

Edward Lundgren  
201 Vairo Blvd 157B  
State College Pa, 16803  
11/6/2007

Mrs. Neidig,

I write this letter today, November 6<sup>th</sup> 2007, to file an official complaint about the actions of the judge of elections for the 25<sup>th</sup> precinct SC East 2. The actions that I witnessed today by this individual and the resulting consequences of those actions caused me great concern over the possible effects they could have had on outcome of the election. It is my belief that the failure of the judge of elections to adequately perform the duties that he volunteered for resulted in disorder during the course of the election and could have potentially affected the outcome of the election. I will start by pointing out that the judge of elections showed up late to the polling place which resulted in the failure to follow the correct procedures on setting up a precinct. The failure to do so resulted in unnecessary confusion and chaos at the close of the polls. On numerous occasions the judge, who is supposed to be present during the entire day, went missing for extending periods of time leaving his precinct understaffed and on two different occasion poll workers from different precinct were required to fill in. I also believe that a conflict of interest existed between his official position as judge of elections for the 25<sup>th</sup> precinct and his position as president of the college democrats. I do not bring this up for the political affiliations of this group but for the fact that he did not place priority on his official position for Centre County. On numerous occasions he could be seen organizing, both outside as well as with the polling area, campaign activities of the members of his group. Although the political significance of the actions of this group raises questions, the major issue here is that his job performance as judge suffered. With the large amount of importance placed on elections in this country I find it very troubling that the person who is in charge of a precinct engaged in other activities that prevented him from executing the duties of this important position. I believe that sole responsibility for the actions of this judge lies with this individual. From the beginning of the process he knew what his role was, what was required of him and he knowingly accepted the responsibilities of the position. It is therefore my belief that the poor performance of this individual lies in the unprofessional manner in which he carried out his duties. I believe that any person who takes on the responsibilities of such an important position owes the community, which they are representing, their total commitment since that community has entrusted that individual with the task of guaranteeing a fair and properly run election.

My intent in writing this letter is not to point fingers but rather inform you of a concern of mine. If this happened once, it can happen again. I believe it is Centre County's responsibility to its citizen that a scene such as the one that was witnessed today does not happen again. Although I do not blame Centre

County for the actions of the individual in question, I do believe that had the elections board engaged in some minimal oversight of the selection process for officers, this situation could have been avoided. When I was informed of opening for this election, all that was required of me was to state my interest and when exactly I would be available. Outside of that, little visible oversight of the selection process was conducted. In the future I believe that in order to avoid the unfortunate situation that took place in the HUB, a few new procedures should be introduced in order to determine if a potential conflict of interest exists. When some one informs the election board of their interest in serving in an official position, it might be wise to email them a short questionnaire asking various questions about their affiliation with any group, political or not, and why they are interested in working an election. This would help to inform the election board of any potential conflicts or alternative motives, such as resume building, for working a poll. After receiving a completed survey, a five minute follow up interview could be conducted over the phone as a means to weed out any candidate that might be unsuitable or one that could cause a potential problem. I acknowledge these steps would add more work to the process, but I truly believe that when dealing with an institution so fundamental to American democracy as the voting process, it is of the utmost importance that Centre County avoids situations that could potentially affect the outcome of an election. We are lucky that the actions that were witnessed today did not result in those dire consequences but I implore the elections board to examine this issue and put in place the necessary safeguards to prevent this from happening in the future.

Sincerely,

Edward C Lundgren IV