## U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

COMMISSION MEETING

BRIEFING ON VOTING AND ELECTION REFORM-IS AMERICA READY TO VOTE?:
VOTING BARRIERS, PROVISIONAL & ABSENTEE BALLOTS,
AND VOTER ENFRANCHISEMENT

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2004

WASHINGTON, D.C.

The briefing convened at 11:00 a.m. in Room 540 of 624 9th Street, N.W., MARY FRANCES BERRY, Chairperson, presiding.
PRESENT:

MARY FRANCES BERRY, CHAIRPERSON
CRUZ REYNOSO, VICE CHAIRPERSON
JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, COMMISSIONER
CHRISTOPHER EDLEY, JR., COMMISSIONER
PETER KIRSANOW, COMMISSIONER
ELSIE M. MEEKS, COMMISSIONER
RUSSELL G. REDENBAUGH, COMMISSIONER
ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, COMMISSIONER

LESLIE R. JIN, STAFF DIRECTOR

#### STAFF PRESENT:

MARGARET BUTLER DEBRA CARR, ESQ., Deputy General Counsel IVY DAVIS TERRI DICKERSON, ASSISTANT STAFF DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS EVALUATION PAMELA DUNSTON, CHIEF, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND CLEARINGHOUSE DIVISION DORELLE GRAY GEORGE HARBISON SOCK FOON MacDOUGALL TINA MARTIN EMMA MONROIG JENNY PARK KWANA ROYAL MICHELLE ROYSTER ALEXANDER SUN DEBORAH VAGINS TIFFANY WRIGHT MIREILLE ZIESENISS

#### COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

JOHN BLAKELEY

LAURA BATIE
PATRICK DUFFY
JOY FREEMAN
CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS
KIMBERLY SCHULD
MELISSA SHARP
KRISHNA TOOLSIE

# I-N-D-E-X

SPEAKER	PAGE
MARIA VALDEZ Regional Counsel, Chicago Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund	9
JACQUELINE JOHNSON Executive Director, National Congress of American Indians	20
COURTENAY STRICKLAND Voting Rights Director, American Civil Liberties Union	27
SHELDON T. BRADSHAW  Deputy Assistant Attorney General for Civil  Rights, Department of Justice	41

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1 (11:00 a.m.) 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I am Mary Frances 3 Berry, Chair of the United States Commission on Civil 4 Rights; and Geraldine Segal, professor of history, at 5 the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. 6 Vice Chair, who also is a distinguished professor at 7 the University of California Davis Law School and was 8 formerly a judge, a justice of the California Supreme 9 Court, is here with me. And Dean Christopher Edley 10 11 from the Boalt Hall Law School at the University of California at Berkeley; Commissioner Elsie Meeks, who 12 -- I've forgotten what your title is, Elsie. 13 14 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Executive Director, 15 First Nation Corporation. 16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Executive Director, 17 First Nation. Executive Director. I started to say I hope that's not somebody else. 18 President. 19 And Commissioner Peter Kirsanow, who --20 could you describe yourself, Commissioner Kirsanow? COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: 21 Master of the 22 universe. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Master of the universe? Is that all you wish to say, 24 Yes. 25 Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think that 1 pretty much covers it. 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Master of 3 the universe. And Commissioner Russell Redenbaugh, 4 who I hear today for this proceeding -- this 5 proceeding concerns America's readiness and 6 preparation to vote in the November 2004 presidential 7 election. 8 This is the third in a series of such 9 10 proceedings that we have had here at the Civil Rights Commission under the title "Voting and Election 11 12 Reform." And this is part of our continuing probe of 13 potential barriers and challenges confronting voters in November. 14 The commission will explore today barriers 15 16 to the ballot box, specifically recently reported 17 problems with provisional and absentee balloting, 18 implementation of voter identification requirements, 19 voter intimidation, and suppression, and poll worker preparedness. We will also talk about voter 20 21 enfranchisement generally as covered under the Help 22 America Vote Act. And the commission is involved in this 23 24 because as a bipartisan fact-finding agency, one of

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

our jobs is to investigate complaints that citizens

are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, national origin, or by reason of fraudulent practices. And we are doing research and submit reports on these matters also.

This has been a core responsibility of the commission since 1957. And we, of course, investigated the controversial 2000 elections in Florida and issued a report, "Voting Irregularities During the 2000 Presidential Election."

We also testified before the Senate

Committee on Rules and Administration in connection

with the Help America Vote Act as it was passed by the

Congress. We at first this time in April considered

the voting systems, technology and the issue of

machines and paper trails and all of that kind of

technical stuff related to voting.

Then we had a paper, which is on our Web site, usccr.gov, concerning these issues and the status of electronic systems. We also in July looked at not only the voting system standards but the reliability of those and other kinds of voting, voter list maintenance, whether the lists were maintained properly, and we looked at the issue of the felon purge and felony disenfranchisement.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

There have been a lot of reports recently in the press about voter suppression and alleged voter suppression: South Dakota, where some Native American poll workers asserted that Indians were wrongly required to produce photo identification, for example; Chicago, problems with voter identification and provisional balloting; Florida, elderly black voters who had been reportedly intimidated by police investigating alleged absentee voting fraud; Texas, where students at a predominantly black university were threatened with arrest by the local D.A., who suggested erroneously that they were not eligible to vote.

Helping us to examine these and other concerns are a number of person, today, who we are very happy to have with us. They are: Maria Valdez, Regional Counsel, Chicago of the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, MALDEF; Jacqueline Johnson, who is Executive Director of the National Congress of American Indians; Courtenay Strickland, who is Voting Rights Director from the American Civil Liberties Union, Miami, Florida; and the honorable Sheldon T. Bradshaw, who is Deputy Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, the principal deputy for civil Rights in the Department of Justice, who will

tell us about what the Justice Department is doing, 1 its approach on these efforts, and what is happening 2 3 that would inspire the public's confidence that the rights of people to vote will be protected, are being 4 protected, and will continue to be protected as we go 5 through this process. 6 7 We are going to begin with Maria Valdez, Regional Counsel for MALDEF. MALDEF, of course, is a 8 9 national civil rights organization dedicated to 10 promoting and protecting the civil rights of the over 11 38 million or more, whatever the number is, Latinos --12 MS. VALDEZ: Forty-two. 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Forty-two million. 14 MS. VALDEZ: Probably 43 today. 15 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Forty-three by the 16 time we finish -- residing in the United States. Over 17 ten years she has litigated a number of important 18 voting rights cases, which have resulted in increased 19 political opportunity for Latinos in Illinois. 20 successfully defended the creation of the only Latino majority congressional district in Illinois against 21 22 constitutional challenge. 23 She fought to implement the motor voter law in Illinois and has challenged a number of illegal 24 25 voting practices in the Chicago area. She is a

national expert on voting rights law and has been a 1 panel presenter at a number of conferences. 2 Please proceed, Ms. Valdez, and thank you 3 for coming. 4 MS. VALDEZ: Well, thank you, Madam 5 Commissioner and commissioners. It is certainly my 6 honor and my privilege to discuss with you certain 7 issues that have been facing the Latino voters in the 8 Midwest region. 9 Chicago has a long history of voter fraud. 10 11 And it's an unfortunate history of voter fraud. while we don't see the overt fraud occurring within 12 13 the City of Chicago to the extent that it had in the 14 past, we continue to see problems with access to voting for language minorities and for minorities in 15 16 general. 17 Specifically, what happened in the past 18 primary election in Chicago of this year was simply a 19 lack of adequate training on behalf of poll workers 20 with respect to the Help America Vote Act. We had a 21 number of instances where Latinos were not allowed to 22 vote because they did not have photo ID, even though 23 they had been long-time registered voters at that very 24 precinct. 25 The City of Chicago and Cook County have

assured us that they will take care of that for the November election by more training, but when you have over 12,000 poll workers for the City of Chicago and Cook County, it is a monumental task. While we are very concerned, we are working with those jurisdictions to make sure that it is mitigated as much as possible.

The other issue within the City of Chicago and Cook County is access to bilingual assistance and materials. It was very unfortunate that we had to file litigation against the City of Chicago and Cook County two years ago for violations of the Voting Rights Act section 203.

That litigation did end up in a compromise agreement. And they have agreed to cede to a series of our demands with respect to compliance, primarily the demand was that the bilingual materials it appears for the whole City of Chicago were being translated by the receptionists in the front office, somebody who may or may not have complete Spanish proficiency.

With the diversity of the Latino

population in Chicago, which includes Mexicans, Puerto
Ricans, Cubans, Central Americans, other Caribbeans,
the Spanish translations must be done with some
delicacy. So they have agreed to use a certified

translator, rather than the receptionists in the front office.

We have also agreed to do a number of outreach efforts with them to recruit for bilingual election judges. The law in Illinois is that there can be no independent appointment of poll workers until 30 days before the election. The poll workers are primarily left to the discretion of the political committee men.

We mentioned to the city and Cook County that that doesn't mean you can't stop from recruiting people well before that time and then signing them up within 30 days. So we are working very, very hard and very strong to make sure that within the City of Chicago and Cook County, where 50 percent of the Latinos in Illinois reside, that that work is going to lead to more enfranchisement in the November election and ultimately complete enfranchisement.

We have also experienced problems with newly covered section 203 jurisdictions. For example, Kane County, which is a suburb of the City of Chicago, had attempted to meet the requirements of section 203 but was very confused on a number of issues.

I do want to commend the Department of

Justice for stepping in and making sure that working

with other organizations, like MALDEF, Kane County was on the right track.

One of the issues we have experienced with Kane County is that they're not sure that they have to translate all election materials. They thought translation of the ballot was appropriate but not much more than that.

So we have assured them with a phone call from the Department of Justice, I believe, right after we met with them that no bilingual translations must occur of all voting materials, that it is quality of information that we strive for under section 203. And hopefully we're on the right track on that.

Within Illinois, there is also an additional issue, and that has to do with the mail-in voter registration that is allowed under the Help America Vote Act and under Motor Voter. What we have seen is that there has just been a complete backlog of the ability of the election officials to process those in a timely manner. The average time in Chicago is six to eight weeks.

Over half of the mail-in registrations that we have tracked, people don't even actually get a voter registration card in the mail. They're not quite sure that they are actually registered to vote.

13 So you can imagine what kind of disarray is going to happen in the November election, when people think that they might be able to vote. They're not quite sure where their precinct is. And they very well may go to the wrong precinct, which leads me to the issue of provisional voting. One of the major problems we saw under provisional voting is that while it was used very much in the City of Chicago in Cook County, within the City of Chicago, 91 percent of the provisional ballots were

rejected. And the primary reason for rejection of those provisional ballots was that the ballot was filled out at the wrong precinct.

Each state has its own laws with respect to when a provisional ballot will actually be counted. And Illinois requires that for a provisional ballot to be counted, it be submitted at the correct precinct.

Well, if you don't know where your precinct is and you haven't gotten your voter registration card and you go into the wrong precinct and they kindly offer you a provisional ballot, it's going to become meaningless.

So we have worked with the City of Chicago and Cook County to institute some safequards, such as cell phones are available at every polling place so

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that the workers are supposed to be trained to call
the central office to verify a voter's precinct when
a voter comes in and they're not on the voter
registration roll at that precinct.

Now, that sounds wonderful in theory, but we are going to really hope that it works out in practice. When you have 91 percent of your provisional ballots rejected, then it simply is not working.

And, again, it's a training issue. The city tells us we just don't have the funds to make sure that they are adequately trained. So HAVA can really become meaningless in that respect.

It leads me to my final comments. And I think it is important to highlight certain jurisdictions. There is a very small town in Indiana called East Chicago, Indiana. It is a town of less than 35,000 people, but it is a majority minority town, predominantly Latinos, African Americans, and Anglos. It has had an Anglo mayor for the past 30 years.

There was an incredible amount of voter fraud that occurred in the mayoral election, where a Puerto Rican candidate was running against the mayor.

