

 Follow up
**Alcorn, James (SBE)**

**From:** Ables, Alex [alex.ables@fauquiercounty.gov] **Sent:** Tue 7/7/2009 4:29 PM  
**To:** Alcorn, James (SBE)  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** FW: Residency document  
**Attachments:**

I wish to express my professional concerns over Section 16(a, b, c and d) of the proposed voter residency task force report. These provisions will require the Registrar to undertake new processes and procedures that in addition to requiring additional manpower to perform is also creating a process that is not able to be effectively managed through automated means.

No mention is made about VERIS being modified to track these incomplete/deficient/ error laden applications and generate the necessary notifications or establishing firm timelines/deadlines for action by the applicant. Not having this process automated will result in lingering applications which will create significant problems come the close of voter registration rolls in advance of each election; typically a time of high volume. Additionally, no process is outlined about how to deal with a voter at the polls who has submitted a deficient application and has not responded to Registrar inquiries by election day.

The proposed Registrar actions in Section 16 should be permissive in nature to allow for maximum flexibility and expedience. However, it is also my professional opinion that the existing established process of voter registration denial is the most expedient and legally defensible process to use and should continue to be used in dealing with deficient, incomplete or error laden applications.

It is also my professional opinion that Section 16 of the proposal goes well beyond the original scope of residency task force, that being, to establish residency requirements, not what constitutes a complete voter registration application.

Alex Ables

General Registrar

County of Fauquier

---

**From:** Tracy Howard [mailto:radfordelections@jetbroadband.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 07, 2009 1:33 PM  
**To:** 'grlist'; EBList@sbe.virginia.gov; 'SBE - STAFF - All users (SBE)'  
**Cc:** james.alcorn@sbe.virginia.gov; 'Jim Hopper'; 'Cunningham, Jean'  
**Subject:** Residency document

Hello all,

By now you have received and I hope examined the proposed residency document put forth by SBE.

Please peruse and provide your input to James Alcorn.

You will notice substantial differences in the final draft put together by SBE and the first proposal put forth by the registrar/e-board members of the task force.

While the SBE document does address and confirm the registrars' responsibility to ask questions of an applicant whose address is in question, it limits this responsibility to certain questions and circumstances.

The intent of the GR/EB document was to reaffirm the registrars responsibility to their localities by making ABSOLUTELY sure that every individual placed on the rolls of a locality were actually residents of that locality. That is I believe the intent of Article 2 Section 1 of the Constitution. The safeguards suggested by the GR/EB members were ignored in this document.

IT WAS NOT the intention of the VRAV or VEBA task force members to saddle the registrars with additional duties or an intermediate step in the denial /acceptance process. Indeed I believe that adding or changing information on an attested document AFTER the applicant has signed is and will continue to be illegal.

Particularly duties that are in the SBE document open ended. There is no timeline during which an applicant may respond to the requested information. How will this be handled when that applicant who is not registered shows up on election day? More provisional ballots, that's how.

Please read sections 16, 17 and 18 very closely.

It is my belief that in the case of 16 a, b,c and d the notification to the applicant must still be the current procedure of the denial letter and a new application, with the current checks of an appeal to the circuit court.

There is a contradiction in 16 f that the request for additional information be placed only in writing.

I also have a HUGE problem with #19 in that we do not know what information will be placed before the public and third party groups.

PLUS the fact that no where within the document is the Application addressed.

We had specifically asked for a residence explanation to be placed on the application itself.

due to our believing that rules are of no use to the process if they were not placed where every applicant could have the opportunity to read them.

Now is the time to act.

Thanks for you attention,

Tracy Howard, GR Radford