TANDING CON	1MITTEE ON ELECTIC	)NS
Public	Hearing in the Matt	er
Ele	ction Law Issues	
	Including	
Help	America Vote Act	
		Yonkers City Hall Council Chambers – 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor 40 South Broadway Yonkers, New York 10701  October 5, 2009 Monday
PRESIDING:	Senator Joseph I	10 a.m. P. Addabbo
	Chairman Senator Andrea	Stewart-Cousins

INDEX OF SPEAKERS
ROSS GALIN
TERHAND BRANDON
MR. GORDON
LILLIE GALLON
ELEGRA DENGLER
MARJORIE GERSTEN
JOANNE ROBINSON
VIRGINIA MARTIN (Statement read by Catherine Skopic)
CATHERINE SKOPIC
ERIN MALLOY
MARGARET SETTERMORE
CHUCK LESNICK

INDEX OF SPEAKERS
PATRICIA BRENNAN SCOVA
JOHN NONNA
KEN JENKINS
ASSEMBLYMAN BRIAN KAVANAGH

# (PROCEEDING)

## 2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

### CHUCK LESNICK

### City Council President

MR. LESNICK: Good morning, it's Monday, October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2009, and it's approximately 10:20. It's my pleasure to welcome everybody to the Yonkers City Council Chambers.

I'm Chuck Lesnick, your City Council President, but I'm not sitting in my normal seat today because we have a Senate hearing that's being presided by Senator Joe Addabbo.

Joe Addabbo has been a member of the Senate for a number of years. He served first four years in the New York City Council, and this is actually his first term. It just seems like he's been here forever, because his father, Congressman Joe Addabbo, served for 13 terms in the House of Representatives, so Senator Addabbo certainly has grown up around elections.

He represents the 15<sup>th</sup> District in the New York State Senate, encompassing many Queens neighborhoods, including Forest Hills, Glendale, Hamilton Beach, Howard Beach, Massmith, Middle Village, Old Howard Beach, Ridgewood, Woodhaven, parts of Elmhurst, Forest Hills, Ozone Park, Regal Park,
Richmond Hill, and South Richmond Hill, Sunnyside and
Woodside.

He's a practicing attorney; he is a sixthterm New York State Democratic Committee Member and a
ranking member of the South Queens Regular Democratic
Club, and a whole host of other civic organizations.
He is the Chair of the, was the Chair of the New York
City Council Civil Service and Labor Committee where
he fought for the health needs of 9/11 first
responders as well as retiree rights, fair practices
and workplace safety. He's got a lot of other
credentials, which are on his website.

Senator Stewart Cousins hardly needs an introduction in this building, where she served as the first Director of Constituent Services, first African American, I should say, to have that job here. She defined the job, so in many senses, she was the first. She was certainly the first, we worked together on creating Riverfest, and we did all sorts of other firsts during that time here.

She, in 2004, really became the poster child for election reform. The four-month legal battle that followed her election was part of the full Employment

Act for Election Lawyers for New York State that year, and every variation and theory of whether ballots should be opened or not were tested out in the courts thanks to Andrea Stewart Cousins, and although she didn't prevail in the courts that year, she prevailed in the hearts and the minds of the voters, and two years later, they elected her to represent Greenberg, Mount Pleasant, and Yonkers.

She has had a tremendous tenure in the State
Senate working with her colleagues to provide
additional funds for the Yonkers School Systems,
Yonkers City Government, keeping Dobbs Ferry Hospital
open. She is the Chair of the Local Governments
Committee and a member of the Banks Commerce Economic
Development, Small Business, Environmental
Conservation, Finance, Health, boy you do a lot of
work up there. Veterans Homeland Security, Military
Affairs. Also the Temporary Committee on Rules and
Administrative Reform.

She made history by being the first African American woman to preside over the Senate. As Presiding Officer, she is charged with maintaining order, interpreting the rules in the practices of the Senate, and calling the members to debate and vote on

legislation brought to the floor; a very challenging task, especially this past June.

She did have a stint, which I didn't mention, as a Westchester County Legislator, where she was elected Majority Whip and Vice Chair, and authoring and passing several landmark legislation, including the Westchester County's first Human Rights Law, Living Wage Law, Smoke-Free Workplace Laws, tougher gun laws, laws that prosecute predatory lenders, and laws that have provided tax cuts for seniors and veterans. Again, more on her website for more information.

It is my pleasure to pass the gavel over.

You can gavel the meeting open, to Senator Joe

Addabbo, Jr., the Chair of the New York State Senate

Standing Committee on Elections.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, very much,
City Council President, Lesnick, thank you so much for
the introduction, and thank, I want to thank you and
your staff for allowing us to be here working on this
Committee Hearing with us today. Thank you, very
much, to allow us to be in this beautiful chambers.
Thank you, very much.

And to all who are here this morning,

welcome, to another hearing for the Elections

Committee. Again, my name is Joe Addabbo, I am the

Chair of the Committee.

It is a great pleasure to sit next to a member of the Senate that I respect so much, our Senator Andrea Stewart Cousins, who we will hear from in a moment.

Just to do a little grounds keeping over here, I want to thank a couple of people who have put this hearing together. Again, Council President Lesnick and his staff. The legal counsel for the Committee, David Kogelman; my staff, Vickie Clark, Peter DeLucia, Jr., and Frank Scaduto. We have Council Alison Kelrick, and again, I understand we'll be joined by Assemblyman Brian Kavanagh, who chairs the Harbor Subcommittee for the Assembly.

I want to thank the Senate staff who's here for the video, thank you, very much, for the team with us today.

In today's hearing, excuse me, today's hearing is the fourth of a series that we do here today in Yonkers. We started this past April, you know, and we've taken this show on the road to Buffalo, Syracuse, Rochester, Albany and New York

City, in an effort to open up and make more transparent what we do in Albany, in the Committee Hearings. In this case, the Elections Committee. And we've spoken about a number, excuse me, a number of issues in the Elections Committee over the past year regarding how to make the process more feasible for our voters, how to clear certain barriers for our voters, how to make the actual voting process a better process, and more efficient process. And again, in an effort to open up what we do in Albany in our government, more transparent for people and have a great dialogue and a great communication and discussion with our people.

Today's hearing, we will be discussing ballot access of political candidates, deceptive practices and barriers that we have for suppression, designed to keep voters from our polls. A piece of legislation from Senator Stewart Cousins regarding voter intimidation, and the pilot program that was being introduced this year in our primary and both general, upcoming general elections, with the new optical scanners in the effort to comply with the Help America Vote Act.

As far as voters' suppression, one of our

most fundamental rights is the right to vote, and yet there are still barriers that exist to that right.

There has always been those who have tried to suppress voters, and we're going to talk about that today. A bill that Senator Stewart Cousins has introduced,

Senate Bill 2554A, makes it a crime to disseminate false information to disenfranchise voters by discouraging them from going to the polls; such as publishing a false election date or location. And it makes it a crime for any person, or organization, to suppress a person from voting, or voting for a particular candidate for office by use of force, authority, or abuse of power.

So we'll be talking about voter suppression, access to our ballot, and of course, as we go to the next generation of voting machines, possibly in our efforts to comply with the Help America Vote Act.

It's a great conversation that we have, we talk about the pros and cons of the legislation, we talk about the pros and cons of our election process, and the information that we gather here today is useful to the members of our committee as we go forth in our legislative process or administrative decisions that need to be made with regard to the election

process. So again, I look forward to a good debate, a good conversation that we have today.

Before I introduce our Senator here, I will let you know that we have a good number of witnesses; we have roughly 13 witnesses. In order to have a good conversation and allow for some questions and answers, I'd like to keep the witnesses, if we could, to about roughly five minutes. I don't have a big buzzer, no electric shock goes to the podium if you go over your time. Just that we ask for a little respect both ways as we go through this process in a very orderly manner, so I look forward to the conversation we'll have today.

Again, it is my pleasure to sit next to and serve with a person who is so dedicated to her people and her district, and that is our Senator Andrea Stewart Cousins.

SENATOR STEWART COUSINS: Thank you, so much, thank you. Okay, you can hear me now, right?

Okay, thank you so much, Senator Addabbo.

He also, I guess you came in just the term after I

did, and he just hit the ground running. And the

realities of what he's done on the Election Committee

are reflected not only in this hearing and making sure

that people understand what it is we're doing in the Senate, and why it's important to you, but coming out to the communities, letting people weigh in on all of the different areas, it really is a pleasure to work with you in the Senate.

And of course, my colleagues in the City of Yonkers, and Council President Chuck Lesnick, I do want to thank you, very much, for facilitating this meeting and making sure that the chambers are always welcoming. And, of course, I understand that we'll have other members of the Council who will come. I think Patricia McDow is scheduled to speak, and also from the County Legislature, we're expecting John Nonna, and Ken Jenkins, and also former mayor, Erin Malloy, will come from Irvington. They're all scheduled to testify today, and I hope that in the testimony, they will be able to illustrate why locally the selection of Yonkers, in particular, was an appropriate selection.

Before I go further in my thank yours, I do want to thank my staff; Betsy Ball, and Chris Johnson, Steve McGlott and Brian Hegt, and Kate Glasser, and I'm sorry, it's Kate Glazer, and Tonya Holt for being here and coming down. I have some of my Albany staff

that has come down, who has joined with my local staff, so they get a full flavor of the district, and, you know, participate in what is very, very important.

I appreciate the opportunity to open this
Elections Committee Hearing to briefly talk about the
reasons that I've introduced the Deceptive Practices
and Voter Suppression Prevention Act. In so doing,
I'd also like to recognize and to express my gratitude
to Ross Galin, Zoe Segal-Reichlin, and Sarah Egan for
all of their hard work in drafting and amending this
legislation; their time, effort and talent have
resulted in a bill that is bold, expansive, and strong
in its attempt to ensure clean and fair elections in
the state of New York.

Since the first day I declared my candidacy in the New York State Senate, and through my subsequent campaigns with all of their ups and downs, and I know we all remember those; the courts decision that I was 18 votes short of a victory in 2004, and ultimately my election and reelection victories in 2006 and 2008, I've been an advocate for laws that ensure accountability, and correct disenfranchisement and inequality, as well as an advocate for legislation that benefits all New Yorkers who are best served when

they are able to freely exercise their inalienable rights.

In 2006, an editorial observer in the New York Times summarized the stories of the "Dirty Tricksters" who win elections by gaming the system, intimidating voters, stifling turnout among low-income blacks, Latinos, throwing up serious challenges to legitimate registrations, and ferociously twisting legal technicalities in their favor. At the time, I wrote a letter to the U.S. Department of Justice requesting Federal monitors of polling places on Election Day, and while I referenced the mishandling of the 2004 election, which concluded with a recount, there was a more important and overriding message that I attempted to communicate as clearly as possible. could not, and would not, let voter suppression happen again. What were apparent brazen attempts to intimidate voters, suppress voter turnout, however, we're not necessarily practices that were specifically punishable according to our current laws. So there's no law that says suppressing of vote is illegal. is one of the reasons why this Bill is so important. It clarifies the issues, it leaves nothing to the imagination, it ensures that there are consequences

24

for any actions, individual or collective, which seek to disenfranchise any voter, anywhere, any time.

On election night in 2006, I concluded my remarks by saying that this appears to be a win. I'm not claiming it, however, as only mine. We are awake now. We are inspired now. We've got to work now, like we've never worked before, to change the state and to change our country.

Ultimately, that second time, although it didn't happen on election night, it was a win. But it was a win because all of the votes were counted, and because ultimately, my opponent had to join the chorus of people who were forced to condemn the actions of a few, which threatened to tarnish the integrity of our entire electoral process. And it was a win because here we are today, discussing legislation that we are poised to pass when we return to Albany, which will ensure that our fight for power is still about each and every individual, will not serve to selectively protect political parties, or special interests, or to serve the status quo.

I've introduced the Deceptive Practices of
Voter Suppression Prevention Act to protect the rights
of every voter, and the power of every vote. My

commitment to ending business as usual, and to real reform, brought me to this place, certainly with your help, and we must empower all New Yorkers equally.

Over the course of almost four years I spent running for this office, I promised my constituents over and over again that I would champion a legislative agenda that produced positive change and represented real reform. To that end, I'm proud not only to have introduced this bill, but to have introduced and passed two other key pieces of reform legislation;

Senate Bill 2443B, which enabled voters to vote in the correct polling place by providing such items as maps, street finders, or other descriptions of polling places to ensure that their vote counts. It requires a poll clerk or election inspector to consult a map, street finder, or other description of polling places in order to advise voters of his or her correct voting place. Something very fundamental that wasn't done before.

The next one, Senate Bill 2810, which has been signed at this point by the Governor, Chapter 40, and that allows for the use of titles, initials or customary abbreviations on an absentee ballot request

letter, and absentee ballot application form, or absentee ballot envelop, and prevents the invalidation of an absentee ballot if the identity of the signer or witness may be established similarly referencing the signature on the request letter, application form or ballot, or to that of a person whose name appears on the registration poll ledgers.