A state judge found that voter fraud existed that

permeated the process. The voter fraud occurred 1 through the tool of absentee ballots. 2 Evidently the incumbent's campaign workers 3 went to the minority communities, particularly the 4 limited English-speaking communities, and purchased 5 absentee ballot votes for 10 to 20 dollars. 6 7 In addition, they were requesting absentee ballots on behalf of individuals that never requested 8 9 the ballot so that when an individual went to the polling place for Election Day, they were denied the 10 right to vote because under Indiana law, once you 11 requested a ballot, if you did not turn that ballot 12 in, the only way for you to vote was to travel 20 13 14 miles to the county seat to execute your vote. 15 Now, you can imagine for people of low 16 income, limited English proficiency, no access to 17 transportation that requiring to travel 20 miles to 18 vote is just absolutely ridiculous. 19 So we had an incredible amount of findings 20 of voter fraud. With those findings of voter fraud, we also determined that the Lake County election 21 22 officials had imposed some same day election rules, which did not allow anyone to speak Spanish in the 23 24 polls on voting day. 25 That's not to say they were saying that

the poll workers were not allowed to speak Spanish.

No one was allowed to speak Spanish. So that if my aunt who doesn't speak any English needed my assistance in voting, I was denied the right to assist her in the voting process.

Because of the facts of voter fraud, because of the bilingual assistance issues, we filed a Voting Rights Act lawsuit under section 2 and under section 4(e).

We are in the process of litigating that, but the judge has imposed a preliminary order requiring bilingual assistance in all phases of voting, including bilingual election judges in each precinct.

In addition, we had to go into court last week to compel the judge to appoint federal examiners to oversee the elections in East Chicago, Indiana because the Indiana Supreme Court has ordered a redo of that mayoral election because of the extent of voter fraud.

This past election in East Chicago, in the past primary election, when they were trying to implement the court's order for bilingual assistance, they were trying to implement the HAVA provisional voting, they got it all wrong. There were actual

signs put up in a number of precincts that said, "No ID, no vote."

There are a number of people that we interviewed who had been 20-30-year residents of East Chicago, Latinos, who were denied the right to vote because they didn't have their ID.

I interviewed a woman, Helen Hernandez, who was on a 20-minute break from her janitorial job at the local school. She ran into the polling place to vote, was denied the right to vote, and got into a screaming match, unfortunately, with the poll worker as she insisted, "I have been a voter here for 20 years. I do have the right to vote without an ID."

observers to get the Lake County authority to call that precinct. It was devastating for the Latino community because they finally felt like they were making some headway with the bilingual assistance at the polls. And then they get these signs up saying, "No ID, no vote," again a complete lack of training on behalf of the poll workers on the limitation under HAVA on requesting identification.

There was an entire family denied the right to vote. The father of the family, Aldaba family, was a newly minted U.S. citizen. He had been

a lawful permanent resident for over ten years and became a U.S. citizen. This was his first opportunity to vote. He went into that polling place. He couldn't vote because he didn't have an ID.

Here we are in the process. The Latino community is in the process of trying to get our community to exercise their rights to vote. In the City of Chicago, there is an initiative called the New Americans Initiative. They have registered 20,000 newly minted U.S. citizens to participate in the City of Chicago. Those 20,000 applications came through mail-in registration. And we are very concerned whether those 20,000 are going to actually be able to vote in November.

I stress to you the importance of looking at these issues, providing guidance to the jurisdictions through the Department of Justice or any other department you may suggest, of the importance of training not every two years, not every four years, or maybe not at all but training for every election for every poll worker so that they understand that this is not about keeping people out of the polls but about allowing people to go in and vote the way that they want to vote.

Thank you.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Thank you 1 very much, Ms. Valdez. There will, of course, be 2 You understand that? 3 Our next presenter is Ms. Jacqueline 4 5 Johnson, who is Executive Director, National Congress of American Indians, founded in 1944, the oldest and 6 7 largest tribal government organization in the United States with a membership of more than 250 tribal 8 governments in the United States. 9 In addition to leading NCAI, she is a 10 1.1 member of the Executive Board for the Leadership 12 Conference on Civil Rights, the National Conference 13 for Community Injustice and National Voices. 14 also a board member of See Alaska, an Alaska native 15 regional corporation. 16 Prior to joining NCAI, she was the Deputy 17 Assistant Secretary for Native American Programs in 18 the Department of Housing and Urban Development. 19 Welcome. Please proceed. Thank you for 20 coming. 21 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. 22 Madam Chairman and members of the 23 Commission, I am pleased to be here to talk a little bit about the Native American voting rights issues. 24 25 First I want to start with on September 15th, just

recently, there was a decision that was made in South Dakota on the Bone Shirt v. Nelson.

This is an historic victory for Native

Americans because although this didn't deal with some
of the more significant issues having to do with some
voter suppression issues I will talk about earlier, it
does begin to set a trend in the State of South

Dakota, an area of concern for Native American voting
rights, where the federal court, both at the trial and
the appellate level strongly supported the Native
voting rights issues and made it very clear that they
wouldn't tolerate dilution of voting rights of Native
Americans.

This decision was a 114-page decision, very, very clearly laid out, I believe, laid out its findings in a way that kind of sent a strong message that because of the number of cases that have come to South Dakota, laid out the message saying, there is enough information in here. And it should set a precedent for any other cases coming forward.

The Bone Shirt case was really one more about creating jurisdictions and districts with a super majority and didn't address some of the other voting issues that we have heard more recently in June, particularly the most recent election that

happened in South Dakota.

I guess to give a little bit of history about Native American voting and some of the issues, we were amongst the last groups in this country to be able to experience the right to vote. And so it wasn't until 1965 that many states actually addressed the right to vote because of addressing the literacy language issues and other kinds of residency requirement issues so that we could vote.

Since HAVA and the Voter Rights Protection
Act, many states, as you know, have been trying to
readdress how do they do their job and how do they
proceed with making the voting rights changes.
Similar to the kind of experiences that Maria talked
about, Native American communities have also
experienced those.

I think that they are becoming more prominent and profiled a little bit more and probably addressed a little bit more, such as the challenges that we heard about in the post-Johnson race, senatorial race, in South Dakota, when there were allegations of voter fraud because the Native American vote, although not significant in numbers as the Latino population, the Native American vote populations are concentrated, our reservations are

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

concentrated, as well as we happen to be in significant states that in this political environment are critical to either presidential or senatorial And I think that elevates the profile of the Native American vote, which is also very much a challenge to us in Indian country since many folks have not felt very enfranchised into a voter system and haven't participated in a voting system and now with trying to get our Native Americans out to vote, we deal with the issues of the feeling of disenfranchisement from the past and historical reasons but clearly confusion and a little frustration over and concern about engaging in the system that had been challenges such as the voter fraud challenges in South Dakota, et cetera.

Some of the most recent concerns that we have that we have been trying to work with the states to address as well as some of the Native American legal fields is trying to make sure that we are well-educated onto the Voter Rights Act. I think it's really important for us to be able to understand and to work with the states to resolve the problems early on, and that's exactly what we want to do.

In South Dakota, we clearly went after we recognized that there were some situations and issues

to talk about how do we make sure and it's clear we know when an affidavit can be filed versus a provisional ballot, what is going to be the process or the procedures in making those determinations on those things.

In June, the last election that was held,

In June, the last election that was held, after there was training in South Dakota for the poll watchers -- and, mind you, the training isn't mandatory that all of the poll election judges attend. So even though the training was held in good faith by the state, not everybody apparently went there. And there was still confusion on those issues.

We also had signage that was outside of precincts that said, "No ID, no vote." After a call to the state, the state clearly took those down early that morning. We don't know how much that affected.

There were also issues of challenges in the polling sites as to by poll watchers, partisan and otherwise, who would be pushing for a provisional ballot versus allowing for an affidavit. And those kinds of concerns came forward. And that is really where we are trying to get to to resolve the issues to make sure that everybody understands the rules, that we understand the rules, we can educate our people to what the rules are, that the voting judges understand

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the rules, that any poll watchers who are participating in the process, but they also understand the rules and so that we don't have to address the voter intimidation issues to the extent that we have. Some of the other issues that we experience in Indian country other than just those issues, of course, we still are working on and working with the states on language barriers and primary Native-speaking languages. And, as you know, there are many, many Native languages in this country. And so we're addressing that as well as the fact that there are still unwritten languages or written literacy is very low. And we're continuing to work

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

into those areas and need to make sure that we still have the ability to have an assistant with a person to be able to help in those areas. We also are concerned about access to

polls. Because our reservations are so vast and transportation issues are so challenging to many of our members of our community, many of our Native American voters still have to travel well beyond a 100-mile radius to be able to go to exercise their right to vote.

This year earlier some tribes were very successful as we have launched this effort to try to

engage our community to get more involved in the Native voting, such as in North Dakota, they are actually able to get a polling site on the Fort Berthold Reservation. That made a major difference in their voter turnout. It was a very positive performance by making those changes. And Navajo Nation, for the first time, as other tribes are trying to do the same thing, is to have their tribal elections and the federal elections at the same time to encourage people to participate in the federal voting process. One of the challenges that they are trying to address is being able to have a single site similar to any other state or other governmental county. You know, when you go to vote, you get to do the city elections and the county elections, and they are all there at the one site. In Indian country, in far too many of our places, we still have to go to multiple sites to be able to exercise the tribal ballot as well as the federal ballot or state ballot. So those are some of the other challenges that we are trying to address as we move forward. Our community is very engaged in trying to also be very supportive as we look forward to the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26 voting rights reenactment to be able to correct and to 1 be able to work with trying to address the concerns of 2 3 our community. We think that this is a good opportunity for us to be able to engage in making 4 positive differences to encourage our community to 5 maintain its interest and to be engaged in its right 6 7 to vote. Thank you. 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Thank you 9 10 And, again, there will be questions. very much. Our next presenter is Ms. Courtenay 11 12 13

Strickland, who is the Director of the Voting Rights Project of the ACLU of Florida. She coordinates their legal legislative and grass roots efforts on election reform issues.

She has been working very hard for the past few years on election reform in that state. At the September 2002 primaries in south Florida, she joined with others to form what is called the Miami-Dade Election Reform Coalition, a leading advocate of reform in voting practices, particularly with regard to the use of DREs. Those are direct recording equipment voting systems, ATM-type systems, touch screens and the like.

She is the primary organizer of the ACLU's

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

campaign to restore the voting and civil rights of the 1 2 600,000-plus ex-felons in Florida also an issue that we have dealt with. 3 We thank you very much for coming. Please 4 5 proceed. Thank you, Madam MS. STRICKLAND: 6 7 Chairperson, and thank you, honorable commissioners, for the opportunity to be here and speak with you 8 9 today and also to share with colleagues about problems 10 that apparently we are all facing in some respects in various states throughout this country. 11 12 My testimony here today builds, in part, on testimony offered on behalf of the Florida Equal 13 14 Voting Rights Project by JoNel Newman in January of 15 2001 and Charles Elsesser and Howard Simon in June of 16 2002. The Florida Equal Voting Rights Project, which 17 came before you on both of those occasions, was a 18 collaborative effort of the ACLU, the Florida Justice Institute, and Florida Legal Services. 19 20 building on what has already been presented in that 21 area. 22 In January 2001, JoNel Newman testified that Florida's voting problems were of two kinds. 23 24 First, not every eligible elector who went to the polls to cast a vote was permitted to do so. 25

28 second, not all the votes that were cast by eligible electors were counted. These two problems continue to lie at the crux of all voting irregularities in Florida. Prior to the failed primary elections in

south Florida on September 10th, 2002, many believed that the latter problem, making sure votes cast were accurately counted, would be solved by the new technology that had been put into place. The subsequent problems with both the

technology and management of direct recording equipment, or DRE, voting machines have since called that into question. But the persistent issue across Florida elections since 2000, even in elections for which vote counting has gone smoothly, has been vote suppression due to a compendium of policies and procedures often unrelated to technology.

