

ELECTIONS COMMISSION
City and County of San Francisco



Gerard Gleason, President
Richard P. Matthews
Joseph B. Phair
Rosabella Safont
Arnold Townsend
Malcolm Yeung
Winnie Yu

John Arntz
Director of Elections

Shirley Rodrigues
Commission Secretary

City and County of San Francisco
Elections Commission

Approved:

Minutes of the Meeting held
City Hall, Room 416
November 19, 2008

1. President Gleason called the meeting to order at 6:04 pm.
2. **COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:** Commissioners, Gerard Gleason, Richard P. Matthews, Winnie Yu, Rosabella Safont, Malcolm Yeung, Joseph B. Phair, Deputy City Attorney Mollie Lee and Director John Arntz. **ABSENT:** Commissioner Arnold Townsend.
3. **Public comment on any issue within the Elections Commission's general jurisdiction.** *Richard Hanlin* said he was concerned that Rank Choice Voting (RCV) does not meet the one man, one vote test. *Blair Bobier* said that she wants the RCV tabulations released as soon as possible on election night because the town of Pierce County, Oregon has RCV and was able to have their election results posted on election night. *Otto Duffy* said that he agreed with Mr. Hanlin regarding RCV, and added that he worked in precinct 3614 and that there were inexperienced pollworkers and inspectors at that site. Mr. Duffy suggested that if students at City College were encouraged to take a day off from instruction to work at the polling sites, the City could have a large pool of capable workers.
4. **Director's Report.** Director Arntz reported that the November 4, 2008 election was the largest in the history of the City. There was a 50,000 voter registration increase from early September to mid-October. Of citizens casting ballots, 47 % voted by mail. Twenty Thousand people chose to vote at City Hall (in 2004, there were 13,000 – which, then, was a record high). The Director said that over 80% of voters voted, and that the last time this happened was in 1968.

There were over one thousand election observers, almost two per polling place. Nearly 300 people from overseas visited the election facilities at City Hall and at the Pier.

7. a

Certification of the Election is expected December 2, 2008. The Director reminded the Commission that his permanent staff is only 22 people, for the election 400 people were hired. This number is now down to 200. He said it is staggering to observe the scope of work the permanent staff oversaw for the November 4, 2008 election.

Director Arntz said that in the 15 elections since he has been Director, he has never seen the Elections Department run better than it did for this election. He said, "I don't think that any election in California was run better by a group of people than the one in San Francisco. Honestly, it's amazing and I want to commend every body. One of the things this group was really good at doing was to respond to situations...before and during election day and even afterwards."

The Director complimented the voters as well. He said that even with the lines outside of City Hall, some people waited a couple of hours, sometimes in the rain, the voters were patient and the long lines were managed by the competent Elections Department staff.

Commissioner Matthews congratulated the Director and the Department on the well run election. He asked the Director what his policy is regarding releasing the RCV ballot count. Director Arntz responded that he released the preliminary RCV tally numbers on Friday getting as much information as possible into that report because releasing numbers too early can lead to misinformation by the media. Waiting until Friday allows for more absentee ballot numbers and vote by mail ballot numbers.

Commissioner Matthews asked who was doing the manual review of the ballot cards what were rejected by the voting equipment. Director Arntz replied that they were being reviewed by the re-make staff - DoE people, not Sequoia Voting Systems employees. The Commissioner asked if the comment on one of the Elections Department Voter Comment Forms that questioned whether a supervisorial candidate actually lived in the district for which he was running would receive a reply. Director Arntz said that the complainant visited the DoE and did receive a reply. Commissioner Matthews asked the Director what happens to the complaints from voters alleging voter fraud. Director Arntz responded that those complaints are forwarded to the District Attorney's Office.

Commissioner Phair congratulated Director Arntz on the election and reported that he visited almost twenty precincts for approximately ten to fifteen minutes each, and was very impressed. He asked the Director how quickly vote-by-mail ballots could be counted because this question comes up often, and added that Oregon is voting only by mail. The Commissioner asked Director Arntz if he has looked into Oregon's process in counting their ballots. Director Arntz reminded the Commission that usually locations like Oregon have a one-card ballot, or at the most a two-card ballot. In San Francisco we had a four-card ballot, therefore we must count more ballot cards, and we are counting 89,000 cards a day – a large

number, but which is only 20,000 ballots a day. Another point to remember is when the ballots are received. In Oregon, their entire office is organized around vote by mail elections, but in San Francisco we have two elections going on – vote by mail, and polling place elections. Therefore San Francisco's resources are not concentrated on vote by mail like Oregon's.

Director Arntz reminded the Commission of the procedure for counting Absentee or vote by mail ballots. Before they are counted, the signature on the envelope must be verified by comparing it to the voter's signature on that voter's registration form. Then the number of ballot cards in the envelope are checked and rechecked to be sure the number is correct. The ballots are counted again a fourth time and then they are sorted by precinct and then they are opened and batched for the equipment to count.

President Gleason called to the attention of the Director and Commission the number of voters who complained that they had registered to vote at the Department of Motor Vehicles but whose names were not on the voter roster at their polling places.

5. **Commissioner Reports.**

(a) **Commissioners will report on their experiences and observations of the November 4, 2008 Consolidated Presidential Election.**

Commissioner Matthews reported on his observations regarding the DRE (Director Recording Equipment). The Commissioner expressed concern whether the training and materials for poll workers addressed the DRE issues appropriately for this election. The usage of the DRE for the election was lower; it was 4% for the last election and 2% for the recent election. However, ten percent of all the 561 polling sites account for half of all the DRE usage for the November 4, 2008 election. This indicates an over use - a hotspot. This is an indication that pollworkers and inspectors are receiving the wrong training. Commissioner Matthews will make more detailed comparisons of the numbers of DRE users and the precincts with the higher number of users and report his findings at the next Commission meeting in December.