When former Mayor Erin Malloy comes, I'm sure she wills speak more to that issue, of how that particular thing played out in her election.

The same standard will be used now that is used for signatures on designating and nominating petitions, so that is a step forward.

So again, I thank you, and I am, you know, looking to hear your concerns, as my constituents, and I really, again, thank you, Senator Addabbo for hosting the hearing and empowering all of the speakers, and hopefully we will work towards passing not only my bill, but all of the great bills in the Election Committee. And thank you, so much, for being part of this.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, very much,
Senator Stewart Cousins. With you and your staff, not
only for the benefit of your constituents, but voters

1 in your district and throughout the state, and again, 2 that is part of the process that we are attempting to 3 do today, is further that work as we look to make this 4 process a better process for the voters, and again in 5 general, the election process. 6 So we will start to call our witnesses. 7 our first witness for today is Ross Galin of Davis, 8 Poke and Wardwell, regarding election protection. 9 Galin.

# ROSS GALIN

## Davis, Poke and Wardwell

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Mr. Galin.

MR. GALIN: Chairman Addabbo, Senator

Stewart Cousins, Council President Lesnick, Members of the Committee, thank you, very much, for having us here today.

As I mentioned, my name is, as you mentioned, my name is Ross Galin. I'm joined here by my colleague both with Election Protection, N. Davis Poke, Sarah Egan.

We come today in support of what we believe to be a very important piece of legislation. We thank you for holding this hearing, and the others that you've held in this series, on how we can best

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

modernize New York State's election system and address the deficiencies we all know currently exist.

I have to add that I am personally quite pleased to be here today as a constituent of Senator Andrea Stewart Cousins in the 35<sup>th</sup> District. I'm particular proud of the role you've played in helping advance the cause of this Committee in supporting election reform in an important and meaningful way, so thank you.

As you know, election protection is led by the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, and is supported by a diverse network of local and national coalition partners and over 10,000 legal volunteers across the country. The cornerstone of Election Protection's work is our 866-OUR VOTE hotline. Last year, over 240,000 voters, including 17,000 here in New York, called the hotline seeking assistance with a variety of questions and election-related problems. Additionally, tens of thousands more received assistance from our teams of mobile legal volunteers who were stationed throughout New York City on Election Day this past November.

Election Protection's sole mission is to work to ensure that every citizen, who is legally

entitled to vote, has the ability to freely and fairly exercise that right. Unfortunately, what seems like a rather simple goal is anything but. As the Committee knows well, the current election system places a number of obstacles between voters and the exercise of their right to vote. Many of these obstacles, including a flawed registration process and restrictions on the ability to vote by absentee ballot, have already been the focus of this Committee's important work, and we appreciate that.

It's in that same spirit that we are here today to support the Committee in its efforts to address another important obstacle, that is the focus of Andrea Stewart Cousins' Bill S2554A, the Deceptive Practices and Voter Suppression Prevention Act. This important legislation offered by the Senator addresses two of the obstacles that currently prevent voters from freely and fairly exercising their right. As hard as it may be to believe that decades after the Civil Rights Movement and adoption of the Federal Voter's Rights Act, there are still those, who through acts of deception and coercion, seek to prevent individuals from voting.

In recent years, our hotline and poll

watchers have documented instances of several individuals using intimidation, threats and coercion, to suppress the vote, as well as the dissemination of false information intended to frighten and confuse people in to not registering to vote, or not actually going to the polls.

In addition to those instances already mentioned by Senator Stewart Cousins, in November of 2008, voters in Shirley, New York received automated phone calls advising that due to the anticipated high voter turn out on Election Day, Democratic and Liberal voters should cast their votes on Wednesday, November  $5^{th}$ , the day after the election. On these calls, it was possible to press zero and speak to a live person, who conveniently reiterated the same false information. Similar deceptive information was printed on flyers and distributed in Lower Manhattan in areas where minorities were most susceptible to these flyers. The same is true in areas near Riverhead, New York. In Manhattan, it was reported that a sign posted near a legitimate polling place misdirected voters to a fictional polling place allegedly because the legitimate polling place was overcrowded.

1

2

In 2006, proving this is no recent phenomenon, voters in New York reported receiving harassing phone calls, or what are now known as robo calls, sometimes in the middle of the night, claiming to be from one candidate, when in fact, the calls were traced to the candidate's opponent.

In 2004, a caller to the Election Protection Hotline reported that Spanish-speaking residents of Port Chester, New York were being told that they could not vote unless they owned property in an effort to dissuade them from voting.

Deceptive practices like these have been reported all over the country in connection with recent elections. Voters in nearly a dozen states were the victims of misinformation in the weeks leading up to the 2008 election. Inaccurate information was disseminated about registration, polling locations, poll closing times, voter ID requirements, and a host of other eligibility issues.

During the 2000 election cycle, out-of-state students in Virginia, Michigan and Colorado, were told that if they registered to vote where they went to school, they could jeopardize their financial aide, their health benefits and their parent's tax status.

All untrue. In Philadelphia, flyers were distributed in minority neighborhoods stating that police officers would be positioned at poll locations to arrest anyone with an outstanding record -- ticket, including something as small as an unpaid parking ticket.

In 2006, in the federal election, deceptive practices were employed in Orange County, California, where 14,000 Latino voters received mailings informing them in Spanish that if they were immigrants and tried to vote, they faced criminal penalties, including incarceration. Also in 2006, some Virginia voters received automated phone messages informing them that they were ineligible to vote and would receive criminal penalties if they tried to do so. And in Maryland, flyers were distributed in predominately African American neighborhoods falsely claiming that certain candidates for federal office had received endorsements from their opponent's party.

Current New York law does not effectively address voter suppression or deceptive practices;

Conduct intended to create confusion, frustration and fear that interfere with the electoral franchise.

Senator Stewart Cousins' Bill will rectify this shortcoming by criminalizing deceptive practices in

connection with any election and creating a new electoral crime of voter suppression, punishable as a misdemeanor. Adoption of this legislation will both send an important message to anyone considering engaging in such conduct, and it will also importantly give law enforcement the necessary tools to address these problems and punish perpetrators.

Legislation similar to that proposed by

Senator Stewart Cousins has been adopted

overwhelmingly in both Minnesota and Virginia. A

federal version has also been introduced in the United

States House of Representatives and will soon be

reintroduced in the Senate. Even if it passes, the

legislation, the Federal legislation will not protect

the rights of voters in state elections and local

elections here in New York, as it applies only to

Federal elections.

Moreover, S2554A would empower the New York State Attorney General's Office to act to undertake all effective measures necessary to provide correct information of voters who are affected by the intentional dissemination of false or misleading information. Whereas prosecutions are important and serve to punish wrongful conduct, prosecution alone

cannot undo the effects of wrongful conduct prior to an election. Vesting the Attorney General with the power to remediate deceptive practices would better ensure that fewer voters are prevented from voting, and it is an important and necessary step.

Adoption of S2554A is needed to protect New

Adoption of S2554A is needed to protect New York voters seeking to vote in New York elections. In addition to denying a voice to eligible voters, suppressive and deceptive practices are poisonous towards the system and undermine confidence in our electoral system. It is critical, therefore, that it be stopped, and that is why we're here, to applaud Senator Andrea Stewart Cousins and this Committee for considering this very important piece of legislation.

We thank you, and we are very appreciative of your time and attention to these issues.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, Mr. Galin.
Mr. Galin --

MR. GALIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: We should note, you know, for the public, that this piece of legislation, in a time when, obviously our state's not doing well financially, this piece of legislation that is no cost to the state to implement, and would be effective

immediately upon signing by the Governor into law. So this is a good piece of legislation for an issue that is concerning us now.

Mr. Galin, how long have you been interested or working on this issue?

MR. GALIN: On this particular issue, I would actually say I have a personal history going back to 1996 when I was working in a different capacity in the state of New Jersey, and saw voters who were dissuaded from voting in the '96 presidential and senatorial election by people inserting in the Newark Newspapers, flyers telling, in minority areas, telling them that if they voted and they had an unpaid parking ticket, or outstanding child support issues, they would be arrested.

I was also troubled in 2000, when working with volunteer lawyers, I found out that people were being scared, using scare tactics telling people that if they voted on the new computerized machines, they were linked to the Federal Government, that would somehow know any outstanding records they might have, and would arrest them on the spot. These, as I've mentioned in my testimony, are the type of things we've seen. We're now, I guess, 13 years since I

first encountered this in 1996, and that's why this legislation is so important, and, and I underscore that one of the important things about this legislation is not just that it will punish people, but that it empowers the Attorney General to act proactively before Election Day when these reports come in. When this type of conduct is notified to election officials, they can notify the Attorney General's Office to do corrective work. That's something that New York law simply doesn't provide for right now.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Mr. Galin, one more question. Since 1996, 13 years, like you've mentioned, have you seen an increase in voter suppression tactics?

MR. GALIN: I can only speak anecdotally and refer the Committee to a report by the Lawyer's Committee and Common Cause, called Deceptive Practices ACT 2.0, which does in fact indicate that unfortunately, as social networking and the intranet has taken off and electronic media, we have seen a decided increase. Unfortunately, just as communication has become easier with the intranet, so too has it become easier to engage in deceptive

1	practices. So, yes, Senator, we have seen an
2	increase.
3	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Okay. Mr. Galin, I
4	appreciate your time and testimony today.
5	MR. GALIN: Thank you, very much.
6	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, very much.
7	Next is Mr. Terhand Brandon, Corrections
8	Officer and voter.
9	SENATOR STEWART COUSINS: And also while Mr.
10	Brandon is approaching, I wanted to say that, Zimmer
11	Brandon, former City Council Person, is a staff member
12	who has also been very, very helpful in pulling these
13	hearings together.
14	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, Mr. Brandon,
15	for your time today.
16	TERHAND BRANDON
17	Correction Officer, Westchester County
18	MR. BRANDON: First, I'd like to say good
19	morning to everyone.
20	As you indicated, I am a Correction Officer
21	in Westchester County, sworn to uphold the laws of New
22	York State. And one of the things that my presence in
23	uniform, or with my shield, is intimidation, and/or
24	force.

The night of November 6<sup>th</sup>, when I went to 1 2 vote, I perceived a higher than normal level of, it 3 appeared to be official activity. Also, there was a 4 larger number of people acting in an official capacity 5 at the polling place. Perception. Perception is just 6 as dangerous as direct action. 7 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Mr. Brandon, if I can 8 interrupt you for one second, respectfully, what year 9 are we talking about? November 6<sup>th</sup>. 10 MR. BRANDON: 11 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: November. 12 MR. BRANDON: November, in 2006. 13 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Six, okay. Thank you. 14 MR. BRANDON: Senator Cousins' second 15 election. 16 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Okay. 17 MR. BRANDON: There. 18 After signing in, I was approached by two 19 individuals, one male, one female. One asked for my identification. These individuals passed over younger 20 21 voters and zeroed on me, as an older person. 22 rather than object or cause a scene, I did not give 23 them my New York State driver's license ID. I showed 24 them my shield. They immediately left the scene.

at least for a short period of time, that form of intimidation ceased at that polling place.

I was born in 1946 in the south, where direct, indirect suppression, and outright denial of the vote was commonplace. All my years of voting, I have not seen or perceived any real changes. The way it's done has modified itself, but there has been no change. Whenever it's conducive for a candidate who sees that they are in jeopardy of losing an election, it's almost like no-holes barred contest. It's longer than it should be, that this practice needs to be stopped. Not just encouraged to be stopped, but stopped.

Now having a proposal saying that an activity of this nature will be deemed a crime, a misdemeanor or a felony, is nice. But again, it comes down to it, if there's no jeopardy, why should I even care? So it comes, this is also, I encourage the vote of this legislation, and it at least will be a beginning to start stopping the process of having a public vote intimidated by presence, by news, newscasts, misinformation, or using the intranet, again to, to discriminate wrongful information to prevent people from coming out to vote, for any

1 candidate. I don't care what candidate. But vote. 2 If people don't vote, they don't count, their numbers 3 don't count, and services to them in their community 4 does not happen. 5 That's my statement. 6 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Well, it's a good one, 7 Mr. Brandon. Thank you, very much. A question. 8 Since you're here in New York and that 9 incident that happened in 2006, that was the only 10 incident that happened to you, is that correct? 11 MR. BRANDON: Since I began voting? 12 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Yes. 13 MR. BRANDON: The only time. 14 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Okay. And it's a good 15 point that you make. This is a, you know, a good 16 piece of legislation that has no boundaries, in a 17 sense, that this is for every voter, and for every 18 candidate, that the Andrea Stewart Cousins Bill would 19 set up the perimeters, correct, in making it fair for 20 everybody? 21 Well, as a minority who is the MR. BRANDON: 22 person on the inside of the situation, this would be, 23 would help me, and my brothers and sisters, to have no 24 fear to come out to make their official opinion known

as to who they want, good or bad, to support them. By
electing them.
SENATOR STEWARD COUSINS: Just, I wanted to
clarify something. I think you made it clear in your
statement, but I just wanted to make sure that people
understand. Did you attempt to vote and they didn't
find your name in the book
MR. BRANDON: No.
SENATOR STEWART COUSINS: before they
asked you to identify yourself?
MR. BRANDON: My name was in the book, I
signed in the book. Stood in line to proceed to the
voting machine. They approached me and asked for my
ID.
SENATOR STEWART COUSINS: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Mr. Brandon, again, thank
you for being here today
MR. BRANDON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: and for your testimony
on this issue. Thank you, very much.
on this issue. Thank you, very much.  SENATOR STEWART COUSINS: Thank you.
SENATOR STEWART COUSINS: Thank you.