November 2000 taught us that voting policies and procedures that if taken singly might result in relatively small numbers of votes lost can combine to create significant disenfranchisement of large numbers of eligible voters. That was the case in November 2000 with quality implementation of voter identification policies, precinct rolls that failed to show the voter roll for the full county, busy phone

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

lines at the offices of supervisors of elections, inadequate language assistance at the polls, precincts that were moved at the last minute, and a host of "little" problems. The November 2000 election taught us that

even the seemingly smallest voting policy, practice, procedure, or problem must be scrutinized in order to prevent widespread disenfranchisement. With that in mind, I wanted to touch today upon just four types of vote suppression that currently threaten the ability of eligible voters in Florida to cast their vote and have it accurately counted.

Written testimony has been distributed. And so I would refer the commissioners to that I am only going to hit the highlights in testimony. what I say here today.

First of all, in Florida, no discussion of vote suppression can be had without at least some mention of Florida's voting and civil rights ban against citizens with past felony convictions. I know the commission has already examined this problem at length along with the problem that flows from that: the purging of eligible voters erroneously from the rolls. So I am not going to spend much time on that at all.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

However, that injustice is the primary form of vote suppression in our state. We have more than 600,000 people who have served their time, have paid their debt to society and, yet, still cannot exercise their most fundamental right in a democracy.

The fact is were they to live in another state given that Florida is one of only seven states that permanently takes away the right to vote from all people with a past felony conviction, even after completion of the sentence, those folks probably would be able to vote. Because they are in Florida under this voting ban that has been in our state constitution since 1868, they cannot.

The disproportionate racial impact, of course, is hard to overstate with nearly one in three African American men of voting age in the State of Florida being unable to cast a ballot. Nearly 120,000 Latinos in the State of Florida are also disfranchised by Florida's voting ban. Over 12 percent of the disfranchised population is, in fact, Latino.

Loss of civil rights in Florida includes not only loss of the right to vote but also loss of the right to hold certain state job licenses. That's directly affecting people's ability to support their families, pay their taxes, and act as productive

citizens through meaningful employment.

I would merely point out to the Commission right now on this subject that there are short-term and long-term solutions. In the short term, the governor and the cabinet sitting as the Board of Executive Clemency have the power to amend the rules of executive clemency that govern Florida's rights restoration application process to make restoration of the right to vote virtually automatic. And they can do so tomorrow with the stroke of a pen.

In fact, under Governor Askew I believe in the years 1975 to '77, restoration in Florida was virtually automatic, in spite of the ban that was still in the state constitution at that time. The governor and the cabinet should take action now to change this process. In the short term, the legislature should also allocate additional funding to deal with the backlog of pending applications awaiting review, a backlog that has been in existence for many years. But in the long term, ultimately we do need to amend Florida's constitution.

To that end, there is a ballot initiative petition currently being circulated in Florida. It is being supported not only by the ACLU but by the Florida Rights Restoration Coalition, a nonpartisan

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

32 1 group of nearly 40 local, state, and national organizations that are dedicated to bringing an end to 2 3 Florida's voting ban. However, the legislature also has the power to place the state constitutional 4 amendment on the ballot for the voters to vote on. 5 And they should do so immediately. 6 7 In the long term, our most fundamental 8 right in a democracy, a right for which people have died, the right to vote, should not lie in the hands 9 10 of politicians, as it does in the State of Florida. 11 Moving on to another form of vote

suppression in Florida, one that has already been mentioned earlier in discussions today, provisional balloting, specifically in Florida, the requirement that one be in the correct precinct when the provisional ballot is cast in order for that ballot to count.

In Florida, if a person is not in his or her correct precinct, the entire ballot is rejected as illegal, meaning that none of the choices made on that ballot, even in races for which the voter would have otherwise qualified, no matter what his or her precinct, will be counted.

Of course, provisional balloting was adopted in Florida as part of the Florida Election

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Reform Act of 2001, prior to the adoption of the Help America Vote Act.

In general, the move toward provisional ballots is certainly a good thing. The problem is in Florida, the precinct requirement robs provisional ballots of their ability to remedy many of the exact circumstances they were intended to solve after 2000. Worse still, provisional ballots can leave people feeling as if they legitimately participated in the democratic process when, in fact, they were disfranchised.

The ACLU urged legislators in 2001, at the time of the passage of this legislation, to amend the language to remove the precinct requirement but to no avail.

I want to provide you with just a little bit of hard data. We are in the process now of collecting additional data on the rejection of provisional ballots in counties across the State of Florida. So this is only a preliminary touch. But I do want to give you a little bit here.

Data from elections that have occurred since implementation of provisional balloting confirms our concerns that the correct precinct requirement has disfranchised significant numbers of voters.

The ACLU has made public records requests

of 15 Florida counties, 8 of whom have responded, for
information on provisional balloting for various
elections during 2002 through 2004. The information
sent by the eight counties concerning various
elections during that time period indicated that out
of a total of 1,220 provisional ballots cast, 584 were

accepted and 636 were rejected.

of those rejected, 122 were rejected because the voter cast a provisional ballot in the wrong precinct. The number amounted to 19.2 percent of all the provisional ballots that were rejected, or 10 percent of the total number of provisional ballots cast. That means some ten percent of those sating provisional ballots probably left the polling place feeling as if they had voted when, in fact, their ballots were merely rejected as illegal.

Now, in the written testimony before you, you will find some additional statistics from other counties. Some of the percentages rise to as high as 12.5 percent of all provisional ballots cast rejected because the person was in the wrong precinct.

There have been a couple of objections made to changing this precinct requirement. One has been that in doing so, we would make it such that

voters would stop into any polling place to cast their vote. And that might have a detrimental impact on local elections.

Certainly we do have concerns about making sure people participate in local elections. However, with the advent of early voting in Florida, people do have the opportunity to go to a variety of locations and cast votes in both their local and larger elections on a number of days prior to Election Day.

Another concern that has been raised is the certification deadlines. Some have said that those are too tight to allow for the counting of the provisional ballots in such a way that the voter's choices in the races for which he or she would have otherwise qualified would still be counted. If that is the case, then we need to consider changing the certification deadlines because speed is not the ultimate goal of our democracy. And speed should not be something that causes us to compromise the end result and the tallies of our elections.

With regard to the voter identification requirement in Florida, that, too, has caused a long history of problems. This Commission is already aware, I believe, of signage that was posed in 2000 that was both inconsistent and inaccurate and that led

to voters being turned away.

I would point out that the ACLU received a complaint from a voter in March of 2004 concerning similar signage posted in Lee County and complaints from 2002 of people being told while waiting in line to vote, "Get out your photo ID. You must have photo ID," which, of course, threatens to mislead people into thinking that they need to go home, perhaps at their only time during the day to vote. And their vote may, in fact, be lost.

We need to refrain from posting misleading signage in the polling places. Poll workers need to be trained in the affidavit process: when that should be used versus when a provisional ballot should be given out.

And people who under HAVA must use a provisional ballot when they show up without ID; that is to say, first-time voters who register by mail and don't provide proper ID to the supervisor prior to Election Day, those exceptions should be clearly noted on the voter rolls of every county so that provisional ballots are given only to the voters who actually need them and other voters without ID but who are properly registered can fill out an affidavit and vote a normal ballot.

I would also just echo the concerns raised earlier about delays in processing voter registration applications and the mailing of voter registration cards. The Voter Protection Coalition, of which the ACLU is a part, has received complaints about delays in processing voter registration applications.

Voter registration activists in Miami-Dade

County report that as many as 20 percent of their

registrants are never receiving voter registration

cards, even though apparently they are on the rolls.

The delays for those who are getting them can be

something like eight weeks in many cases.

Of course, this has a huge detrimental impact on voters. First of all, they're not sure whether their application has been processed at all and whether they are, in fact, on the rolls and eligible to vote or not.

Secondly, many voters are under the mistaken impression that you must have a voter registration card in order to vote. And so not having that card, particularly for new voters, can be very intimidating and have a chilling effect on turnout.

Without the card, it's also obviously hard for voters to know where they are supposed to go vote, which is their correct precinct. And not having a

card may lead to duplicate applications, which again feather clogs systems in the supervisors of elections' office and makes it difficult to respond to legitimate requests from voters.

In conclusion, the other important lesson that I believe we have learned is that these problems all play into each other. Just as the erroneous removal of people from the voter rolls as felons in 2000 and even more recently flows from Florida's larger voting ban against people with past felony convictions, so, too, can faulty implementation of voter identification policy lead to misuse of provisional balloting. And not receiving a voter registration card in the mail and, thus, not knowing which precinct to go to can lead to the discounting and the rejecting as illegal of provisional ballots.

So we have learned that no problem, no policy, no procedure is too small to be scrutinized in our voting processes, especially when they work together to influence each other in these ways. For the sake of our democracy, we have to look at each and every aspect of our system.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you very much,
Ms. Strickland. I very much appreciate your

testimony. And there will be questions, of course. 1 Now, our next presenter is Mr. Sheldon T. 2 Bradshaw, who is principal Deputy Assistant Attorney 3 General for Civil Rights in the Department of Justice. 4 As the principal deputy, Mr. Bradshaw runs everything. 5 I mean, he helps oversee the enforcement of federal 6 statutes prohibiting discrimination on the basis of 7 race, sex --8 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I thought that 9 was Commissioner Kirsanow that did that. 10 11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Kirsanow is the master of the universe. Well, he is the 12 13 principal deputy master. As the principal deputy in 14 the Civil Rights Commission, Mr. Bradshaw helps 15 oversee the enforcement of federal statutes 16 prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, sex, 17 disability, religion, and national origin. He 18 previously served as a deputy assistant attorney 19 general in the Justice Department's Office of Legal 20 Counsel. While at OLC, the Office of Legal Counsel, 21 22 Mr. Bradshaw provided written opinions and oral advice 23 in response to legal questions from government officials, including counsel to the president and 24 25 various offices.

1 Mr. Bradshaw practiced law in the D.C. 2 office of Howrey, Simon, Arnold, and White and prior 3 to that was a law clerk for Judge Karen Williams, U.S. 4 Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Please And thank you very much for coming. 5 6 MR. BRADSHAW: Thank you, Madam 7 Chairwoman. Thank you, commissioners, for the opportunity to appear here today and show the members 8 9 of the Commission the important steps that the Civil 10 Rights Division is taking to ensure the right of 11 citizens to vote free of interference and intimidation. 12 13 The Civil Rights Division takes its 14 responsibility of protecting American voters very 15 seriously. And all of our lawyers are dedicated to 16 carrying out this noble duty. 17 The Civil Rights Division has initiated a 18 number of programs that I would like to discuss today to ensure compliance with the Voter Rights Act, the 19 20 National Voter Registration Act, the Help America Vote Act, and other federal voting rights statutes the 21 22 Department of Justice is responsible for enforcing. 23 Before describing those programs, however, 24 I would like to note that for the past month, the 25 Civil Rights Division has been working very closely

with the Commission, providing it with countless documents on voting rights issues at a time when our division attorneys and staff were engaged in extensively election monitoring and, to give you just one example, just three days ago, on September 14th, we had 43 of our lawyers and other staff out in the field monitoring primary elections in several areas of the country.

In addition to engaging in that extensive election monitoring, we are also planning coverage for the general election. Notwithstanding that fact, we expended a great deal of time and resources responding to the Commission's several requests. And we hope that we have been successful in providing the Commission with the materials that it has needed. And we have very much appreciated your consideration and cooperation during that process. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you.

MR. BRADSHAW: Let me turn now to some of our plans to protect voting rights this year. So far this year the Civil Rights Division has coordinated and sent 726 voting rights observers and monitors to 72 elections in 66 counties in 20 states.

I would like to thank Ms. Valdez for noting the work of some of our elections observers and

monitors in some of the areas that MALDEF has been closely monitoring. As a result of the monitors, as Ms. Valdez noted, we were able to correct several mistakes, a number of mistakes, that were being made related to both provisional balloting, language assistance. Also in South Dakota, our monitors were able to catch some of the problems that Ms. Johnson identified and bring those to the attention of poll workers as well.