Commissioner Yeung reported that he canvassed approximately 14 precincts in districts 3, 5, 11, and 10 on election day, and spent an average of 20 to 30 minutes at each site observing general operations. The vast majority ran smoothly especially considering the very high voter turnout. He observed that inspectors and/or poll workers were proactively offering voters to use the DRE in three of the precincts – and the voters didn't appear to have disabilities. Two out of the three times appeared to be because the workers wanted to lessen the time voters were in line to vote. The Commissioner observed a voter rejecting the offer to use the DRE, saying that he preferred to use the paper ballot. Among his observations, Commissioner Yeung noticed that workers were not handing out the blue secrecy sleeve to voters; clerks were holding

ballots, looking at them and then processing them; when ballots were rejected, workers did not refer to the tape report to tell voters the problem but looked at the ballot and told them what to do to correct the problem. Commission Yeung said that he noticed nothing that prevented anyone from voting, but perhaps future training could lessen these concerns. Five of the fourteen polling sites had some type of confusion in identification of voters. Two sites had inspectors requesting identification from every voter. Commissioner Yeung asked one inspector why he was doing this and was told that the inspector heard on the news that he was supposed to do this. At one polling site, an inspector arrived late, posted all the electioneering signs on the front door instead of posting them 100 feet outside the site. Commissioner Yeung returned to this same polling site later in the day and found that the inspector had been replaced by 10:30 am by some one who knew what needed to be done and had the site running well. The Commissioner reported that he observed a poll worker speaking in Cantonese and appeared to be steering a voter to vote in a certain way on an issue. The other two pollworkers were visibly uncomfortable with this activity and commented to him that he should not be steering voters. The Commissioner spoke to the inspector who said that because she didn't speak Cantonese, she had no idea what the pollworker was saying to the voters and therefore unable to hold them accountable and was glad that Commissioner Yeung had informed her of the situation.

In precinct 3346, Commissioner Yeung said, apparently a pollworker who had been intimidating voters throughout the day was reported by a campaign staff observer around 10:00 am (this was reported to the Commissioner at approximately 4:45 pm when he arrived at the site) and the worker was dismissed by the FED (Field Election Deputy) just as the Commissioner arrived. Because the inspector was told of the problem at 10:00 am, the FED dismissed the inspector as well.

Commissioner Joseph Phair reported that he visited seventeen polling places which were located in precinct 7 and precinct 10, and he observed that the pollworkers were very competent and he witnessed no major problems. The Commissioner recalled a very experienced inspector raised the question "from where does the 100 feet boundary for electioneering prohibition begin." The inspector told Commissioner Phair that he had gotten two different responses to this question when he contacted the Elections Department. Commissioner Phair asked the Director for the answer and Mr. Arntz responded that it's 100 feet from where the roster is being signed. The Commissioner reported that he observed ballot jams in the equipment, but most were due to voters not removing their receipts from the bottom of the ballot. He recalled his report of commercial establishments as polling sites during the June election and said he was not surprised to hear that there had been problems at "The Toy Boat" during the November election because the establishment is very small, and asked that the Department reconsider using it in the future. The Commissioner's complete report is attached to these minutes.

President Gleason's report is attached to these minutes and he said his training experience was excellent and congratulated the Department.

Commissioner Safont said that her experience from training to working the election as an inspector was incredible. She reported that during her training session, workers were told that if one voter used the DRE, then five more voters had to be encouraged to do so. The Commissioner questioned this policy, but two trainers told her that their information was correct. Supply pick up and delivery was great. Commissioner Safont was assisted by three very competent high school students, and one experienced pollworker. There was one incident of electioneering in the window of a home next to the polling place. Twenty people had already lined up at 6:30 am and continued to grow until poll opening at 7:00 pm. Once voting began, people were taking a lot of time deciding and marking their (4) ballots in the four booths at her site, and she had been supplied only 12 pens for the voters. Although the Commissioner removed the pen's caps, pens continued to disappear, and this slowed down voting. When the FED was told more pens were needed, the FED informed the workers that he had no more. Most people were understanding about the delay but some voters were very angry.

Commissioner Yu said that she has greater appreciation for the logistical requirements of putting on an election, and that reading the Election Plan is no replacement for hands on experience with an election. The Commissioner took two classes, the training for new inspectors and for pollworkers, because she felt she needed more training. Whenever "pollworker" Yu contacted a FED during election day, she received prompt response. Due to the absence of one student pollworker, Commissioner Yu's site had two students and one very experienced pollworker. She reported ballot jams with the Insight machine and response was prompt and many errors were cleared quickly with telephone instruction from election central. The Commissioner said that the information cards on the voting equipment were very helpful in explaining RCV to voters.

Public Comment. *Otto Duffy* suggested that some voters had difficulty keeping their personal feelings, on election day, private. *Sacha Ielmorini* said that she worked as an inspector for the election and that she hoped the department would take note of problems like one box of pens per precinct and make improvements for the next election. She said that other counties have more experienced poll workers which include judges who work as "mini" inspectors. *David Pilpel* said that as a voter, he was annoyed by the S.F. Examiner story about faster election day reports, and that he would rather have the "right answer" than the faster answer and that he understands this takes time. Mr. Pilpel reminded the Commission of its duty to evaluate the Election Plan.

- 5 (b) **Discussion and possible action regarding further Commission observations, research or investigations needed for evaluation of the**

November 4, 2008 Consolidated Presidential Election. Commissioner Matthews said that he would complete his report of DRE usage. President Gleason said that he would give a report of Provisional Ballots and Absentee Ballot usage, and reminded everyone that the election is not final and the Commission's evaluation would not be until the December 17, 2008 Elections Commission meeting. Commissioner Phair suggested IRIS Report review assignments for Commissioners to make suggestions for improvements. This suggestion was accepted as follows: Electioneering – Commissioner Phair; Equipment mal-functions – Commissioner Matthews; Pollworker errors – Commissioner Safont and Commissioner Yu; Bi-lingual problems – Commissioner Yeung; Poll site openings – Commissioner Gleason. Also DMV (Department of Motor Vehicle) voter registration deficiencies should be an ongoing concern for this Commission.

6. New Business

- a. **Discussion and possible action to approve the Minutes of the October 15, 2008 meeting, and the October 20, 2008 Special Meeting.** Commissioner Matthews MOVED and Commissioner Gleason SECONDED the approval of the minutes. The Roll Call Vote was UNANIMOUS to accept the minutes with minor corrections from David Pilpel.
- b. **Discussion and possible action regarding the Board of Supervisors establishment of a Voting Systems Task Force.** Commissioner Phair expressed his surprise that the Elections Commission had not received any communication from the Board of Supervisors regarding its intention to establish a task force on voting systems. He said his first knowledge of the Board's intention was from the newspaper on election day and that the Board's meeting was held on that day. The Commissioner asked that the Commission express its disappointment to the Board at not being consulted and he asked for comments from other Commissioners regarding the Board's action and whether members of the Commission should seek a meeting with Supervisor Ammiano regarding this matter. President Gleason MOVED to appoint Commissioners to meet with Supervisor Ammiano and Commissioner Matthews SECONDED the motion. Commissioner Matthews reported that he received a phone call earlier today from Mr. Roger Donaldson in which Mr. Donaldson said that he was the principle author of the Board of Supervisor's ordinance regarding the voting system task force and that he hoped that the Elections Commission would not take the action by the Board as a snub. The Supervisor felt that the Commission had not been responsive to this issue in the past and wanted to see it go forward. Commissioner Matthews explained to Mr. Donaldson that the bulk of the public's comments to the Commission regarding voting systems were about "open

source”, which is in some ways the least important part of the voting systems.