1	Frazer, Yonkers Democratic Committee Board Leader and
2	District Leader. Ms. Frazer. No? Okay.
3	We're going to call, let's see, is John
4	Nonna here?
5	Is Robert Gordon here?
6	MR. GORDON: Yeah.
7	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Okay. Robert Gordon,
8	next witness. New York Democratic Voter Council Anti-
9	Fraud Committee Chair. Mr. Gordon.
10	MR. GORDON
11	New York Democratic Voter Council
12	Anti-Fraud Committee Chair
13	MR. GORDON: Would you like me to provide
14	you with copies of my written statement?
15	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: If you have, I'll take
16	and that issue for anyone, if you have a copy, I will
17	take it here. If you don't have it today, certainly
18	you can send it subsequent to the hearing today.
19	And thank you, Mr. Gordon. Thank you, very
20	much.
21	SENATOR STEWART COUSINS: Thank you, very
22	much.
23	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Yes, thank you, very
24	much.

MR. GORDON: My name is Robert Gordon. I am here today on behalf of New York Democratic Lawyers Council, the NYDLC, to speak in favor of S2554A.

Thank you, Senator Addabbo and the Committee, for convening this hearing.

The NYDLC is a coalition of lawyers and non-lawyers who work on Election Day and throughout the year, to foster participation and trust in the electoral process by ensuring that all eligible persons can register to vote easily, voters are able to vote simply, fairly and without intimidation; all votes are counted, and all voting systems are open and reliable.

Voter participation is not a partisan issue. We at the NYDLC do not ask voters who they plan to vote for, or what party they are a member of. I am not here to speak for any one party. I am speaking about the need to have an election process that is fair so that whoever wins has the respect of the public who are going to be governed.

In our representative democracy, no civic duty is more fundamental than voting. It is the elemental step to all of our decisions. Citizens elect their representatives, who then make decisions

for us all. That is why the process for the selection of public officials must be one that citizens can trust as fair and honest. Political parties can disagree about policy, but we all agree that the election process itself must have integrity. Just as important, there must be the utmost appearance of integrity. That is why incidents where a candidate or supporters use intentionally false information to deceive eligible voters is so insidious. Worse, telling voters intentionally false statements that are an attempt to frighten them away from voting, is a heinous misuse of the political process. challenging voters becomes obstruction of the voting process if the challenger challenges everyone waiting to vote and doesn't have a factual knowledge and basis that those individuals are ineligible.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It's unfortunate that many people look down on public officials these days, when you all work hard every day for the public's good. But the reason is, that politics has a perception that it's just a game. That candidates can use deceit because it's part of gamesmanship. That is why this legislation is needed. To have a clear statement in the law that we do not approve of those tactics.

As elections become competitive, the motivation for dishonest behavior increases. I can give you a few examples from New York, from my experience in elections.

In the 2006 race for State Senate in Syracuse, we had to send an attorney out after reports that a man falsely claiming to be from one candidate was outside the polling place telling the candidate's supporters the polling place had been changed and sending them away.

Also in the 2006 race for Congress in Utica, it was reported that people went door to door on election morning falsely claiming to be from the Board of Elections, and falsely telling perspective voters their polling place had changed.

Recently in 2009, there was a special election for Congress in Saratoga Springs. We had to send an attorney out after reports that a man went through Skidmore College with a bullhorn telling the students that they weren't allowed to vote. In that race also, we had to send out an attorney after a challenger was challenging every student who came in to vote.

Then there's also general chicanery in 2006,

1 which the prior speaker spoke to, about repeated robo 2 calls at night by one candidate deceptively pretending 3 to be from the other candidate. 4 I understand that you'll be hearing from 5 various incidents from Westchester so I won't cover 6 that. 7 This sort of behavior is considered part of the political process in some circles. There's one 8 9 commentator, Rush Limbaugh, boasted in September 2006 10 on his radio show that this was an appropriate 11 technique to deceive voters. 12 There are numerous examples from other 13 states, others were mentioned earlier, I'll just go 14 briefly. 15 There were flyers in Philadelphia in 2008 16 telling students that the authorities were planning to 17 monitor the polling place to catch anyone who had 18 tickets. 19 In Arizona in 2006, men with guns were 20 posted outside the polling places to check for 21 immigrants. 22 Flyers in Milwaukee in 2004 told voters that 23 if they owed child support, they would be arrested at

the polling place.

There have been numerous of incidents over
the years of falsely claiming, in the name of a Board
of Elections, that has false information. Several
states have recognized the need to criminalize
deceptive practices. Florida, Minnesota, Missouri,
New Hampshire, New Mexico, Louisiana, and North
Carolina specifically outlaw deceptive practices.
California even has a sanction against communication
on line that's deceptive. Montana, Nevada, New
Jersey, Pennsylvania, South Dakota and Wisconsin
outlaw impeding the vote through "fraudulent
contrivance". Colorado, Ohio, and Virginia make it
unlawful to otherwise interfere with the free exercise
to vote or induce someone to refrain from voting.

The value of \$2554A is several fold:

The value of S2554A is several fold:

Presently Election Law 17150 does refer to

intimidation fraudulent device, but without

identifying what behavior is covered. This leaves the questions subject to interpretation. This bill clarifies the type of behavior that is prohibited.

Two, it clarifies and increases the punishment under Election Law 17166 for intimidation or deception of voters to make it a class A misdemeanor for the first violation, a class D felony

for the second, and then a class D felony thereafter.

For those who are involved in the campaign, there should be a clear statement as to what is permitted and what is not permitted. In this way, well meaning people will have a clear understanding of what they are supposed to do. Similarly, by clarifying the law, we avoid having dishonest people who will claim the law is unclear to try to avoid responsibility for their actions.

In closing, these voter protection bills, the statutes in other states that I've mentioned, passed in Republican control legislatures and Democrat control legislatures because it's the right thing to do. The State Senate should pass this bill because it restores to politics a recognition that it's a profession, and the legislature respects the voting public. Everyone, from every side of the aisle, can agree to take affirmative steps to improve the image of politics and politicians. This bill sends a strong statement that the New York Legislature finds that deception and intimidation have no place in our election process.

The NYDLC commends the Senate for taking up this important issue.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, very much, Mr. Gordon. I want to thank the New York Democratic

Lawyers Council for the work that they've done on this issue. I know they've done some work, and I appreciate that.

I asked the question earlier to Mr. Galin about, do you see this as a rising issue? You mentioned some instances in your testimony, but again, the work that you've done on this issue, have you seen it, is it becoming a rising or more important issue over the years?

MR. GORDON: It's become, it's become a rising issue in the last few years, but I will say my own judgment, it's part and parcel of the closeness of many elections. In other words, when it's a landslide, they don't, no one really work very hard for one side or the other. But when races area few percentage points here or there, at the margins, there will often be someone who will want to, rather than promote themselves, will also try to shave off votes from the adversary. And that's where getting, you know, a few hundred, a few thousand votes lost, can make a difference in a race. So I think because of the general politics of our state and our country,

1	being as close as they are, that has given more
2	motivation to certain people and certain groups to use
3	those kind of tactics more often.
4	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Okay. There being no
5	other questions, Mr. Gordon, thank you, for your time
6	and testimony.
7	MR. GORDON: Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, very much.
9	Ladies and gentleman, I just want to make an
10	announcement. We have been joined by Assemblyman
11	Brian Kavanagh. He is Chair of the HAVA Subcommittee
12	for the State Assembly, and I want to welcome Brian
13	for being with us here today.
14	Thank you, very much, Mr. Gordon.
15	Next witness, Lillie Gallon. Is Ms. Gallon
16	here?
17	Ms. Gallon is Yonkers Democratic Committee
18	Ward Leader and District Leader.
19	Good morning, Ms. Gallon.
20	LILLIE GALLON
21	Yonkers Democratic Committee Ward Leader
22	MS. GALLON: Good morning. Thank you, for
23	having the hearing here.
24	I didn't prepare a speech, but I've been a

Co-Ward Leader in Yonkers now since I guess maybe

1996. And on Election Day, the Ward Leader and I

travel the whole Third Ward, to all the polling

places, to hopefully be able to minimize the conflicts

that occur in the polling places. And actually, that

seems to have worked pretty well, most of the time.

But we do see problems, not as great as some other areas of the city. And it also depends upon the seriousness and the wanting to keep the position of that particular race by the candidate or candidates.

One of the issues that, or many of the issues that we frequently see on our side of town is poll watchers being very aggressive, thinking they're part of the process when they're not. Creating a hostile environment for the voters because sometimes things happen, and then the voter is drawn in to the conflicts that are occurring at the poll.

Arguing with the poll inspectors. Sometimes the poll inspectors, who may not even come from the City, become really aggressive with other poll inspectors, upsetting them, creating, again, a hostile environment within the polling place for the voter. And drawing that voter into that, and certainly that's not what the voter is there for.

The other issue is challenges. Or asking for ID when clearly in the book, it doesn't require the ID. And when you tell them that they're not supposed to ask for the ID, or ask them, does it say in the book that ID is required, then they become hostile with you. And again, it's an intimidation tactic.

A lot of times, things happen early, early in the morning when people are on their way out to work, but they want to get their vote in before the day is gone. And they don't appreciate having to do that, and sometimes they leave because of it, because it's taking too much time.

People's names in the book are missing.

We've had many instances where we've had old-time couples living in the area, going to the same polling place for years and years and years, and all of a sudden, one is there and one isn't. Now they didn't die. So we want to know, well, what happened, and then they're required to do a paper ballot. They're not always told that they can go to the City Hall and actually only came to my attention recently, that the judges sitting usually in City Hall, during primaries, only general elections. So as a result, even if they

had the time or the desire to come to City Hall to be allowed to vote in the polling machine, they're not interested in doing it, or they just don't have the time to do that.

I have noticed over the years, and I was listening to the attorney, and I know it's not all politicians, but there are a few that make it a bad name for everybody. And a lot of time, over and over again, you hear people when you talk to them about voting and making sure of the importance of voting, they say, what's the purpose? My vote doesn't count. Because they see it as an illegal process, not a legal process. Because when you have the redistricting to make sure that you have, you keep your position, all the money that's spent to make sure that you win, all the little things that happen, that make it so that less and less the voter has any say so in their process, and it's very disturbing.

And I'm really glad that there is some legislation pending, and I hope that it goes through because as far as I'm concerned, the only people who are important in this process is the voter. That's what this country was built on. But that's not what it seems that the politicians, not all, again, but

it's pervasive on all levels of government, that they forget that. And in my perception, sometimes I think they're trying to make them less and less valuable to the process, to eliminate them, on any level, whether it's signing petitions, registration, voting, any level, I see it happening over and over and over again. And I don't think it's right, and I don't think that's what this country is about. So that truly I do hope that the legislation passes, and that again, the confidence can be built within the community, that it is important.

And education. Education is key. Because a lot of people don't understand the interdependence of government, levels of government upon each other. And what rights they have, because it always seems that they have less and less rights all along.

So that's all I have to say. Thank you, for listening.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Well let, Ms. Gallon, and I appreciate your testimony, and I think you're correct, the focus should be the voter. It's a great right to have, and obviously the Election's Committee has been trying to increase voter participation and clear some barriers to make sure that voter turnout

and the voters that do vote have a good experience.

If a voter doesn't have a good experience, they feel intimidated, or they just see something not right, in your opinion, you're there, you see something, who should you contact? If you're a voter and you see something, or you're a victim of it yourself, if you're at the polling site, who do you suggest they contact?

 $\label{eq:MS.GALLON: Well I've never personally had} $$ a problem.$ 

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Mm-hmm.