This November, however, the Civil Rights
Division expects to deploy more voting rights
observers and monitors than in any other time in
recent history. While we are preparing to undertake
the most extensive monitoring of an election in recent
memory this November, let me emphasize that the voting
rights observers and monitors will be Civil Rights
Division personnel and persons working for the Office
of Personnel Management.

While in the past the division has occasionally used some assistant United States attorneys and other prosecutors, Alex Acosta, the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, has made it clear that criminal prosecutors will not be stationed at polling places on Election Day. Instead, we are actively recruiting attorneys and staff and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

throughout the Civil Rights Division to ensure sufficient capacity to monitor the November elections.

The Voting Section will both train and supervise these other lawyers and staff to increase our ability to send Civil Rights Division staff to more locations. We are also working with the Office of Personnel Management to greatly increase the number of federal observers who will be available under section 8 of the Voting Rights Act to be assigned as observers and to monitor elections in jurisdictions subject to section 5 of the Voter Rights Act.

In connection with these preparations this past May, Alex Acosta convened a meeting with representatives of major civil rights organizations. He briefed them on the division's efforts to protect voting rights, explained how the division's federal observer program works, and solicited their help in providing information on jurisdictions that we should consider for monitoring during the upcoming election.

Of particular importance, he reemphasized that the Civil Rights Division had no plans and will not use criminal prosecutors as election monitors. If the Commission would like additional information on our federal observer program, I would recommend that they go to the Web site, a link of which is in my

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 | written testimony.

Other important protections for voters include sections 4 and 203 of the Voter Rights Act, which protect certain language minority groups.

Covered jurisdictions are determined by the Census Bureau after each census based on a formula set out in the Voter Rights Act. These provisions require covered jurisdictions to provide all voter registration or voting notices, forms, instructions, assistance, or other materials or information related to the electoral process and the covered languages.

Over the past two years, the Civil Rights Division has undertaken the most rigorous protection of the voting rights of language minorities under the Voter Rights Act in its history. The initiative began immediately following the July 26th, 2002 determination by the Director of the Census of which jurisdictions were covered based on the 2000 census.

The Civil Rights Division not only mailed formal notice and detailed information on compliance to all covered jurisdictions but also initiated face-to-face meetings with state and local election officials and minority community members in almost all of the newly covered jurisdictions to explain the law, answer questions, and to work to foster the

implementation of effective programs.

Since then the Voting Section has initiated systematic review of the full range

initiated systematic review of the full range of information provided by covered jurisdictions to voters in English, just not ballots and election pamphlets themselves but also newspaper notices that are required by state law, Web site information, and any other election information in order to determine whether that same information is available in each of the covered minority languages.

The division has also been systematically reviewing whether covered jurisdictions are providing sufficient numbers of bilingual poll officials and translators in polling places where they are needed to serve the language minority population.

The division recently sent a letter to more than 400 covered jurisdictions across the United States to remind them of their obligations under the language minority provisions of the Voter Rights Act. An example of one of these letters is attached to my written materials.

Other provisions of the Voter Rights Act and the requirements of the National Voter
Registration Act also contain important safeguards for voters that ensure their ability to register to vote

and to access polling places in order to cast a ballot 1 without interference and intimidation. 2 3 During the last three years, the division has continued its vigorous enforcement of the Voter 4 5 Rights Act and the National Voter Registration Act 6 litigating enforcement actions to protect minority 7 voters, including suits in, among other states, Missouri, Tennessee, Arkansas, New York, Colorado, 8 Florida, Pennsylvania, Montana, South Carolina, et 9 10 cetera. 11 Earlier this year starting in April, the division won two voting rights cases brought under 12 1.3 section 2 of the Voter Rights Act at the Court of 14 Appeals level. In one case against Blaine County, 15 16 Montana, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed 17 a judgment obtained by the division involving the dilution of the votes of Native American voters and 18 19 just a few days ago denied a motion for a rehearing in 20 that case. 21 In a second case against Charleston 22 County, South Carolina, the Fourth Circuit Court of 23 Appeals affirmed a judgment that we obtained involving the dilution of the votes of African American voters. 24 25 Since 2001, the division has filed a total

of 22 lawsuits protecting access to the polls and the voter registration electoral process. We settled a number of additional cases without the need to actually file a lawsuit. These cases and our actions demonstrate our continuing vigilance in our pursuit of persons who violate federal voting rights laws.

The division also recently sent a letter

The division also recently sent a letter to the chief election officials of all 50 states reminding them of their legal obligations under the Voter Rights Act and other federal voting rights statutes and offering the assistance of the division's Voting Section to ensure compliance with the requirements of these statues. An example of one of these letters is also attached to my written materials.

One of the most important new statutes passed by Congress affecting voting rights is the Help America Vote Act of 2002. Section 401 of that statute gives enforcement authority for title II of the statute to the Department of Justice.

The Attorney General has assigned that responsibility to the Civil Rights Division. And after HAVA's passage, the Civil Rights Division worked to ensure the implementation of the nondiscriminatory election technology and administration requirements of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

title III by engaging in extensive outreach to state and local officials across the United States.

The division sent a letter in March 2003 to the governor, attorney general, and the chief state election official in every covered state and territory discussing the requirements of HAVA and offering assistance of the division's lawyers to states as they begin to working to implement the new statute.

The division's outreach included attending and making presentations at numerous meetings and conferences of elected officials and state legislators, responding to inquiries from state and local officials about HAVA's requirements, and implementing a HAVA information page on our Web site. Again, a link to that site is contained in my written materials.

In addition, the division has also already filed its first enforcement action under title III of HAVA against a county in California. This action was successfully settled by a consent decree. We are continuing to closely monitor the implementation and compliance efforts of all of the states and territories covered by HAVA and will file further actions, if warranted, to enforce title III of that act.

I might make one additional note. The ability of disabled voters to access polling places in order to be able to cast a ballot is also of critical importance to ensuring the right to participate in the democratic process.

Our Disability Rights Section has been working with our Voting Section to answer questions from the public and local officials about the provisions of HAVA that will provide disabled voters the ability to vote without assistance and of the same privacy of other voters. Of course, those particular provisions of HAVA will not take effect until 2006.

In order to more promptly protect the voting rights of voters with disabilities, in February the division published a guide for elections officials titled "ADA Checklist for Polling Places." I have placed a copy of that -- it's about a 40-page document -- in my written materials as well.

This guide shows officials how to make sure that their polling places are accessible to blind and other disabled voters and if not, provide easy and cost-effective solutions for making them accessible.

I have some additional information in my written materials. I see I am out of time. I will leave them for you to read. And I look forward to

answering any questions that you might have. 1 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you. And I 2 should have mentioned earlier that all of the written 3 testimony will without objection be included in the 4 record. 5 Does any commissioner have any question 6 7 for any -- yes, Commissioner Edley? 8 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Thank you, Madam 9 Chairperson. And thanks very much to the panel. 10 was very helpful. Mr. Bradshaw, if I can start with you, 11 I'm trying to get a little bit of a handle on 12 13 two issues. One is the impression -- I hope it's a 14 misimpression -- that while there is a federal 15 monitoring effort, that the attention is to the correction of retail problems of poor implementation. 16 17 But at some point surely a pattern of poor 18 implementation should give rise to enforcement action. 19 In other words, it's one thing to have 20 federal monitors there to say, "Oh, no, that sign 21 shouldn't be up that says 'No ID, no voting,'" but 22 it's another thing to recognize that in a quarter of 23 the polling places in a particular jurisdiction, such signs are present. 24 25 Without inventing grand schemes of a

conspiracy to affirmatively suppress voting, at least that kind of really quite widespread misimplementation isn't that cognizable under some statute as a violation of the civil rights laws. MR. BRADSHAW: You're absolutely right that there are sort of two, albeit related, activities that we're working on. One is our monitor and observer program. And it is of particular importance to have people at the polling places on the day of elections. COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Right. MR. BRADSHAW: And I think we have heard information today about how effective our monitors and observers can be in correcting violations of the law. But you are also right in that that needs to be coupled or supplanted with vigorous enforcement of the federal voting rights statutes. And over the last 3 years, as I noted in my written testimony, we have brought 22 suits to enforce the voting rights laws, which compares -- that has been over the last 3 and a half years, which compares to 21 suits brought in the previous 3 years. So we have, in fact, placed a large amount of focus on litigating where necessary. In fact, one 24

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

of the things that we have found, though, through our

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 monitoring programs and why they are interrelated is quite frequently our monitoring leads to lawsuits and 2 ultimately consent decrees. So that's one of the 3 ways, in addition to the great work of organizations 4 5 like MALDEF and others bringing problems to our attention, it is through our monitoring program that 6 7 we actually find out about noncompliance and violations that ultimately lead to lawsuits and 8 ultimately consent decrees. 9 10 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Do you have a sense of roughly how many pattern or practice 11 investigations, cases you are working up at the 12 13 present, order of magnitude: more like 2 or more like 14 30?

> MR. BRADSHAW: I mean, we have a number of cases in the pipeline right now based on cases that we're investigating based on allegations of voter suppression and intimidation. I don't have a specific number for you, but we are actively investigating a number of allegations of voter suppression throughout the country.

> COMMISSIONER EDLEY: That just leads me to the last question I'll ask, and then I will subside. On that issue of allegations of voter suppression, I am sure you or your staff reviewed the report that was

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

issued a couple of weeks ago by the NAACP and People 1 for the American Way Foundation concerning a sense of 2 3 efforts to suppress the vote, particularly in minority communities. And I was wondering whether or not --4 well, let me ask, what is the division's reaction to 5 6 that report? 7 MR. BRADSHAW: We are obviously very concerned about protecting the electoral franchise for 8 9 all Americans. Whenever we see allegations suggesting suppression of the right to vote, we receive those 10 11 allegations and we open an investigation. So I am 12 quite troubled and the division is troubled and is investigating all allegations we receive of voter 13 suppression and intimidation. 14 15 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Thank you. 16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Meeks was next and then I think Commissioner Braceras and Commissioner 17 18 Kirsanow. 19 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: You know, I'm just 20 not sure how fine the line is when you're talking I'll give you some really good 21 about intimidation. 22 examples from my precinct. 23 I mean, one, the ID issue, which the word 24 got out, yes, you need your ID to go vote, I mean, I 25 know because I have talked to a couple of people who

said, "Well, I didn't have a picture ID. 1 couldn't vote" when, in fact, I mean, the word just 2 didn't get out well enough that, "Well, you need it, 3 but if you don't have it, you can do an affidavit." 4 In that, it's a small enough community. 5 Then there was this other weird thing 6 during the primary. And when I went to vote, then the 7 poll worker hollered out, "Elsie Meeks, Democrat," 8 9 which that's fine. It's a precinct that is primarily 10 Democratic, and I wouldn't care anyway. But there is this young guy the first time 11 12 he voted who was a Republican. And his mother caught me later in the grocery store and was like, "I didn't 13 14 know he was a Republican." 15 You know, I feel sorry for the young man. 16 That's the first time he voted. And I don't know if 17 he will know the difference that this won't happen in 18 the general or not, but people are a little timid and may not come back. 19 20 Is this a law? I mean, do we have to do 21 I asked a poll worker that. She said, "Yes, it's a law." I thought it was just an unusual thing. 22 23 And then this other that really not many 24 of the poll workers -- there were some Natives on hand 25 to sort of advise some of the people, but they're

mostly non-Indians. And people are just intimidated 1 by that because this is a new thing for a lot of 2 people outside elections. And I just wasn't sure what 3 role the Department of Justice plays in monitoring 4 what kind of state laws and practices get passed. 5 MR. BRADSHAW: I appreciate your question 6 7 because South Dakota is one of the states that we have been following very closely. And, in fact, as I noted 8 earlier, we had monitors and observers at the primary 9 10 elections. And, as Ms. Johnson noted, there were some irregularities there that our monitors and observers 11 identified and immediately brought to the attention of 12 13 poll workers and corrected. In addition --14 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: There is one at my 15 precinct. Unfortunately, we 16 MR. BRADSHAW: Yes. 17 don't have enough monitors and observers to have one 18 in every precinct. But, as I noted earlier, we are 19 going to really have record numbers, at least for 20 purposes of recent history, a record number of 21 monitors and observers out in place for the general 22 election. 23 And going back specifically to South Dakota, in addition to immediately notifying poll 24 25 workers of these problems, attorneys from our Voting

Rights Section have subsequently met with the 1 Secretary of State from South Dakota and brought each 2 one of these problems to the Secretary of State's 3 attention. And we, of course, will be following this 4 jurisdiction again or this state very closely for the 5 upcoming general election. 6 7 And my understanding is we are going to have another meeting with the Secretary of State's 8 9 office to again make sure that they understand all of 10 the requirements of HAVA, particularly the concerns about turning people away who don't have IDs and 11 12 making sure that they and their poll workers 13 understand the law. 14 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: So the issue about 15 hollering out what party you belong to --16 MR. BRADSHAW: In a primary that is based, 17 I guess, like in South Dakota, on party affiliation, 18 that would be all a matter of state law and not 19 covered. 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: How about the general 21 election, which was the other question? 22 MR. BRADSHAW: Well, it's my understanding 23 they will not be hollering out people --24 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I would assume they 25 won't.