Commissioner Phair asked that the minutes reflect that he stated that in the year that he has been on the Commission “he has never seen Supervisor Ammiano or any other member of the Board in attendance at an Elections Commission meeting, and doesn’t recall Mr. Donaldson’s discussion requesting action on establishing a group to evaluate equipment.” The Commissioner added that “this is ridiculous for the City and County of San Francisco to spend its resources to develop hardware and software which is proprietary to our county when we have a state which is the fifth largest economy in the world – we should have equipment that is for the state of California. This should be taken up with the Secretary of State (SoS). We shouldn’t have counties out there buying or developing equipment which is then stuck in warehouses and not used, such as the county of San Diego, which I understand has \$15 M worth of hardware sitting in a warehouse that can’t be used at all because the wrong decision was made.”

The Commission decided to add to the motion the appointment of members Phair, Gleason and Matthews to meet with Supervisor Ammiano or any other member of the Board of Supervisors regarding the proposed Voting Equipment Task Force.

Public Comment. *Sacha Ielmorini* said that there was a hearing on this subject on October 20, 2008 that she attended and explained that it was brought to the Board of Supervisors because some citizens thought it was too big of a task to ask the Department or the Commission to perform because those bodies “already have a full plate”. *David Pilpel* suggested that the Elections Commission calendar a meeting in which it will appoint a member of the Commission to the Task Force should it go forward.

Commissioner Phair asked that the record of this meeting reflect his statement that he has never heard a member of the public ask the Elections Commission to establish a Voting Systems Task Force.

The Roll Call Vote was UNANIMOUS to organize and schedule a meeting with Supervisor Ammiano or any other member of the Board of Supervisors regarding the Board’s proposed Voting Equipment Task Force.

7. **Discussion and possible action on written and e-mailed communications from the public to the Commission; Communication from Mr. William J. Smith.** President Gleason gave a brief description of the communication and agreed that the issue of possible disruptions to voters while they are voting by electronic devices is one that the Commission should consider, and suggested that the Secretary of State and the City’s lobbyist be contacted, because there may need to be a change

in the Election Code regarding these devices not be used in the polling place except where the person is communicating with the Department of Elections.

Commissioner Matthews recalled his experience of hearing a voter, in the voting booth, having a conversation in which she vocalized how she was voting.

Commissioner Phair asked the Deputy City Attorney if the City could adopt a policy about this type of electioneering. Deputy City Attorney Lee said that the electioneering laws are a matter of state law, and the City cannot adopt anything to preempt state law, however there might be some local policies the City could adopt to deal with some of the more egregious examples.

Commissioner Phair said he was looking for some way to limit the use of electronic devices in the polling place, not adding something to the electioneering laws. For example, Restaurants have signs that say "no cell phones or electronic devices", why can't the City do the same.

Deputy City Attorney Lee said she would research this possibility.

This item was continued to a future Elections Commission Meeting.

Public Comment. *David Pilpel* said that informal communications with the Secretary of State's office was a possibility. He said that the usual route for Commissions to express their views on state legislation is through the City's State Legislation Committee.

8. Discussion regarding items for future agendas

Commissioner Matthews requested the following items; a hearing or special meeting regarding the DMV-Motor Voter program; a hearing or special meeting devoted to the issue of privatization of election functions; performance reviews of the Commission Secretary and the Director of Elections.

ADJOURNMENT AT 8:15 pm

ATTACHMENTS:

SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCES FROM ELECTION DAY -- NOVEMBER 4, 2008

[GLEASON]

The following is a summary of Election Day activities at the precinct where I served as a poll worker (Inspector) for the recent General Election. This summary is meant only to provide an overview of my experience and observations that day while serving as a pollworker and related activities to serving as a pollworker. I submit this to you before the Commission meeting on November 19, 2008 in order to conserve time at that meeting.

Election Day: November 4, 2008

Precinct 2112 - 235 12th Avenue - Sutro Elementary School (SF Supervisor District 1)

Training class: Saturday November 1, 2008

Length: 1.5 Hours (Experience Inspector)

Ballot & Precinct supply pickup: after training class, Civic Auditorium
pick-up time process: less than 6 minutes

Pollworker crew other than myself

1 Adult clerk, 3 high school student clerks –

2 of the high school student clerks served as the required bilingual translators. I observed that translation services were needed several times that day. Students represented three participating SFUSD high schools (Galileo, Lowell, Washington). Pollworker arrival time at precinct: all arrived between 5:45AM and 5:55 AM.

Voters listed on Roster (Active & Supplemental): 1023

Voters who signed roster at precinct and voted: 445

Provisional Ballots cast: 13

Vote-by-Mail (VBM) Ballots dropped at Precinct: 73

Surrendered VBM Ballots: 3

VBM Ballots issued before the election as noted on roster: 396

Spoiled ballot cards: 50

Voters in line when Precinct opened at 7:00AM : 38

Examples of cause for Provisional ballot cast:

- 1) Not on roster: Voter stated she registered to vote in Orange County, was told she could cast a provisional ballot
- 2) Not on roster: Voter stated she thought she had registered when she completed a change of address with United States Postal Service
- 3) Not on roster: Voter appeared to have voter registration postcard from SF DOE verifying voter registration on August 18, 2008 at address in Precinct 2112. Her husband had his won copy of same SF DOE voter registration verification postcard, from the same date, and he was on the roster for Precinct 2112

One voter arrived at 7:20 PM with a yellow Vote-by-Mail ballot for Placer County (Auburn).