MS. GALLON: But when I'm around and there is a problem going on, I try to resolve it if I can because I make sure that I go to all the poll inspector trainings so that I have a, kind of a birds eye view of things that are changing in the polling place. So I do try to, if possible, intercede. And then other times, I tell them they need to call the Board of Elections which isn't always helpful. But, you know, I think from a personal perspective, and when I think about sometimes people having problems, I don't think they think they have an avenue to make a complaint and that it be made and taken seriously and a resolution. Because that goes in tune with

1	sometimes poll inspectors that have been a problem
2	over and over and over again, who are argumentative,
3	who prevent other poll inspectors from doing their
4	job. Who stockpile paper ballots, and because they're
5	able to intimidate the other poll inspectors, you
6	don't know if it's valid or not why these paper
7	ballots are being filled out. And in writing, and
8	also in phone calls, complaints have been made. The
9	person isn't removed. So that's another issue.
10	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Okay. Thank you, very
11	much, Ms. Gallon.
12	MS. GALLON: You're welcome.
13	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, for your time
14	and testimony. Elegra Dengler. Is Ms. Dengler here?
15	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She is.
16	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Oh, I'm sorry. Ms.
17	Dengler is from the Citizens Voting Integrity.
18	ELEGRA DENGLER
19	Democratic District Leader, Dobbs Ferry
20	MS. DENGLER: Thanks a lot for having this
21	hearing and giving the public a chance to address you
22	guys.
23	I'm Elegra Dengler, I'm a Democratic
24	District Leader in Dobbs Ferry here in Westchester

County, former Trustee in the Village of Dobbs Ferry; have experience on the ballot, protecting the ballot, in the polling place.

I observed the primary recount in New Hampshire, the Clinton/Obama recount where paper ballots and scanners were used. I've also participated in election protection in Florida as, from New York Democratic Lawyers Council sent to volunteers to Florida to help protect the election in Broward County, Florida, which is another infamous, a place with infamously bad elections in the past.

And since 2004, we've had a group in Westchester County, Citizens for Voting Integrity, seeking to protect our vote as we potentially go to this new voting system.

After decades of generally trusted and reasonably tamperproof elections in New York, run on mechanical lever voting machines, the transition to a new voting system based on paper ballots and scanners caries much risk, which I have seen firsthand. The threats to our elections posed by this new voting system must be taken seriously. New York State must adequately fund all the increased costs of training, administration, security, audits and equipment. Local

government in this fiscal climate, will not, on their own, be able to adequately fund this replacement voting system.

I'm currently working for the Town of Greenburg, and Greenburg's cutting police, they're cutting recreation. The county is in fiscal crisis, and the state is in fiscal crisis, but if' you're going to implement this new system, you must adequately fund it. You've got to fund the audits. You can't push this down to the local level. If adequate funding in New York is not available, New York should not replace the current voting system, which is functional and has proven functional over the years.

Security costs money. With this new voting system, we have two very vulnerable, we're replacing it with two very vulnerable points; one is we need security for the paper ballots. The other is, we need security for the vote counting scanners.

In the case of the paper ballots, the problems are well documents. Ballot box stuffing, misplacement of ballot boxes, substitution, destruction of ballots. In the old days, it was, the reason we got the lever voting machines was when

ballot boxes were floating in the East River. So paper ballots are vulnerable. Chain of custody is crucial.

And then the second is the security for vote counting scanners. The problems of computerized vote counting are similarly well documented. Study after study shows what Princeton found in 2002 with their security analysis of the Diebold Accuvote Scanner, scanner system. The study shows that -- I have links to the studies, it found that an attacker who gets physical access to a machine, or its removable memory card, for as little as one minute, could install a malicious code. Malicious code on a machine could steal votes undetectably, modifying all records, logs and counters to be consistent with the fraudulent vote count it creates. An attacker could also create malicious code that spreads automatically and silently from machine to machine during normal election activities. A voting machine virus could effect the entire election if only one machine is infected.

So adequate audits are essential to ensure that the scanners are counted accurately, are counting accurately, and I'm not sure, I don't see a timer, so I don't know how much time I have, but, you know.

23

24

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's not regulated.

MS. DENGLER: Just give me a, you know, 60 seconds, whatever.

I observed the elections in September, you know, the primary ballot, the voting that we just had. And I only was in four polling sites, but of the four, two of the machines were already dented, the door was dented. In one of them, a door was dented so much that you could have access through that door. quality of these machines is, you know, we're paying as much as the cost of a small car for these voting machines, and they should be able to hold up, you know, at least one election, because they're not even being widely used yet in Westchester, only by disabled voters. Also one, there's supposed to be, I understand, three security stickers and on one out of the four, one of the stickers, the one over the ballot box door was there. Indicates need for training, support for our poll workers, which costs money, which we need from the state.

And I would say there are three circumstances under which New York State should not, under these conditions, use these new scanners at all.

The first is, if the scanners do not pass

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

the certification to New York standards. They're currently being evaluated. If they don't pass those standards, they should not be used.

Two, if New York State does not completely support the counties with funding to cover all of their increased costs, especially adequately, statistically adequate audits.

And the third thing is if the voting machine vendor is found at any time to be in violation of New York State Finance Law, and the New York State Comptroller's Procurement and Disbursement Guidelines, to date, most of the large voting machine vendors have failed to meet these standards. I have a report attached that details the problems that vendors have created for election officials, counties and election workers around the country over the past few years.

So in conclusion, given the known vulnerabilities and costs of both paper ballots and electronic vote counting, I urge you, I urge the State Legislature, in these fiscally uncertain times, to amend NYS ERMA Law to allow counties to retain their lever voting machines. And secondly, the Federal HAVA Law appears not to ban lever voting machines, but to ensure that there's no cost to litigation, I urge you

to, the State Legislature, to convince our Congressional Delegation to clarify Federal Law by granting an exemption for New York State to keep our level voting machines. And I have a couple of attachments.

Voters Unite Report, vendors are undermining the structure of U.S. Elections. And the GIO Report from 2005 General Accounting Office, the Federal Agency, Elections, Federal efforts to improve security and reliability.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, Ms. Dengler.

Ms. Dengler, a couple of questions. A previous hearing of the Elections Committee we had was in Albany, and the argument was made by a number of witnesses to keep the lever machines. And again, I'm mindful of their concerns, and obviously their points of view. A question. There is an ongoing discussion that even with the HAVA and ERMA requirements, that even with the lever machines but by having at least one optical scanner machine at a polling site, that would satisfy the requirements of HAVA and ERMA. To your understanding, would that be correct?

MS. DENGLER: On my reading of the law, you know, any, maybe a couple of you may be lawyers, there

is not, it's not clear in HAVA. In my reading of the law, it says that a lever -- does not ban lever voting machines. It says you must have this handicapped accessibility, which we now have, because we have these scanners in every polling place. So the Federal Law, I don't think, is clear. The State Law is clear. It says levers must go. And you folks are from the State, so you can just, you know, take that sentence out of there and let us continue with our existing voting system.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: And we are of the understanding that the State will make a decision, roughly by the end of this year, they still have the pilot program going on for this next November, upcoming November general elections, and so you know, this Committee will have another hearing after the general elections to again, examine how the new machines faired during both primary and general elections, so we'll take a look and reevaluate the new machines there.

Assemblyman Kavanagh.

ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: Just a question.

You mentioned that it's important to have statistically significant audits of the new election

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

systems. Do you have an opinion about how those audits ought to be structured, what percentage of the ballots ought to be audited?

MS. DENGLER:

I'm, that's not my field of

expertise. There have been comments, I think on that, from other parties about what's a statistically adequate audit. In my position of what I saw in New Hampshire, especially, I think it's really crucial what happens on election night, before those paper ballots leave the polling place, that the audit, whatever audit and count happens, has to start on election night. You can't put those paper ballots in a box and send them off someplace and, and have them out of public view and then have a count. So, because in New Hampshire, you know, what I observed was there was the paper ballots exactly, or approximately matched the printout from the computer. But the ballots that we were looking at in the State Capital, we had no way of telling whether those were the same ballots that had been actually voted on in Londonderry, or wherever they came from. Because there was no, they had been out of public view, they were in, well, New York won't have this problem, but in New Hampshire, they were literally in Staple's

1 boxes, used Staple boxes with the tape around them. 2 But once those paper ballots go out of view, anything 3 can happen to them. We didn't even get the, in New 4 Hampshire, we didn't even get the poll books so that 5 we could determine that the same amount, we had the 6 same amount of ballots that had been voted on in the 7 local town. 8 ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: Okay, thank you. 9 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, Ms. Dengler. Appreciate your time and testimony today. 10 11 MS. DENGLER: And the --12 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: I'll take them here. 13 Thank you, very much. 14 I know our Senator, our State Senator Andrea 15 Stewart Cousins has other appointments. I want to 16 thank, once again, our Senator for being here, for 17 representing the people so well, for her staff and her 18 efforts with this issue, so thank you, very much, Senator Andrea Stewart Cousins. 19 20 SENATOR STEWART COUSINS: And of course, 21 thank you, Senator Addabbo, for hosting these 22 hearings, and for having them right here in Yonkers, 23 because as you can see, people have quite a lot to

24

say.

1	And again, Assemblyman Kavanagh, thank you
2	for coming, and welcome to the district, and again,
3	thank you, to all who have taken their time to
4	participate in this, and hopefully with your help, we
5	will really create, again, the type of electoral
6	system that you can have confidence in and be proud
7	of. So thank you, so much.
8	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, very much,
9	Senator.
10	Our next witness, I believe in continuing
11	the issue about lever machines and optical scanners,
12	Marjorie Gersten.
13	MS. GERSTEN: Correct.
14	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Marjorie is from Where's
15	the Paper.org.
16	MARJORIE GERSTEN
17	Representing Brooklyn Chapter of
18	WheresThePaper.org
19	MS. GERSTEN: Representing Brooklyn.
20	And I will do this in an amended fashion,
21	just to sort of speed it along.
22	I do have some comments though, on what was
23	just, with what Elegra Dengler spoke beautifully
24	about, as always.

You mentioned the pilot program, but what, from what I understand, is not really sufficient auditing, so it's not a true pilot program. And with certification, you keep talking about the importance of certification, it's immutable process and whatever they certify and test months and years before has nothing to do with operations during an election.

And I would also ask, I also have memory of New Hampshire, where the memory cards got immediately erased. So here you're counting ballots at infinitum and you're not really comparing it to anything. So there are a lot of problems with having to audit and cross-check when we don't have funds and we don't have set up procedure.

I'm just going to talk for a little bit about the lack of accurate information for the public and public officials. And I thank you for holding this hearing and inviting us to speak.

I am increasingly concerned that our state is moving ahead to replace our lever voting machines without accurate information, about either the levers or the new equipment of paper ballots and scanners.

The public has not been informed, and worse, neither have our public officials. I want to briefly

address four areas and submit documentation to inform this Committee.

Number one, I'm of the contention, as of many, that HAVA does allow the use of levers if supplemented by accessible equipment in each poll site. And it's attached, the relevant portions.

Public officials have heard for years from vendors and their public relations firms that HAVA, the Help America Vote Act of 2002, prohibits continued use of lever voting machines. The widespread belief in this falsehood shows that on one reads legislation.

I urge you to distribute this paper, company documentation, that quotes "the relevant portions of HAVA in order to inform our legislators, Governor, county election commissioners and deputies, and staff."

Another point I just want to mention is that parts and service for lever machines are easily available and expensive. It is almost an urban legend that you can't get parts and service for lever voting machines. Except that people in suburban and rural parts of our state also have heard this repeatedly, and it is false.

I would like to submit into public record

this letter, it's attached, from the Voting Machine
Service Center, which has been in business for over 32
years, and services the AVM lever voting machines used
in most upstate counties, as well as into public
record the facts from International Election
Solutions, which services the Shoup machines used in
the city and Albany County; that state levers can be
maintained indefinitely and inexpensively.

To the best of my knowledge, the lever voting machines in Ulster County were renovated to nearly new condition recently for an average cost of just \$400 each, and such maintenance needs to be done once every four years. The average cost per machine then is just over \$100 per year.

Point three. The lever machines can be broken. However, if our county maintenance personnel are sinners when it comes to doing a proper job of keeping the levers in nearly new condition, they will not all of the sudden become saints when they have to work on computers.

The main difference is: When a lever machine is broken, everyone notices. When a computerized optical scanner is working improperly, dropping votes or crediting votes to the wrong

candidate, no one will notice. As long as people can still slide their paper ballot into the slot, everything will look fine.

And you talked about giving everybody a wonderful experience. They will have a wonderful experience of pushing buttons and sliding paper in, but that is not what we consider a voting procedure.

The lever machines were designed to facilitate quick visual inspection and simple mechanical tests, so that they are easy to maintain and inspect. They cannot switch votes. The low undervote rate in New York State tells us they work very well. In 2004, our undervote rate was under 1 percent. In 2008, it was similar.

In contrast, computers are impossible to inspect visually. They require expensive, time-consuming tests by making up test ballots and feeding them through the scanner.

The scanners are allowed to handle up to 4,000 ballots on election day, according to New York State's Regulation 6210.19. Yet no one will test that many ballots in their pre-election tests, and errors that kick in after a few hundred or a thousand ballots are cast, will never be detected by pre-election

testing. We need realistic testing, but we cannot afford it.

