

**From:** Deborah Munitz (Seidman) deb@welcomedriver.com  
**Subject:** [RockNet] Election canvassing clarification  
**Date:** July 30, 2015 at 6:45 PM  
**To:** rocknet@npogroups.org

DM

I received a number of calls yesterday after the Journal News article was published. In the article it said:

“The board has already canvassed voting machines, but will not tally the electronic results until the paper ballots are counted. Results will be counted and certified by the the board.”

This was different than what I had been told by the BOE and also by Chris Sampson so I did contact the BOE today to clarify what that might have meant.

—> Kristen Stavisky was extremely clear in saying that NO canvassing of the vote has taken place and this is as of the end of business today.

At the opening preface of start of the validation procedures yesterday Chris Sampson did make certain statements and did take a few questions. Some of the things he said seemed to be in conflict with one another and I don't think they were clear and this may be the cause for the incorrect information in the paper.

Chris Sampson initially made a statement that seemed clear to me that they would run the absentee and affidavit ballots through the machines and then only after all ballots were cast would they request the BOE to read the memory sticks.

There as an orthodox gentleman who attended who asked about the election day results and Chris Sampson clearly explained that they were not available. However Chris also made a statement that the town would know how many votes came what which kind of ballot. That statement might have been the cause of the confusion as it could have been misinterpreted to mean that the town knows the number of votes (and results) from election day.

I have studied the canvassing procedures released by Chris Sampson and have my own concerns. I have sent one email on some of my concerns with the affidavit ballot validation and I sent a letter this morning about my concerns regarding the ballot reconciliation and the plan to not tally the votes in accordance with standard operating procedure which is to start with the election day results and then tally the votes for each category of ballot separately.

It is my understanding the town is not tracking data by ED at all and that at best information will be read by polling location. It is what it is and while it is not as one would expect, if everything is handled by polling location and tallied up consistently then at this point that is the best we can hope for. There is one stick per machine and there is one or more machine by polling location. Any voters in any of the ED serviced by a given polling location will have their votes combined. All this being said, there appears to be a plan to just lump all the affidavit ballots together and not break down the numbers even by polling location and I for one believe that is wrong.

The BOE was somewhat perturbed by my assertion that a considerable number of the affidavit ballots are incomplete and do not even have the polling location information included. My concern is that the procedures don't cover all the examples of problems found which mean that the process is not transparent as promised by the town. Hopefully they will be updating their procedures.

To better understand the concern of those who were fighting for a yes vote everyone needs to understand that:

- The news regarding the ability of non registered voters to vote was not revealed to the public until less than 24 in advance of the election and then not announced widely
- None of the poll worker training classes mentioned that unregistered voters would be allowed to vote and no one was told how to handle unregistered voters.
- On the day of the election there were no instructions regarding unregistered voters distributed to all polling locations
- Unlike normal elections where there is required signage on the doors of the polling locations as to what constitutes a qualified elector there was no documentation at any polling location.
- The poll workers seemed to follow a number of differing procedures on what to do about these voters ranging from turning them away, to using the affidavit ballots with id and proof of residency, to using them without id, and to possibly not using the envelopes at all.
- The affidavit ballots range from being completely filled out with polling location included and ballot numbers included to missing all manner of information.
- The numbers of ballot envelopes delivered to and utilized by different location varied considerably and some locations were better “trained” than others.
- The affidavit ballot envelope is meant to serve as an affidavit oath but the envelope form does not follow the standard form used by the board of election with distinct and important differences. This is what what was used for this election:  
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/adhl4x8vpu4o8e/Affidavit%20Ballot%20Envelope.pdf?dl=0> and this is a standard affidavit oath form:  
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/owhzw8p9zawjco5/Standard%20Affidavit%20Oath%20Form.pdf?dl=0>

It is great to have the Journal News cover events like this election validation but the details tend to be lacking. Since many people are curious I wanted to share a smattering of the details with you all.

If your really want to change how the processing occurs please take the time to write to the town clerk or the supervisor and voice your concern. Hopefully constructively and politely. They may ignore it but who knows. My support for the ward referendum is premised on the deep rooted belief that the majority of our town is actually tired of the bickering back and forth and would all really be better represented by representatives with closer ties to the community who are not dependent on the deep pockets of opportunists in the town to get elected. There

is simply so much work to be done in managing a town of the size and diversity of ramapo and if the energy of its citizens could be better harassed in working together to solve problems and improve understand than perpetuating the ad nauseous bickering.

Best wishes, Deb

---

You received this message as a subscriber on the list:

[rocknet@npogroups.org](mailto:rocknet@npogroups.org)

To be removed from RockNet, send any message to:

[rocknet-unsubscribe@npogroups.org](mailto:rocknet-unsubscribe@npogroups.org)

To invite new members to join RockNet, send blank e-mail to:

[rocknet-subscribe@npogroups.org](mailto:rocknet-subscribe@npogroups.org)