They won't? Okay. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 1 Commissioner Braceras had her hand up. 2 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Good afternoon. 3 Thank you all for coming. 4 First, before I ask my question, I did 5 just want to on the record commend the efforts of the 6 Department of Justice and of groups like MALDEF for 7 increasing bilingual access to the ballot. I know the 8 9 department has been very proactive in doing that. So 10 I wanted to thank you both for your efforts in that 11 regard. My question I would pose specifically to 12 13 the department's representative, Mr. Bradshaw, as well 14 as the ACLU's representative, Ms. Strickland, and see 15 if you could both focus on this. And that is, how do we as a democracy strike the balance between 16 17 preventing fraud and making sure that those who are 18 eligible to vote get to vote? Because I see both of 19 these as they're both terrible problems. 20 And, as we know from past reports from the last election, there were thousands of fraudulently 21 22 cast ballots just in Florida. I myself have had 23 experience where my name has been on the voter rolls, 24 unfortunately, in more than one place, several places, 25 the place where I currently live, the place where I

grew up, and the place where I went to college. It took me years and multiple letters and phone calls to get my name off of the rolls in the places where I no longer lived.

Those places did not request ID. In any of those places, somebody could have gone in and said, "Jennifer Braceras, 65 Sperry Road, check," and they could have gone in and voted as me. I don't know that that happened, but it's certainly plausible when you are registered in three places, even though you don't intend to be.

So I do think that fraud is a very real problem. And my concern is that there is a false perception out there, sometimes fed by interest groups, that efforts to prevent fraud are improperly motivated. I am wondering what mechanisms we can put in place to prevent fraud and secure access to the ballot.

At the same time, how do we strike that balance? How do we do it? How do we ensure that the people voting are the people they say they are without making people feel as if they're being challenged for some illicit reason? So how do we combat both of those issues at the same time? Mr. Bradshaw?

MR. BRADSHAW: As you know, in October of

2002, the Attorney General announced his Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Initiative. It splits the initiative has two main focuses. One is the voting integrity side, and the other is ballot access.

The voting integrity/fraud side is handled by the Criminal Division at the Department of Justice. The ballot access side is handled by the Civil Rights Division. It is important for us, as I noted earlier and this is why the Assistant Attorney General, Alex Acosta, has made this decision, that for purposes of doing what we do, guaranteeing ballot access, making sure that individuals aren't intimidated and kept from voting, that those individuals who are observing and monitoring elections not be federal prosecutors and that they are individuals from the Civil Rights Division, they are employees of the Office of Personnel Management.

Then on the opposite side, you have the voting integrity, which is run by the Criminal Division. There are assistant U.S. attorneys that will be stationed in their offices on Election Day who can receive complaints of election fraud. And that will be operated completely separate from the program the Civil Rights Division is operating with respect to guaranteeing ballot access.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But at the place 1 of polling at the local level, how do you ensure that 2 3 without asking for identification, the people walking in and claiming to be the registered vote, that they 4 are that person without somehow causing offense? 5 mean, is there a way to ensure? 6 7 I am just one example in these very small Ms. Valdez spoke about the long history of 8 towns. 9 voter fraud in Chicago, and we know it has happened on 10 a massive scale in certain cities. In my case, the 11 only reason I know about it is because my parents went 12 in to vote. They said, "She hasn't lived here in 13 seven years." They saw my name. "Can you take her 14 off?" 15 "No, we can't. She needs to write a 16 letter," blah blah blah blah blah. Letters were 17 written. It took a whole other election cycle for it 18 to happen. 19 So my point is, how can we ensure that 20 fraudulent ballots aren't being cast without making people feel intimidated? I think it is a very fine 21 22 line. What can we do to get the message out to people that anti-fraud efforts are meant to protect the right 23 24 to vote, not to disfranchise? 25 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now you, Ms.

Strickland?

MS. STRICKLAND: Sure. Well, first of all, I think that preventing fraud and providing access certainly aren't necessarily mutually exclusive goals.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, of course not.

MS. STRICKLAND: But they are often perceived that way, I think. And that is very unfortunate. The ACLU, for example, has taken a number of steps in the Miami-Dade Election Reform Coalition on both sides of that spectrum.

We, for example, advocated for a longer period of time after the end of early voting before Election Day because big counties like Miami-Dade County have concerns that they wouldn't be able to mark off on everybody who voted on the Monday before the Tuesday elections, that sort of thing. And the coalition spoke out about that.

From my perspective, I think a lot of what causes problems, both in terms of access and preventing fraud, are to some degree, certainly not all, management issues and that in addressing the ways policies are implemented and addressing the management of the technology itself, we can actually get at both problems.

Taking the voter ID example, under the Help America Vote Act, someone who is a first-time voter who registered by mail and did not provide the proper identification prior to Election Day is going to have to vote a provisional ballot.

But for other voters for whom there is no problem with their registration, it's not that they are going to be able to just vote normally if they show up without ID. They will be able to vote a regular ballot, but they will first have to fill out an affidavit stating that they are who they say they are.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I have never been asked for an ID in my 20 years of voting.

MS. STRICKLAND: I can't speak, unfortunately, for other states because my expertise is with Florida, but certainly in Florida, voters are absolutely asked for identification. The problem in Florida is that if they don't have it, instead of being provided with the affidavit and then being allowed to vote, they are often turned away. But I think the process itself is an attempt at striking the balance between those two concerns.

I would also point out that one of the challenges in Florida is that after all of the

problems that we have had, voter confidence in the system generally is obviously very low. I mean, that is for a variety of reasons, but we need to address all of the reasons, like if there is a perception of fraud with the new electronic voting machines, for example, whether or not there is the reality of fraud, then that, too, has to be addressed. And so in some senses, that is another example of how these aren't necessarily mutually exclusive goals and that addressing the perception or reality of fraud can actually have a positive effect on voter confidence.

All of that being said, I do think that in

All of that being said, I do think that in the end, we have to err on the side of the voter. That is sort of sometimes frustrating perhaps in our systems in the United States, not just voting systems but whether you are talking about the justice system, any of a number of ways that we look at due process issues. But in the end, we do have to err on the side of the voter trying to prevent fraud but at the same time protecting, above all, the most fundamental rights that are guaranteed to us because if we start sacrificing those rights, in the end, we are undermining what makes us strong.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I just have one sort of follow-up question -- well, one comment and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

one follow-up question. The comment is that by preventing fraud, you are protecting the voters, whose identity may have been stolen or misused or what have you.

And so it's not a question of pitting the voter against the system or some other nebulous concern. Voter fraud imperils particular voters and imperils our democracy equally, I would argue.

My follow-up question is, what is the role both of the government and of the activist groups in educating the public, not just about their rights but also their responsibilities in voting, showing up with whatever they need to show up with, showing up at the right times, not ten minutes before the polls are going to close, et cetera, et cetera, and can we prevent some of the problems we saw in the last election cycle by educating people to get there early, bring their ID, whatever so that things can go more efficiently because both the bureaucrats have a responsibility to have it flow smoothly as well as the people showing up.

MS. STRICKLAND: Well, I think that is an excellent question. The ACLU, for example, has been producing voter empowerment cards that address exactly those issues. And we are distributing those as fast

and as furiously as we can to all segments of the population.

They include by when do you need to register, what do you need to include with that registration, what do you need to take to the polls, what are the hours.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.

MS. STRICKLAND: And I think that there is a role both for government and for activist groups in trying to get that information out to all of the voters.

One of the things that the Miami-Dade Election Reform Coalition, for example, also advocated for after the failed September 2002 primaries was for sample ballots because sample ballots had never been mailed out in Miami-Dade County, to our knowledge.

And so for the first time ever, sample ballots were mailed out, which is something that one would hope would decrease the number of lines at the polls because people would not -- they would be able to mark their answers before they arrived and be able to vote more efficiently.

So we are very concerned at looking at the practicalities like that. The only caveat I think is it has to be done at the appropriate time. For

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

example, a mistake that the Florida legislature made, again after 2002, was that they mandated for posting in all Florida polling places a list of voter responsibilities and a voters' bill of rights.

Voters' bill of rights is very good. And the voter responsibilities have since been amended to get rid of a lot of the concerns that first existed with that, but, for example, number three or something on the list was voters have the responsibility to bring proper identification to the polling place, something like that. And that was to be posted at the polling place, which, at best, is only a partial statement of Florida law.

And it no longer says it in this way. But when they first passed it, number one on the list was to study and know candidates and issues. Well, of course, we should advocate that people study and know the candidates and the issues. That is good civic responsibility. But to post it at the polling place inside after the person has already arrived to vote can serve as a means of intimidation.

So we have to look very carefully at what are the appropriate times and mechanisms for achieving those goals.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Kirsanow?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thanks, everyone, 1 for appearing. Your presentations have been very 2 3 helpful. The first is to I've got two questions. 4 Mr. Bradshaw. A myriad of issues were raised in the 5 2000 election with respect to access to the polls 6 7 counting ballots. One of the issues that was generated in 8 2000 was counting military ballots for difficulties in 9 folks who are serving overseas and registering or to 10 cast a ballot. 11 First, does your division have any 12 1.3 jurisdiction over issues related to that? And if so, 14 what, if anything, is being done in 2004 given that we have a lot more people currently serving overseas? 15 And if you don't have jurisdiction, who does? 16 17 MR. BRADSHAW: The division, Sure. No. 18 among other things, in addition to all of the other 19 federal statutes that I described, has responsibility 20 for protecting military voters overseas. 21 specifically the Department of Justice is responsible 22 for enforcing UOCAVA, the Uniformed Overseas Citizens 23 Absentee Voting Act. And that quarantees the rights 24 of military overseas to be able to cast absentee ballots in elections. 25

б 

As far as the sorts of things that we are doing, recently again the Assistant Attorney General along with the Associate Attorney General, Robert McAllen, individuals at the Department of Defense sent a letter to all of the states informing them of their obligations under UOCAVA. That includes when absentee ballots need to be sent out, how they have processed them. And that is something that we have been following very closely.

Again, we're in a year where we have thousands of American men and women serving in harm's way. It's vital that their right to vote is protected as well. In fact, we have already filed several law enforcement actions just this year under UOCAVA, one in Pennsylvania, another in Georgia, to protect the rights of overseas voters. In both instances, a number of the counties had mailed out the absentee ballots too late for the ballots to be received.

They sent them out overseas too late for them to be filled out and sent back to the United States. The Civil Rights Division brought actions in both of those cases and got the states to amend the rules not only to looking forward to comply but to make sure that votes in that particular race were counted.

question goes to Ms. Valdez and Ms. Strickland. I agree with Ms. Strickland that I don't think that preventing voter fraud and assuring maximum accesses are mutually exclusive propositions. Both of you had talked about provisional ballots and what appear to be pervasive local requirements that result in the provisional ballots if not executed within the local jurisdiction.

