

Citizens for Wayne A. Strnad

2308 N Monitor
Chicago, IL 60639
(773) 889-2963

November 24, 2006

Mr. James M. Scanlon
Eight South Michigan Avenue – Suite 3500
Chicago, IL 60603

Dear Mr. Scanlon,

I would like to thank you for briefly talking with me on Friday, November 3, 2006, on your way down from the 8th floor at 69 W. Washington and as per your request, I am faxing this letter over to your office.

I intentionally waited till after the election of November 7, 2006 to give you this letter because I figured your time would be occupied with other matters centering on that election.

For the sake of clarity, there were two Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) requests that were submitted to the Chicago Board of Elections (“CBOE”). One was dated two days after the March 21, 2006 election, in which I was a candidate for the office of State of Illinois, 3rd Representative District, and faxed to the Office of Mr. Lance Gough, and the other was dated September 18, 2006. Briefly, the first FOIA dealt with information pertaining to the 3rd Representative District and the second pertained to data of the 30th Ward of Chicago.

First, I must admit that I was rather taken aback to find out after all this time in handing FOIA’s to the CBOE under the organization name Citizens for Community Action, Inc. (“CCA”), a non profit corporation registered with the State of Illinois, that now CCA could not receive any data in digitized format on CD or diskette. History indicated otherwise.

Not being able to receive digitized information does bring up the question as to when this policy took affect? I could not find anything written within the Illinois Compiled Statutes stating that only a political committee can get data in digitized format, as told to me by Yvonne (please see third item below for detail). The CBOE had literally months to tell me this but gave no indication whatsoever that CCA would only get paper copies of anything. Needless to say, had I known that then the Citizens for Wayne A. Strnad, a political committee, would have immediately filed the FOIA again. I want to see in writing were it states this policy.

Second, on or about October 26, 2006 I was asked to resend the first FOIA of March, 2006. This I did on October 27, 2006.

Third, on November 3, 2006 on or about 11:00 am while I was verifying signatures for a petition, Yvonne came to the 6th floor with a large envelope. It was an incomplete reply to the second FOIA and after a quick browse of the envelope's contents, I asked where was the CD? I pointed out that I wanted the data on CD, not printed. That's when I found out about not being able to get data in digital format supposedly because only political committees can get data in that manner. The fact of the matter is that I could print out any report I so desired to create, and to my heart's content.

After I mentioned that there has been a violation of the FOIA, Yvonne then stated they never received the second FOIA until the end of October and even mentioned that she always tells people to call back and confirm that the fax was received. Not receiving this second FOIA struck me as very strange and after looking over my fax records later that evening, I confirmed the fact that I never sent over another copy of the second FOIA but only the first, as requested. Yet, I signed and received a copy of this second FOIA when the paper data was handed over to me on the 6th floor. Question would be, if the CBOE never received a copy of this second FOIA, how is it that I could sign a paper that in theory does not exist at the CBOE? It was never faxed a second time! So, obviously they did receive the original second FOIA back in September, 2006.

Fourth, in Exhibit A, I have included a copy of the City of Chicago –Precinct Canvass – Statement of Vote, Official 2006 Primary Election (“SOVO”), pages 220 and 221. I have downloaded the entire file. It consists of all the democratic races for the 2006 Primary and has the filename, DEM_Precinct_Canvass.pdf. For further reference, this Official document is 612 pages in length.

Here are some of the things that I find interesting in relation to the data for the 3rd Representative District:

1. According to the SOVO report, the total registrations are 34,066 voters. Yet in the dataset I received from the CBOE there were 52,915 registered voters. The difference is 18, 849 voters. This was dismissed as my being given the wrong dataset for the election. Yet, from my perspective, I think not and in (2) found below, you can see why.
2. The dataset I received on or about October 7, 2006, sent Priority Mail, has 54,613 registrants or 20,547 more voters than appear in the SOVO report. It might be a reasonable assumption that 1698 people were added to the voter count within the six and one-half month period after the election in the 3rd Representative District but again, this total voter count is no where near the number found in SOVO.
3. When one sums the number of votes for Delgado and Strnad, not a single sum adds up to the number of Ballots Cast, for any precinct! In fact, the total discrepancy amounted to 1,213.

