (which ones?) exerted a statistically significant, negative effect on whether or not the CPS survey respondents said they had voted in 2004. That is, compared to states that require voters to only state their name, those states which require the voter to sign his or her name, to provide a non-photo ID, or to provide a photo ID as a maximum requirement, were shown to have a negative influence on turnout. Also, a negative influence on turnout was found when comparing those states that require voters to only state their name, as compared to those states which have as a minimum requirement for verifying voter ID, signing an affidavit.

This probability analysis also found that the competitiveness of the presidential race had a significant effect on turnout as well as some significant demographic and educational effects. For the entire voting population signature, non-photo identification and photo identification requirements were all associated with lower turnout rates compared to the requirements that voter simply state their names. The analysis further found that:

- The predicted probability that Hispanics would vote in states that required non-photo identification was about 10 percentage points lower than in states where Hispanic voters gave their names and that Hispanic voters were less likely to vote in states that required non-photo identification as opposed to only having to state one’s name.

- Hispanic voters were 10 percent less likely to vote in non-photo identification states compared to states where voters only had to give their name. African American and Asian-American voters were about 6 percent less likely, while white voters were about 2 percent less likely.

- Asian-American voters were 8.5 percent less likely to vote in states that required non-photo identification compared to states that require voters to state their names under the maximum requirements, while they were 6.1
percent less likely to vote where non-photo identification was the minimum requirement.

- For those with less than a high school diploma, the probability of voting was 5.1 percent lower in states that required photo identification as the maximum requirement and 7 percent lower in those states that required an affidavit as the minimum requirement. These percentages were arrived at when comparing these states to ones that use as a minimum or maximum requirement, the voter to merely state his or her name.

Conclusions from the statistical analysis

The statistical analysis found that as voter identification requirements vary, so do voter turnout rates. These findings were borne out through analyses conducted on aggregate data and individual-level data. There were, however, some distinctions found depending upon whether or not the state’s particular voter identification requirements were set as minimums or maximums.

- The overall relationship between voter identification requirements and turnout for all registered voters was found to be small but statistically significant.
- Using the aggregate data the signature match and the non-photo identification requirement correlated with lower turnout. The photo identification requirement did not have a statistically significant effect.
- In the individual-level data the signature, no-photo identification and photo identification requirement were all correlated with lower turnout when compared to the requirements that voter simply state their names.
- Across various demographic groups (African-Americans, Asian-Americans and Hispanics) a statistically significant relationship was found between the non-photo identification requirement and voter turnout.

Caveats to the Analysis

The Eagleton Institute for Politics and the EAC make note that while this analysis is a good beginning, significant questions remain regarding the relationship between voter identification requirements and turnout. These analyses are unable, for example, to capture how or why identification requirements might lower turnout. That is, is it because voters are aware of the identification requirements and stay away from the polls because of them? Alternatively, do the requirements result in some voters being turned away when they cannot provide the identification, or must cast a provisional ballot?
Knowing more about the "on the ground" experience of voters regarding various identification requirements will guide state and local level policy markers in their efforts to educate voters about the requirements. These experiences could also help instruct election judges on how to handle questions and possible disputes over voter identification requirements.

**Public Policy and Administrative Considerations**

Voter Identification, often described as the critical step in protecting the integrity of the ballot, is a process which can ensure that the potential voter is eligible and, if eligible, is permitted to cast one ballot. A voting system that requires voters to produce an identification document or documents may prevent the ineligible from voting, but also may prevent the eligible from casting a ballot.

Evaluating the effect of different voter identification regimes can be most effective when based on clear legal, equitable and practical standards. The questions outlined below might point policymakers to standards that can be created around voter identification requirements.

1. Is the voter ID system designed on the basis of valid and reliable empirical studies the will address concerns regarding certain types of voting fraud?
2. Does the voter ID requirement comply with the letter and spirit of the Voting Rights Act?
3. How effective is the voter ID requirement on increasing the security of the ballot and can it be coordinated with the statewide voter registration database?
4. How feasible is the voter identification requirement? That is, are there administrative or budgetary considerations or concerns? How easy or difficult will it be for pollworkers who must administer the requirement?
5. How cost effective is the voter ID system? That is, what are the monetary and non-monetary costs to the voter and to the state for implementing the ID system?
6. If voter ID requirements are shown to reduce voter turnout (generally, or with some particular groups), what possible steps should be taken to ameliorate this problem?

