



To: Board Members

From: Henry Curtis, Manager & Laura Black, Assistant Manager

Date: January 17, 2013

Re: November 6, 2012 Poll Worker Performance Evaluation Summary Report

Pursuant to Directive 2010-55, the Board of Elections must monitor and assess the performance of poll workers for each election. Based on a review of poll worker performance standards, the Board of Elections must determine if a poll worker should be reappointed, retrained, or removed based on a review of his/her performance on Election Day. The Secretary of State prescribed twenty-two (22) activities and responsibilities that must constitute the minimum standards of a Board of Elections' poll worker performance evaluation. An additional seven (7) criteria were originally, created based on the particular needs of Cuyahoga County. Two (2) of the additional criteria are partisan primary election specific, and did not apply to this election. 1 criteria, "Was the provisional verification number utilized" has been eliminated because the process is no longer in place. Each criterion was worth one point and a total of 26 criteria were utilized for the November 6, 2012 review.

The following range of scores was required for retention, retraining, and removal of a poll worker for the November 6, 2012 Presidential Election.

- Retention: 21-26
- Retraining: 14-20
- Termination: 0-13

After the November 6, 2012 Presidential Election, the Poll Worker Department collected and analyzed materials submitted from various departments. A total of 7,160 workers were reviewed.

Based on the requirements of the Poll Worker Performance Directive, the Poll Worker Department recommends to the Board the following actions:

- 7,029 Poll Workers should be retained
 - 1,975 (28%) poll workers received the maximum 26 points
- 131 Poll Workers should be retrained based on the results of the Poll Worker Performance Evaluation.
- 0 Poll Workers should be removed based on the results of the Poll Worker Performance Evaluation.
 - Although zero workers missed more than the 13 criteria necessary to remove a worker, the Poll Worker Department removes workers based on egregious errors regarding 1 or more criteria. For example, 9 precincts had a difference of more than 10 ballots versus signatures cast, 14 precincts had more than 10 provisional ballots cast in the wrong location, and 8 precincts had 10 or more ballots that were unable to be reconciled during ballot reconciliation.
 - The workers for each of these precincts were contacted by poll worker department staff to determine who the problem workers were and why the mistakes were made. Staff made determinations based on this information as to whether or not the poll workers in each precinct should be rehired. Approximately 40 poll workers have been recommended as “DO NOT HIRE” based on their performance in the November election.
 - Poll Worker Department staff has also contacted Voter Assistance Table judges for precincts with more than 5 wrong location rejections. The majority of these workers will not be utilized as Voter Assistance Table judges in future elections, but may be eligible to serve in other roles.

A historical comparison of the workers retained, retrained, and replaced is below:

	Total Trained	Total Retained	Total Retrained	Total Removed
Nov-12	7,160	7,029	131	0
Aug-12	112	112	0	0
6-Mar	4,903	4,893	10	0
Nov-11	5,102	4,983	119	0
Sep-11	174	174	0	0
Aug-11	356	0	0	0
May-11	1396	1396	0	0
Feb-11	104	104	0	0
Nov-10	5588	5072	516	0
Sep-10	4,820	4,808	12	0

The following criteria had the most noncompliant precincts in the November 6, 2012 Election:

Criteria	Noncompliant Precincts
#15 Did the number of ballots voted match the number of signatures in the poll book (in accordance with R.C. 3505.26)?	589
#9 Were provisional ballots properly issued to voters (in accordance with BOE instructions)?	504
#16 Did the number of ballots issued (includes voted, provisional and soiled), plus the number of unused ballots, equal the number of ballots received from the BOE (in accordance with SOS Directive 2008-85?)	461
#17 If unable to reconcile, was a satisfactory explanation provided to the BOE for any discrepancy (in accordance with RC 3505.26)?	430

Comments/Explanations:

