

CITY OF CRANSTON  
BOARD OF CANVASSERS  
Regular Meeting of August 29, 2017 – APPROVED MINUTES

The Cranston Board of Canvassers met on August 29, 2017, in a meeting advertised in accordance with the Rhode Island Open Meetings Act on August 23, 2017. The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson, Randall Jackvony, at 3:04 p.m. It was held in the Canvassing Office at Cranston City Hall, Room 100.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Randall Jackvony, Gary Vierra

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ed Lemoi

NON-MEMBERS PRESENT: Nicholas Lima (Registrar), Theresa Bucci (Canvassing Aide), David Iglizzi (Assistant City Solicitor)

The chair declared a quorum present.

AGENDA

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – 6-27-17
- IV. PUBLIC COMMENT
- V. CHAIRPERSON'S ANNOUNCEMENTS – RANDALL JACKVONY
- VI. UPDATES AND REMARKS
  - A. REGISTRAR – NICHOLAS LIMA
- VII. OLD BUSINESS
  - A. VOTERS REGISTERED AT COMMERCIAL PROPERTY
  - B. BORDER STREET ISSUES – PROVIDENCE/CRANSTON BOUNDARY
- VIII. NEW BUSINESS
  - A. WARD 2 POLLING LOCATION FOR PRECINCT 0704
- IX. COMMENTS OF BOARD MEMBERS
- X. ADJOURNMENT

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOTION: By Mr. Vierra and seconded by Mr. Jackvony to approve the agenda as posted.  
PASSED ROLL CALL VOTE – 2-0

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: By Mr. Vierra and seconded by Mr. Jackvony to approve the meeting minutes of 6-27-17.  
PASSED ROLL CALL VOTE – 2-0

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members of the public present who appeared to speak.

CHAIRPERSON'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

CHAIRPERSON – Randy Jackvony

Mr. Jackvony noted that Mr. Lemoi had an excused absence from the meeting to attend to a pressing health matter.

UPDATES AND REMARKS

REGISTRAR – Nicholas Lima

Mr. Lima said he had just completed a project reviewing the term expiration dates for all Board members and alternates, as the state Board of Elections requested an update regarding all Board of Canvassers contact information and term expiration dates for their records. Mr. Lima noted he discovered several dates that were listed in the city's records inconsistently with state statute, which defines terms beginning and ending the first Monday in March, fixed on a six-year cycle. Mr. Lima said he met with the City Clerk and Deputy City Clerk, who were very helpful in reviewing his findings, and they are correcting city records accordingly to reflect the proper term expiration dates.

Mr. Lima said the City Council approved the nomination of Deborah Canzone to serve as the new Democratic Alternate on the Board at the Council meeting on Aug. 28. He said he has reached out to the party chairperson in order to get in touch with her and document her contact information.

Mr. Igliazzi arrived at 3:10 p.m.

OLD BUSINESSA. VOTERS REGISTERED AT COMMERCIAL PROPERTY

Mr. Lima said the state Board of Elections had initially made the Canvassing Department aware of several voters suspected to be illegally registered at commercial property on May 1, 2017, who were all immediately contacted via letter. In June, the Cranston Board of Canvassers voted to contact the three voters who failed to respond to that mailing via return-receipt certified mail. At the same time, the Board of Elections alerted the office to an additional group of voters that may be registered at commercial addresses, who were also subsequently sent letters.

In July, the Secretary of State's office submitted a list of more than 80 properties suspected of being commercial in nature who had one or more voters registered at the address. Mr. Lima said he completed a full review of the list, and using assessor's records, visual inspection of properties, and available imagery, he determined less than half of the list contains voters who are likely registered at non-residential addresses. He

said a number of properties were clearly mixed-use, with apartments above or behind a commercial shop or storefront at the same address.

Mr. Lima said the remaining voters would be contacted via an initial letter, just as the previous Board of Elections-identified voters were. He asked for guidance on how to proceed, and outlined a procedure where if voters do not respond to an initial letter within 30 days, they should be contacted via certified mail, as was done previously. If another 30 days passes without a response, it would be up to the Board how to proceed, including filing a formal challenge of a voter who has failed to respond, dispute the office's findings, or update their address. Mr. Lima said he informed both the Board of Elections and the Secretary of State of this procedure, and they were each in agreement that it was acceptable to proceed as outlined, pending approval from the Cranston Board of Canvassers.

Mr. Vierra asked Mr. Lima if he has identified the voters in question on the list of addresses provided by the Secretary of State. Mr. Lima said he has included all on a tracking spreadsheet, so the office can keep accurate records of which voters have been contacted and when, and where each voter is in the process.