**Recommendations and Next Steps**

As the Federal agency charged with informing election officials and the public about various issues related to the administration of elections EAC believes it should, in its capacity as a supporter of elections research, undertake additional study into the topic of voter identification requirements and the implementation of them in the following ways:

- Longitudinal studies of jurisdictions that have changed voter identification requirements.
• State-by-state and precinct-level analyses that will examine the correlations between various voter identification requirements and voter registration and turnout.

• Alternative forms and methods for verifying a voter's identity.

• Continuing research into the connection between various voter identification requirements and the number of ballots cast and counted.

• A continuing state-by-state update on changes to voter identification requirements.

• Continued collection of state-by-state data which will help examine the impact that voter identification requirements are having on the number of voters who are casting provisional ballots because of voter identification verification issues.

Appendix A: Summary of Voter Identification Requirements by State

Appendix B: Court Decisions and Literature on Voter Identification and Related Issue

Court Decisions

Appendix C: Annotated Bibliography on Voter Identification Issues
Commissioners,

Commissioner Davidson asked that I forward to each of you the following questions that I drafted at her request last week. She also asked that I let you know that she is interested in asking questions 3, 5, and 7.

1. What is meant by "statistically significant"? Please explain in plain language when a result is considered statistically significant. Also, please provide an academic definition of that term. How did you calculate the mean and standard deviations from the mean?
2. What data was used to derive these research findings?
3. Did you attempt to find information or data related to elections prior to 2004 in states that have voter identification requirements?
4. What other variables other than voter identification were tested? Contested race? Historical voter turnout? Weather? Media attention to the area? Candidate activities/campaign?
5. What was the impact (positive or negative) of these other factors on voter turnout?
6. How did you control these variables/factors when measuring the impact of voter ID on voter turnout or on prospective voter turnout? For example, did you only apply the factor to like circumstances — similar historical turnout, same level of contention in the races of the ballot, etc.
7. Would the study and your conclusions have been more reliable if additional data had been analyzed? Data such as voter turnout in states that have had voter ID in past Federal elections?
8. What data did you use to identify voter turnout?
9. What data did you use to identify whether people or groups of people were more or less likely to vote when identification is required?
10. Why did you use census data as opposed to data on registered voters? Doesn’t census data also include information from people who are not registered voters and people who are not even eligible to be registered voters?

In addition to the questions above, I provided the following feedback to Commissioner Davidson concerning the draft report provided by Eagleton:

- I am troubled by the concept that Eagleton compared states as if they were equal. They assume that, all factors being equal, that the voter turn out in each state would be equal. I am not at all certain that this is the case. Further, there is no evidence that the statistician actually compared previous years' turnout in the same state to determine whether 2004 was some sort of anomaly for that state (high or low). Long story short, I am very skeptical of the data that they used to draw conclusions. We should ask questions about what data they used, how they parsed it, why they used the data, what other data could have been used to provide better, more reliable results.
- My second concern is how they (statistically speaking) differentiate between a minimum requirement
(i.e. state name, photo i.d., etc) and a maximum requirement (i.e., state name, photo i.d., etc.). It makes no sense to me how they could possibly arrive at a different percentage for these requirement levels.

- My third issue is the persistent use of the phrases "ballot access" and "ballot integrity" without some definition or some explanation of what those concepts are.

Commissioner Davidson also asked that I ask some questions related to the first bullet, above, specifically relating to the comparison of states without validation that the state's turn out for 2004 was "normal" for that state as opposed to an anomaly.

Last, Commissioner Davidson asked that you all coordinate your selected questions to avoid having two commissioners wanting to ask the same question.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns about these questions or if I can explain my reasoning behind the questions.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins  
General Counsel  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3100
Commissioners,

Commissioner Davidson asked that I forward to each of you the following questions that I drafted at her request last week. She also asked that I let you know that she is interested in asking questions 3, 5, and 7.