And to the last point, people say paper ballots will protect us. That would be true if the votes on the paper ballots were to be hand-counted immediately upon close of the polls while under continuous observation by observers.

However, 97 percent of paper ballots will be counted only by computer, invisibly, via software that cannot be inspected by any candidate or voter, or even our county election officials. The ballot programming is on little memory sticks, or memory cards, that will be secured with a piece of sticky paper called a tamper evident seal, that could be lifted up and stuck down again instead of tearing to pieces when it is peeled off.

I do not believe that a 3 percent spot-check of scanners, combined with 97 percent invisible computerized vote counting will protect anything except errors and fraud.

At the September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2009 meeting of the New York Sate Association of Counties, Aimee Allaud, Elections Specialist, New York State League of Women Voters, said, we advocated for the paper ballot,

ballot marker-scanner system because with rigorous procedures and citizen oversight, it is effective in ensuring both access and accuracy. She also said, newer technology can provide better verifiability. However, New York State will not have rigorous procedures. Three percent spot-check is not rigorous. To give a sense of what three percent means, ATM transactions are verified 300 to 500 percent.

We will not have citizen oversight because our state law allows the voted ballots to be out of observers' view for up to 15 days wit no oversight whatsoever. And it's just a couple more paragraphs.

Regardless of what new technology can or cannot provide, we should not move ahead to replace our lever votings based on theoretical possibilities. It is time for our public officials to get more realistic.

Our nation faces an economic downturn. Our people are out of work. Our tax base is shrinking.

Our state faces at \$2 billion deficit this year, \$18 billion in three years.

The likelihood of rigorous procedures in the foreseeable future is zilch. No county can afford them, no county has invited its citizens to observe

1	the paper ballots between the end of the election day
2	and the three percent audit that takes many days after
3	the election.
4	Given these circumstances, it is urgent for
5	our state to reconsider the path we are on
6	immediately.
7	I urge you, Chairman Addabbo, and your
8	Committee, to try to spread light on these issues to
9	other officials, and to try to halt our misguided
10	plans to replace our lever voting machines until we
11	can afford to handle the new technology as securely as
12	it needs to be handled.
13	Thank you. And I think just a change of a
14	word in ERMA from shall to may, I think that's been
15	brought up before, gives us some breathing space.
16	Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, Ms. Gersten.
18	A question, Ms. Gersten, I'm sorry.
19	MS. GERSTEN: Oh, sorry.
20	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: A quick question from
21	Assemblyman Kavanagh.
22	MS. GERSTEN: Yes.
23	ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: I just want to focus
24	on this issue of the paper ballot being out of public

view.

MS. GERSTEN: Mm-hmm.

ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: Currently the lever machines are open on election night, the numbers are read, if anyone is there to observe, they're then locked up, packed up, shipped back to the Board of Elections, and at some later date, they're opened up again and we all have a chance to review them. Is that --

MS. GERSTEN: It's not apples and oranges because it's transparently, it's transparent immediately. Whereas, you know, with New Hampshire, as I'm saying, the memory card, you know, unless it's read and not erased, there are just too many variables that are unknown that can be falsified. Whereas, I mean a lever machine is like a bicycle. It's just gears and chains and, and it's all very transparent. And we can see, to a certain extent, and up to one percent undervote, what's happening. Whereas everything is pretty secret with an electronic system.

ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: I understand that, but in terms of actual custody of the machinery, -
MS. GERSTEN: Mm-hmm.

ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: -- I mean, if I

wanted to, if I were someone at the Board of Elections has custody of a machine and I want to change the outcome on a lever machine, that would be probably not significantly more difficult than changing the paper that's in the bin and simultaneously changing the --MS. GERSTEN: I mean what you can do electronically is, is a lot greater than what you have to do with a machine one at a time. ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: But you're not going to change the paper --

MS. GERSTEN: And with --

ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: -- as well, right? I mean, just for example, the ES&S machines, which were in use for a pilot in Buffalo. There is a box where the ballots go in, there's a counter. The counter reveals the count on Election Day, to anyone who happens to be there at the closing time so everybody gets a digital readout of what the count was as of that night.

MS. GERSTEN: Mm-hmm.

ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: The paper's still in the bin. The counts are presumably on those chips, and I'm not, I'm just, since you're here to advocate a particular position, I'm just questioning that

1 position, I'm not --2 MS. GERSTEN: I'm just saying. 3 ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: -- taking a position 4 myself here. 5 MS. GERSTEN: When we had election law 6 change from paper, they determined that the 7 transparency of the mechanical, and the hand counting 8 that night of whatever paper ballot was done for 9 absentee, or whatever, because that was 100 percent 10 transparency. And chain of custody was satisfied. 11 When we're talking about three percent, or unless 12 you're doing 100 percent that night, which is nothing 13 I would wish on any Election Board or Commission poll 14 site, so that's the difficulty of what the optimum is. 15 Am I sort of getting this? You're talking about an unrealistic goal with electronics. 16 17 ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: And just to be clear, 18 what my, I share your concern about the adequacy --19 MS. GERSTEN: Yes. ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: -- of the audit. I 20 21 believe the law is currently too vague about what, 22 three percent of what ought to be counted. I think 23 three percent is probably too low a number. But just, 24 I'm just focusing on this chain of custody issue.

MS. GERSTEN: There are statisticians, I mean if you're insistent on like pursuing this, there are statisticians, and it's not just a flat percentage, there are ways to economically do this --

ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: No, I understand that, I'm just, my question is different. I'm just, I understand that if we have machines, whatever kind of machines they are.

MS. GERSTEN: Mm-hmm.

ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: We need them to accurately count the vote. We then need to secure them, reliably. And then we need to open them at a time when everyone can see it.

My question is, if the machines are, you know, visible throughout Election Day, they're closed up, they're secured, just like the machines are now, and then we review the results, if the review is adequate, is there something about paper machines --

MS. GERSTEN: Well there's something about the mechanic, mechanical machine, which does not change without changing it versus electronic, which is a mutable. It changes all on its own. Or it may be programmed to do so. It's just very much an unknown, and we're never really ahead of the curve. So, you

know, it's very important to take this memory card,
whatever the results are, and do as much as you can
do, and it's a lot of work and a lot of expense. So
what we're saying, is for all the time and trouble,
and money we don't have, why switch at this point?
Because I don't think what we're being offered in
electronics is anywhere near what we deserve with the
money we're spending. I mean there are people, and
I'm one of them, that electronics are always a
problem. And there are some people that just sort of
like them, believe in them, and like their computer is
the one computer that never crashes.

ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: Right.

MS. GERSTEN: But even if you, you want to pursue it and say it's of the future, we're just not there yet. They haven't really changed the designs since they foisted it on us like 10, 15 years ago.

All the money hasn't, has been spent on PR and litigation, and nothing on designer research.

ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: Okay, and I take it -MS. GERSTEN: And it's junk, so that's part
of the problem.

ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: And I take it your concerns about the electronics are not assuaged by the

1	fact that there's, unlike our current machines,
2	there's actually paper that indicates the, that could
3	be an indication of the intent of each voter.
4	Obviously that doesn't matter
5	MS. GERSTEN: I think
6	ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: whose out auditing
7	it.
8	MS. GERSTEN: It's the devil we know, and
9	we've worked with it for years, and we know where
10	things happen. It's one percent, it's stuff we don't
11	know. Things have happened, and we know that. It's
12	what we don't know and will never know with
13	electronics that really should terrify us a lot more.
14	ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: Thank you.
15	MS. GERSTEN: Okay.
16	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, Ms. Gersten.
17	Our next witness, Joanne Robinson, Yonkers
18	Democratic Committee.
19	JOANNE ROBINSON
20	Democratic District Leader
21	MS. ROBINSON: Good morning, my name is
22	Joanne Robinson. I'd like to say thank you for
23	coming, Senator Addabbo, and your Committee.
24	I don't have a prepared statement, but I

have been a Democratic District Leader for the last 20-so years, some years, and I've seen what I consider abuses, especially when I listen to the testimony of Ms. Gallon, and I would agree with her on the fact where you have some people ask for identification, and that's, and it says that you're not, and I think that intimidates people. Many incidences, I've seen couples who have come to vote year after year, and then all of the sudden, their name doesn't appear, and I think this really discourages people from voting.

Also, I don't know if this, you would consider an abuse, but when it says permanent registration, and people think that when they fill out that registration card, that, you know, if they move from one apartment to the next, or they move someplace else, that they don't have to register anymore, and I think that's an abuse because in a sense, it disenfranchises them, they're not aware that this happens.

The other thing is when you take somebody's name off the list, I think that's another abuse because you're disenfranchising them, and that person should be notified by the Board of Elections. And I think that's unfair.

And when you were just talking about percentages and the electronic system, I'd like to say that I think money should be spent, especially in training. We have a difficult enough time training people on the levers, and I really strongly believe levers because if you see what happens on the intranet, can you imagine what you can do with those electronic machines?

And I also feel that it's very important that you talked about percentages. Why is it just that certain percentages, certain machines are examined and not all? Doesn't everybody's vote count?

And I really feel very strongly, when it comes to prisoners, maybe it's not an abuse, but they really are not aware of when they can vote and when they're not. And when people come up to me and say, oh, when I'm registering someone, they'll say to me, I can't vote, or this or that, and then I'll say to them, were you incarcerated? And nobody really explains to them exactly when or when they cannot vote. I think that should be an education by the probation officers, because I think that's an abuse of their right. They've served their time in jail, or whatever institution, and then they come out and they

don't really know whether they can. I know it's a misdemeanor, or there's certain felons or things, but they really should educate them.

And I also think another thing that's important, that money, that I think it's an abuse that we can spend loads and loads of dollars on voting and telling people, you know, to vote for this candidate or not, but money should be set aside so that people know that voting, voting is important. And that when it is, when it occurs, the days, the voting days, and where people can get information. And especially if they're, if they are challenged, they don't have an I have taken people personally to the judge because I don't care whether you're Republican or Democrat, you should not be disenfranchised. And, you know, you sit there and affidavit paper, and an affidavit doesn't count. You need to have that vote on the machine. And people are not aware of that. And I think that's, I personally think that's an abuse when people are not aware. And they're also intimidated. They have to go to the judge, and it's a simple, it's a simple process, but they don't know And we need to spend more money on education and making people aware. I think, that, to me, is a

24

terrible, terrible thing. We always want people to vote, and we talk about why they don't vote when you have 30 percent, or, you know, or 40 or 50 percent when other nations that we are talking to about democracy have a much higher percentage of voting than we do.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Ms. Robinson, I just want to let you know, I think you bring up a fine point about education and awareness, which is why we do these hearings, and I think that's why Senator Stewart Cousins' legislation is so important, it will raise the awareness of voter intimidation now that they'll be a law again, that deals with it, and deals with the penalty, and I think you're very correct when you say there needs to be an awareness and education about voter intimidation. And hopefully as you we go forward, we can get this issue out there, so I think you're right on point.

MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, very much.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, Ms. Robinson.

MS. ROBINSON: I'm sorry, I don't have a statement written for you, but I do hope that you will have your court reporters, or whomever, take all this

1	information down.
2	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: We do.
3	MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, very much.
4	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you.
5	Our next witness, Catherine Skopic.
6	<u>CATHERINE SKOPIC</u>
7	Also Representing Virginia Martin
8	MS. SKOPIC: Good morning, and thank you,
9	Senators Addabbo.
10	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Good morning.
11	MS. SKOPIC: And our HAVA representatives.
12	My name is Catherine Skopic of Tribecka, New York, and
13	we just received testimony this morning from Virginia
14	Martin, who is the Democratic Commissioner of Columbia
15	County Board of Elections. And I have both her
16	testimony and mine. May I bring you copies?
17	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Sure thing.
18	I will first read the testimony of Virginia
19	Martin, the Democratic Commissioner, Columbia County
20	Board of Elections. The Help America Vote Act and the
21	New Voting System.
22	VIRGINIA MARTIN
23	(Reading from Catherine Skopic)
24	Thank you, Senator Addabbo, for this

opportunity to be heard, which I take advantage via proxy, as I am busy in Hudson preparing for the November election.

I entered the Columbia County Board of Elections as commissioner last December, and I did so with high hopes for implementing our Sequoia voting equipment, which included both the ballot marking device, which our county had already displayed, or deployed in two elections, and the optical scanner, which it had not, and has not yet.

It didn't take long for me to realize that I had a very difficult row to hoe. It didn't take long to realize that any and all efforts to help people with disabilities to vote were getting lost in the shuffle. Or that the resources this voting system would require were fantastically more than my county ever dreamed of spending on elections. Or that the equipment was shoddily made and poorly designed. Or that given today's economic realities, my changes of getting the funds and the staff my board would need to successfully implement this system were somewhere south of zero. Or that given the increasing number of optical-scan problems coming to light across the United States and around the world, the chance of New

York State giving me a system of regulations that would truly protect my voters, my candidates and myself, while also protecting my taxpayers was, yes, far south of zero.