Voting Equipment

Sequoia Insight (optical scan): Public Counter at close of polls: 1782

Sequoia Edge (touchscreen/DRE): Public Counter at close of polls: 0

Ballot transfer: Sequoia Insight ballots started to jam at 670 on the LED Public Counter (670 cards in machine). This occurred at approximately 10:15 AM. After a call to the Field Election Deputy (FED) and the DOE Command Center, it was determined the FED could not arrive

within a reasonable amount of time to transfer the ballots to allow voting to continue for voters waiting. I opened the doors to the ballot storage area, reaching my arm in, rearranged the pile of ballots cards in bin #2 and closed the storage area doors. This allowed ballots to now have room to continue to drop into bin #2. This gave us another 45 minutes of ballot accepting until our FED arrived and we completed the one transfer of ballots that day. The ballot transfer at Precinct 2112 was the first one our area FED had done that day. The ballots started to jam again in the evening, after 7:00PM and we were required to lift the ballot tabulator and reposition the receiving of ballots in storage bin #2 for the least few voters of the day.

The precinct did not have an SF DOE supplied table to use for roster signing and ballot distribution when I arrived at 5:45 AM. I believe SF DOE intended for us to use one of the many school cafeteria tables in the room. As those tables have built in benches, my one adult clerk could not sit at them (access issues and backless) and voters cannot completely approach the table to sign the roster. I called the SF DOE command center. A DOE table was delivered to the precinct at 6:05AM (within 15 minutes of the call).

Our precinct never received the Yellow (Voter Identification Required) Roster that was supposed to be delivered to our precinct. I overlooked inquiring about it to our FED.

Shortage of ballot pens (some disappeared with voters) was problematic during the first hour of voting. Our FED delivered a few additional ballot pens and the school office where the precinct was located provided us with several #2 pencils for voters to use to mark their ballots. The school office also provided band-aid for the numerous paper cuts from ballot handling.

Last voter of the day placed ballots in the Insight at 8:25PM

Voting machine memory packs and tally tape were picked up by Parking Control at 8:40PM (Parking Control had been there earlier, by re-routed due to voters still marking ballots).

Student clerks completed tasks and were dismissed at 9:15PM

Sheriff arrived to pick up ballots and other materials at 10:05PM

At the opening of our precinct we had 18 visiting election observers from Mexico, from various government agencies and NGOs. This group observed the setup of our precinct and the first 45 minutes of voting before leaving to visit other precincts in San Francisco and voting in other counties. An attached news article from the *Santa Cruz Sentential* of November 5 describes more on this group's visit. SF DOE arranged a visit and tour of the office for this same group on Sunday November 2, led by SF DOE spokesperson Giannana Miranda.

Special mention: Before the election, I signed up with a nonprofit group called Pollworkers for Democracy, which was organized by the Credo cellular phone service (a division of San Francisco-based Working Assets). I signed up with the group out of curiosity as to what they were doing. The organization claims to have recruited over 12,000 people to work the polls on November 4. During the preceding month before the election, Pollworkers for Democracy had arranged a series of telephone conference calls involving pollworker information and issues; one

call hosted California Secretary of State Debra Bowen. One great surprise benefit of signing up with the group was that on Election Day, Robert McKennzie who is the Pollworkers for Democracy coordinator for SF County, delivered hot coffee and food (bagels & cream cheese) to the crew at my precinct. Our entire staff of pollworkers at Precinct 2112 was extremely grateful for this kind and unexpected treat.

(Note: the LED counter at the end of the day is not divisible by the 4 ballot cards for 445 voters having signed the roster. There may be 2 extra cards from spoiled ballots that were inserted in error. This may have occurred at about 3:15PM.

All Numbers provided are from information collected from pollworkers at the end of the day at the precinct and have not been verified)

**San Francisco Elections Commission
Commissioner Joseph B. Phair**

Report on November 4, 2008 Election Precinct Polling Places Review

Further to the Elections Commission's (the Commission) authorization at its October 20, 2008 meeting, I visited and reviewed voting operations at eighteen (18) polling places from 6:30 AM to 6:00 PM during the November 4, 2008 election. Polling places visited were in Precinct 7 (west end) and Precinct 10 (east end). Following is a summary of findings and observations at these polling places.

In summary, no irregularities were observed. All polling places reported opening on time, adequate numbers of ballots (while some polling places came close to running out of ballots before noon, replacement ballots were delivered by the Department's FED personnel in time at those locations), adequate numbers of poll workers, competent Inspectors, generally adequate facilities, no major equipment problems (see specifics below) and no difficulties or voter issues regarding emptying the Sequoia optical scan equipment (OSE) during the voting period. Polling places located in open areas, such as garages in the City's western end, were cold and windy, but not excessively problematic.

Observations and recommendations, including those reported by the poll workers/Inspectors, are summarized below.

Precinct 7 Polling Places (numbers identify the specific polling place):

2734 Garage, 32 San Jacinto Way 6:30 to 8:15

Opened: On time. Observed opening and "zero out" of OCR. Polling place adequately arranged at opening.

Lines at Open: 13

Number Voting Booths: 6

Staffing: 2 adults, 3 students (one adult Chinese fluent)

Equipment: Some Difficulty starting the touch screen but it was working by 8:00 am.

OSE Count: 130 as of visit (no line at that time)

Touch Screen Vote: One voter was not able to use the equipment in morning due to a delay but this didn't prevent the person from voting.

Provisional Ballots: A few vote by mail ballots were dropped off in the morning

Ballot Availability: Adequate in morning

Supplies: Adequate

Conditions: Cold and windy

Observations, Comments and Recommendations: Poll workers were not well versed on touch screen operation. Did not observe touch screen use.

2733 School, 105 Aptos Ave 10:15

Opened: On time

Lines at Open: 32 reported. No line as of visit

Number Voting Booths: 6

Staffing: 3 adults, 3 students

Equipment: Inspector stated that he didn't like the touch screen. No problems reported.

OSE Count: 702 as of visit

Touch Screen Vote: 0 reported as of visit

Provisional Ballots: None reported as of visit

Ballot Availability: Adequate as of visit

Supplies: Adequate as of visit

Conditions: Excellent

Observations, Comments and Recommendations: Inspector reported that the voter information guides were a nuisance and they didn't have any State guides (but some were delivered by the FED later in the day).