1. What is meant by “statistically significant”? Please explain in plain language when a result is considered statistically significant. Also, please provide an academic definition of that term. How did you calculate the mean and standard deviations from the mean?
2. What data was used to derive these research findings?
3. Did you attempt to find information or data related to elections prior to 2004 in states that have voter identification requirements?
4. What other variables other than voter identification were tested? Contested race? Historical voter turnout? Weather? Media attention to the area? Candidate activities/campaign?
5. What was the impact (positive or negative) of these other factors on voter turnout?
6. How did you control these variables/factors when measuring the impact of voter ID on voter turnout or on prospective voter turnout? For example, did you only apply the factor to like circumstances — similar historical turnout, same level of contention in the races of the ballot, etc.
7. Would the study and your conclusions have been more reliable if additional data had been analyzed? Data such as voter turn out in states that have had voter ID in past Federal elections?
8. What data did you use to identify voter turnout?
9. What data did you use to identify whether people or groups of people were more or less likely to vote when identification is required?
10. Why did you use census data as opposed to data on registered voters? Doesn’t census data also include information from people who are not registered voters and people who are not even eligible to be registered voters?

In addition to the questions above, I provided the following feedback to Commissioner Davidson concerning the draft report provided by Eagleton:

- I am troubled by the concept that Eagleton compared states as if they were equal. They assume that, all factors being equal, that the voter turn out in each state would be equal. I am not at all certain that this is the case. Further, there is no evidence that the statistician actually compared previous years’ turnout in the same state to determine whether 2004 was some sort of anomaly for that state (high or low). Long story short, I am very skeptical of the data that they used to draw conclusions. We should ask questions about what data they used, how they parsed it, why they used the data, what other data could have been used to provide better, more reliable results.
- My second concern is how they (statistically speaking) differentiate between a minimum requirement
Matt (and Amy) are working on a speech for the Chairman to deliver at the Vote Fraud conference in Utah at the end of the week. Matt has asked for the consultants' definition of vote fraud/voter intimidation and the draft recommendations. As neither have been through full Commission review, I would like to speak with one or both of you before I drop this information in any one Commissioner's lap. Matt is looking for this information today. FYI, attached are copies of the consultants' definition and the draft recommendations from the consultants and others from the working group. Also attached is a summary of concerns expressed by the working group. --- Peggy
Bryan:

An electronic copy of the status report is attached, as requested for the USA Today inquiry. The status report includes the attachment listing the Working Group members. I suggest that you check to ensure that I have protected the copy against any manipulation, and protect it yourself if I have not, before sending it out to anyone. --- Peggy

EAC Boards VF-VI Status Report.doc
Jeannie

We suspect that someone from the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Project Working Group has been talking to reporters, tipping them off about what we are finding in our preliminary study, and referring them to our consultants (although the information could have come from anyone on the EAC boards, too). Apparently, the U.S. News & World Report reporter who contacted me also contacted both consultants working on the project.

Based on my recommendation, Tova Wang and, possibly, Job Serebrov, who are on EAC personal services contracts for our voting fraud and voter intimidation research, will seek further clarification from you about what they can and cannot say to reporters and in public fora about vote fraud and voter intimidation and about EAC's research. I have previously advised Tova and Job not to discuss the work they are doing for us as this is EAC research, the Commissioners have not yet received and accepted the final report, and the Commission has not approved their speaking about the EAC research.

Tova plans to call you tomorrow (Tuesday, June 27) about the issue. In addition to the reporter's inquiry, she has been invited to speak on the subject at the summer conference of the National Association of State Legislatures. She has plenty of knowledge of the subject in her own right (apart from our study), but is having trouble differentiating between her own work and the work she is doing for us. Please, just let me know what you advise her to do.

--- Peggy
Julie:

I received pieces of the draft final report on voting fraud-voter intimidation this morning. If it is OK with you, I'll hold it until all I have all of the pieces, so that you can review it as a whole document. --- Peggy
Karen,
I need info from you for question number 2.... Thanks.

----- Forwarded by Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV on 03/13/2006 05:10 PM -----
*ROY SALTMAN* <roygsaltman@msn.com>

03/13/2006 05:01 PM

To *Jeannie Layson* <jlayson@eac.gov>
cc
Subject Standards Board and Study on Voting Fraud

---

Dear Ms. Layson:
I have two questions about the 2005 Annual Report that you gave me.

(1) Who are, currently, the nine members of the Executive Board of the Standards Board?

(2) On p. 27 of the 2005 Annual Report, it states that EAC contracted with two consultants to conduct preliminary research on the issues of voting fraud and voter intimidation. Can you tell me who these organizations or individuals are, and when their reports might be available? If they are available now, how can I obtain them?