Then I read HAVA, and I saw that while the legislation does provide money to replace lever machines, it most certainly does not require that they be replaced.

And then my worldview shifted, and I started advocating to keep our lever voting machines, which we could use alongside our ballot-marking devices.

Because clearly, the new machines, the opscans, are nothing, if not a very expensive and insecure means of voting that demands that we institute a backup system of very expensive and very insecure paper ballots.

When I made the decision to keep our lever machines, I also decided that I would redirect the energy of my board otherwise would have put into making the opscans work toward what I thought HAVA was supposed to be about in the first place; helping people with disabilities to vote. Since then, our board has jumped in with both feet, so to speak, to help disabled people to know that we have ballot-marking devices, to make sure we have appropriately

trained staff in charge of those BMDs at our poll sites, to make sure our poll sites are fully accessible, to help everyone all over the county understand the challenges that people with disabilities face, and to set up mechanisms by which all kinds of voters can come to appreciate their many differences and welcome the participation of all in the democratic process of casting their votes.

I'm very proud of the modest strides we've made so far, and of the people who have stepped forward to assist us as we make the act of voting more democratic. I'm very proud that my county is solidly behind me and recognizes how illogical it is to transition from a voting system that works to one that, without throwing endless piles of money in its direction, would give us no more than a toss-up chance of doing what a voting system should do; account for every vote cast just as it was cast by the voter who cast it.

And my county knows that I won't certify a computer-counted election.

I have taken a proactive position against electronic voting. While it's not one that many other election commissioner will take publically, it's a

position that most are sympathetic to. I know it's what our voters, our poll workers, our staff, and our candidates want. It's certainly what the legislators who levy our taxes want.

Please, listen to the experts who say that, for electronic voting to be secure, election boards must conduct very thorough, and yes, expensive, auditing of the paper ballots of every race. Please, read the case studies that show how costly electronic will be for us. Please, acknowledge that optical scanners have very real limitations and vulnerabilities. Please, pay attention when yet another hack into an electronic voting machine is brought to light. Please, listen and believe when the two companies providing parts for lever machines tell you that they are ready and willing to continue providing all the parts we need, even manufacturing new lever machines if necessary. Please, think of the voters, the candidates, and the taxpayers. Please understand that, to maintain my own integrity, I have no choice but to refuse to certify a questionable election result. Please rethink the notion of electronic voting.

We're the Empire State, and we can be the

24

1	first to take the courageous step in saying no thank
2	you to electronic voting. If we do, others will
3	follow. Because when it comes to voting, a simple
4	mechanical system alongside a ballot-marking device is
5	better.
6	And now, my very brief statement of my own.
7	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Just one point
8	MS. SKOPIC: Sure.
9	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: for clarification,
10	because I made a mistake upon introducing you. You
11	had read a statement from Virginia Martin, the
12	Democratic Commissioner for the Columbia County Board
13	of Elections.
14	MS. SKOPIC: Correct.
15	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: That was
16	MS. SKOPIC: We just received this testimony
17	that I just read.
18	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: And I appreciate you
19	reading it, thank you.
20	MS. SKOPIC: Yes. That was from Virginia
21	Martin, Democratic Commissioner, Columbia County Board
22	of Elections.
23	MS. SKOPIC: And now I'm going to read my
24	own.

As citizen of these United States, reside of New York State and Educator of 35 years, and I've also worked on election protection in Philadelphia in the 2004 election, I am present standing here before you this morning to speak of democracy and the vital importance of maintaining it.

As you know, in order for a democracy to be a democracy, there must be fair, transparent and honest elections. The lever voting machine has shown to be the most reliable, transparent and tamper-proof voting mechanism we have.

Integrity of the vote means that every vote is counted as the voter intended. Citizen oversight of elections needs to be facilitated by the voting technology itself, as well as the procedures with the vote. As one who has worked several elections as an inspector, I can assure you that with our lever voting machines, ordinary people can meaningfully, with checks and counterchecks, witness, manage, count, record, and deliver the results of the election to protective custody who deliver it to the Board of Elections.

There is the protective counter, there is the public counter, there is the cards, there is the

registration book, all of these serve as checks and counterchecks against the vote and can be proven.

So why am I here today concerned about our democracy? New York State plans to replace these dependable voting machines with voter-marked paper ballots and precinct-based optical scanners as of 2010. About one third of upstate counties began using this new technology as of this year's September primary. This is a problem for our democracy because no one can meaningfully observe the handling, storage or counting of votes.

Scanners are computers, and computers have to be audited. In all other applications, outside of elections, every computerized step is verified, such as in the ATM where one's transaction is verified at least three to five times. New York State law requires only three percent spot-check of the scanner's recording, which is not enough to ensure that the correct winners were found. It means we will have 97 percent invisible vote count.

Another problem with this voting system is that the resultant voting ballots are out of the observer's view for up to 15 days, offering the opportunity for tampering and public suspicion. And

1 there won't be any way of knowing if tampering took 2 This is not the way of democracy that place or not. 3 conducts its business in complete public view. 4 In addition to the lever voting machines 5 preserving our democracy, we already own them. 6 Millions of dollars will not have to be spent on 7 something that does not work as well as what we 8 already have. And levers were built to last over 120 9 years. We still have decades left on them. 10 Maintenance is easy and inexpensive. We could save 11 the money. I urge you to preserve our democratic 12 process by keeping our lever voting machines. 13 Thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, Ms. Skopic, 15 and thank you for the reading of the prior statement 16 as well. 17 MS. SKOPIC: You're welcome. 18 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, for your time. 19 Our next witness is Ms. Erin Malloy, former 20 Mayor of Irvington. Malloy, good afternoon. 21 ERIN MALLOY 22 Former Mayor of Irvington 23 MS. MALLOY: Good afternoon to you, and 24 thanks for the opportunity to speak to you today.

As you mentioned, I'm the former Mayor of Irvington. I also served as a trustee. Prior to that, I was President of League of Women Voters of Westchester and the Local Rivertown's League. I am here in none of those capacities.

My name is Erin Malloy, Erin B. Malloy, or as the good sisters of Immaculate Heart of Mary would have it, Mary Erin Malloy. And I have, under those guises, a checking account, Social Security card saying Mary Erin, and the only time I've ever used B. in the last, you know, so many years, is when we refinanced my house. So the IRS is perfectly happy to accept a check for Mary Erin Malloy's taxes, from Erin Malloy, and as is everybody else, so there are many, and I use those examples from a personal standpoint, of how there are differences in the way one frequently signs their name.

And I'm here in support of the two Senate bills that Senator Stewart Cousins has sponsored, 2810, and 2545. And both of these address the removal of restrictions of, as a reason, as a rational for excluding an absentee ballot. The reasonable expectations of differences in the way one signs their names.

So very frequently, especially in the last 40 years, 30 years, women in particular, will have hyphenated names. I did not do that. There are certainly any number of women who are Stewart Cousins, for example, and what does happen is that sometimes if it's not a hyphenate, or you would sign Andrea S. Cousins, Andrea Stewart Cousins, and there are a couple of things that happen with that. One is it depends on how the computer sorts the names. So while I am not personally a victim, I was collateral damage to a situation that arose just because of that.

A woman sent in for an absentee ballot for my first mayoral campaign. She received it in the mail. She filed her absentee ballot in a timely fashion, signing it Susan B. Morton. On election night when they were counting it, they did not see a Susan B. Morton. They looked under Morton. As it turned out, the election, without going into all the hideous details, wound up with a split vote of, I was tied with the incumbent, with one, well first I was ahead by one with two votes uncounted, two absentee ballots uncounted. We asked, they asked if they would allow one of those votes to be counted but not the other, and we said certainly, but we reserved all

rights for the second ballot. The second ballot was Susan B. Morton, Susan Brenner Morton, sorted under Brenner in the files.

Well eight months later, after original rulings that her vote should be counted, I mean obviously there, you know, the interest of her having done exactly the right thing, the name was there, she had voted in any number of other elections, and the point of not counting her ballot was just absurd on the face of it. And why, and that it didn't happen, and resulted in on this ciaos in our village, was really a source of a lot of amusement, cost destruction of our budgets, and in general, you know, disregard for, you know, the idea that every vote should count.

I have a lawyer friend who says that

Republicans think that voting is a privilege, and the

Democrats think it's a right. I think that's not a

fair assumption. I think this is beyond what

anybody's political stripe is. I think -- and I saw

that in my village. People were outraged that this

woman -- people who were not my supporters, that this

woman, who legitimately cast a ballot, could not have

her vote counted. And so I think as a philosophical

1	point, the idea of finding reasons to not cast
2	legitimately, not count legitimately cast votes, is
3	really just anthemia to everything that we stand for.
4	
	So, I would ask that you support this, as do
5	I, and I appreciate your time. Thanks.
6	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, Ms. Malloy.
7	Just out of curiosity, how many voters in
8	the village? How many votes were cast?
9	MS. MALLOY: We have, there's 6,600 people,
10	about 4,000 voters. In that election, we had about
11	1,800 people, which was a pretty fair turnout for
12	anybody in the, you know, in 2005. I mean, we've done
13	better lately, but
14	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: I think we had you
15	slightly more than the past runoff in New York City, I
16	think.
17	MS. MALLOY: Yeah, right. Three hundred and
18	ninety.
19	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: You have a higher
20	percentage of voters, certainly. You know, and I'm
21	very happy that you acknowledged the Senator. Senator
22	Stewart Cousins has really been successful in
23	championing the name issue of a voter in the State
24	Senate, and obviously we encourage her to go forward

with those issues, but it is an issue. And certainly
I agree with you, anybody who's qualified to vote, to
go vote, and their vote should be counted. So any way
we can help in that endeavor, certainly we look
forward to working with you.

MS. MALLOY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, for your time today.

MS. MALLOY: My pleasure.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, very much.

Our next witness, Margaret Setterhome.

MS. SETTERHOME: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Good morning.

#### MARGARET SETTERMORE

MS. SETTERHOME: And thank you, for holding these hearings. I only found out about them on Friday, so I don't have something prepared. And also, it seems that there could have been a better turnout. I don't know if the email outreach in, you know, for the Hispanic community was dated properly? I'm just questioning about the turnout if there was, you know, does this Committee have a proper outreach in their communiqué, and could you review that, because this is such an important issue.

The right to vote, that every vote is counted, that every vote is a reflection of our inalienable rights enshrined in our Constitution; the right to vote is like a pillar of our entire country. It's probably the most substantial pillar, pillar of all. And for that to be under attack.

I want to pause and tell you a true story, briefly, that throughout the summer of 2001, I was the favorite voter registration person in Grand Central Station. The Station Master's Office gave me, they blocked out most of the time they had for public space for, you know, for public service, so I got the prime space nearly every day of the month; August, July, August and September.

Now I had an American flag behind me tapped up. I wrote red, white and blue. I had, you know, a stars and striped scarf. And I had my little table there, and I would say register to vote, register to vote, as people would pass, you know, come and go. I didn't have a lot of people until 9/11. After 9/11, now of course, the station had been closed, and then when it reopened, there I was. I was mobbed. There now was, there were grand American flags hung, and they still stand today in the station. I had the only

one prior to that. And I had lines. And I had help from the police. And I took care of everyone. I registered every party there. I was non partisan. It's just the passion for what we have.

I've lived overseas most of my life, in third-world countries where there were dictatorships, and I'd lived in a war zone. And people would look at me as an American and know what I had, you know, and they dreamed for that. You could see it in their eyes, they wished for what we have. So when I came back in the year 2000, really relieved to be stateside again, I just had this feeling, we don't seem to value what we have. Then I saw this overwhelming passion for what we have after 9/11. Because terrorists threatened to take away what we have.

So, therefore, I had these incredible lines after 9/11. That's because of terrorism that was, shall we say, from the outside. But what's happening now with our voter system, is like terrorism from the inside.

I've heard it today with the speakers before me as described as tucannery (phonetic), insidious poisoning of our system, that, you know, they're deceptive practices, fraudulent, contrivances and all

I'm going to use a stronger word. It's a type this. To corrode our voting system, to make of terrorism. it so weak and unreliable that we can't depend on it when our entire democracy depends on this. There are hackers for hire. It's very serious. The Pentagon spends billions protecting their system because we want to be safe from what? Terrorism. We don't have enough resources to protect, we're not going -- it is too vulnerable to turn this precious voting system to an electronic system that can be very easily under It's something we cannot give the grace of our country to. I don't feel we should do it. is not about the fear of the new or the fear of No. Our whole election process is about is all about that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

very well.

Now one of the issues, the pressures we're under, there are two pressures mainly in our voting system, and I'll wrap this up.