- Criteria #15 - Ballots cast versus signatures recorded
 - 454 of the non-compliant precincts had a difference of less than 2 in signatures recorded versus ballots cast.
 - 98 precincts had a difference of 3 to 5 signatures versus ballots cast.
 - 28 precincts had a difference of more than 5 signatures versus ballots cast.
 - 9 precincts had a difference of 10 or more signatures versus ballots cast.
 - Each of these poll books underwent a review by the Poll Worker Department Staff and the following determinations were made:
 - Cleveland 05D (Missing 46 Signatures) – Located in Friendly Inn Settlement. Voters signed the pink memo and voted in the wrong precinct in result of misinformation shared by a Presiding Judge in 05F.
 - Cleveland 07G (Missing 25 Signatures) – Located in Thurgood Marshall. Let at least 17 voters from other precincts in 7G. 17 voters from other precincts in the location are listed on the pink memo.
 - Euclid 06D (Missing 21 Signatures) – Located at Forest Park Middle School. 20 voters signed the Location List of Electors at the back of the Alphabetical Poll Book and should have voted in another precinct in the location.
 - Cleveland 05E (Missing 18 Signatures) - Located in Friendly Inn Settlement. Voters signed the pink memo and voted in the wrong precinct in result of misinformation shared by a Presiding Judge in 05F.
 - Euclid 04F (Missing 18 Signatures) – Located at Euclid City Hall – 15 voters signed the Location List of Electors at the back of the Alphabetical Poll Book and should have voted in another precinct.
 - Cleveland 07F (Missing 17 Signatures) – Located at Daniel E. Morgan. 12 voters signed the Location List of Electors at the back of the Alphabetical Poll Book and should have voted in another precinct in the location.
 - East Cleveland 04F (Missing 16 Signatures) – Located at Chambers Elementary School. 11 voters signed the Location List of Electors at the back of the Alphabetical Poll Book and should have voted in another precinct in the location.
 - Cleveland 02K (Missing 15 Signatures) – Located at Holy Trinity. The pink memo indicates that at least 5 voters from 02R received ballots from 02K. These voters signed the Location List of Electors at the back of the Alphabetical Poll Book and should have voted in another precinct in the location.
 - Cleveland 11I (Missing 10 Signatures) – Located at the Salvation Army on Grovewood. The pink memo indicates at least 3 voters from the wrong precinct received a ballot from 11I. The 3 voters signed the Location List of Electors at the back of the Alphabetical Poll Book and should have voted in another precinct in the location.
 - We determined that a majority of signature issues were caused by high turnout and voter confusion that resulted in voters standing in the wrong line to receive a ballot. We also determined that when busy and/or overwhelmed, poll workers deviated from the ballot

distribution procedures they were trained to follow and allowed voters to vote a ballot from any precinct if they were able to determine they were in the correct location.

- Moving forward, our training curriculum will include clear instructions that poll workers should NEVER allow voters to vote in the wrong precinct. We will clarify that if a voter is listed on the Location List of Electors that voter should be directed to the precinct indicated next to their name. We will also emphasize that poll workers must verify that the signature written by the voter should match the signature that is in the poll book. The Location List of Electors does not include a preprinted signature and does not allow a poll worker to ensure the signature is the same.

- **Criteria #9 – Issuing of Provisional Ballots**

- A total of 1,200 provisional ballots were cast in the wrong location in 504 precincts throughout the county.
- 237 precincts had 1 provisional ballot cast in the wrong location.
- 253 precincts had more than 1, but less than 10 provisional ballots cast in the wrong location.
- 14 precincts had 10 or more rejections due to the provisional ballots being cast in the wrong location (wrong location rejections noted in parentheses).
 - Cleveland 08J (26) – Located at Morning Star Towers. We were unable to contact the Voter Assistance Table (VAT) judges at this location. Prior to rehiring these individuals we will determine how and why the mistakes were made.
 - East Cleveland 02A (26) – Located at Apthorpe Tower Apartments. The VAT judge stated they used the Location List of Electors and the other VAT judge made some calls to the Board of Elections. The VAT Judge also indicated there was a man who kept bringing in voters (at least two different occasions) that had no ID and weren't on any list. These voters were provided a provisional ballot without a call to a BOE to ensure they were in the correct location.
 - Cleveland 16K (16) – Located at Simpson United Methodist Church. VAT judges used tools to find voters, but indicated that they were busy. The PLC and other poll workers assisted with making calls to the BOE when they were available.
 - Cleveland 2K (16) – Located at Holy Trinity Baptist Church. One judge indicated this was her first time as a VAT judge and she stated she does not want to be VAT judge again. Both VAT judges stated there were long lines and indicated that the PLC would make the calls to the BOE and heavily relied on the map to determine where voters should be.
 - Cleveland 09A (14) – Located at Glenville High School. VAT judge indicated that they utilized the Location List of Elections, Precinct Finder by Address List and conducted appropriate calls to BOE. They also indicated that they had ongoing long lines all day. One VAT judge indicated that many voters were informed that they were in the wrong location, but that they did not have transportation to go to their correct precinct and insisted on voting in the wrong location. The 12-D forms were not utilized in accordance with procedure.
 - Cleveland 09B (11) – Also located at Glenville High School. See comments above.
 - Cleveland 4M (13) – Located at Murtis Taylor Elementary. The VAT judge indicated that they were the only VAT and that the other person at the table was the PLC. The Location List of Electors and the Precinct Finder by Address Finder were used to find voters, but the VAT judge remembered at least 5 voters that insisted on voting at the location after the poll workers informed them they were in the wrong polling place. The 12-D form was not utilized.