Regards,
Roy Saltman
Sounds good. Would later this afternoon work for you? Right now I'm working on the management guidelines with Brian. Let me know, thank you!

Laiza N. Otero
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202)566-1707
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
To Laiza N. Otero/EAC/GOV@EAC
02/24/2006 08:41 AM
cc
Subject Re: Fw: Tova Wang/Job Serebrov/Improving Election Data Collection Project--FY06 Budget

FYI-

On the budget figure for Improving Election Data Collection

Also, when you're ready let's go through more of the detail on your proposed agenda.

For example, I'd like for us to have some presentations (brief) on various subject areas, so that folks have a basis for their discussion and conclusions.

As we discussed, I think we also will want to have some breakout working groups which focus on particular issues/areas of concern.

Let me know when you're ready to pursue.

K

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 02/24/2006 08:34 AM -----
What Paul V said is NOT at all an accurate statement of what Tova said. I was there. This is very disappointing to read. I may call Mr. V myself.

I watched and heard what was said and by whom. I will be glad to brief you tomorrow morning.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Paul DeGregorio

From: Paul DeGregorio
To: Gracia Hillman; Donetta Davidson; Raymundo Martinez; Juliet Thompson; Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Subject: Call from Paul Vinovich

I took a telephone call this morning from Paul Vinovich. He had attempted to reach Gracia, but since she was not here, he asked Sheila if I was in the office so he spoke to me.

Paul was very upset with comments that Tova Wang had made at yesterday's AEI's meeting in which she basically indicated that voter fraud did not exist in the USA. He asked how a person who believes that voter fraud does not exist--or not seem at least willing to listen to both sides--can be hired by the EAC to do a study on voter fraud/voter intimidation. I explained to Paul (as I have now had to explain to many others) that Tova was "balanced" on the study with Job Severbrov. He did not know Job but was well-aware of Tova's positions and was concerned that her public comments indicate that she will not be fair in looking at this issue. I explained to Paul that we were monitoring the work of our consultants on this study and no report would be issued publicly without the support of at least three commissioners. I sent him some background information on Job. I think this study will need close monitoring.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdeggregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov
Tom's response was that the letter looked fine. Setting aside NAS, I wanted to make certain that pilot projects on list sharing were a part of our thinking on this study, irrespective of who handles the project for us. You will notice that I did not mention NAS in my letter to Linda.

From: Karen Lynn-Dyson
Sent: 11/08/2005 05:22 PM
To: Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Sheila Banks; Bert Benavides
Subject: Re: Draft Letter to Linda Lamone

Tom-

I'll defer to you on this one since I'm not at all aware of how things have been left with NAS (what, if anything, has been said to Herb Lin) and what the timelines are for possibly working with him on the technology refresh project.

K
Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123
Karen -

Did some tightening up on language in this SOW. Let me know if you have any changes you want to make ASAP so this can go in for contract processing tomorrow. Thanks!

Carol A. Paquette
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202)566-3125 cpaquette@eac.gov
I have attached a draft proposed schedule of events for our discussion today. Please keep in mind that this is only a proposal but I thought that we needed somewhere to start from.

Regards,

Job Task Contractor Deadline EAC
Gaylin -

There are 3 files of reference materials for this RFP: the spreadsheet of vote definitions and two summaries of statutory provisions on recounts (which are not consistent in information provided, e.g., one provides statutory language without commentary - the other provides summarized commentary without statutory language). We need a brief paragraph to accompany each to explain what the Offeror can glean from it. For example, the spreadsheet on vote definitions has references in it such as "See pdf of Arkansas statutes in file.", "There is a pdf of the manual in the document folder", "See .doc in file." "I was not able to find copies of these manuals." So this is clearly an internal working draft, not really a final product. How would the Offeror use this in preparing their proposal? Similarly, the two disparate summaries of statutes on recounts - we need to explain that this is a preliminary collection of information and that the two files are different in terms of content. Again, how would the Offeror use this information in preparing their proposal? Also, the title that printed out on first file citing statutory language is not correct and needs to be changed. It currently reads "Voting System Certification by State as of April 22, 2005." There is no heading on the second file.

This is a voluminous amount of information. We need to think about whether it is needed for the preparation of proposals. I will be considering this point this evening when I review the SOW and proposal instructions. Would appreciate your thoughts on this tomorrow.