Mr. Lima asked the Board if he could proceed as outlined, and contact the voters based on the framework of sending a letter and, if there is no response, a certified letter in each instance in which a voter clearly appears to be registered at commercial property.

Mr. Jackvony asked what the response rate was from the previous certified mailing. Mr. Lima said one voter changed their address because of the mailing, and two did not respond despite verification of them having received the notice.

Ms. Bucci said some properties identified as being commercial by the Secretary of State were easily determined to contain residential units upon a few minutes of research, including the Governor Sprague Mansion, which has caretakers living on site, and a local parish.

Mr. Jackvony asked if a voter registration could be made inactive as a result of this process, if there is no response. Mr. Lima said a limited mailing cannot be used to make a voter inactive, in accordance with state and federal law, and that the only means available to the Board would be a challenge of the voter by specific, formal proceedings outlined in R.I.G.L. § 17-9.1-28.

Mr. Iglizzi said any voters reaching that point must be challenged via an affidavit submitted by an eligible person, who would then be contacted again via certified mail or served in-person to notify them of a formal hearing challenging their registration at the alleged non-residential property. If the Board decides to find any voter does not reside at the commercial property in question, that voter would still have a right to appeal the decision to the Board of Elections.

Ms. Bucci said that at times, the assessor's office may have a property coded wrong, or may not be aware of an apartment inside an otherwise apparent commercial structure. Mr. Iglizzi said that is a reason why the law requires due process and diligence in these matters.

Mr. Igliazzi advised that, once all options have been exhausted, any voters remaining at suspected commercial properties should be challenged by the Registrar in his official capacity, so that the Board can hear the cases and make a determination.

Mr. Lima said that, prior to taking the final step of filing a challenge, he would see if there is an email or phone number on the voter's record to make a final attempt at contact or correction, and he would ensure the assessor's office is able to affirmatively testify that there is no evidence of a residential unit at any properties in question. Mr. Jackvony said that effort would be sufficient that the office has done its due diligence before filing a formal challenge. Mr. Vierra said we should wait until later this fall, after all letters and possible certified letters have gone out, before moving ahead with any challenges, so they can all be addressed simultaneously.

Mr. Igliazzi said it is imperative to give voters plenty of time to respond to correspondence, as their voting rights could be put into question. The Board members agreed.

**MOTION:** By Mr. Jackvony and seconded by Mr. Vierra to send any voters suspected to be registered at non-residential addresses an initial letter, and provide those voters 30 days to respond; and, absent a response, to send remaining voters a return-receipt certified letter, and provide an additional 30 days to respond; and, absent a response, to make a final attempt to contact any remaining voters by phone, email, or other means available; and, absent a response or if the address remains in dispute, to authorize the Registrar to file formal challenges of the voters, to be heard at a public hearing before the Board, in accordance with state law.

Mr. Jackvony said the intent of his motion was not necessarily to enable the striking of names from the voter rolls, but to uphold the integrity of the voter rolls by correcting voters who do not actually live at the address at which they are registered and are illegally casting votes. He said it was important for people to have confidence in the election process.

PASSED ROLL CALL VOTE – 2-0

Mr. Lima asked what should be done regarding the two voters who, at present, have failed to respond to the certified letters sent to them in June. Mr. Jackvony said that following an attempted email or phone communication, Mr. Lima should prepare to challenge their registrations with any others that are elevated to that level later this year. Mr. Jackvony said, upon receiving notification of their challenge, at least four attempts would have been made to contact them, which he felt was more than sufficient notice.

Mr. Igliazzi added that the extra time will also allow Mr. Lima to receive official documentation from the assessor's office stating that the properties in question are commercial-only, which he can add to challenge affidavits and submit to the Board as evidence to make an informed decision. Mr. Igliazzi said each document and copies of letters sent should be included with any eventual affidavits.

## B. BORDER STREET ISSUES – PROVIDENCE/CRANSTON BOUNDARY

Mr. Lima said these issues, totaling about 34 streets, have occupied the bulk of his time this summer. He said that in most of the cases, simple, administrative changes can be made to street ranges that overlap between the two cities; however, Providence must make changes in collaboration with Cranston in order for the changes to be effective and prevent voters from being inadvertently added in the wrong city, which can lead to disenfranchisement.

Mr. Lima said he has met with his counterpart in Providence, Kathy Placencia, and she is in agreement regarding all of the changes he is presenting to the Board. Mr. Lima and Ms. Placencia will be working cooperatively to institute these changes in the coming weeks. However, where changes may affect voters who, not through administrative error, became registered in the wrong city, both Board of Canvassers in the two cities should come to a mutual agreement before any voters along boundary lines are moved.