2749 Garage, 95 Keystone Way 10:33 am

Opened: On time

Lines at Open: 15, voting reported to have continued "non stop" for 2 hours"

Number Voting Booths: 5

Staffing: 2 adults, 3 students

Equipment: No problems reported

OSE Count: 449 as of visit

Touch Screen Vote: 0 as of visit

Provisional Ballots: Not reported

Ballot Availability: Running out at 9:30, but more delivered by 10:30 am

Supplies: Adequate as of visit, running out of pens

Conditions: Very small garage, crowded

Observations, Comments and Recommendations: Inspector was very concerned re ballot availability but the shortage was addressed before the polling place ran out. Not sure how this worked out during the rest of the day.

1111 Ingleside Library, 1649 Ocean 10:35 am

Opened: On time

Lines at Open: Not reported

Number Voting Booths: 6

Staffing: 4 (one no show)

Equipment: The OSE broke down. FED fixed it. The Inspector held the voted ballots in the blue box until the unit was working, then the Inspector fed all previously voted ballots into the OSE equipment. Equipment problem did not delay or prevent any voting.

OSE Count: 319 as of visit

Touch Screen Vote: 1 as of visit

Provisional Ballots: Not reported

Ballot Availability: No problems as of svisit

Supplies: Adequate as of visit

Conditions: Excellent

Observations, Comments and Recommendations: No difficulties as of visit

2751 Firehouse, 1000 Ocean Avenue 11:05

Opened: On time

Lines at Open: 39

Number Voting Booths: 5

Staffing: 5

Equipment: No problems reported as of visit

OSE Count: 508 as of visit

Touch Screen Vote: 4 as of visit

Provisional Ballots: Number not reported, but the provisional voter lists were reported as being late arriving at the polling place

Ballot Availability: No problems reported as of visit

Supplies: Adequate as of visit

Conditions: Acceptable interior, but a bit crowded and difficult outside due to very busy intersection

Observations, Comments and Recommendations: Some voters complained that this is not a good polling place location. It is located at a very busy intersection (on Ocean by City College, major Muni stop and heavy traffic). There is very limited parking (unless voters park in nearby merchant lot or Muni turn-around) and no pedestrian cross walk. DoE should consider not using this facility in the future.

2753 School 250 Forester Street, 11:25 am

Opened: On time

Lines at Open: Not reported

Number Voting Booths: 5

Staffing: 5 (2 adults/3 students)

Equipment: No problems reported as of visit
OSE Count: 463 as of visit
Touch Screen Vote: 0 as of visit
Provisional Ballots: Not reported
Ballot Availability: Came close to running out as of visit but additional ballots were delivered at 11:25 am
Supplies: No problems reported as of visit
Conditions: Excellent
Observations, Comments and Recommendations: Good location with adequate parking.

2752 Garage, 526 Flood Ave, 11:37

Opened: On time
Lines at Open: Big line (number not reported)
Number Voting Booths: 6
Staffing: 6
Equipment: Inspector reported having difficulty connecting the touch screen equipment to the electric source (plug problem). Two OSE jams, cleared by workers.
OSE Count: 776 as of visit
Touch Screen Vote: 0 as of visit
Provisional Ballots: Not reported
Ballot Availability: Ran low early but got a redelivery.
Supplies: Low on pens as of visit
Conditions: Marginal. Very small and crowded garage. Limited parking
Observations, Comments and Recommendations: Try to locate larger facility. Staff at this location did an excellent job managing the small space. Had one problem with an elderly voter who was not listed and refused to vote provisionally, but the Inspector was able to resolve the situation.

Precinct 10 Polling Places (numbers identify the specific polling place):

3002 Playground facility, Arkansas and Mariposa Streets, 2:00 pm

Opened: Opened 5 minutes late (Park & Rec. employee late with key)
Lines at Open: 20
Number Voting Booths: 8 (not enough for this polling place)
Staffing: 4 adults and 2 students
Equipment: Touch Screen had 34 votes on it when the poll opened and the Inspector did the "zero out" test. The problem was fixed and the touch screen was operational. No other equipment problems reported as of visit.
OSE Count: 1224 as of visit
Touch Screen Vote: 0 as of visit
Provisional Ballots: Inspector reported a lot of provisional ballots as of visit.
Ballot Availability: No problems as of visit
Supplies: Not enough "I voted" stickers or voter information books
Conditions: Excellent

Observations, Comments and Recommendations: Very good location with a lot of parking and interior space, but need to impress on Park and Rec. the importance of being on time to allow set up and opening of polling places on time.

3005 St. Teresa Church, Sammon Hall, 390 Mission Street, 2:40 pm

Opened: On time

Lines at Open: 50

Number Voting Booths: 6

Staffing: 5

Equipment: No problems reported as of visit.

OSE Count: 900 as of visit

Touch Screen Vote: 0 as of visit

Provisional Ballots: As of visit there were reported to be 12 vote by mail where voter was unable to surrender the mailed ballot

Ballot Availability: Ran out of ballots in the morning and had to hold 3 people while waited or more ballots. No voters were turned away due to insufficient ballots

Supplies: No problems reported as of visit.

Conditions: Excellent

Observations, Comments and Recommendations: None

3006 Garage, 613 Wisconsin Street, 2:51 pm

Opened: On time

Lines at Open: Not reported

Number Voting Booths: 6

Staffing: 3 adults, 1 student

Equipment: OSE jammed a number of times, twice while I was on site. Problems related to over-votes (2 while I was on site). The Touch Screen equipment wasn't working properly when the polling place opened therefore the unit had to be replaced.

OSE Count: 923 at 3:00 pm

Touch Screen Vote: 0 as of visit

Provisional Ballots: A number of non-SF voters voted in the presidential election. See below re individuals dropped from the voter list.

Ballot Availability: No problems reported as of visit

Supplies: No problems reported as of visit

Conditions: Adequate, some crowding in a very narrow space (like a hallway).

Observations, Comments and Recommendations: The Inspector reported that he had experienced a number of individuals who had been dropped from the voter list, situations where the husband was still on the list but the wife had been dropped for no evident reason.