What, if anything, if you know, -- I don't know if anyone articulated this, but in East Chicago, I think it was, and wherever it may have occurred in Florida, what did those jurisdictions articulate as the basis for that rejection? I mean, is there an underlying premise for rejecting a provisional ballot in an improperly executed or an improper precinct?

MS. VALDEZ: Well, from my standpoint in Chicago and in East Chicago, mostly in Chicago, the rejection was based on the state law provision that required that you vote in precinct, in the correct precinct. That was the primary reason.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. I understand that, but is there some underlying premise in terms of is this something ostensibly to reduce fraud or is there --

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Most of the restrictions of 1 MS. VALDEZ: that type are under the auspices of fraud reduction. 2 I did want to address the issue of identification 3 because there are alternatives to photo IDs. 4 For example, in Chicago, we have 5 signatures. So that when you go to register to vote, 6 7 you have to sign the sheet. And there is a comparison 8 of your original signature in your application and the 9 signature that you make. 10 We have been against photo IDs because we 11 had determined that the Latino community \* does not 12 have photo IDs to the extent that other people might 13 have. 14 In Chicago, we have great public transportation. 15 There is not a lot of need for 16 driver's licenses or photo IDs. We have people who 17 are very insulated and can live their whole lives 18 without having any photo IDs. So we determined that 19 having that requirement would have a detrimental 20 effect on the Latino community. 21 And that was shown in East Chicago, when 22 you had people going to the polls thinking that they 23 didn't need ID, were told they needed ID, and it was 24 just difficult to go get it or they didn't have it.

They quite simply didn't have ID. So it's under the

auspices of an anti-fraud measure.

recommendation as to how this requirement of provisional balloting being relative to the particular precinct can be implemented in a way to ensure that the provisional ballot is counted but at the same time there is a reduction in the probability of fraud without using the photo ID, for example? Is there some other kind of mechanism that you would recommend?

MS. VALDEZ: I'm sure the states would raise a number of constitutional arguments once you start delineating very specific issues with respect to voter registration. That happened in Illinois. They refused to implement motor voter because they thought that it violated states' rights. So, again, we have a lot of issues with respect to that.

Certainly federal government has the right to dictate how a federal election process will be run.

I'm not advocating for dual processes here, but I think that there can be some sort of measure that the states are aware.

I, quite frankly, am not sure that

Illinois was even aware of how difficult this

provision was going to have an actual effect in the

precinct, the provisional voting requirement that you

do in precinct. So it certainly is -- I intend to go to the state legislature and get that changed right 2 But we are going to have to do that in each 3 state that has this provision. I think there was more 4 than a majority of the states that have this law on 5 the books. 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner 7 Thernstrom? Oh, you wanted to answer that. 8 9 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Ms. Strickland 10 wanted to respond. MS. STRICKLAND: Just very briefly. With 11 12 respect to provisional ballot in Florida, at the time 13 this was passed with the precinct requirement, I 14 didn't hear any articulation of fraud being one of the 15 That's not to say that it wasn't, but I reasons. 16 didn't hear that articulation. 17 I heard two things. One was that it would 18 make for convenience voting, where people who just 19 want to vote for a U.S. president or whatever would 20 pop in to the closest polling place, which wasn't 21 their actual polling place, and, thus, miss the 22 opportunity to vote in local races that would only 23 appear in the precinct where they would get their normal ballot. 24

The other one I heard was that there

wouldn't be enough time given Florida's certification 1 deadlines to count the races on the provisional ballot 2 for which the voter would have otherwise qualified, no 3 matter what precinct the voter voted in. And so I 4 think that there are pretty easy remedies for both of 5 those things. 6 First of all, in Florida now we have 7 extended early voting prior to Election Day so people 8 9 have the ability to go to a location other than their regular polling place, one that is more convenient for 10 them, have ample opportunity to do that. And they 11 12 will be given the ballot that contains all of the 13 races, including local, for which they are qualified. 14 With respect to the certification 15 deadlines, again, I don't think that the need for speed should dictate whether we are going to count the 16 17 choices made by eligible voters. 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner 19 Thernstrom? 20 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, I have a 21 bunch of questions for at least three of you. 22 also extremely interested in the fraud question and in 23 the voter ID question as well because, frankly, if it 24 was a well-known requirement that you produce an ID

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and well-known beforehand so people aren't ending up

25

at the polls suddenly having to go home to get something, do you regard this -- and obviously my concern again is fraud -- as a problem? I mean, there are so many occasions in this society and I suspect with current security concerns that those occasions will, the number will, 6 increase where voter ID is necessary. I come here on 7 I can't get on a plane -- not voter ID, a 8 a plane. I can't get on a plane without proper 9 picture ID. identification and so forth aside from it's part of 10 the driver's license process and so forth. 11 In seconding what Commissioner Braceras 12 13 said, fraud is a matter of protecting the electoral It's not kind of punitive in my view. 14 15 Ms. Johnson, I was very interested in your hint of wanting amendments to the Voting Rights Act in 16 17 2007. As an old student of the Voter Rights Act, I 18 would love to know what you had in mind. 19 Ms. Strickland, I would like to go to the 20 kind of felon question, the ex-felon question. 21 said that is the primary question with respect to vote 22 suppression. Of course, it is under our 23 constitutional arrangement the state prerogative to 24 determine voter qualifications. Therefore, you said,

"Well, this shouldn't be a political issue," but it is

25

1

2

3

4

5

a political issue everywhere because it is a state prerogative, it seems to me.

In the Voter Rights Act, there has been no decision, so far at least, that determines, despite the disparate impact, that has determined that there is a voting rights violation that I know of anyway in a state barring ex-felons, whatever we think of the policy.

Then you had a point you repeated a couple of times that the whole bunch of small problems do add up to one big problem. I understand that is a valid point, but my first reaction to that is, gee, I don't know of perfect elections. I mean, elections are messy affairs in which -- no perfect elections in which there aren't small problems. And you add them up together. And yes, they, arguably, are all big problems and which I'm not sure we know how to run perfect elections.

I am happy that the Florida constitution is amended, but that seems to me a Florida problem, rather than a federal agency problem.

Finally, on the kind of wrong precinct question, I mean, again, we do have a precinct-based voting system in every state. It would seem to me not a question simply of ensuring participation or

encouraging participation in local elections but also 1 the fraud question once again. 2 I mean, we are all telling personal little 3 anecdotes here. I called at one point my local town 4 hall -- I live in a relatively small town in 5 Massachusetts -- and said, "What does it take to 6 7 register to vote?" "Well, come in and fill out a form." 8 "Well, do I have to show you any 9 10 identification?" "No." 11 12 "Do I have to prove that I live in the 13 town?" "No." 14 15 I could go to five towns in Massachusetts and register to vote. Now, it happens in 16 17 Massachusetts that wouldn't affect the outcome of the election because, of course, it is basically a 18 19 one-party state. Nevertheless, I do think it is 20 legitimate to worry about the fraud question. 21 Anyway, those are questions I'm throwing 22 out on the table. I want to second the statements of 23 others who have said how much we all appreciate your 24 coming today. I have found it very informative. 25 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any of you who wish to

respond please do. Ms. Johnson, I think. 1 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. I'll just start 2 because that's the beginning of where the questions 3 came from. As far as the voting right 4 reauthorization, we are really at the infancy part of 5 6 that evaluation. We are counting on participating with a 7 number of other groups to hold hearings throughout the 8 9 country but to be able to gather the data and to 10 evaluate the success of the Voter Rights Act and then also to look at some of the newer implementations and 11 12 some of the challenges that we are having today and to 13 see where we need to improve, as you would any other 14 reauthorization as it goes through that. 15 So we are clearly in the beginning and are 16 really working on the education component to make sure 17 that our folks are very well-educated as to their 18 responsibilities in voting and then what are the 19 barriers. 20 One of the barriers for us -- you mentioned ID. So I just want to take one moment 21 22 because I didn't -- the red light came on real quick. 23 And I didn't talk past the red light, like others. 24 (Laughter.) 25 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Good Indian. I was

kidding. I'll be getting notes from people.

MS. JOHNSON: But what I wanted to say, one of the challenges to voter ID for us is we, like the Latino community, have issues with not having a lot of picture IDs. One part of that is for the traditional concern.

There are a number of many of our folks who are very, very traditional and still have very traditional practices and don't. There are still communities in our communities, pueblos that you go to today that you cannot even take a camera into without permission of the tribal council. So taking photos is still a challenge to a photo ID process in our communities.

The second thing is most of our IDs that many of our tribal members use are tribally issued IDs, rather than state-issued IDs. And because of resource issues, we would be challenged resource-wise, just like any other state would be, to move to a picture, a photo ID for our tribal IDs. We don't have the resources to be able to deal with those. So we have, in addition to just the regular access and since a lot of our communities don't necessarily get on a plane and travel -- and still there are other alternatives when you get on a plane to a photo ID.

MS. VALDEZ: Let me just add really quickly that the issue of HAVA requiring identification is something new in Illinois. We don't require identification. So you have voted and voted and voted and voted for all of these years without having to show identification. Then you have the federal government mandating that in these particular instances, you have to show ID. So talk about a logistical nightmare of educating people when the practice had been never to require identification.

I did mention fraud in Chicago, but I will tell you that most of it happens not necessarily with people voting but with the counting, with the counting aspect of it, which is another aspect of fraud.

I am really concerned about access to the polling place, being able to let the individual get in there and vote without a lot of hassle, without a lot of intimidation.

I mentioned East Chicago, The intimidation was not just identification, but every time an issue came up, four cop cars came to that precinct, four police officers with guns. How ridiculous is that? I mean, on one hand, you do have to balance voter fraud and access, but there you go with the extreme reaction to a potential issue of

fraud or a problem. 1 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: And whose 2 decision is that? What level of government was that? 3 The Lake County Board of MS. VALDEZ: 4 Elections had issued an edict to all of the poll 5 workers that when something went wrong, police were to 6 be called in. 7 I personally saw three African American 8 men go into the precinct, see the cops, and turn right 9 back out. Why would you want to go into that 10 situation? 11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Ms. Strickland, 12 13 briefly, please. MS. STRICKLAND: And I will be very brief 14 15 since I did, indeed, go past the red light. I just wanted to respond. I think one of the important 16 17 reasons to bring forward issues like felony 18 disfranchisement and the correct precinct requirement to this body is because counties and states look to 19 20 this Commission as a respected source of recommendations and actions that can be taken. So in 21 22 that sense, even for issues that are either county or 23 state-level issues, groups look to the recommendations 24 that this Commission makes. 25 Forty-eight states have some form of felon disfranchisement laws. And what states like Florida democracy.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are doing that have full bans is that they are creating degrees of citizenship. When we start to create degrees of citizenship, we are starting to create something that looks not quite like a

In Florida, restoration of the right to vote, it's not that it's a political issue. That's all been a political issue throughout the entire history of the United States. It's that restoration currently lies in the hands of politicians.

For example, approximately 85 percent of people leaving supervision have to actually have a hearing before the government and his cabinet in Tallahassee. At one of the hearings that I attended, I saw someone berated, for example, for the level of personal debt that he has. It's not clear to me what one's personal debt has to do with the right to vote. And I think that that is an issue that is a matter of democracy. And, as such, it has to be taken seriously at every level, from the local to the federal.