- Cleveland 17J (11) – Located at Eastman Branch Library. The VAT judges indicated that the location was very busy and that one VAT served in other roles throughout the day. The tools were utilized to determine if voters were in the correct location and the PLC made calls to the Board of Elections. One VAT judge indicated that they remembered at least five voters that refused to go to the correct location. The VAT judges did not utilize the 12-D form for these voters.
 - Cleveland 10C (11) – Located at East Clark School. Unable to contact anyone at this location. Prior to rehiring these individuals we will determine how and why the mistakes were made.
 - Cleveland 10E (10) – Also located at Clark School. See comments above.
 - Euclid 08D (11) – Located at Euclid Public Library. VAT judge indicated that the blue voter assistance tabs were used to determine a voter’s precinct at the beginning of the day until the VAT judges realized these tabs indicated the table the voter came from and not where the voter should vote. VAT judge also indicated many voters refused to go to their correct location, but 12D forms were not completed.
 - Cleveland 04D (10) - Located at Mount Auburn Manor Apartments. VAT judges indicated that they used the Location List of Electors to find the voter's current and correct precinct. They called the BOE when they could not find a voter on the list and directed voters to their correct polling location and precinct when necessary. Indicated that some voters refused to go to the correct location and voted at the wrong location.
 - Euclid 01D (10) – Indian Hills Building “G”. Unable to contact anyone at this location. Prior to rehiring these individuals we will determine how and why the mistakes were made.
 - Cleveland 06E (10) – Located at Union Square Apartments. The VAT stated that voters who were not on the location list of electors signed in the back of the Provisional Poll book and then voted provisionally.
 - In many of the precincts with 10 or more wrong location rejections, the poll workers indicated that voters refused to go to the correct location and informed that their provisional ballot would not be counted.
 - 27% (320 out of 1200) of the ballots cast in the wrong location were cast by voters who voted in their old location. These voters should have been directed to their new voting location to cast a provisional ballot.
 - Future training on provisional ballots will clarify that voters must vote in the location where they currently live and that if a voter has moved they cannot vote in their old location and must be directed to their new polling location to cast a provisional ballot.
 - Future training will also emphasize how important it is to follow the proper procedure when a voter refuses to go to the correct location, including filling out the 12-D form, so we can identify and track these wrong location provisional voters.
 - The Voter Assistance Table judges for each of the precincts with a high number of provisional ballots cast in the wrong location will not be utilized to process provisional ballots in future elections. The Training Coordinators have contacted these judges to inquire whether or not the proper tools were utilized when handling these voters.
 - The Zone Leaders have been asked to review each of the Voter Assistance Table judges for all precincts that had more than three provisional ballot cast in the wrong location.
- Criteria #16 – Were the ballots reconciled?
 - The ballot reconciliation resulted in 43% of precincts having a discrepancy between the number of ballots received on Election Day versus the number of ballots returned.