4. At one point in the more than 8 months I have been waiting for the fulfillment of this first FOIA, there appeared to be some confusion relating to the dataset I was seeking. Yet, there should have been no confusion whatsoever because the FOIA was submitted two days after the election. Logic would dictate that I wanted data from that election i.e. the 34,066 total registrants. By the way, I still don't have that dataset!
5. In the initial dataset I received from the CBOE in 2005, during the petition circulation period, the voter count was 52,915 with an accompanying history of 30,178 records. This means 22,737 or nearly 43% of the people had no history within the dataset of the CBOE.
6. A simple query of the first dataset I received from the CBOE, which, among other things, was used for mailing purposes, showed that there were nearly 500 duplicate entries.
7. Even if the election was a close race, I could never had won because despite the fact that the dataset I received in 2005 was 18,849 voters larger than the final totals found in the SOVO report, more than 4100 voters appeared in the dataset received from the CBOE, but did not appear in SOVO's report. Please see Exhibit B, Missing Information
8. More alarming information found in Exhibit B, shows the total Voters we knew nothing about i.e. 2,120 people. Even with a low 20% turnout, this translates into more than 400 people that voted.

Fifth, in a letter addressed to Mr. Lance Gough, appearing as Exhibit C, dated August 29, 2006, many items are addressed but specific to the data in question is the following:

Due to the extended length of time that has transpired from election day, March 21, 2006, the dataset received does not reflect an accurate picture of who was actually able to vote on that election date. Data has no doubt been added, modified and perhaps even deleted from the file.

The dataset I need to work with is a "freeze"¹ of the voters that could vote on March 21. Obviously, with nearly 20,000 people missing from the District, any meaningful analysis of the data would necessarily find many errors and perhaps be construed as a voting irregularity.

I need a copy of the dataset as it appeared in the CBOE records on March 21, or in other words, a copy of the dataset used to compile the binders that went out to the precincts; I assume it's the dataset with the SOVO totals. It should be obvious from the date of the FOIA, what information was sought and what dataset I wanted.

¹ A freeze of a dataset is a "save" or "backup" of the dataset saved in such a way that the data cannot be altered. For example, a common accounting function is to save the customers' transactions file on a daily basis or weekly basis, depending on the number of transactions that occur. For definition sake, let me define a freeze of the voter data as an image of all voter records that are somehow saved to any media currently available at the CBOE for backup.

Mr. James M. Scanlon

November 24, 2006

Page 4

I further assume there is a backup, or freeze lying around somewhere that can be restored to some temporary directory on a system and then copied to CD. Had the FOIA been responded to in a timely fashion then that would have been the dataset I could have worked with. Indeed, it would have been a more accurate picture of what transpired on election day, from a dataset point of view.

It should be noted that at the time of the letter of August 29, 2006, more than 5 months passed since the original FOIA was submitted. I believe that FOIA requests are to be responded to within 7 days (5 ILCS 140(3)(e)) and reason(s) provided in the event additional time is required to fulfill the request, or, in the event it would be claimed to be unduly burdensome, arrangements could have been made to rewrite the FOIA (5 ILCS 140(3)(f)).

I cannot phantom how copying data (a file) to CD would be unduly burdensome. Filtering records from any database, such as all the voters in the 3rd State Representative District, is merely the writing of an SQL statement, so that should not be unduly burdensome either. In fact, since the data comes in either of two formats, an ASCII text file or an mdb database file, it is a simple matter of setting up a query over the dataset table. This has been done numerous times for people/committees in their asking for voter records. I want the query statement that is utilized to create the dataset. Perhaps there is an error in its construction.

The point is that more than eight (8) months have passed since this first FOIA was submitted and we are still at square one, with absolutely no progress in terms of the dataset I need for analysis.

