

**From:** Deborah Seidman-Munitz deb@welcomedriver.com  
**Subject:** FW: [RockNet] Affidavit Ballot Validation Procedures  
**Date:** August 3, 2015 at 11:57 AM  
**To:** rocknet@npogroups.org

DM

Oops – here is a link to the instructions I received for those who want to look:  
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/ln4rputziz1goa4/2015-08-03%20Affidavit%20Procedures.PDF?dl=0>

---

**From:** Deborah Seidman-Munitz [mailto:deb@welcomedriver.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 03, 2015 11:50 AM  
**To:** rocknet@npogroups.org  
**Subject:** Affidavit Ballot Validation Procedures

For those interested in the proceeding at Town Hall related to the Ward Referendum processing...

Today at 9:30 the town got off to a somewhat slow start. The ballot inspectors were in another class being given by Mona Montal to review the affidavit ballot validation procedures. I did hear from Chris Sampson that he did amend the procedures to include sorting by polling location. (His idea of what this means turned out to be fairly different than my suggestion.)

Once everyone filed in they had to take a little time to finish processing 30 absentee ballots. It turns out that while the town was very efficient about checking and rejecting people who weren't registered or whose signature seemed off, but if you appeared before the town and asked for a ballot and insisted you were registered they did seem to allow some people to get an absentee ballots anyway. So late registrants were able to vote by absentee ballot. There were 30 ballots not found in the polling books and they sent a list to the BOE to confirm if they were or weren't registered. This morning they got back 20 signature sheets to check the envelopes against and they needed to conclude that effort which they appeared to do.

I came expecting that Chris Sampson would review his affidavit ballot validation procedures to the "audience" – in this case I was there along with Mike Parietti and Bob Romanowski. While he did not go over the procedures as expected at 9:30, around 10:00, upon request, Bob Romanowski did get a copy of the procedures which he gave to me to review. Chris promptly left the room for about 30+ minutes without explanation but I waited until he returned so I could ask my questions:

1. How will illegible information be handled? (There are a number of forms filled out that resist all interpretation.) This instruction is not on the sheet but Chris assumes that if an inspector can't read it then they will put it in the bin for Chris' review and he will review it. He agreed that if he absolutely can't read it then he would "probably" discard it.
2. Polling location: All the affidavit ballots were delivered to the BOE with the rest of the materials by the polling location where they were cast. I asked that the ballots be maintained that way in order so that the ballot reconciliation process can be performed. This is where there is a requirement that all ballots used up at any polling location be accounted for (X machine voted, Y affidavit ballot, Z voided because of damage or otherwise, etc.) As it turns out the Town went out of their way to merge all the piles into one massive pile. I recommended that they start by subsorting it back into polling location piles and to maintain the results that way for auditing purposes. He added a requirement that the inspectors look up the polling location of the street address provided and to add that information to their "database". This solution does not match my recommendation since a non registered voter may not know where to vote

and the location where they voted may not have been the location where they should have voted. Additionally it does not serve to subvert the piles for ballot reconciliation purposes.

3. Missing information?
  - a. What if there is no date or an incomplete date of the voter's signature? Chris has stated he plans to accept the ballot.
  - b. What if there is no date or an incomplete date of the inspector's signature? Chris has stated he plans to accept that.
  - c. What if there is no inspector's signature? Chris stated he plans to accept that.
  - d. What if there is no polling location? Chris plans to accept that.
4. What if the voter edited the form? I explained that many of the forms were edited by the voter or the inspector to remove the words oath, or swear/sworn. In some cases these were overwritten by the word affirm, sometimes no word was replaced? I asked what he would do. He said he will have to see but he assumes he will accept them.
5. How will ballot #'s be added to the form if the polling inspector did not note it on election day? Chris has no plans to do this. He still has not provided me the ballot reconciliation forms under FOIL or included any instructions as to how he plans to do ballot reconciliation. While the town has a lot of leeway in how they do the election this is a fundamental process that I understand absolutely must be done. This will be interesting to see how they manage this process in the absence of so much important data.
6. Town of Ramapo location confirmation by "street finder"? I asked about the street finder database and was told that it was not solely by street but also by range of addresses of the street.
7. Part A Box Selection – what to do about Boxes 1 & 3? If no box is selected they are supposed to reject the ballot. If Boxes 1 or 3 are selected there is an implication that the voter should be registered and were not found or they were required to present ID that they could or would not provide. I asked how they would be processing those selections. Chris explained that he had planned to process them all the same. When I explained that by virtue of the selection of Box 1 or Box 3 that the voter was not affirming that they are a "qualified elector" and therefore the processing must be different – either they are found in the registration records or the ballot is discarded – he said that my comments were "noted".
8. If the ballot is incompletely filled out and at the top the type of form is not selected how will it be treated? Chris will not toss. He will process.
9. I asked if the DOB would be checked to see if it is valid and in range. He claims that is implied? It is not currently specified. There aren't too many that are off but some are.
10. I asked about the Affidavit Ballot Count. He still claimed not to know but when I pointed out that they have a database he asked Nate Oberman who said he believed the count was 2,534. I received 2,132 under FOIL and am working with Maureen Pehush to get the missing files. I also FOIL's the database as well and am waiting to get that under FOIL.

These guys have their work cut out for them. It still makes no sense to me – as I believe many/most people agree – that they did not release the election day results along with the overall count of the ballot types to see if the paper ballots are even material in this election.

Overall it is good to see that the procedures were updated but unfortunately they are still too incomplete for my comfort and certain decisions fly in the face of common logic.

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)