- 399 of the 461 noncompliant precincts had a difference of 2 or less.
 - 54 precincts had between 3 and 9 discrepancies.
 - 8 precincts had a 10 or more discrepancies.
 - The largest discrepancies were found in the following precincts:
 - Cleveland 09E (15) – Located at Glenville Library. Zero soiled and defaced ballots were returned. Unable to determine why ballots would not reconcile.
 - Euclid 02D (15) – Located at Chardon Hills Elementary School. Unable to determine why ballots would not reconcile.
 - Cleveland 06D (13) – Located at Zelma George Community Center. Unable to determine why ballots would not reconcile.
 - Cleveland 14K.02 (12) – Located at Fulton Branch Library. Unable to determine why ballots would not reconcile.
 - Euclid 01E (12) – Located at Indian Hills Building “G”. Unable to determine why ballots would not reconcile.
 - Cleveland 16E (11) – Located at Cudell Recreation Center. Unable to determine why ballots would not reconcile.
 - Cleveland 14K.01(10) – Located at Fulton Branch Library. Unable to determine why ballots would not reconcile.
 - Euclid 08F (10) – Located at Euclid Public Library. Balanced when reconciled by location. Voters may have received ballots from wrong precinct.
 - A review of the data by polling location indicated that an additional 177 of the 461 precincts reconciled based on a review of the polling location.
 - Based on the number of provisional ballots that we are unable to open due to rejection we are unable to complete a full reconciliation of the provisional ballots.
 - Future training will encourage poll workers to conduct a mid-day reconciliation. A mid-day reconciliation will ensure poll workers are following the proper ballot and signature procedures and allow poll workers to record any processing errors that may have occurred.
- Criteria #17 – Was an explanation provided by poll workers if the Certificate #1 did not reconcile
 - 98% of all precincts throughout the county filled out the Certificate #1, however a majority of the Certificate #1s did not include accurate reconciliation information.
 - In cases where the poll workers were able to reconcile their numbers, only a handful of precincts included a written explanation detailing why the numbers may not have matched.
 - In result, poll worker training will continue to emphasize the importance of noting any processing errors that occur throughout the day on the pink memo and on the Certificate #1.



The November 6, 2012 Election was the tenth election that poll workers in each precinct were reviewed in accordance to the Poll Worker Performance Standards of Directive 2010-55.

The election was the first Presidential Election that poll workers were reviewed based on these criteria.

The following is a historical comparison illustrating the November scores as compared to the scores in prior elections.

Election	Total Votes Cast at Polls
Nov-12	356,093
Aug-12	9,652
Mar-12	144,480
Nov-11	241,632
Sep-11	1,451
Aug-11	7,331
May-11	25,865
Feb-11	6,913
Nov-10	214,994
Sep-10	48,243

	Precincts in Compliance in November 2012	Precincts in Compliance in August 2012	Precincts in Compliance in March 2012	Precincts in Compliance in November 2011	Precincts in Compliance in September 2011	Precincts in Compliance in August 2011	Precincts in Compliance in May 2011	Precincts in Compliance in February 2011	Precincts in Compliance in November 2010	Precincts in Compliance in September 2010
1. Before serving at an election, each new poll worker must be trained, and each returning poll worker and presiding judge must be trained, as outlined in R.C. 3501.27(B).	1063 (100%)	46 (100%)	1063 (100%)	1066 (100%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	292 (100%)	25 (100%)	1068 (100%)	1068 (100%)
2. All poll workers appointed by boards of elections must comply with Ohio ethics laws and the provisions of the Secretary of State's Ethics Policy applicable to them. (in accordance with SOS Directive 2007-35)	1063 (100%)	46 (100%)	1063 (100%)	1066 (100%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	292 (100%)	25 (100%)	1068 (100%)	1068 (100%)

	Precincts in Compliance in November 2012	Precincts in Compliance in August 2012	Precincts in Compliance in March 2012	Precincts in Compliance in November 2011	Precincts in Compliance in September 2011	Precincts in Compliance in August 2011	Precincts in Compliance in May 2011	Precincts in Compliance in February 2011	Precincts in Compliance in November 2010	Precincts in Compliance in September 2010
3. Did poll workers report the absence of a poll worker by the time determined by BOE (in accordance with R.C. 3501.31)?	1063 (100%)	46 (100%)	1063 (100%)	1066 (100%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	292 (100%)	25 (100%)	1064 (99.6%)	1060 (99.3%)
4. Prior to opening polls, did poll workers print and appropriately sign a zero tape(s) (in accordance with BOE instructions)?	953 (90%)	40 (87%)	972 (91%)	965 (91%)	35 (95%)	75 (100%)	275 (94%)	25 (100%)	1000 (94%)	1067 (99.9%)

	Precincts in Compliance in November 2012	Precincts in Compliance in August 2012	Precincts in Compliance in March 2012	Precincts in Compliance in November 2011	Precincts in Compliance in September 2011	Precincts in Compliance in August 2011	Precincts in Compliance in May 2011	Precincts in Compliance in February 2011	Precincts in Compliance in November 2010	Precincts in Compliance in September 2010
5. Is the oath statement document signed (in accordance with R.C. 3501.31)?	985 (93%)	45 (98%)	1023 (96%)	1022 (96%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	288 (99%)	24 (96%)	1055 (99%)	1042 (98%)
6. Did the polling place open on time (in accordance with R.C. 3501.32)?	1063 (100%)	46 (100%)	1063 (100%)	1066 (100%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	292 (100%)	25 (100%)	1068 (100%)	1068 (100%)
7. Did poll workers follow required procedures for reporting voting machine/device malfunctions to BOE (in accordance with SOS Directive 2008-30)?	1063 (100%)	46 (100%)	1063 (100%)	1066 (100%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	292 (100%)	25 (100%)	1068 (100%)	1068 (100%)