3009 Recreation Center, Potrero Hill, 801 Arkansas Street, 3:37 pm

Opened: On time

Lines at Open: No line when opened

Number Voting Booths: 5

Staffing: 2 adults and 3 students

Equipment: No problems reported as of visit

OSE Count: 246 as of visit
Touch Screen Vote: 0 as of visit
Provisional Ballots: Not reported
Ballot Availability: Adequate as of visit
Supplies: No problems reported as of visit
Conditions: Excellent
Observations, Comments and Recommendations: None

3008 School, 1251 Carolina Street, 3:37 pm
Opened: On time
Lines at Open: 21, very busy until 11:00 am
Number Voting Booths: 6
Staffing: 3 adults and 3 students
Equipment: Minor jamb of the OSE when in reached 900 votes, -- wouldn't feed. No problems after the unit was emptied (once prior to my visit)
OSE Count: 1080 as of visit
Touch Screen Vote: 0 as of visit
Provisional Ballots: Reported about 24 provisional ballots as of visit, mostly individuals who were voting out of their registered polling place or vote by mail voters who did not have their mailed ballot to surrender.
Ballot Availability: No problem reported as of visit
Supplies: Adequate as of visit
Conditions: Excellent
Observations, Comments and Recommendations: None

3003 School 2641 25th Street, 3:57 pm
Opened: On time
Lines at Open: 15
Number Voting Booths: 6
Staffing: 3 adults and 2 students
Equipment: No problems reported as of visit
OSE Count: 875 as of visit
Touch Screen Vote: 13 as of visit
Provisional Ballots: A lot of provisional ballots, mostly out of precinct voters and late registrations that didn't get a voting registration acknowledgement in the mail.
Ballot Availability: No problems reported as of visit
Supplies: No problems reported as of visit
Conditions: Excellent
Observations, Comments and Recommendations:

3001 Firehouse, 299 Vermont Street, 4:20 pm
Opened: On time
Lines at Open: 5
Number Voting Booths: 6

Staffing: 5

Equipment: No problems reported as of visit

OSE Count: 980 as of visit (8 in line to vote at that time)

Touch Screen Vote: 1 as of visit

Provisional Ballots: A lot of provisional ballots. This polling place ran out of provisional ballot envelopes and had to send some voters (I observed two) to another polling place. One was a voter from Monterey voting in San Francisco, and one was a SF resident who did not have his vote by mail ballot to surrender and had to be sent to 3005 polling place.

Ballot Availability: Other than lack of provisional ballot envelopes, no other problem reported as of my visit.

Supplies: Adequate as of visit

Conditions: Acceptable, similar to a residence garage (cold and windy)

Observations, Comments and Recommendations: Not sure the workers were in adequate contact with their FED.

3011 Omega Boys Club, 1060 Tennessee Street, 4:45 pm

Opened: On time

Lines at Open: 15

Number Voting Booths: 6

Staffing: 2 adults and 4 students

Equipment: No problems reported as of visit

OSE Count: 1288 as of visit

Touch Screen Vote: 10 as of visit

Provisional Ballots: A lot of provisional ballots, mostly for individuals who were not on the voting list but said they had registered to vote in this precinct.

Ballot Availability: No problems reported as of visit

Supplies: No problems reported as of visit

Conditions: Excellent

Observations, Comments and Recommendations: Inspector doing a good job of handling the large number of provisional ballots.

3007 Muni Barn, 700 Pennsylvania Ave, 5:00 pm

Opened: On time

Lines at Open: 15

Number Voting Booths: 7

Staffing: 5

Equipment: No problems reported as of visit

OSE Count: 1198 as of visit

Touch Screen Vote: 5 as of visit

Provisional Ballots: Not a large amount, mostly vote by mail voters who did not have their mail in ballot to surrender, or individuals who said they had registered through CA DMV but did not appear on the SF voter lists.

Ballot Availability: No problems reported as of visit

Supplies: No problems reported as of visit

Conditions: Excellent, but a long walk in from sidewalk.

Observations, Comments and Recommendations: Inspector suggested that the SF Department of Elections phone number be put back on the voter registration form in the section that the registrant keeps, which is where it used to be. Now the phone number is only on the section of the form that is mailed/returned to the Department, thus this Inspector had to hand write the phone number on all forms that she used.

Also, it is the Inspector's opinion, based on her numerous experiences as an inspector that the DMV voter registration does not work and should be modified or improved. This Inspector also stated that there needs to be more and better training regarding the seals used on the voting equipment and other items to better inform the poll workers of what and how to use these seals.

There was also raised the question of where to measure the 100 feet from the polling place in which electioneering may not take place. Is it from the front door of the voting area, from the voting roster, from the front of the particular facility or some other position? This is important for polling places such as this Muni Barn, schools, churches etc. where the actual polling place is located in an inside room. Should electioneering be allowed inside the facility if it is 100 feet from the particular room being used for voting (i.e. down the hall)? I believe it should be measured 100 feet from the front door of the facility (i.e. along the sidewalk) to avoid voter problems inside, even if the hall is 100 feet from the voting room (i.e. classroom etc.). But this point needs to be cleared up (this Inspector got multiple answers from the DoE) and included in the Poll Worker's Manual as well as the pre-election poll worker training.

3010 The Futon Shop, 2150 Cesar Chavez Street, 6:00

Opened: On time

Lines at Open: 15, 150 voters in first hour

Number Voting Booths: 5

Staffing: 2 adults and 3 students

Equipment: One OSE jamb at 9:30 am caused by a ballot not dropping because the voter receipt had not been removed. Other than that, no problems reported as of visit

OSE Count: 703 as of visit

Touch Screen Vote: 0 as of visit

Provisional Ballots: Not many (no number reported) as of visit

Ballot Availability: No problems reported as of visit

Supplies: No problems reported as of visit

Conditions: Excellent (very good cooperation and support from business owner)

Observations, Comments and Recommendations: None

Commission Gleason's Report on Election Evaluation Precinct Openings, Election Day Ballot Transfers and Provisional Ballots

IRIS Report

Review of the Incident Reporting Information System (IRIS) Report can be a useful gauge for the Commission in reviewing Election Day issues and response, however it must be noted that the IRIS Report is a printout of real-time communications involving many urgent and stressful operational situations. It should be acknowledged that misunderstanding of actual events can and do make their way into the IRIS report. The Election Day log for the precinct I was at (2112) on 11/04/08 contains information and omissions of actual situations I was involved with and know about. This is not meant to be a criticism of the Department, but rather a cautionary point regarding use of the IRIS Report for evaluation of the election.

The IRIS Report does give a clear indication of how responsive the Department of Elections is to precinct operation incidents and Election Day concerns of the voting public. Noted throughout the IRIS Report from 11/04/08 are situations where the Department of Elections staff provided exceptional service to both pollworkers at the precincts and the voting public.