Mr. Lima reviewed the following streets, and showed documentation and copies of voting ward and assessor's maps to the Board, in addition to lists of any voters that could be impacted by a change to the street ranges on the streets. For each street, Mr. Lima listed the probable action that, subject to change due to the fluctuating nature of voter files, will be taken to eliminate overlap or correct outstanding issues. Some actions, such as range reductions, will be undertaken as soon as possible by both cities at the discretion of their chief elections officials, provided that no active voters are impacted. In other cases, voters discovered via this process to be registered in the wrong city by clerical error may be switched back to their correct city administratively. However, Mr. Lima said that any street ranges where a voter's residence is in question due to immediate proximity to a boundary line would have to be reviewed by the Board. Those voters and ranges should not be altered unless the voters have been notified and both Providence and Cranston are in agreement that the voter is in the incorrect city, which is a process that Mr. Lima said will take some time over the course of the next several months.

A St – Both cities have an unrelated A St in their street list. Ms. Placencia plans to remove A St from the Providence range, once voters believed to be inadvertently registered at two addresses in Providence are moved, which will eliminate any overlap with Cranston. No action is needed from Cranston regarding this street. Action: Possible elimination of A St from Providence range; no Cranston action.

Alexander St – Mr. Lima said this street is indicative of many of the streets on the list of issues, in that no voters are impacted, but Providence and Cranston have considerable overlapping address ranges that go well beyond the municipal boundary. The overlap can result in a voter being registered in the wrong city, or multiple voters at the same address being registered between the two cities, despite the property existing in only one of the cities. This street file cleanup will reduce these overlapping ranges, and significantly reduce the possibility for disenfranchisement of voters who become registered in the wrong city due to registrant, clerical or electronic error. Both cities will need to reduce ranges on the street. Action: Reduce Cranston range to 86-168 Even and 87-169 Odd; Reduce Providence range to 1-78 All.

Alto St – Mr. Lima said this is an example of a street where some voters may be impacted, and will have to be moved between cities before a street range change can take place. Mr. Lima said numbers are fluid as voters can change their registration at any time; however, as of this time there are seven voters in Cranston who should be in Providence, based on where the boundary lines are, of whom two are inactive. Additionally, two cancelled voters are in Providence whose records should be switched to Cranston according to the boundary. Mr. Lima said the cancelled voters have to be moved, as well, as the street ranges cannot be corrected to reflect the actual boundary if any voters, including cancelled voters, are listed. Mr. Lima reviewed his records for Alto St with the Board.

Mr. Iglizzi said that voters who are currently registered in Providence should be notified by Providence before being pulled by Cranston, and voters registered in Cranston who should be in Providence should be notified by Cranston before being pulled by Providence. He said that the notifications should be undertaken only upon agreement between the two cities. Mr. Iglizzi added that in cases where, for instance, a house is split down the middle of the boundary line, and voters at the address are currently registered in both cities, it might be best to let the voters decide and keep the address in both cities' ranges, although he does not believe there will be too many addresses like that.

Mr. Lima said an important goal that may be accomplished by this effort is preventing voters from being disenfranchised due to inaccurate street files maintained by each city's canvassing office. He said that he has observed voter records where voters at the same address are registered in both cities, but all show up in the same city on Election Day to vote. One voter is told they are not on the list, and given a provisional, which is ultimately disqualified, while the other voter, who is on that city's list, is given a normal ballot and votes. The confusion that results from voters living at the same address being registered in two cities can and has led to disenfranchisement, especially when the voter's physical address – and personal belief – is that they are a resident of one city, but the misaligned street range has them registered to vote in the other city, likely without the voter even realizing it.

Mr. Lima said a second goal of this process is to eliminate overlap in the street ranges between cities to prevent voters from being incorrectly added in the wrong city in the future, and prevent either city from having to go through this process all over again. Mr. Iglizzi said that determination makes perfect sense. Mr. Jackvony agreed that in cases where there is a 50/50 or 60/40 split of a property along a boundary line, determining which city the structure is in for voting purposes is virtually impossible. Mr. Iglizzi said that owning property in a community grants rights to persons for purposes such as attendance for their children in the school system, but that does not apply to making a determination of a resident's right to vote in a city. Mr. Iglizzi said that the only problem he foresees in this process is if either city does not agree on a street, it could derail the process. Mr. Lima said he agrees, and he does not plan to pursue any changes that Providence is not in mutual agreement with Cranston on. Mr. Vierra asked if action needed to be taken by the Cranston Board where there are no Cranston voters affected. Mr. Lima said in some cases, voters who should be in Cranston are in Providence, and the Cranston Board should resolve to request the Providence Board contact those voters and initiate the same procedures that Cranston is undertaking, such as holding a

public hearing for affected voters and reducing street ranges accordingly. Action: Upon correction of voters in the impacted ranges, Reduce Providence range to 2-24 Even; Reduce Cranston range to 26-172 Even.