	Precincts in Compliance in November 2012	Precincts in Compliance in August 2012	Precincts in Compliance in March 2012	Precincts in Compliance in November 2011	Precincts in Compliance in September 2011	Precincts in Compliance in August 2011	Precincts in Compliance in May 2011	Precincts in Compliance in February 2011	Precincts in Compliance in November 2010	Precincts in Compliance in September 2010
8. Did poll worker follow required procedures for reporting if/when the ballot supply ran low (in accordance with SOS Directive 2008-30)?	1063 (100%)	46 (100%)	1063 (100%)	1066 (100%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	292 (100%)	25 (100%)	1068 (100%)	1068 (100%)
9. Were provisional ballots properly issued to voters (in accordance with BOE instructions)?	559 (53%)	44 (96%)	966 (91%)	657 (62%)	35 (95%)	70 (93%)	271 (93%)	23 (92%)	512 (48%)	982 (92%)
10. Were poll worker sections on provisional ballot envelopes properly completed and signed (in accordance with BOE instructions)?	887 (83%)	44 (96%)	1034 (97%)	948 (89%)	37 (100%)	74 (98.7%)	287 (98%)	25 (100%)	918 (86%)	1066 (99.8%)

	Precincts in Compliance in November 2012	Precincts in Compliance in August 2012	Precincts in Compliance in March 2012	Precincts in Compliance in November 2011	Precincts in Compliance in September 2011	Precincts in Compliance in August 2011	Precincts in Compliance in May 2011	Precincts in Compliance in February 2011	Precincts in Compliance in November 2010	Precincts in Compliance in September 2010
11. Did polls remain open until required time (in accordance with R.C. 3501.32 or Court order if applicable)?	1063 (100%)	46 (100%)	1063 (100%)	1066 (100%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	292 (100%)	25 (100%)	1068 (100%)	1068 (100%)
12. Prior to closing each voting machine, was a summary report printed and appropriately signed (in accordance with BOE instructions)?	1058 (99.5%)	46 (100%)	1052 (99%)	1053 (99%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	291 (99.6%)	25 (100%)	1015 (95%)	1068 (100%)
13. Were voting devices/machines properly closed (in accordance with BOE instructions)?	1063 (100%)	46 (100%)	1063 (100%)	1066 (100%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	292 (100%)	25 (100%)	1068 (100%)	1068 (100%)

	Precincts in Compliance in November 2012	Precincts in Compliance in August 2012	Precincts in Compliance in March 2012	Precincts in Compliance in November 2011	Precincts in Compliance in September 2011	Precincts in Compliance in August 2011	Precincts in Compliance in May 2011	Precincts in Compliance in February 2011	Precincts in Compliance in November 2010	Precincts in Compliance in September 2010
14. Were the number of voters reconciled with the number of signatures in the poll book (in accordance with SOS Directive 2008-85)?	1048 (98%)	45 (98%)	1002 (94%)	883 (83%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	289 (99%)	25 (100%)	757 (71%)	1041 (97%)
15. Did the number of ballots voted match the number of signatures in the poll book (in accordance with R.C. 3505.26)?	474 (45%)	45 (98%)	978 (92%)	845 (79%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	292 (100%)	25 (100%)	755 (71%)	1034 (97%)

	Precincts in Compliance in November 2012	Precincts in Compliance in August 2012	Precincts in Compliance in March 2012	Precincts in Compliance in November 2011	Precincts in Compliance in September 2011	Precincts in Compliance in August 2011	Precincts in Compliance in May 2011	Precincts in Compliance in February 2011	Precincts in Compliance in November 2010	Precincts in Compliance in September 2010
16. Did the number of ballots issued (includes voted, provisional and soiled), plus the number of unused ballots, equal the number of ballots received from the BOE (in accordance with SOS Directive 2008-85?)	620 (57%)	46 (100%)	1032 (97%)	867 (81%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	289 (99%)	25 (100%)	657 (62%)	1031(97%)
17. If unable to reconcile, was a satisfactory explanation provided to the BOE for any discrepancy (in accordance with RC 3505.26)?	633 (60%)	45 (98%)	1033 (97%)	922 (86%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	289 (99%)	25 (100%)	754 (71%)	1031 (97%)
18. Was the reconciliation certification document signed (in accordance with R.C. 3505.26)?	1020 (96%)	40 (87%)	1009 (95%)	1010 (95%)	36 (97%)	75 (100%)	290 (99.3%)	17 (68%)	922 (86%)	970 (91%)