Carol A. Paquette
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(202)566-3125 cpaquette@eac.gov
Karen and Nicole:

Please see suggested changes in the attached (highlighted as tracked changes). In some cases, I could only note that we should insert something to address a particular issue. I don't have specifics for the inserts because we have not had time to discuss or confirm exactly what should be added. --- Peggy

voterfraud project consultants.2changes.doc
You've probably seen this already, but I wanted to toss it your direction. It's an interesting report on the topic that Demos did last year. Might not be a bad starting point for ideas, ect.

Best,

Adam
Commissioner Hillman:

PFAW was not represented on the Working Group for the Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation research project. Also, I have had no communications with the organization about the study. I did work with Jeannie and Gavin on a response to PFAW’s FOIA request for the study. Jeannie should have the final copy of that reply.

Peggy Sims
Election Research Specialist

I know that People For the American Way delivered petitions to EAC about release of the Fraud report but I need to know what other communications EAC has had with People For about the study.

Was it represented on the study's working group? If so, by whom? Did they write to us and did we answer? Did anybody from there talk with anybody at EAC about the study and our work? Thanks.
DATE: November 23, 2005
TO: Craig Donsanto, U.S. Department of Justice
Fax Number: 202-514-3003
FROM: Peggy Sims
NUMBER OF PAGES (INCLUDING COVER PAGE): 3

MESSAGE

ORIGINAL TO FOLLOW BY MAIL.
November 23, 2005

Craig C. Donsanto  
Election Crimes Branch  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Bond Building  
1400 New York Avenue, NW, 12th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Mr. Donsanto:

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has undertaken a short term project to research voting fraud and voter intimidation. As an expert in the prosecution of election crimes, your expertise and unique experience would be a valuable resource as we move forward. I am writing to ask if you will be available to advise and inform our efforts.

As you know, EAC is a federal agency established in accordance with section 201 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA), Public Law 107-252. HAVA requires EAC to conduct research regarding election administration issues. The election administration issues itemized in the statute include:

- Collecting nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring, and investigating voting fraud in elections for federal office [section 241(b)(6)]
- Identifying, deterring, and investigating methods of voter intimidation [section 241(b)(7)]

The EAC Board of Advisors, established in accordance with HAVA section 211, recommended that EAC place a high priority on these topics when initiating our research projects. Subsequently, EAC obtained the services of two consultants (Tova Wang and Job Serebrov) to:

- Define Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation - develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of federal elections;
- Research Available Resources - perform background research (including federal and state administrative and case law review), identify
current activities of key government agencies, and civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics, and summarize this research and all source documentation;

- **Establish a Project Working Group** - in consultation with EAC, establish a working group composed of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about voting fraud and voter intimidation, provide a description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation and the results of the background research to the group, and convene the group to discuss potential avenues for future EAC research on this topic;

- **Produce a Report** - Provide a report to EAC summarizing the preliminary research and working group deliberations, including recommendations for future EAC research, if any;

- **Assist EAC in Initiating Future Research** - if EAC decides to pursue one or more recommendations for future research, draft the project scope and statement of work for the request for proposals.

The EAC manager for this project is Peggy Sims. It would be most helpful if you could offer your expertise to Ms. Sims and our team of consultants. Ms. Sims will contact you to follow up on this request. If you are able to assist us, she will set up an initial interview, which will focus on the identification and prosecution of offenses involving voting fraud and voter intimidation, as well as possible resources on these subjects for our consultants' review. Our consultants and project manager may have follow up questions as the research proceeds. It also would be helpful if you would be able to attend the working group meeting to contribute to its discussion. This meeting will likely be held in February 2006.

If you have any questions about the research or this request, please contact Peggy Sims by email at psims@eac.gov or by phone at 202-566-3120.

Thank you so much for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely yours,

Gracia Hillman
Chair
The Honorable Garcia Hillman  
Chair  
United States Election Assistance Commission  
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Madam Chair:

I am in receipt of your letter of November 23, 2005 requesting my assistance in the development of a statutorily mandated report on voter fraud and intimidation that the Commission is currently undertaking.

I would be pleased, indeed honored, to assist you and the Commission in this matter and invite Ms. Sims of your staff to contact me at her convenience to discuss this matter further with me.

Sincerely,

Craig C. Donsanto  
Director, Election Crimes Branch  
Public Integrity Section