Sixth, more than two (2) months have passed since the second FOIA was submitted and I still do not have any digitized information on CD. Admittedly, I was told it would be ready by the end of this week, which translates into today, the day after Thanksgiving Day.

Seventh, several years ago it was suggested that the training of judges include various important aspects of the law that a judge should really be aware of. Also, it should be emphasized in the training session that judges of elections do not take orders from Precinct Captains. Below you can find an item that shows what I'm talking about. By the way, several others and I witnessed this. I have affidavits to confirm this.

It's Just Another Day....Of Breaking the Rules

Election Day November 7, 2006

Here's one of Ariel Reboyras' workers, a poll watcher named Javier Valdez, handling the tape as it comes off the electronic vote tabulator.

According to the rules, no poll watcher is to handle anything. The person standing at the end of the table, without a jacket, is a judge.

In the photo to the right, this person was allegedly sent in by the Chicago Board of Elections because there was a shortage of judges when the poll opened. Question is, how did the Chicago Board of Elections come up with judges so quickly? We were there at 5:30 am and he was there. Did they just pull judges off the street? If so, they had no training whatsoever! One would shutter to think that judges were put in by the precinct captain. If that's the case, then where are the elections with "integrity," as stated in the Constitution for the State of Illinois.

If this man was indeed from the Chicago Board of Elections, then why did he allow such activity as described below?

It was discovered after the poll closed at St. James Church that several of the judges were filling out poll sheets for a person named Javier. In fact, one of the judges made comment that, "Javier had asked us to fill it out." The judges were marking off names on the sheet in yellow highlighter, of all the people that voted that day. This is not the role of a judge of election. Taxpayers do not pay them for filling out sheets for poll watchers. The marking of the poll sheet was pointed out by Wayne to the judges. They stopped filling out the sheet (17th Precinct).



However, the 6th Precinct judges had completed the task and handed their poll sheet to Felix.

Wayne told Javier and Felix to put the material back. You are absconding evidence. Poll watchers are only there to watch and perhaps challenge a signature. They cannot handle any materials relating to the election - binders, etc. that are sitting on the judges table. Javier's and Felix's confiscating of the material was done in front of two agents from the Cook County States Attorney Office named Joseph D. Cook and Bill Gorey, neither of which did anything about this. A formal complaint was filed with these gentlemen by Wayne on behalf of all the voters.

Felix is another one of Ariel Reboyras' cronies who was circulating a petition for Ariel Reboyras and Miquel DeValle. He was doing this in front of the polling place until Wayne called upon the judge to straighten out the matter. This was also reported to the Chicago Board of Elections and witnessed by at least four other people. Such circulating activity is a violation of the Illinois Compiled Statutes (state laws), referred to as the 100 foot rule.

As a footnote: Javier Valdez also circulated a petition for William "Willie" Delgado, whose petition for State Representative was wrought with fraud and forgeries of signatures. To view all the circulators turn your browser to www.mywayne.info.

Care to help Wayne in the next election?

Call 773-882-1328.

Eighth, due to the extended length of time that the CBOE has taken in its reply, or lack thereof, there is question as to whether or not the right to due process that would have been available to me has now been denied because of statutory time limitations.

Mr. James M. Scanlon

November 24, 2006

Page 6

Ninth, although I am not one to endorse “Big Brother” type of surveillance, I do feel that there should be a video camera, with audio, inside the polling place, started after the poll closes. This should not violate the privacy issue for voters but act as a safeguard for Poll watchers as well as judges of election. Either the Cook County States Attorney or the Attorney General for the State of Illinois can then prosecute irregularities that are filmed inside the polling place. It should also be available to any and all interested parties, as per a FOIA request. I have yet to see a fair election and one with integrity, for at least the last 10 years.

According to the Constitution of the State of Illinois, Article III, Section 4, elections are suppose to have integrity. Now although from a legal perspective that might be “vague and ambiguous and subject to interpretation” I also know that in Federal laws there is that fictitious person, usually referred to as a “reasonable person,” who knows what it means. Indeed, the data that is used by the CBOE should also have integrity for if it doesn’t, the integrity of the election itself stands at bay, and the CBOE is potentially in violation of the aforementioned Article of the Constitution of the State of Illinois.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Wayne A. Strnad

Exhibits follow.