One is convenience. There are long lines, and people have to go. They've got to, you know, so there's this pressure. Oh, let's make it easier so everyone votes, they know it's not going to be a, you know, hell, you know, a day that is wasted waiting in line. Americans want convenience. Things are instant. We have microwaves, we have, we're like this, okay. I think the remedy is simply to have better trained poll workers, and also more of the lever machines.

I've been a poll worker, and I know that when everyone's well trained in the crew, and we have, and all the machines are working, we don't have a situation, there are three down, you know, that they have to be working. When everyone's trained very, very well, we keep it moving. And then the people waiting in line see that it's moving, and it won't be that long, and there's this, you have to have good training, and monitoring, and all that.

And now before I go into the other point

24

that's important on, you know, the pressure we're under, is that on 9/11, I was a poll worker. near the Trade Center. And when it was clear we were under attack, people in line started to cry. you know, they wanted to cast their vote, but now what do they do, you know? And I just cried out, vote. They don't want us to even have the vote, the people that are doing this. I was emotional, I said vote, just vote, show that you can fight this. You know, some people just voted just because they felt that This was as we were under attack. And, you way. know, then of course there was no line because of the situation, and everybody was running north. But I stayed with the machines, and an officer did, and one other person, until we got the call that the election was cancelled. It was primary day for the Mayor of the City of New York, so the election was cancelled, so oh, we could all run north. But, you know, we have to protect what we have, from an inside corrosion, inside unreliability. That smacks of a kind of terrorism. And you can be sure that those who want to destroy what we have would use this as a means to, you know, hackers for hire, get in there and get their person who's going to, you know, give the contract, or something.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The other thing is, anything to destroy what Now, the other pressure we're under aside from convenience, which can be addressed; more machines and a better trained staff, is lobbying. These computer companies and programmers, they have expensive, you know, they have lobbyists, who then carefully, public relations wise, they shape their campaigns to sell this so called remedy. And then, of course, too, part of selling what they think is, you know, they want you to believe it would work, is to downplay the advantages of the lever machines. is a sales pitch. That is their sales pitch. You're under pressure from, you know, the industry that wants an account. So you have to just look at it that way, and you will be standing firm and protecting what is so valuable, so extraordinary in this country is the voting right for every person, and to stand strong, and acknowledge the brilliant sales pitch that the electronic industry is promoting, but say thanks, but no thanks, and keep what is so precious.

And so thank you, for indulging me with these remarks.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, Ms.

1 Setterhome. 2 MS. SETTERHOME: Thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, for your time 4 and testimony. 5 Our next witness is a gentleman who was up 6 here earlier, City Council President. Senator, step 7 forward. Mr. Lesnick. 8 MR. LESNICK 9 City Council President 10 Thank you, Senator, and MR. LESNICK: 11 Assemblyman, and it's good to see you from this angle 12 as well. 13 I wasn't going to speak today, but in 14 hearing some of the comments that people were making, 15 I thought about some previous comments that I've made 16 about the election inspectors. Because they are the 17 backbone of this system, and they work very hard. I 18 think they get \$200 for a very long day that starts 19 about quarter to 6 and goes till about quarter after 20 9. 21 In some parts of the state, it's really easy 22 to find election inspectors. In other parts, it's 23 very difficult, and I have two suggestions that will

increase the pool of election inspectors.

The first is, to recognize that it is every much a civic duty as jury duty is, let's say. And as a citizen, you get called for jury duty once every four years, you have to serve five days. Many people, especially sole entrepreneurs, can't take five days off in a row. And if you gave them the option of serving as an election inspector for five elections during a four-year period as an exemption and alternative to jury duty, they might pick it. And that would give you a pool of people that you could call upon.

The second is, and again, some of these election inspectors have been doing this for so many years, they're getting a little old and tired. They can't always lift the books, they can't always see the lights and things. It's important to bring young people into the process. If you drop the age from 18 to 16, obviously a 16-year old isn't a registered voter, but if they could be an apprentice election inspector for that two-year period, you'd be training new people, you'd be providing jobs and opportunities for young people, and teaching them about the electoral process in the same fell swoop.

So, two suggestions to increase the pool of

1 inspection people. Thank you, very much. 2 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Well before you go. 3 MR. LESNICK: Yes. 4 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Just so you know, one of 5 the reasons I love doing these hearings is that we get 6 to hear ideas, and some of these ideas turn into 7 legislation, so that is another purpose of these kind 8 of hearings. And already, we have a couple of 9 suggestions from previous speakers. 10 Just so you know, there is legislation 11 pending in my Committee reducing the age of poll 12 workers and inspectors, technically, to again, 13 encourage younger people to get involved, and also 14 widen the pool of perspective workers. 15 And certainly the other idea about serving 16 in lieu of jury duty is something that we can discuss 17 in the Committee, so again, City Council President 18 Lesnick, I appreciate your suggestions and certainly 19 will bring it back to the Committee. 20 MR. LESNICK: Sure. It would especially 21 work for people like lawyers who are often exempt from 22 jury duty anyway, so make them work on the polls 23 instead. Thanks. 24

Thank you, very much.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO:

1	Thank you.
2	I'll read off a couple of names here. If
3	you're here, please step forward.
4	Do you have a Ms. Margarette Walton? Is she
5	here today? Ms. Margarette Walton?
6	Do we have a Mr. John Noona? These were
7	people I mentioned that they may want to testify.
8	Ken Jenkins? Is he here?
9	Patricia McDow? I don't think, she's not
10	here.
11	Roberta Frazer, right? That's your sister,
12	correct?
13	MS. FRAZER: Yes, we're identical twins.
14	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: So I figured if I didn't
15	see another one of you here, then she's not here.
16	MS. FRAZER: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Right.
18	Now those were all the people that had
19	signed up to speak. We have a please, come
20	forward.
21	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Good afternoon.
22	MS. SCOVA: Good afternoon.
23	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Just please state your
24	name for the record, please.

#### 1

#### 2

## 3

# 4 5

## 6

## 7

# 8

## 9

#### 10

#### 11

#### 12

#### 13

#### 14

### 15

# 16

## 17

#### 18

- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23

24

#### PATRICIA BRENNAN SCOVA

#### Town Clerk, Town of Mt. Pleasant

MS. SCOVA: Patricia Brennan Scova, I'm the Town Clerk in the Town of Mount Pleasant. I've been a Town Clerk for about 18 years. Before that, for 25 years, I worked as an election inspector. I was involved with my mother in politics, she was the secretary to Electoral College for New York State back in the 1970's, so I've been around the process for a while.

My concern is also the lever machines. new machines, I understand they were used in Putnam. I've spoken to some of the clerks in Putnam. They're concerned about the count, the three percent. It goes beyond that. They said the privacy of your vote was not good. They said once they mark their ballot, they walk with their ballot to the machine to put it into the scanner, and they felt the inspectors could see Especially the primary, when there wasn't their vote. a large list of candidates. They also said with your seniors, some of them are a little shaky, they have to mark the box that if you're just out of the line of the box, it's rejected. So there are things to consider for our seniors voting on these new machines.

They're very used to the lever machines. In fact, some of them still come in and look for the handle overhead from the old lever machines instead of in front.

Your lever machines are so safe. I will point out a personal example.

Several years ago, the keys weren't returned for the, after the election. And the Board of Elections came to recanvas, and I didn't have the keys for a particular district. They said they wanted me to break the machine, to break the lock. I said give me some time, I'll call and see how fast I can get keys, and also I'll call a locksmith. I had two locksmiths and one of my detectives. The two locksmiths came in, they could not get into that machine to open it, and my detective, who has picked a few locks, could not get into the voting machine. So your lever machines are very secure.

And one thing I'd like to point out to the Assemblyman, not all of the lever machines are stored with the Board of Elections. Mine are stored in my building, right with my police department. So my machines are always secure. There is a gate into the area, besides the locked door, and when there is an

1 2

impoundment, we padlock the door and we tape the door with crime tape. So our machines are very secure.

The problem with, I think, some of our elected officials, is they don't know the process of Election Day. They don't know the process of a voting machine. We, as clerks, did run the elections up until two years ago, and now the Board of Elections has taken it over. We have secured our machines, we have secured our voters' integrity, as far as their vote, and I feel the proposed machines, we are not ready for them, our voters are not ready for them, our inspectors are not ready for them.

And going back to the inspectors, their training has to be upgraded. They need more training. They don't need training in April, for a 70-year old person, 75-years old person, a training in April for voting in November. We have to have ongoing training. We have all, most of us in our communities now in Westchester, we have our own cable stations. should have something on our cable stations for the training of our inspectors, as an ongoing thing. Especially say from mid-August with primaries and with the voting in November.

But, I thank you for your time.

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	you'll consider all that was said today about the
2	lever machine.
3	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Patricia, I'm sorry, for
4	the record, could you just spell your last name,
5	please?
6	MS. SCOVA: S-C-O-V, as in Victor, A.
7	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Scova. Ms. Scova, how
8	many you said that you had actually, you had the
9	experience of running the elections and obviously
10	overseeing it, for how many years?
11	MS. SCOVA: Well I'm there, about 14 years.
12	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: About 14. And now the
13	Board of Elections, correct?
14	MS. SCOVA: Now the Board of Elections.
15	Well, they've taken over part of it, we still do part.
16	It's kind of a mish mash in that right now. We're not
17	doing it, but we are doing it. There's still a lot of
18	gray area, and it's not easy for the Clerks or the
19	Board of Elections, because we're not sure who's
20	responsible for what at this point.
21	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: And do you know how many
22	registered voters in the area?
23	MS. SCOVA: In my area?
24	CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Right.

MS. SCOVA: About 26,000.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Twenty-six thousand.

We have a questions from Assemblyman Kavanagh.

ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: Thank you, and I just want to say that you mentioned elected officials not fully familiar with the election process. As I, I'm a very newly appointed share of a sub-committee in the Assembly on Election Day Operations, and certainly will be looking forward to learning a great deal from folks like yourself, and I've already been around the state to meet with election officials in a few counties, and we'll continue that, and that's also why I'm here today, even though I'm not a member of this Committee.

I just want to talk to you about the, your points about the, about securing the machines, and your point is well taken that in some parts of the state they're not, there's not a central location where the Board of Elections stores them. But in terms of physically securing machines after the polls close, would you anticipate, assuming, and I understanding you have concerns about implementing the non-lever machines, the electronic machine, but would

you anticipate that the security of the machines from the point the polls close to the point where the machines are opened and examined, would be handled similarly?

MS. SCOVA: Yes. I know a lot of places, you know, like Yonkers, they have 300 and some I don't know if they get them all back election night, or it's the next day, or if it's the course of several days. But there has to be one, one size fits all, as far as -- if you're doing this, do it right. Everybody should be under the same guise. All machines go out one day before, or they're picked up one day afterwards, but I think one size fits all, it should be, across the state. At least the state. I know HAVA was designed to make the whole country, you know, more or less in compliance, and one page, but that's not happening, it's not happening in New York because counties are allowed to pick whatever machine they decide on and that, I think is a mistake. I think the state should be uniform.

And one thing I would ask that as clerks, we've been completely ignored. There was a committee previously to yours, that we met with with the League of Women Voters in White Plains several years ago, and

22

23

24

not a clerk was invited to be on that committee. And, you know, we're the guys on the front line. We're still getting the calls from our voters and our inspectors, even though the Board of Elections is doing the hiring of the inspectors at this point. The clerks are still on the front line. We're still getting the phone calls. And we're the ones that deal with the voters, not the Board of Elections, and not with a committee, so we'd like to be include to, you know, know about these public hearings or any committee meetings that you'd have. I think we have good input.

ASSEMBLYMAN KAVANAGH: I appreciate your input today, thank you.

MS. SCOVA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Ms. Scova, thank you, for your time and testimony today.

Ladies and gentleman, we're going to take a brief intermission here, a recess. John Nonna, who's Westchester County Legislator and Ken Jenkins of Westchester County Legislator, both are traveling together and they're on their way. They are technically the last two to give testimony today, so we'll take a brief recess until, upon their arrival.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Okay, good afternoon, everyone. And thank you, for your patience.

We will reconvene, and the next witness will be John Nonna, Westchester County Legislator and the New York Democratic Council's Co-Chair. Mr. Nonna.

#### JOHN NONNA

### Member New York Democratic Council

MR. NONNA: Thank you Senator.

I am a member of the New York Democratic

Council, in fact, I'm Co-Chair of that group, and a

Westchester County Legislator. And the purpose of our

group is to protect the right to vote. We're a

coalition of lawyers and non-lawyers dedicated to

fostering universal participation and trust in the

electoral process by ensuring that all eligible

persons can register to vote easily, all registered

voters are able to vote simply, fairly and without

intimidation, and all votes are counted, and all

voting systems are open and reliable.