Ashmont St – Mr. Lima said in this case, there is an overlapping ZIP code and street name in both cities, despite the physical streets being separate geographically, which has led to voters being assigned in the wrong city due to processing errors. Errors can be mitigated by reducing the Cranston range to just the addresses where voters can be registered, instead of having a wide range that includes addresses that do not exist in Cranston, but may exist in Providence. Mr. Lima noted that both cities would continue to have a 40 Ashmont St address, which both offices will have to be mindful of when processing registrations. Action: Reduce Cranston range to 12-12 and 40-42 Even.

Aumond St – Mr. Lima explained that there are no Providence houses on the street, but Providence has the street in its street file with a range that extends into Cranston. Action: Eliminate Providence range entirely.

Bartlett Ave – Mr. Lima said there are no active voters impacted here, although there are two cancelled voters in Cranston that will need to have their files transferred to Providence. Mr. Lima said while some boundary lines do go through houses on the street, fortunately there are no addresses where voters are registered in multiple cities. Mr. Lima recommended the best way to eliminate the range overlap would be to cut off the range at these addresses. He did not have an end range for Providence; he said it should be up to Providence to determine where their range ends, in case they want to account for new construction or changes on the Providence side of the street. Action: Reduce Providence range to 172-XXX Even and 169-XXX Odd; Reduce Cranston range to 2-170 Even and 1-167 Odd.

Betsey Williams Dr – Mr. Lima said there are overlapping street ranges here, with no voters affected. Action: Reduce Providence range from 67-120 All to 67-79 Odd.

Broad St – Street ranges overlap with no voters affected by Mr. Lima's proposed changes. Action: Reduce Providence Odd range to 1229-1523.

Cranston St – Mr. Lima said this street is an example of street ranges causing voters to be registered in clear error in the wrong city. Mr. Lima said the Cranston range starts at 1 Cranston St, which is an address deep inside of Providence, and the first actual address in Cranston isn't until 828 Cranston St. Mr. Lima said he discovered four voters, of whom one is active, one inactive, one rejected, and one cancelled, at addresses that are clearly in Providence. He said these voters should be moved administratively, as their residence is not in question and it is clearly our error that these voters were registered in Cranston and not forwarded to Providence. Action: After voters have been moved to Providence, Reduce Cranston range to 828-862 Even and Eliminate the 1-867 Odd range.

Edgewood Ave – Street ranges overlap with no voters affected by Mr. Lima's proposed changes. Action: Reduce Cranston range to 2-120 Even; Reduce Providence range to 117-121 Odd and 122-122 Even.

Farmington Ave – Mr. Lima reviewed the street and presented two voters that are registered in Providence but at addresses physically located in Cranston that are nowhere near the boundary line. He said these were additional examples of administrative changes that should be made without need for a formal hearing process, as the city in which they actually reside is not in question. Mr. Iglizzi said that Providence should notify the voters upon moving them back to Cranston, and if for some unlikely reason a voter challenged that decision, the challenge would be heard by Providence. Action: After voters are moved, Reduce Providence range to 1-119 Odd and 2-126 Even; Reduce Cranston Odd range to 121-161 Odd.

Farragut St / Ave – Mr. Lima said this isn't a border street, however, like Ashmont St, the similar street name has resulted in voters being inadvertently registered in the wrong city, including a now-cancelled and a currently pending voter that should be in Providence but are on the Cranston rolls. Farragut in Providence is a street with dozens of voters, but the otherwise unrelated Cranston street is a small, dead-end road with two actual addresses where voters should be able to register. Action: Eliminate Cranston Even range entirely, and Reduce Cranston Odd ranges to 27-27 Odd and 43-43 Odd.

Haddon Hill Rd – Street ranges overlap with no voters affected by Mr. Lima's proposed changes. Action: Eliminate Providence range entirely.

Harborside Blvd – Mr. Lima said this is very different from other streets. Providence has captured about 99 percent of active voters on the street, which should have only one eligible address, 100, where voters can be registered – at the JWU residence halls. Mr. Lima said the issue is many students do not put their building letter on their registration, which, since the address is shared by both cities and the boundary line bisects the complex of buildings, makes it impossible to determine which city the voter should be registered in. In reality, about 40 percent of the voters registered at 100 Harborside Blvd should be in Cranston, based on the boundary line.