This letter and the accompanying exhibits and contents thereof, were digitally created and as such, do not contain a graphic representation of Wayne A. Strnad’s signature. For confirmation and/or verification of this document’s creation and/or content, please contact Wayne A. Strnad at the aforementioned phone number.

Exhibit A

CITY OF CHICAGO -PRECINCT CANVASS- Statement of Vote
OFFICIAL 2006 PRIMARY ELECTION

100051											DEMOCRATIC REP. IN GEN. ASSEMBLY, 3RD										
	Registration	Ballots Cast	Turnout (%)		William "Willie" Delgado	Wayne A. Stroud															
Ward 26 Precinct 04 2604	264	68	25.76		52	3															
Ward 26 Precinct 06 2606	301	86	28.57		68	6															
Ward 26 Precinct 13 2613	307	98	31.92		64	20															
Ward 26 Precinct 16 2616	289	67	23.18		51	6															
Ward 26 Precinct 26 2626	359	67	18.66		51	6															
Ward 26 Precinct 30 2630	420	50	11.90		43	4															
Ward 26 Precinct 42 2642	371	54	14.56		42	7															
Ward 26 Precinct 54 2654	370	71	19.19		54	11															
Ward 26 Precinct 60 2660	368	68	18.48		54	4															
Ward 26 Precinct 62 2662	383	102	26.63		68	17															
Ward 29 Precinct 02 2902	530	104	19.62		70	23															
Ward 29 Precinct 06 2906	321	75	23.36		48	19															
Ward 29 Precinct 07 2907	239	89	37.87		63	18															
Ward 29 Precinct 09 2909	352	94	26.70		56	15															
Ward 29 Precinct 24 2924	210	98	46.67		62	23															
Ward 29 Precinct 30 2930	295	96	32.54		64	19															
Ward 29 Precinct 32 2932	576	111	19.27		72	24															
Ward 29 Precinct 39 2939	390	98	25.13		74	13															
Ward 29 Precinct 52 2952	374	97	25.94		55	22															
Ward 30 Precinct 02 3002	351	103	29.34		84	15															
Ward 30 Precinct 04 3004	552	72	13.04		55	11															
Ward 30 Precinct 05 3005	481	56	11.64		48	6															
Ward 30 Precinct 06 3006	320	73	22.81		44	23															
Ward 30 Precinct 09 3009	454	167	36.78		37	10															
Ward 30 Precinct 10 3010	569	88	15.47		63	19															
Ward 30 Precinct 11 3011	335	70	20.90		45	19															
Ward 30 Precinct 12 3012	387	84	21.71		61	12															
Ward 30 Precinct 17 3017	359	78	21.73		46	27															
Ward 30 Precinct 21 3021	704	107	15.20		86	12															
Ward 30 Precinct 22 3022	716	100	13.97		84	12															
Ward 30 Precinct 24 3024	592	95	16.05		78	10															
Ward 30 Precinct 27 3027	772	131	16.97		86	27															
Ward 30 Precinct 28 3028	455	104	22.86		71	28															
Ward 30 Precinct 34 3034	485	142	29.28		109	24															
Ward 30 Precinct 35 3035	476	105	22.06		73	23															
Ward 30 Precinct 37 3037	427	100	23.42		71	19															
Ward 30 Precinct 40 3040	568	81	14.25		57	21															
Ward 30 Precinct 41 3041	571	101	17.69		91	2															
Ward 31 Precinct 03 3103	356	105	29.49		83	12															
Ward 31 Precinct 10 3110	268	49	18.28		44	1															
Ward 31 Precinct 12 3112	388	90	23.20		74	8															
Ward 31 Precinct 15 3115	264	50	18.94		32	17															
Ward 31 Precinct 17 3117	340	78	22.94		60	8															
Ward 31 Precinct 20 3120	401	66	16.46		50	13															
Ward 31 Precinct 21 3121	466	112	24.03		81	13															
Ward 31 Precinct 23 3123	264	54	20.45		41	8															
Ward 31 Precinct 24 3124	342	78	22.81		64	7															
Ward 31 Precinct 25 3125	425	100	23.53		79	12															
Ward 31 Precinct 27 3127	392	90	22.96		68	14															
Ward 31 Precinct 29 3129	348	76	21.84		63	9															
Ward 31 Precinct 34 3134	337	56	16.62		50	1															
Ward 31 Precinct 35 3135	349	74	21.20		52	14															
Ward 31 Precinct 36 3136	461	125	27.11		104	12															
Ward 31 Precinct 37 3137	459	94	20.48		74	9															
Ward 31 Precinct 39 3139	376	64	17.02		57	2															
Ward 31 Precinct 40 3140	296	79	26.70		56	10															
Ward 31 Precinct 42 3142	442	102	23.08		84	15															
Ward 31 Precinct 43 3143	476	105	22.06		72	26															
Ward 31 Precinct 44 3144	415	73	17.59		54	14															
Ward 31 Precinct 45 3145	423	83	19.62		59	14															
Ward 31 Precinct 51 3151	289	70	24.22		51	12															