And we count several thousand New Yorkers from across the state among our ranks, and as I said, membership is open to not only lawyers, but any people

(518) 371-8910

who share our commitment to voting rights. And since our inception in 2004, we have organized election monitoring activities and municipal, county, congressional and statewide elections in rural, suburban and urban communities across New York State, and we protect the vote no matter which party the voter is enrolled in.

And we have quite a lot of experience in monitoring the polls on election date, and we will quickly bring one to, that our experience brings one to the conclusion that there are some problems at the polls that are better solved through prevention beforehand rather through intervention on Election Day when the time pressure is very difficult in trying to resolve a problem that a voter has at the polls.

We have formed a number of committees that research and investigate election law-related issues, such as implementation of the Help America Vote Act in New York State, minority voting rights, encountering deceptive practices. I believe one of my colleagues on the Lawyers' Council has already testified, Rob Gordon, who chairs the Committee on Countering Deceptive Practices.

I appeared today to speak in support of one

of the measures being considered by the Committee, Senate Bill 2554, introduced by Senator Andrea Stewart Cousins, which amends Article 17 of the Election Law by adding a sew section, 17-153, creating the crime of voter suppression and providing penalties for that We believe this bill will strengthen the current law against voter intimidation and suppression and serve to deter such activities before they occur on Election Day. This legislation would also provide some appropriate penalties for that crime, which undermines not only one of our basic tenants, but one of the basic fundamental tenants of democracy that all registered voters be able to vote simply, fairly and without intimidation. And I'd like to just mention some of our organization's experience in elections in New York State.

We applaud and support measures which serve to protect the essential right of voters to make their voice heard. Such measures need little justification. Senator Andrea Stewart Cousins references Election Day 2006 in Yonkers as a justification for this legislation. The incidents that occurred that day are a prime example of the remaining presence of voter suppression in today's elections, and we can speak

23

directly to what our field attorneys dealt with firsthand on that day.

On November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2006, the Lawyer's Council deployed more than 500 attorneys and other volunteer poll watchers across the state to observe and solve incidents as they arose. When incidents do occur, ranging from broken machines to voter intimidation, they were phoned to our local boiler room of attorneys for further review, and to be recorded. Within in the 35<sup>th</sup> Senate District, this district, where the highest density of incidents occurred, our boiler room recorded 110 incidents on Election Day, an abnormal 28 percent of those incidents involved voter intimidation or suppression.

Poll watchers observed several instances of off-duty police officers and firefighters actively intimidating voters. In several polling places, off-duty police officers displayed guns and badges while questioning voters and escorting certain poll watchers around to question poll workers and voters.

Firefighters, many of whom were not Westchester residents, questioned voters inside and outside of the polls and loitered inside the polling places without purpose. Off-duty corrections officers, still wearing

their correction department jackets, checked over poll workers' lists. Poll workers were also intimidated by the officers accused of electioneering and told they were not allowed to write down license plate numbers of the offending officers.

These intimidating persons came in large groups with different poll watchers reporting the presence, for instance, of seven firefighters, large groups of officers, and "twenty operatives" at different polling places throughout the day. These large groups disrupted the polling, the voting process and clearly displayed their allegiances to voters.

Our poll watchers also reported numerous voters being challenged based on their signatures and details of addresses. These challenges were legal, but the frequency with which they occurred was abnormal and indicated that they were pre-planned.

Josh Stuben, one of our poll workers at the Police Athletic League in Yonkers on that day, witnessed an elderly voter who was having difficulty writing being repeatedly questioned as to why her signature did not match the one on record. The goal of the challenging poll watchers was that challenged voters be made to vote on paper ballots that would be

subject to scrutiny by the candidate's attorneys, and at risk for being disqualified due to simple errors in filling out the affidavit.

These challenges also serve another nefarious purpose. They slow down the voting process, create lines and cause votes to leave without casting a vote. And also tremendously decreasing confidence in the whole democratic process.

One voter sought a court order to vote on the voting machine but was intimidated away from casting her vote by poll workers, even after displaying a court order.

This past November, the NYDLC had a team of over 1,000 attorneys in the field across New York
State. And fortunately, only 4 percent of incidents on Election Day 2008 involved intimidation. However, this is still almost 30 incidents across the state that should not have occurred. And they occurred disproportionately in districts with contentious races, just as they did in 2002. So our work has made it clear that the law on voter intimidation and suppression must be clearer, and the penalties stricter, in order to safeguard the voter's right to participate in the electoral process.

1 So in conclusion, I speak in support of 2 Senate Bill 2554 amending the election law to create a 3 new section creating the crime of voter suppression 4 and providing penalties for that crime. As Senator 5 Stewart Cousins aptly says in her justification, "This 6 legislation would fill an important void in the 7 election law by creating a new statute that would 8 directly address and hold people accountable for 9 intentionally suppression the vote." 10 This measure would be significant welcome 11 contribution to the electoral process in the state of 12 New York protecting the rights of voters and 13 strengthening our democratic process. 14 Thank you, for your time. 15 CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: Thank you, very much, Mr. 16 Nonna. 17 And our last witness for today is Ken 18 Jenkins, Westchester County Legislator. 19 KEN JENKINS 20 Westchester County Legislator 21 MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Senator. 22 First, let me say good afternoon to you, and 23 I appreciate having the opportunity to speak this 24 afternoon. I'm actually going to speak on multiple,

with multiple hats on, as we normally have tendency to do.

Not only am I County Legislator that represents this particular area, the 16-County Legislative District, I was fortunate enough to follow Senator Stewart Cousins in her County Legislative seat, but I'm also the Chairman of the Yonkers Democratic Party. And between the issues as we've seen on voter suppression over the years, there is clearly a necessity for us to have action that's taken at the state level and make some modification in our voter process, and I want to speak about specific items, not just limited to the voter intimidation portion. So, certainly we are in support of Senator Stewart Cousins' Bill that is in front of us, 2554 regarding voter intimidation and specifically created penalties at a different level.

The experience that we've had in Yonkers on several occasions, and legislative, Nonna pointed out one at the PAL, where myself and the First Vice Chair of the party happened to go several times that day because of the level of intimidation and suppression tactics that were there. Not only were there huge numbers of people outside of the polling place, and a

lot of times that happens when people are handing out literature, at least they claim to be handing out literature, in front of polling places, that that intimidates people. But inside of the polling place, we had many different locations where there were multiple people inside of the location.

So an example is at one particular location, had eight different people for the same candidate. But because that candidate was on multiple lines, they were allowed to have, you know, a set of poll watchers for each one of those lines. And I'll get to that a little bit later 'cause that needs to be modified, but I will tell you that the people in this particular voting place were, the workers were intimidated by the amount of people that were there. Not because there were going to be any changes. This particular district was heavily African American, and has been heavily African American and Democrat, and there was not going to be any changes of the vote.

At the end of that particular polling site, if I recall correctly, I believe that Senator received, out of the 600 votes that are in that area, somewhere in the 590 range. So the people being on the polling site did not make a modification, but

tried to serve as intimidation. And it actually served the opposite process, where people said, you know what, I'm, I stood on some situations in the south and in the past where intimidation took place, and this reminded me of that, and I did relate that to some of the officers, the fire officers who were off duty at the time to deal with that.

In addition, the process where every signature is checked, there has to be some kind of limit, I'm not sure if we get to the NFL rules that you can have two challenges per half, but I don't think that's gonna happen at that level, but there certainly should be some reasonable level of challenge.

All of us, I know the signature on my own voting card does not look the same as my signature today since I signed it when I was 18 years old, and it's been a few years since that point in time. Yes, I might have that youthful appearance, but I'm definitely not 18 anymore.

The next point that I wanted to bring up was that in our poll inspectors, there's several bills that are in front of you that happen to do with the poll inspector process as itself, as it is, and to

allow split shifts of our poll inspectors because quite frankly, asking anyone to be working for 16 hours a day, at minimum, is, we would, we have all these other laws that prevent that. All right. They would be a sweat shop, or something else, we would be in violation of many of our own laws, but we ask people routinely, many of them happen to be senior citizens, to stand and to be around for 16 hours and have their wits about them the same way at 6 o'clock at night as they did at 6 o'clock in the morning. So it's something that we should certainly consider as we're going through this particular process.

We did have several improvements. And it would be remiss on my part not to suggest that there weren't, based on the things that we had happen in first our 18 vote laws with Senator Stewart Cousin and then her subsequent wins. There were changes that were made at the polling places that when someone comes to a polling place, they must be told the right polling place now, they're not allowed to vote because of the Ask Ed system that the state has funded, that helps give people information along with a map for them to get to the place they have to go to, in both English and in Spanish, will say the things out to

them, so there are improvements that have been made, and we should note that.

Now the other part was with the registration and training that we have to do for our election inspectors.

The Democratic Lawyers Group, the New York

Democratic Lawyers' Council and all those great

organizations that help people through these process,

and I'm sure there's counterparts on the other

parties; the fact of the matter is, the fact that we

have those groups in existence means that there are

significant problems in the system that must be

addressed. We should not have to have a cadre of a

thousand lawyers to be available to us to be at all

the polling places, which they were for us in Yonkers

and in the 31<sup>st</sup> State Senate District, to be at every

polling place to monitor and maintain, have a boiler

room where they're taking complaints. There's

something wrong with that particular part of the

process that we have to have that in the beginning.

Now I did relate a point of having, you know, six people in a room, and fortunately for me and many other individuals, we are blessed to be cross endorsed by other parties, but the fact of the matter

1

3

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is that you all need to take up that particular change and make a modification in that as well. And it does, much purposes.

One is that we're trying to get more people involved in the electoral process. We can't do that if everyone's scoffing up all the opportunities to say something based on being on multiple lines. But more importantly, it opens up the process, and I think that there's some things that could be modified that would be beneficial to the candidates as well. There's no reason for people that are running for office to be glorified cookie sales people to knock on every door to get the same, a number of signatures on a petition, which is subsequently challenged as a matter of routine, to make sure that you're getting on the line. I think that the parties, all of the individual parties, select people through their endorsement process, and those guys should get on the line automatically. People that want to challenge, therefore, then would carry those petitions and would have that ability to challenge by that, but because there's less people involved, now you're not challenging signatures that said, you signed before the other person signed. And then quite frankly would it would do is, it will eliminate some of the things that we're concerned about from an ethics and a campaign finance reform perspective of. You know, I have candidates that seek other lines, and the fact is that they spend a lot of money trying to seek those lines, and it may or may not be worth that particular effort. Certainly, there will be people that over the years, who say that I didn't have that level of support and they may not have been victorious, but if you're a great elected official, then your message comes across no matter which things that should have to be done on.

The party traditionally has performed the role here, at least in Yonkers before the HAVA Act continued, or kicked in, where we had situations where the party and the ward leaders and the district leaders would go out to polling sites, and they would be the trouble shooters. And many times can tell you still, we're the first line of defense. So on Election Day when there's a problem, the poll watchers call, and from a boiler room, they'll call the local official and the party's chair, and we'll go out to a site, and we'll work with the Board of Elections and say, this is a problem, you need to come down here

because obviously on Election Day when hundreds of sites, they can't be everywhere. But the fact of the matter is, all of the documentation that's in front of the poll inspector, all the documentation that's up on the wall for people with 32 or 33 different sheets of paper around each polling site, is just too much. We need to clarify, we need to straighten up the processes and the procedures, and those things will make more people become voters and stay involved in the process. Right now, that doesn't happen as much as it needs to.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity for coming out and being able to present this information to the hearing today, and I'm happy to answer questions if you have any, Senator.

made a great, great case for being the last witness because you just summed up all our issues that we spoke about today, some of which you should know that, you know, some of the issues you mentioned regarding signature on a card and part-time workers, these are things that either the State Senate has worked on or is currently working, and certainly, we hope to keep in touch regarding the status of all of these issues,

and these are important issues, as we look to increase the, or facilitate the voting process for qualified voters. And obviously make the experience of voting a pleasurable one as they, you know, again, do their Democratic and patriotic duty of voting.

Again, I appreciate your time here today.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADDABBO: And I appreciate, you know, all witnesses' time here today, so thank you, very much, Mr. Jenkins.

Again, thank you, very much for participating.

Just again, I want to thank City, the

Council President Chuck Lesnick and his staff for
allowing us to be here today. Of course, our Senate
staff, the media here. To my right here, the

Assemblyman Brian Kavanagh, again, thank you, for his
efforts. And again, it's this kind of dialogue, as I
take this back to my colleagues in the Election's

Committee, but also the broader body of the State

Senate, as we talk about the processes that need to be
changed, or at least addressed, making it an easier
process for our voters throughout the state. That's
what these hearings are for.

1 Our next hearing is this Friday, coming up 2 in Manhattan, on the same topics, and I look forward 3 to a, you know, a constructive discussion at that 4 point. 5 But once again, it is a pleasure being here 6 in Yonkers, and thank you, very much, and this hearing 7 is adjourned. 8 Thank you very much everyone. 9 (Whereupon, the proceeding in the 10 above-entitled matter was concluded)