Mr. Lima said he and Ms. Placencia will be reviewing each record to determine voters who should be switched back to Cranston, and some who Cranston has who should be switched to Providence, based on building letter information on their voter registration. Buildings L, K, J, H, and G are in Cranston, while Buildings A, B, C, D, E, F, and M are, in whole or in significant part, in Providence. Mr. Iglizzi asked if the building letters could be added to the street file in the CVRS, to make it clear which building letters are in which city, however Mr. Lima said he was informed by the Secretary of State that the system can have numerical ranges only. Mr. Lima said he and Ms. Placencia will try to establish a direct line of communication to JWU residence life staff so that voter registrations can be properly processed going forward when they are received without a building letter identifier. While an office policy should be put in place by both cities to clarify this information before processing registrations, Mr. Lima said a more pressing concern is that, at present, Providence may have upwards of 100 voters who should be in Cranston that will need to be pulled back based on their building letter.

Mr. Lima added that he worked with Maria Giarrusso, Cranston's GIS manager, to adjust census block boundaries to clarify precisely which buildings are in which city for the upcoming US Census Bureau test, which should also make the next redistricting process easier as it relates to Harborside Blvd and ensure people are counted in the

correct city for population purposes. Action: Cranston and Providence work together with JWU staff to ascertain building letter information for any voter registrations that come in, and register voters in the appropriate city accordingly; both Cranston and Providence should reduce ranges to 100-100 All.

Hathaway St – Mr. Lima said the entirety of the even range on this street is located in Cranston, yet Providence has it on their range, as well, which has resulted in a voter that was incorrectly registered in Providence who actually resides in Cranston. Action: After the voter is pulled back to Cranston, Eliminate the Providence Even range entirely.

Hillwood St – Mr. Lima said Hillwood St has up to 18 Cranston voters who should be registered in Providence, and one Providence voter who clearly appears to belong to Cranston. Mr. Iglizzi said that if any voters contest the Cranston Board's findings, and the Board options to press its case based on the information it has, extraordinary effort should be undertaken prior to an appeal hearing to have a city engineer survey the boundary and testify to the accuracy of the GIS, voting map, and assessor's data used in this effort. He felt that such additional evidence should be sought only in the event the Board makes a final determination regarding a voter and the voter disputes the Board's ruling. Ms. Bucci said that as part of any removal, either Providence or Cranston would automatically send a cancellation letter to the voter in question, depending on the city the voter is currently registered in. Action: Pending transfer of voters between cities, Reduce Cranston range to 51-129 Odd and Eliminate Providence Even range.

Laurel Hill Ave – Street ranges overlap with no voters affected by Mr. Lima's proposed changes. Action: Eliminate Cranston 2-2 Even range.

Molter St – Mr. Lima said two voters could be affected here. He said the street is split by Route 10, and was most likely connected as one street prior to the highway's construction. However, Mr. Lima said that both sides of the street, which lie across a municipal boundary and are separated by a few hundred feet at most, contain the same address numbers, which has resulted in voters being registered in the wrong city. Mr. Lima said that while this entire project has an intent of eliminating overlapping ranges, 8 Molter St may be one of the few addresses that will still exist in both cities, since it is assigned to two separate residential structures, one in each city. He said he was unable to locate any documented evidence of the existence of a 2 Molter St in Cranston, including via an in-person site visit, despite Cranston having voters there. He noted that, for example, the mailbox at 2 Molter St in Providence does have a same last name on it that Cranston's voting list has, among other evidence that the Cranston voter actually resides at 2 Molter St Providence. Mr. Lima believes the postal service has been delivering mail addressed to 2 Molter St Cranston to 2 Molter St Providence, which would explain how voters would not have been made inactive by now. Action: Reduce Cranston range to 4-18 Even and 17-17 Odd. Remove addresses 12 and 16 from the Providence range.

Montgomery Ave – Mr. Lima said that three active voters are misassigned here due to overlapping ranges that extend well beyond the established boundary lines recognized by both cities. Mr. Iglizzi clarified that the letters notifying these voters would be coming from Providence's Board of Canvassers. Action: Reduce Providence Even range to 390-498 Even.

Narragansett Blvd – Mr. Lima said some voters would be affected here; however, they are all cancelled voters from addresses that no longer exist, subsequent to the construction of the Harborside Blvd JWU campus. Since their range is being eliminated, he said their records would likely have to be moved to City Hall, 869 Park Ave, per direction from the Secretary of State's office. Once their records are changed, Mr. Lima said his proposed range change would eliminate any overlap and eliminate the now non-existent properties, so voters cannot be inadvertently registered there. Action: Reduce Cranston range to 1009-1217 Odd and 1032-1208 Even; Reduce Providence range to 905-1007 Odd.

Norwood Ave – Street ranges overlap with no voters affected by Mr. Lima's proposed changes. Action: Reduce Providence range to 303-303 Odd and 330-330 Even.