In the IRIS Report for Precinct 2112, the 5:55AM call to the Elections Command Center resulted in a table being delivered to the precinct by 6:10AM. The IRIS Report continues with chatter regarding the issue for a time after the situation was resolved, however that is an indication of how well the Department was responsive and concerned with providing support.

Precinct Opening

I reviewed the IRIS Report and there were relatively few incidents of precincts not opening on time. Several calls prior to 7:00AM reported lockouts at precincts, most of which were resolved by themselves or with assistance of the Elections Command Center within minutes of the first phone call. Considering some 540 precincts, there were few calls regarding late precinct openings. However it may be hard to gauge if all precincts were operational at 7:00AM and ready to serve voters. One precinct did have a notation that the precinct opened at 7:20AM (pollworkers had called Election Command at 6:16AM from the precinct [3032], so they were present early enough to have the precinct open at 7:00AM), and another noted that a voter complained the Insight machine was not operational at 7:15AM [3016] (a precinct which did report a lockout).

Most pollworkers at a precinct that is behind schedule in opening may not pause to call the Elections Command Center to report that fact. The area Field Election Deputy (FED) may be able to make note of the situation if the FED encounters it. A better method of tracking precinct openings after Election Day would be to obtain the time-stamped report of when Insight machines become operational. The Insight machines also report time of first ballot received. It would seem logical that Sequoia could generate the time reports since the time appears on the tape printout and must be part of some audit log.

In past elections, egregiously late opening precinct have been widely reported in the media, so considering the recent high-profile election, the lack of such media reports is a very good indication of few problems with precinct openings.

Mid-Day Ballot Transfers

Overall this task seemed to be handled well in reviewing the IRIS Reports. Some precincts made panic calls requesting a ballot transfer by mid-morning. Pollworkers were instructed to be aware of the Insight LED counter approaching 800-1000. My own precinct [2112] experienced ballot jams at 670 on the LED. Similar ballot jams in the range of LEDs at 700-800 are noted in the IRIS Report. A few of these situations required the precinct inspector to break protocol for the ballot transfer (protocol called for the precinct inspector to be assisted by the FED) in order to keep the Insight operational. Some of these situations must have involved precinct inspectors opening the ballot storage area of the Insight to rearrange the ballots (as happened at my precinct [2112]) or to actually remove ballots to allow more ballots to be accepted.

A few situations resulted in questions or complaints from the voting public:

Precinct 3859 - a voter called SFPD regarding the ballot transfer

Precinct 3332 - a voter complained the Insight would not accept his ballot

Precinct 3331 - a voter complained to the office of the Board of Supervisors regarding ballot jams.

A major concern is that the Sequoia Insight equipment as currently exists, is inadequate to handle ballot capacity for any future General Election in San Francisco -- which in all likelihood will require four ballot cards in many precincts. And not just a high turnout election such as the recent one. Every 2 years, a four card election with a turnout of 250 voters will bring many of the Insight machines past capacity. Unless the City & County of San Francisco and the California Secretary of State are comfortable with mid-day opening of ballot boxes as standard operating procedure, it may be prudent to seek an equipment modification by the vendor.

Provisional Ballots

Spreadsheets attached to this report indicate that the November 4, 2008 Presidential Election generated about the same number of provisional ballots as the February 5, 2008 Presidential Primary, however the overall turnout for the November 4 Election was greater, therefore the percentage of Provisional ballots generated was lower.

November 4, 2008	81% turnout	7.5% of Precinct ballots were Provisional
February 5, 2008	65% turnout	9.5% of Precinct ballots were Provisional

Considering the likelihood that there were an increased number of first-time and infrequent voters this election, the lower percentage of Provisional ballots is remarkable. Much of this may be due to voter registration awareness as well as efforts by DOE and pollworkers to redirect voters to their assigned precinct.

The IRSI Report noted 17 incidents where provisional ballots were inserted in the Insight tabulation machines at precincts which is a major error in precinct operations. It is likely there were other such incidents which were not reported or noticed.

The Provisional Ballot Report from DOE indicates that there were 186 Provisional Ballots which were not counted due to missing voter signature or address on the Provisional Ballot Envelope, which may be considered pollworker error in part. However, DOE made great efforts to make pollworkers and voters aware of this issue, with increased training and precinct signage. In February 2008, there were 495 such uncounted ballots. While having even one such uncounted ballot is a great tragedy and should not occur, DOE should be recognized for the great improvement made in reducing the number of errors occurring when voters fill out Provisional Ballot Envelopes.

From review of the Provisional Ballot Report, it appears there is a correlation with precincts which generate greater overall numbers of Provisional ballots and increased numbers of errors with Provisional Ballot Envelopes.

Precinct 3036	78 Provisional	7 Envelope Errors
Precinct 3014	74 Provisional	6 Envelope Errors
Precinct 3641	85 Provisional	5 Envelope Errors
Precinct 3614	59 Provisional	5 Envelope Errors

Two precincts generated Provisional ballot numbers that were off the charts. Both were precincts that are wholly within the boundaries of university campuses in San Francisco (University of San Francisco [USF] and San Francisco State University). This might be expected with a highly transient population. But the number of Provisional ballots cast, and more importantly, the high percentage of Provisional ballots cast but determined to be invalid was very high (note at USF 80% of Provisional ballots cast were found to be not valid). For residents at institutions of higher learning, the ignorance regarding voter registration requirements is shameful compared to the general voting public.

Precinct 2151 [USF]	165 Provisional	131 Invalid	79.4%
Precinct 2745 [SFSU]	342 Provisional	188 Invalid	54.9%

As in the February 2008 Primary Election, about 25% of all Provisional ballots in November were found to be invalid and were not counted. The vast majority of these voters are simply not found to be registered to vote when checked against the DOE's registration database.

Provisional Ballots remain a safeguard to protect a voter's right to vote. In some cases pollworkers resort to issuing Provisional ballots as the all-purpose cure for any possible situation where a person is not found on the precinct roster, avoiding assistance with redirecting to a neighboring precinct or other possible remedy. In many cases this may be the proper choice so that a voter does not choose to pass up voting.

The public's understanding of what a Provisional ballot is may be something which needs to be addressed in the future. Right now, there is little information available to the public regarding Provisional ballots other than the right to be able to cast a Provisional ballot. Information regarding how Provisional ballots are determined to be valid and counted, regarding partial counting of ballots, ballots subject to remake process, ability to seek court order to insure the ballot is counted...much of this information is not provided to voters. Not in the Voter Information Pamphlet, Voter Information Kiosks in precincts, and once again I point out that voters are informed they can check status of the provisional ballot 41 days after the election -- which is past the 29-day certification of the election..