With regard to the legal status, there is a federal challenge underway brought by the Brennan Center for Justice. It's called Johnson v. Bush. There was a favorable decision, actually, at the

<u> </u>	Appears Court level that was vacated. This now is is	
2	going to be reheard. And so we will be anticipating	
3	the results of that hearing.	
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You said you would be	
5	brief.	
6	MS. STRICKLAND: Having perfect elections	
7	may not be possible, but we have to try.	
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did you have	
9	something?	
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes, I have	
11	some.	
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And then Commissioner	
13		
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: It's late. So	
15	I'll just ask some quick questions. I'm confused on	
16	Florida. I read some articles charging that thousands	
17	of ex-felons voted illegally, but I've also read that	
18	the attorney generals only filed one or two fraud	
19	cases, the local attorney general. How many fraud	
20	cases did the Justice Department file in Florida?	
21	MS. STRICKLAND: I don't know right	
22	offhand the number.	
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I'm sorry.	
24	This is for Mr. Bradshaw.	
25	MR. BRADSHAW: Yes. You know, being a	

1	representative of the Civil Rights Division, I		
2	couldn't tell you.		
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I guess that		
4	would be the		
5	MR. BRADSHAW: The Criminal Division		
6	handles voter fraud.		
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I guess I		
8	haven't read of any federal cases. I've read only of		
9	one or two state. So I'm just a little bit confused		
10	on that.		
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Maybe we can get that		
12	data from the Criminal Division.		
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes. Good.		
14	That would be good.		
15	Secondly, Ms. Strickland, when we have had		
16	hearings, it appeared that some counties utilized		
17	sample ballots; some did not. Is the law now that all		
18	of the counties have to send out sample ballots?		
19	MS. STRICKLAND: I would want to double		
20	check on that, but I think that that is still at the		
21	discretion of the counties. But I would want to		
22	check.		
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Well, my		
24	reaction was that that was a terrible law because the		
25	poorer counties are the ones that don't have the money		

to send out sample ballots. Presumably people are 1 going to take longer to vote. 2 And then we were also told that there is 3 a statutory limit, ofttimes not enforced but a 4 5 statutory limit, about how long you can stay in the polling booth. 6 7 MS. STRICKLAND: There is a limit. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So it is an 8 incongruent situation and one very unfair to those who 9 happen to live in poorer counties, it seems to me. 10 11 MS. STRICKLAND: I think that is certainly a concern and one that we should take a look into. 12 13 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Ms. Valdez, 14 should the law be changed in terms of people who vote 15 in the "wrong precinct"? I still don't understand why their vote can't be counted for all of those positions 16 17 that are not related at the precinct. 18 MS. VALDEZ: Yes. 19 (Laughter.) 20 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Short answer. 21 And, two, for you, Ms. Valdez and Ms. Strickland 22 particularly, both parties have said they are going to 23 send a lot of poll watchers out to make sure that the 24 rules are followed. Are those good positions for the 25 parties to make?

MS. VALDEZ: I think poll watchers can be very helpful and very useful. I also think, though that, community groups sending poll watchers out is very important also. I know that in Chicago, I mentioned the New Americans Initiative that is undergoing, that there are a number of community-based organizations that will be at the polling place, both inside and out, with credentials.

It can be difficult, though, if you have a small precinct with not a lot of room to have five people poll watching and one person voting.

MS. STRICKLAND: I think that brings up a really important issue in Florida. Poll watchers can definitely play a very important role. However, in Florida, to actually be a registered poll watcher inside the polling place, one has to be affiliated with a political party or with a political committee.

This is something that the ACLU would like to look into further. So I don't want to offer any sort of official position, but I think that it is somewhat problematic that nonpartisan groups, who are merely concerned with making sure that the elections run fairly and smoothly, are not able to be poll watchers inside the polling place.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Thank you,

Madam Chair. 1 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner 2 Redenbaugh? 3 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Thank you. I'll 4 5 also try and be brief. Ms. Valdez, I know Cook County does have 6 a reputation for imaginativeness practices. I am from 7 Philadelphia. We're very proud of our facility there 8 9 and our citizenship. In fact, in some recent 10 elections, we have had in some precincts over 100 11 percent participation. And we are very proud of that, 12 really civic mindedness that you don't often see. 13 My question really is for all of you. 14 Sort of ignoring for the moment the focus on the 15 general election of 2000 and the upcoming one, do you 16 see more of a problem in general elections or in 17 primary elections, where in one party, places like 18 Philadelphia, the only election that really matters is 19 the primary elections? 20 MS. VALDEZ: The jurisdictions I work in are exactly the same. The only race that really 21 22 matters seems to be the primary elections. For good 23 or bad, that's just the way it works out in practical 24 I don't know what the other panelists' 25 experiences are, but that has been the experience in

the Midwest.

I think we have to be vigilant on every election. It's the smallest election to the largest election.

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: But do you get the public interest up enough? The tendency is for people to pay attention to the generals and not the primary, I presume.

MS. VALDEZ: Obviously there are issues that have turned out in getting people interested. And that is the job of everyone to do, whether it's the government to the lowly community-based organization in a small town.

But yes, it's clear, though, in the jurisdiction I work in that the primary elections become the most hotly contested elections. That's where you get a lot of the battles. That's where you get a lot of the plane, the tricking, the things that are going on. And that is where the fight is won or lost, in the primary election. But that is not to say we don't focus on general elections and what happens.

What we're focusing in on, the small, little special election that is going to happen in East Chicago, is going to deal with one race only. Then we're going on to November. Then we're going on

to the general election on that small, little special 1 election. So we take every election seriously because 2 it is about making sure that the voters feel that they 3 have a part in the process if they're voting for 4 dogcatcher or voting for president. 5 It increases voter participation if they 6 vote in every particular election because everything 7 is in. All politics are local at some level. 8 9 everybody is interested in who their city council member is, but they might not be interested in who the 10 11 state comptroller is going to be. But it's important 12 to foster political participation at every level. 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone have 14 anything different to say about that or anything to 15 add to that answer or would you support Ms. Valdez's 16 answer? 17 I support what she says. MS. JOHNSON: 18 think in Indian country, clearly where they are more 19 heavily contested is when the political stakes are 20 higher and people pay more attention. 21 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Did you have 22 another question? 23 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Well, I wanted to try 24 to just shed a little light on someone based on that 25 experience I had in this National Commission on

Federal Election Reform that Presidents Ford and Carter co-chaired after the Florida thing because this question that Commissioner Braceras raised was really at the heart of a lot of the discussions in that commission.

And, for what it's worth, let me share what our theory was because I think there was really a bipartisan consensus on this and part of it led to the provisions that are in HAVA in this regard, some dilution, of course, on the Hill.

There was a fair amount of sentiment,

principally on the Republican side of the aisle,

concerning the importance of doing more with respect

to voter fraud. But there was a fair amount of

sentiment, principally on the Democratic side, with

respect to the dangers of overdoing the fraud

prevention in a way that would lead, through one

channel or another, to people feeling deterred or

inhibited or chilled in the exercise of the franchise.

So the notion of acquiring the ID for someone who had previously registered, not in person, this is the first time, was sort of a position that we came to as trying to fasten on the place where the greatest risk of abuse seemed to be.

So the notion was that somebody shows up

at the poll. There has been some point in their history where they have been forced to really affirmatively identify that they are who they claim they are, they're not somebody's dog.

After that point, there was a sense that if states do the management that they should be doing by moving towards, for example, statewide computerized election lists, making the investments that they ought to in list maintenance, subject to the protections in motor voter, et cetera, that that should go 98 percent of the way towards cleaning up the problem that Commissioner Braceras spoke about of having somebody's name appear on multiple lists in multiple jurisdictions, inviting the possibility of fraud.

So I think yes, the answer was if you manage the system correctly and, in particular, if you develop these computerized voter lists, we can cut down on a lot of the possibilities of fraud.

Third consideration was that empirically most of us Republicans and Democrats came to the conclusion that just as an empirical matter, the incidence and the risks of fraud is far less than the incidence and the risk of the voter chilling/suppression/whatever and that, therefore, you shouldn't blow things out of proportion, that you

ought to have a --1 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Where's the data 2 on that? 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Braceras, 4 5 could you let him finish? COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Well, that's what --6 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Braceras, 8 could you let him finish? 9 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I mean, we listened 10 to witnesses. 11 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm just wondering where I can find that. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could you let him 13 14 finish because he let you finish? Could you let him 15 finish his statement, please? And then I'll entertain 16 your question. 17 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Well, I will say what we discussed was, where is the data with respect to 18 19 either of these questions? We had discussions about it. We talked to election officials about it. 20 We 21 heard testimony from county-level people, from state 22 officials, from academics, et cetera. And the data 23 ain't great, but it certainly was I think everybody's 24 impression that the relative scale of these problems 25 was, as I suggested,

That all said, I guess the last point I want to make is about the provisional ballots, going to what Pete said earlier. Pete's question was that there was a lot of sentiment, again on both sides of the aisle.

I think Slade Gordon, Republican from the State of Washington, was perhaps most forceful in this, of promoting the idea of provisional balloting. Indeed, Slade was talking about how in the State of Washington, they have statewide provisional balloting because they have the voter list because once you have the statewide voter list, as opposed to precinct by precinct or even county by county voter list, you get the provisional ballot, you can tell where that person was supposed to have voted. And you only count those offices for which they really were supposed to go out.

So if they voted in the wrong precinct and they voted for the precinct dogcatcher when they don't actually live in that precinct, you don't count that one. And you can tell what should have been counted based upon the statewide voter list.

So our thought in pushing this idea of provisional balloting, which was then reflected in HAVA, was that this is a way that without introducing huge risks of fraud, you can make it easier for people

1	to vote. You can provide a safety net if there have		
2	been problems with somebody's name appearing on a		
3	voter roll.		
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, Commissioner.		
5	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: But then the problem		
6	is and this was not anticipated that states would		
7	implement this in a way that still required people to		
8	show up in the right precinct when the whole idea was		
9	to create a safety net for people to be able to vote		
10	if they happen not to show up at the right precinct.		
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Before we begin a new		
12	round		
13	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: If I was to get the		
14			
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you. Before we		
16	begin a new round, let's entertain Commissioner		
17	Braceras' questions.		
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I can ask Chris		
19	laster. I'm just wondering where I can access the		
20	data and the information that he just referred to.		
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, I see. Okay.		
22	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Can we make an		
23	affirmative recommendation to the Justice Department?		
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What we can do is,		
25	first of all, we will make what you said about the		

Carter-Ford commission's report, that part of the 1 discussion, send it out again. 2 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Fine. 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Secondly, if there are 4 data -- and maybe the two of you can --5 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I'm checking 6 7 the underlying --COMMISSIONER EDLEY: There's no --8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Who said it. But I'm 9 10 not finished yet. 11 I have listened very attentively to the questions that everyone has asked and the answers to 12 I must say that part of the discussion 13 all of them. 14 proceeded without context because the context in which 15 we are having this discussion is the history of large 16 numbers of people of color being deprived of the right 17 to vote. And the reason why the Voting Rights Act was 18 passed in the first place was because large numbers of 19 people had a history of having their vote not just 20 suppressed but exterminated or not permitted 21 altogether. That was our goal. We sort of missed in 22 talking about all of these trees in my opinion the 23 And then we have new immigrants who suffer from the same disabilities. 24

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

So the whole intent here and my

25

understanding of why the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department was established, in part, and given this responsibility in the Voter Rights Act is to pay attention to trying to see to it that these once excluded folk get an opportunity to vote.

And if one is going to err in any way,

And if one is going to err in any way,
then one ought to err in terms of trying to make sure
that everything is done that is possible so that we
don't have, one, no count; that is, people who can't
get in the door or get in the door and aren't
permitted to vote; and, two, count, absence of absence
of counts, not having their votes counted. And that
was my understanding about the process.

No one believes in fraud. Every time one of these discussions takes place, there's this, you know, let's balance fraud against not having fraud. I don't know anyone who is, publicly at least, in favor of having fraud in the voting process, whatever their politics happen to be.

The other thing that we want to keep in mind is that in managing the process, this Commission recommended provisional ballots. We said that most of the problems in Florida could have been solved if they had provisional ballots. We didn't know that they were going to have them and you've got to be in the

right precinct and you didn't know it and all of that.

And anyone listening to this discussion because part of this is about educating people, not just ourselves, might ask, "Why not educate all of these voters you people keep talking about so that they have everything when they get there and everything goes fine?" You have answered that.