Marion Ave – Both Providence and Cranston have separate, unconnected streets named Marion Ave in the same ZIP code, which have resulted in several voters over the years being incorrectly registered in the wrong city, particularly when USPS has delivered acknowledgement letters or other correspondence to the same address number in the wrong city. Mr. Lima and Ms. Bucci met with the Providence postmaster and local managers about these and other issues, and they are well aware of them and working to mitigate as much as possible. While some problematic addresses will persist, reducing the street ranges in both cities will significantly reduce the chances of a voter being added in the wrong city. Ms. Placencia also indicated to Mr. Lima that she plans to change the name of Marion Ave in Providence on correspondence and records in her office to Marion Ave North, per Providence records that document the street name as such, which will further reduce confusion. Additionally, the state's Online Voter Registration system may have been incorrectly assigning voters, as the system looked at street names, address numbers and ZIP codes when determining which city to assign voters to, which Mr. Lima reported the Secretary of State's office is correcting. Action: Reduce Cranston range to 14-82 Even and 114-114 Even, and 15-89 Odd; Providence also plans related range reductions that are presently to be decided.

Park Ave - Street ranges overlap with no voters affected by Mr. Lima's proposed changes. Action: Eliminate Providence 329-333 Odd range and Reduce Providence Odd range to 401-499 Odd; Eliminate Cranston 389-399 Odd range.

Parkside Dr – Mr. Lima said this was the first street brought to his attention by Ms. Bucci back in February, which eventually led him to review the entire border with Providence, culminating in this project. Mr. Lima said Cranston has no tax or property records of any homes on Parkside Dr, with the city boundary clearly lying along Park Ave; however, at least four houses on the street have Cranston voters who live entirely in the City of Providence. Action: Pending transfer of affected voters, Eliminate Cranston range entirely.

Parkman St – Street ranges overlap with no voters affected by Mr. Lima's proposed changes. Action: Reduce Cranston range to 24-98 Even and 25-97 Odd.

Pontiac Ave – Street ranges overlap with no voters affected by Mr. Lima's proposed changes. Action: Reduce Providence range to 1-86 All and Reduce Cranston range to 90-324 Even and 91-375 Odd.

Reservoir Ave – Street ranges overlap with no voters affected by Mr. Lima's proposed changes. Action: Reduce Providence range to 1-411 All.

Sinclair Ave – Mr. Lima said Sinclair Ave has issues at three different locations on the street, due to Providence currently having the entire even side on their range, the majority of which is located within Cranston. Although the boundary line crosses properties, the physical residential structures are, in whole or in significant part, located in Cranston. However, eight voters on the Cranston side of the line are registered in Providence, of whom three are cancelled, and all should be in Cranston. Action: Pending switching of voters, Reduce Providence range to 1-299 Odd and 2-38 Even and 174-298 Even.

Terrace Ave – Street ranges overlap with no voters affected by Mr. Lima's proposed changes. Action: Reduce Cranston range to 129-259 Odd.

Webster Ave – Mr. Lima said there is one cancelled Cranston voter who should be on Providence's rolls, and six active and one inactive Providence voters who should be registered in Cranston, based on boundary lines. Action: Pending switching of voters, Reduce Providence range to 257-277 Odd and 142-280 Even; Reduce Cranston range to 282-438 Even and 279-437 Odd.

Wheeler Ave – Street ranges overlap with no voters affected by Mr. Lima's proposed changes. Action: Reduce Providence range to 179-299 all.

Wentworth Ave – Street ranges overlap with no voters affected by Mr. Lima's proposed changes. Action: Reduce Providence range to 210-299 All; Reduce Cranston range to 257-277 Odd and 142-280 Even.

Union Ave – Mr. Lima said this is one of the most complex streets in terms of boundary lines. Mr. Vierra noted up to 25 voters could be impacted based on Mr. Lima's recommendations. Mr. Lima said the majority appear to be clear-cut, with the entirety of structures and most properties contained entirely within the City of Cranston, however Providence has them on their rolls. Mr. Lima said the problematic addresses are at either end of the block, where the boundary line breaks back towards the structure and bisects it. Mr. Lima said the eastern-most address is now a vacant parking lot, where a residential structure was demolished. The address still has active Providence voters and cancelled Cranston voters. Mr. Iglizzi said it will be up to Providence to make corrections at the address, even though it is physically located in Cranston, as the voters who are active are still Providence's responsibility.