	Precincts in Compliance in November 2012	Precincts in Compliance in August 2012	Precincts in Compliance in March 2012	Precincts in Compliance in November 2011	Precincts in Compliance in September 2011	Precincts in Compliance in August 2011	Precincts in Compliance in May 2011	Precincts in Compliance in February 2011	Precincts in Compliance in November 2010	Precincts in Compliance in September 2010
9. Was the chain of custody form properly completed and signed (in accordance with SOS Directive 2008-85)?	1063 (100%)	46 (100%)	1056 (99%)	1034 (97%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	292 (100%)	25 (100%)	1027 (96%)	990 (93%)
20. Were transport containers returned to BOE properly sealed/locked in accordance with board instructions (in accordance with SOS Directive 2008-20)?	972 (91%)	46 (100%)	1056 (99%)	1066 (100%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	292 (100%)	25 (100%)	943 (88%)	1066 (99.8%)

	Precincts in Compliance in November 2012	Precincts in Compliance in August 2012	Precincts in Compliance in March 2012	Precincts in Compliance in November 2011	Precincts in Compliance in September 2011	Precincts in Compliance in August 2011	Precincts in Compliance in May 2011	Precincts in Compliance in February 2011	Precincts in Compliance in November 2010	Precincts in Compliance in September 2010
21. Were all ballots (voted, provisional, soiled, and unused), poll books and other election materials properly returned in accordance with board instructions (in accordance with R.C. 3505.31)?	1058 (99.5%)	46 (100%)	1062 (99.9%)	1035 (97%)	36 (97%)	74 (98.7)	289 (99%)	24 (96%)	1021 (96%)	1045 (98%)
22. Were all Voter Verifiable Paper Audit Trails/ Memory Cards properly returned (in accordance with BOE instructions)?	1063 (100%)	46 (100%)	1062 (99.9%)	1065 (99.9%)	37 (100%)	74 (98.7%)	292 (100%)	25 (100%)	1068 (100%)	1058 (99.1%)
23. Were ballots distributed properly ie. pages, types	1060 (99.7%)	46 (100%)	1058 (99.5%)	1065 (99.9%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	289 (99%)	25 (100%)	1066 (99.8%)	1068 (100%)

	Precincts in Compliance in November 2012	Precincts in Compliance in August 2012	Precincts in Compliance in March 2012	Precincts in Compliance in November 2011	Precincts in Compliance in September 2011	Precincts in Compliance in August 2011	Precincts in Compliance in May 2011	Precincts in Compliance in February 2011	Precincts in Compliance in November 2010	Precincts in Compliance in September 2010
24. Were emergency slot procedures properly followed	1059 (99.6%)	46 (100%)	1061 (99.8%)	1064 (99.8%)	37 (100%)	74 (98.7%)	290 (99.3%)	25 (100%)	1068 (100%)	1068 (100%)
25. Was the provisional poll book utilized	1059 (99.6%)	46 (100%)	1049 (98%)	1063 (99.7%)	35 (95%)	75 (100%)	291 (99.7%)	25 (100%)	1060 (99.2%)	1047 (98%)
26. Was the provisional voter verification number utilized	No longer utilized	46 (100%)	1008 (95%)	776 (73%)	36 (97%)	73 (97%)	286 (98%)	25 (100%)	821 (77%)	987 (92%)
27. Were provisional ballots properly returned in envelope and not scanned	1030 (97%)	45 (98%)	1045 (98%)	1050 (98%)	37 (100%)	75 (100%)	291 (99.7%)	25 (100%)	1024 (96%)	1063 (99.5%)
28. Were 10x forms properly utilized	NA	NA	1063 (100%)	NA	NA	NA	288 (99%)	NA	NA	772 (72%)
29. Were the ballots types requested recorded in the poll book	NA	NA	1029 (97%)	NA	NA	NA	283 (97%)	NA	NA	726 (68%)