Misunderstanding of Provisional ballots by pollworkers could be reduced by better understanding of what a Provisional ballot is. This usually comes with the experience of serving for several elections. To that end, while the student pollworker program has been tremendously successful, we need to be sure the two most important tasks at precincts, the rosters and operation of the Insight machine, are handled by adults. Too many precincts this recent election were staffed with 60% of the crew being high school students. That may be why Provisional ballots are ending up in the Insight machines. Usually the Insight machine is not right next to the precinct roster table -- it is across the room and the precinct inspector is then required to determine where to devote vigilance.

Summary

Errors reported and public complaints appear to be very minimal this election. This indicates another high-quality election conducted by the San Francisco Department of Elections.

Provisional Ballots Report

Election	DIST/CONS PCT	TOTAL PVS	ACCEPTED						CHALLENGE CODE										CHECK & BLNG TOTAL	CHECK & BLNG CHITOTAL	CHECK & BLNG MISC	NEFE	NRCSA	CAN	NO INFO	DUP	MAV POBX	AVBR			
			Total: A	EVOTE	FAIL-SAFE	ID-HAVA	WPP	WBT	Total: CH	EVOTE	NO ADD	NO SIGSM	NR	ENS	NO ID-HAVA	NO BLT															
Nov 4 2008	TOTAL	177110	12773	100	2214	0	NA	2616	4337	14	119	0	66	1	3423	12	8	0	6	0	96	177110	4337	554	168	*	151	69	3	38	83
Feb 5 2008	TOTAL	19547	14855	24	2085	0	2681	887	4692	2	10	0	482	0	3169	1	29	0	16	0	44	19547	4692	941	222	28	245	31	8	54	354
Nov 6 2007	TOTAL	4691	4043	NA	603	0	NA	697	648	NA	31	*	113	*	407	*	4		1	*	13	4691	79	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

7.b.4

Provisional Ballots
 February 2008
 November 2008

Election	Reg	Turnout	Turnout	Precinct	Precinct	VBM	VBM	PV	Must PV	PV Valid	PV Valid	Not count	Not count	PV error	PV error	Not Reg	Not Reg
4-Nov-08	477,651	388,112	81.25%	209,527	53.99%	178,585	46.01%	17,110	7.54%	12,773	74.65%	4,337	25.35%	186	1.09%	3,435	20.07%
5-Feb-08	415,961	289,212	64.75%	158,995	59.06%	110,217	40.94%	16,886	9.45%	12,174	72.18%	4,692	27.79%	495	2.53%	3,169	16.21%
								adjusted for political party ballots									

7.b.5

PV error: no signature or address of voter

November 4, 2008

Registered Voters in SF: 477,651

Total Turnout: 388,112 = 81.25%

Vote by Mail Turnout: 178,585 = 46.01% of turnout

Precinct Vote: 209,527 = 53.99% of turnout

Provisional Ballots cast at Precincts: 17,110

Provisional Ballots counted in part or whole: 12,773 = 74.65%

Provisional Ballots not counted: 4,337 = 25.35%

Provisional Ballots not counted due voter not being registered (or not appearing in DOE database): 3,435 = 20.07%

Provisional Ballots not counted due to no signature or no address on provisional envelope: 186 = 1.09%

Percentage of voters who showed up at precincts to vote who are required to vote provisional ballots because they are at the wrong precinct or their name is not on the precinct roster: = 7.54% (of all voters who walked into precincts to vote.)

PCT 2112

Init. Call Time Problem Comments

Time Resolved

Resolution Comment

5:55:50 AM Need Table, Chairs, Booths: Election table needed, Inspector is using Edge table for now.

7:17:27 AM Table delivered

6:01:52 AM District Driver Contacted: School supplied table in the past - DL contacted to deliver table

6:28:36 AM < Other: See Comments > Jenn, can the DL just set it up on legs? Frances

7:17:26 AM < Other: See Comments >

9:19:52 AM

8:41:11 AM Insight Ballots: Send FED with Ballots.

8:58:05 AM FED Contacted: FED will drop off ballots ETA 5 minutes.

10:08:32 AM Insight Ballot Jam: Inspector called and insight is jammed. Needs FED for transfer of ballots-please send

11:51:57 AM ballot box was full and will is being emptied

10:16:59 AM FED Contacted: advsd FED of jam, since insp is a veteran pw, likely needs tech. Fed will check it out, ETA 30 min

11:31:14 AM Technician Contacted: dispatched tech Martin Sweetser ETA 15 mins

11:51:21 AM Technician Contacted: ballot box was full and will is being emptied

PCT 2113

Init. Call Time Problem Comments

Time Resolved

Resolution Comment

7. b. 7

[Forward by Commissioner Gleason]

From former Commissioner Jennifer Meek

Sent: November 4, 2008

An Experience Updating Voter Registration in California Using DMV

I moved from San Francisco to Oakland at the end of July 2008. When I changed my address with the DMV online, I selected to update my voter registration as well. One month later, at the end of August, I checked my registration on Alameda County's website and found that I was not yet registered in Alameda County. Concerned that the DMV registration update had not occurred, I obtained a voter registration card from an AC Transit bus (by the way, good idea), filled it out, and sent it in (it was addressed to the SoS). Within 3-4 weeks I received confirmation from Alameda County that my voter registration had been updated. About 1 week after I received the confirmation of registration (2 months after I requested to re-register with the DMV), I received a voter registration card as a result of selecting to update my registration through the DMV.

The problems with updating registration and/or registering as a voter through the DMV:

1. The DMV does not inform people that they have to take additional actions to register. I assumed that when I registered with the DMV that they would update the information to my registration for me. In actuality, all that happens is that you receive a new voter registration card (completed with your updated information) for you to return to sign and return to the SoS. If it was clear in the instructions on the form the DMV provided that this is the process, then voters would know to expect a new registration card in the mail.
2. The process of either registering and/or updating registration information through the DMV takes at minimum, double the time than it does to just send your registration card into the SoS. This could be very problematic for people who move 1-2 months before an election and assume that updating registration through the DMV will happen smoothly.

Another thing to note... When I registered by filling out a form and sending it through the SoS, my request was completed in a very timely manner.

7. b. 8