Mr. Lima said at the western end of the Union Ave range is perhaps the most confusing property in the city, where the line bisects the structure at 432 Union Ave perfectly and numerous voters have been registered to vote in both cities. Mr. Iglizzi and Mr. Jackvony said it might be best to keep the property within the range of both cities based on the position of the boundary and the fact that a half dozen or more voters have been

registered in both cities from the address. Mr. Iglizzi said his advice would be to not force the residents to pick one city over the other, considering that as long as the same individual isn't attempting to vote in both cities, it should be up to the voter which city to be registered in in this case, and it would be prohibitively difficult for the Board to make a determination otherwise. Action: Reduce Providence range to 432-432 Even; Eliminate Cranston 357-385 Odd range.

Edgewood Blvd – Mr. Lima said that Edgewood Blvd is, by far, the most difficult street in the city, and perhaps the entire state, to contend with in terms of residency for voting purposes, as the boundary line crosses nearly every property on the street, and in many cases bisects houses. Mr. Lima said that one of his predecessors, Jaclyn Caruolo, went through an extraordinary effort in 2006 to move various voters on the street to Providence based on information available at the time. After the Board made the decision to move the voters, many protested, causing the Board to reverse its decision.

Mr. Lima said on Edgewood Blvd at present, there are 74 total voters, of whom 37 are active in Cranston and 26 are active in Providence. In all, 37 voters are registered at an address that has a voter registered in the opposite city, meaning 50 percent of the street's residents are registered at an address that contains voters who are registered in both cities. Mr. Lima said 12 individual addresses have voters who are in both cities. He said nine addresses can be removed from the Cranston range without impacting active voters; 15 additional addresses could be removed, because the physical residential structure, defined by the state law as the voter's fixed and established domicile, is anywhere from 95 to 100 percent on the Providence side of the boundary; and four additional addresses have active voters in both cities and are split along the boundary line in the 40 to 60 percent range, making them infeasible to remove from the list.

Mr. Lima said 2 and 8 Edgewood Blvd are not in the Cranston range, although 8 Edgewood Blvd has a sliver of property attached to it that lies in Cranston. Beyond these two properties, every other residential property on the street has some sort of issue, either with a boundary line intersecting a home, voters being registered in both cities, or voters being registered in Cranston despite the fact that their entire residential structure is located in Providence.

Mr. Jackvony said it may be best in these cases to let the voters decide, since the properties themselves are almost all 50/50 split between the cities, and the majority of structures on the street lie directly on or over the boundary line, with additional structures such as garages located in Cranston. Mr. Iglizzi said while the Board could take up this issue, it may result in the same reversal as 2006, and he advised against repeating the same effort only to expect a different outcome.

Mr. Lima said that if the Board did not want to take such action, the Board could decide to only remove individual addresses that do not affect active voters, or the Board could decide to take no action and maintain the status quo. Mr. Jackvony said it would be odd to have specific houses removed from the range, creating cases where alternating neighbors are in opposite cities for voting purposes, and he advocated for a simple solution such as maintaining the current situation, despite its imperfections. Mr. Vierra said it may be best to maintain the status quo in this case, as the voters aren't committing voter fraud or doing anything suspicious, and they have already chosen

where they want to be registered and vote accordingly in their city of choice. He agreed they should be permitted to register in the city of their choosing based on the boundary so completely bisecting the residences across the entire length of the street. Action: It was the opinion of the Board members that the residents of Edgewood Blvd who currently have the option to register in either city due to the abnormal boundary line should continue to have that ability, and that no action should be taken regarding the voters or street range at this time.

Mr. Igliazzi apologized and said he had to leave to attend to another matter.

Mr. Jackvony said the Registrar's report was very comprehensive, and he thanked Mr. Lima for his work.

Mr. Lima said a review of this magnitude had not been undertaken in many years by the Canvassing Department, which may explain why there are so many streets that need to be corrected. Mr. Lima thanked Ms. Bucci for her work in bringing a number of the streets discussed to his attention, and said she had informed him that many of these streets had been noticeably problematic for several years but went unaddressed.

**MOTION:** By Mr. Jackvony and seconded by Mr. Vierra to preliminarily approve all of the recommendations as discussed, pending agreement with the Providence Board of Canvassers on those voters and street range changes that are within their purview; and to direct and authorize the Registrar to draft and send a resolution, on behalf of the Cranston Board of Canvassers, to the Providence Board of Canvassers, outlining the voter and street range changes that Cranston intends to enact, and also suggesting corresponding voter and street range changes for the City of Providence to enact, with the understanding that those voters, and their related street range changes, who live at addresses where boundary lines may be in question, not resulting from administrative errors, shall not be changed until both cities are in agreement and the voters in question have been notified via letter and offered an opportunity to appear before their respective Board in a public hearing.