And the reality is there are some people who are on their job and, as you said, take time out to run over and vote who don't have an idea or forgot it or got there or whatever because their lives are not like our lives. Their lives have a lot of stress involved in them. Their lives have a lot of problematic things involved in them. And they are the people that we should care about more than those of us who have all of the advantages.

The other thing that I would say is that when it comes to fraud, when it comes to access, we are concerned about disparate treatment. We are concerned about the law being enforced unfairly; that is, if some people are asked questions and others aren't if some people are required to show something and other people aren't required to show it.

My question is this -- and it's for the Justice Department. We received a letter from a

number of civil rights organizations, including your 1 organization, asking us about the minority voters in 2 Orange County, Mr. Esi Thomas and others who were 3 involved in this business of having law enforcement 4 investigators visit their homes of elderly African 5 American voters, who either assisted in get out and 6 7 vote campaigns or voted by absentee ballot in the election. 8 9 They ask us to ask you what the Justice 10 Department knew about this. This has been widely 11 publicized -- whether there were any steps to take to That's my first question. 12 do it. 13 MR. BRADSHAW: Is this a mayoral race in 14 the Orlando area, Orange County, that we're talking 15 about? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 16 Yes and where the 17 Florida Division of Elections says that they were 18 there because they were trying to get rid of fraud. 19 They just happened to be focused on these elderly 20 African American voters who felt intimidated by people 21 coming to their house or they didn't think they were 22 being very helpful. 23 My first question -- I only have two 24 questions; they're both to the Justice Department --25 is whether, indeed, you are aware of this and whether

you have any responsibility in this matter or not. 1 2 3 4 actually not have an open investigation looking into 5 these allegations, I am not at liberty to discuss any 6 7 8 an investigation. 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

MR. BRADSHAW: I can answer that one very We are aware, and we have opened an investigation. As a result of that, because we

further details, but we are aware and we have opened

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: My second question is that I sent a letter to the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Acosta, in July, after our July proceeding here and asked him two questions.

I have never received a response. figured I would ask you while you are sitting here about the letter. One of the things we asked about -this is where we discussed the felon curve -- this was widely publicized, too -- and how in Florida to refresh the recollection of those who do not remember, Accenture, the company, had come before us to describe their work on this. They asserted at the proceeding that the list they were given was very inaccurate and that that was, of course, the problem and that most of the people on this list were African Americans.

After a lot of back and forth and the list being produced publicly, even though the Department of

Elections had told the counties to use this list, they then told them not to use it. And then they told them that they should use their own processes in trying to make sure they purged.

My question to you in the letter or to Mr.

Acosta and your division was: one, whether you were
aware of all of this. Since it had been in the media
everywhere, I was assuming you were aware of it.

MR. BRADSHAW: Yes. We were aware and are aware.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And, two, whether you thought that by the state attempting to require local election officials to use this list, which had a disparate impact on African Americans demonstrably, I would assume, since most of the people on there were and many of them were not felons, whether you would explore whether there was any Voter Rights Act violation of HAVA violation, and, finally, whether you thought under Bush v. Gore having the counties use their own procedures to decide who to purge, rather than using uniform standards, as the Supreme Court said should be used in voting matters, in Bush v. Gore, whether you thought there was a problem.

And so I ask those two questions. And I wonder if you know the answers to them.

The issue with the MR. BRADSHAW: Sure. 1 felon purge list, issues related to that left almost 2 as quickly as they came because almost at the exact 3 same time that Florida announced that they were going 4 to use this new list to purchase names from their 5 voting rolls. 6 We received complaints. At almost the 7 8 exact same time, Florida received complaints and stopped using the list. And as a result, I can say 9 that is something we're monitoring and following very 10 11 closely. To the extent that the state attempts to 12 either reuse that list or if there are complaints 13 about some other actual actions that the state is 14 15 taking, that we would entertain those allegations. As 16 things stand now, they are not, in fact, using that 17 list. 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The second part of my 19 question was --20 MR. BRADSHAW: The Bush v. Gore. 21 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: -- whether you thought 22 that having each county sort of fend for itself with 23 whatever standards it could come up with. And there 24 are how many Florida counties? I forgot. 25 MS. STRICKLAND: Sixty-seven.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Sixty-seven different 1 Whether you thought that this lack of counties. 2 uniformity, should it need up having a disparate 3 impact on some communities, whether you thought that 4 there might be either a constitutional or a statutory 5 problem. 6 MR. BRADSHAW: I should note at the outset 7 that with respect to the Bush v. Gore, I have not had 8 the time to think about precisely what the State of 9 Florida was proposing to do, which, of course, is no 10 11 longer happening, and had they continued to do that, 12 whether it would have been consistent with Bush --13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, no, no. That's 14 not my question. My question is, Florida announced 15 the list would no longer be used. 16 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: By the state. 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: By the state and that the counties might individually -- they announced this 18 19 publicly. It was in the press. And they wrote us a 20 letter saying that. We have a letter around here 21 where we got that letter from them. And we released 22 it to the press. 23 They said each county should use its own 24 standards, whatever standards each county wished to use, in determining how to execute a felon purge and 25

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that the state wasn't going to tell them how to do 1 that. 2 My query to you in the July 26th letter, 3 not to you personally but to your agency, was whether, 4 indeed, there could be some problems in this lack of 5 uniform standards and how you go about doing it in 6 each county. The state said, "We're just going to 7 throw up our hands. And we're not going to use any 8 9 standards." Under Bush v. Gore because Bush v. Gore, 10 11 as I understand it and as the lawyers around here said, requires that there be uniform standards in 12 13 voting matters and they even quoted from it and said 14 equal protection applies to the right to vote as well as the exercise of the right to vote, would include, 15 I guess, being purged from the rolls. 16 17 So I was asking you whether there was a potential legal problem there if this turns out to 18 19 have a disparate impact. And would there be perhaps 20 a denial of equal protection with the standard list 21 sort of procedure going on all over the state? 22 MR. BRADSHAW: I must admit I will go back 23 and look at that letter and look at the question. am just not in a position right now to answer. 24 25 My recollection at the time when we looked

1	at the question, it also raised a question about			
2	whether it was consistent with HAVA's requirement of			
3	keeping a centralized list. And, of course, that			
4	provision of HAVA doesn't come into effect until			
5	January 1st of 2006.			
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right, right. So			
7	could I get a response after you have had a chance to			
8	look at this?			
9	MR. BRADSHAW: Yes. I will go back and			
10	look and coordinate. The letter you said was to the			
11	Assistant Attorney General?			
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. And then,			
13	finally, let me just say that many of the problems			
14	that we have been discussing could be solved. I mean			
15	we as a panel and in the various proceedings we have			
16	had if some of the provisions of HAVA had been			
17	implemented already.			
18	If, for example, as Commissioner Edley			
19	said, we had a computerized voter registration list			
20	now that was clean, some of these problems about who			
21	is on the list, it is unfortunate that HAVA with all			
22	of its weaknesses would have some strengths with its			
23	weaknesses, hasn't been implemented yet.			
24	But I want to make sure that we let voters			
25	understand that it does not mean or potential			

voters -- that they shouldn't go out to vote because there are these problems. You hear people saying, "Boy, there are so many problems," but, in fact, everyone here and people in the organizations and groups are trying to do the best they can to make sure that people have the right to vote. And you have assured us, as I understood you, Mr. Bradshaw, that the monitors that you are sending out are there not to simply report on whether somebody who is trying to vote might be a potential fraudulent actor but that people are not faced with barriers to their right to vote when they are eligible voters just because of who they are and their status and that they will have the right to vote. try to make a suggestion I hope all of the

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Madam Chair, can I commissioners would be able to join in for the Justice Department because I have read the letter of August 31st that the Assistant Attorney General sent to Secretaries of State or whomever?

And it's a perfectly unobjectionable letter except perhaps insofar as that it's -- well, platitudinous would sound harsh, but, I mean, it basically says, "I am writing to remind you to follow And if you're confused about what the law

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 || is, call us."

So that is certainly fine as far as it goes but my suggestion would be that the Assistant Attorney General or perhaps the Attorney General write a letter to the Secretaries of State or, indeed, to the County Supervisors all over the country and not have to come up with a mailing list beyond saying simply, "Follow the law."

I'm sure it would be very easy for your staff to identify fine or ten of the most common problems with implementation that violate the statute or the most common examples of difficulties that your election monitors find. You could add to it common examples on the fraud side as well.

So in a more pointed way than simply saying, "Please implement the statute," you could sort of provide them in a high profile way with a checklist that they should feel responsible for complying with along with the statutory citations telling them which statute they're violating if they don't do it.

I just think that that might be very helpful to some of the local officials as well as to the various civic groups that are trying to be involved in the process.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What's your reaction

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to that, Mr. Bradshaw? MR. BRADSHAW: I mean, we have an 2 extensive program, something to educate state and 3 4 local officials with respect to the current state of 5 the law. Certainly some jurisdictions are covered by separate provisions of the act that others aren't; for 6 7 example, section 203, section 4. So a lot of these letters we try to tailor for jurisdictions. 8 I think if you look at the following 9 10 letter that we sent on that same date, that went 11 specifically to jurisdictions that were covered by 203 1.2 and laid out the more specific requirements that they 13 are required to follow. So we already have and are both informally 14 and in more formal letters like that in contact with 15 16 jurisdictions. We have a lot of these same sorts of 17 materials that you have described at the Voting 18 Section Web page and elsewhere. 19 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Do you have anything 20 that says, a sign that says, "No ID, no voting, 21 violates federal law"? Is there a letter that you have sent to election officials that just says that 22 23 clearly? 24 MR. BRADSHAW: I am not aware of a letter. 25 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: That is the sort of

1	thing I am cornered about. There is a short list of		
2	the most common mistakes that your monitors tend to		
3	find that would be more pointed and would be more o		
4	an easy checklist than a general injunction that they		
5	follow the statute or the informality of the		
6	schmoozing between a DOJ official and it just seems		
7	to me that it would be good for the department to be		
8	on the record being proactive at warning people about		
9	"Based on our experience, here is where the hot		
10	problems are. Be on your guard." That's my		
11	suggestion.		
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do you want to move		
13	that or do you just want to suggest that or what would		
14	you like to do?		
15	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: No. That's all		
16	right. I won't.		
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But you have made the		
18	suggestion.		
19	MR. BRADSHAW: Yes, and		
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Perhaps you will		
21	MR. BRADSHAW: And we have heard it.		
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And even if you don't		
23	want to do a letter, perhaps you could put a few		
24	examples on the Web site and say, "These are no-nos."		
25	You could think about what examples to put, not you		

personally but whoever does that. 1 If it's left to me MR. BRADSHAW: 2 personally, our Web site would probably --3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. 4 MR. BRADSHAW: We had better leave that to 5 the experts. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. How many people do you have? How many personnel do you have that will 8 9 be on this voting rights monitoring business? 10 MR. BRADSHAW: I don't think we have a 11 specific number. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: About how many? 13 MR. BRADSHAW: I mean, it's certainly 14 going to be in the hundreds. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In the hundreds? All 15 16 Well, let me just reiterate that we thank 17 everyone for coming. We want to urge everyone, of 18 course, to vote and to educate themselves before they 19 go to the extent that they can and to officials to 20 ensure that their votes are counted and the groups to 21 do what they can to help in this regard. 22 And unless someone has some other business 23 that they would like to present, we will end this meeting with thanking everyone for coming. 24 Thank you 25 very much.

1		CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did you move?
2		VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I move.
3		CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. It's not
4	debatable.	All in favor indicate by saying aye.
5		(Whereupon, there was a chorus of
6		"ayes.")
7		CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
8		(No response.)
9		CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So ordered.
10		(Whereupon, at 1:16 p.m., the foregoing
11		matter was adjourned.)
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		·
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	1	

# CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in the matter of:

Briefing

Before: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Date: September 17, 2004

Place: Washington, DC

represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting.

Alfally