**PASSED ROLL CALL VOTE – 2-0**

Mr. Lima said he had originally planned a Board meeting for September 12, but that date no longer seemed feasible given the nature of this street range project. Mr. Vierra and Mr. Jackvony agreed that more time should be taken to work with Providence and ensure voters who live along boundary lines in question are contacted. Mr. Lima said Mr. Igliazzi had suggested to him a 30-day notice to the voters prior to holding a hearing to make final decisions.

Mr. Lima said he will draft and send the resolution to Providence, and prepare notices to any Cranston voters who live along boundary lines who may be affected by the Board's decisions. He said Providence will draft a similar letter to send to their voters who both cities believe belong in Cranston. Once Providence is in agreement with Cranston's findings, all voters have been notified, and a public hearing has been held by both boards to afford those voters an opportunity to provide additional information, the voters' records can be pulled by each city, and the street range changes can be implemented.

Voters who have been discovered in the wrong city due to administrative error, who are not adjacent to a boundary line, will be pulled by the appropriate city as soon as possible, as is standard procedure when such errors are discovered. Likewise, both Cranston and Providence will immediately begin making street range changes where no active voters are impacted, at the discretion of Mr. Lima and Ms. Placencia.

Mr. Lima said he will get in touch with the Board to schedule a hearing before the end of next month. He said Providence would likely invite one of our Board members to attend their meeting to discuss these issues, and Mr. Jackvony said he would be happy to attend. Mr. Lima said representatives from each city should also attend the public hearings each Board holds. If any voters do appear at those hearings and object or question either Board's findings, the address in question can be tabled to another hearing, allowing the respective Board an opportunity to acquire additional information, such as a formal survey of the boundary line in question, before making a final determination. Any voter who objects to a decision at that point would still have the right to appeal the respective Board's ruling to the state Board of Elections.

Mr. Lima clarified that voters who are not on or adjacent to boundary lines who will be moved administratively will still be sent a cancellation letter by one city and a confirmation notice by the other, after they are switched, as is standard procedure when an administrative error is discovered by either office, or any substantive change is made to a voter registration. As with any decision, that action would still be appealable to the Board of Canvassers if the voter objects, although Mr. Lima felt that those voters being corrected as a result of administrative error would, generally speaking, not be inclined to object to being put back in the city in which they actually live.

Mr. Jackvony said he was fine with the process Mr. Lima outlined. He said that if the voter is on the line, Cranston and Providence should be in mutual agreement and the voter should be sent a letter notifying them of the public hearing, but if the boundary is not running through a property, the Canvassing Department should follow its normal administrative procedure.

## NEW BUSINESS

### A. WARD 2 POLLING LOCATION FOR PRECINCT 0704

Mr. Lima said that Precinct 0704 is presently the only polling location in the city that is located outside of its ward. The precinct is one of the city's smallest, covering a small, northwestern corner of Ward 2; however, the polling place is physically located well into Ward 3, at the Cranston Senior Center. Board of Elections then-Acting Executive Director Bob Rapoza indicated to Mr. Lima his concern about the Senior Center remaining a polling place following the City Council's decision to name the building after a sitting Cranston School Committee member, and advised seeking a new location in anticipation of that office holder seeking reelection, in order to avoid any confusion or controversy. Mr. Lima said this provided an unexpected opportunity to correct the city's only out-of-precinct polling place and establish a polling location closer to where the residents of the precinct actually live.

Mr. Lima said the reason why the Senior Center was originally chosen was that Ward 2 is considerably divided by state General Assembly districts, creating a jumble of scattered precincts that monopolize most of the city-owned buildings that are suitable for polling places. He said the Cranston Public Schools Special Services Center on Sprague Ave and the William R Dutemple School off of Pontiac Ave are possible options, as both have been used as polling places before.

Mr. Lima said he will entertain other suggestions from the Board, as following a site visit to the Special Services Center, he found that the layout of the structure has changed significantly since it was last used as a polling location, which may preclude its reactivation, and it would be good to have other options. Mr. Jackvony suggested the community room at D'Evan Manor, located on Cranston St a few blocks from the Senior Center, as an option that is closer to Ward 2. Mr. Lima said he would investigate if the other sites do not pan out.

Mr. Lima said he would continue to look at viable alternatives so the Board would have options to consider.

Mr. Jackvony said once the Board of Elections approves the new polling location, Mr. Lima can bring the change back to the Board of Canvassers for final approval.

#### COMMENTS OF BOARD MEMBERS

There were no comments of Board members.

#### ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: By Mr. Vierra and seconded by Mr. Jackvony to adjourn.  
PASSED UNANIMOUSLY – VOICE VOTE

The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nicholas J. Lima  
Registrar  
Cranston Board of Canvassers

APPROVED by the Cranston Board of Canvassers: September 25, 2017