CITY OF CHICAGO -PRECINCT CANVASS- Statement of Vote
 OFFICIAL 2006 PRIMARY ELECTION

100051		DEMOCRATIC REP. IN GEN. ASSEMBLY, 3RD												
	Registration	Ballots Cast	Turnout (%)		William "Willie" Delgado	Wayne A. Smead								
Ward 35 Precinct 02 3502	963	102	18.69		77	18								
Ward 35 Precinct 23 3523	507	88	16.96		55	25								
Ward 35 Precinct 35 3535	683	148	21.67		107	25								
Ward 36 Precinct 01 3601	453	153	33.05		94	31								
Ward 36 Precinct 03 3603	513	253	49.32		145	45								
Ward 36 Precinct 04 3604	414	73	17.63		39	22								
Ward 36 Precinct 06 3606	513	137	26.71		8	10								
Ward 36 Precinct 36 3636	452	127	28.10		71	37								
Ward 36 Precinct 41 3641	445	115	25.84		29	35								
Ward 36 Precinct 51 3651	453	185	40.84		126	35								
Ward 36 Precinct 53 3653	273	117	42.86		65	29								
Ward 37 Precinct 01 3701	469	101	21.54		73	17								
Ward 37 Precinct 02 3702	679	148	21.80		31	11								
Ward 37 Precinct 11 3711	345	48	13.91		28	16								
Ward 37 Precinct 19 3719	546	126	23.06		98	19								
Ward 37 Precinct 39 3739	682	164	24.05		113	38								
Ward 37 Precinct 42 3742	521	98	18.81		64	16								
Ward 38 Precinct 16 3816	563	145	25.75		78	41								
Ward 38 Precinct 53 3853	148	35	23.97		19	3								
Ward Totals	34066	7687	22.57		5172	1302								
Grand Totals	34066	7687	22.57		5172	1302								

Exhibit B

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	The Official Results as it appeared on the Chicago Board of Elections website. Column headings that do not appear below can be found on pages 220 and 221 of the Statement of Vote. The column used as a separation of data has been removed.										Difference between voter count and total of VoterID	Voters we knew nothing about	
2								ward	prec	Total Of VoterID			
3	Ward 26 Precinct 04	2604	284	68	25.76	52	3	26	4	470	206		-13
4	Ward 26 Precinct 06	2606	301	86	28.57	68	6	26	6	544	243		-12
5	Ward 26 Precinct 13	2613	307	98	31.92	64	20	26	13	445	138		-14
6	Ward 26 Precinct 16	2616	289	67	23.18	51	6	26	16	515	226		-10
7	Ward 26 Precinct 26	2626	359	67	18.66	51	6	26	26	632	273		-10
8	Ward 26 Precinct 30	2630	420	60	11.9	43	4	26	30	734	314		-3
9	Ward 26 Precinct 42	2642	371	54	14.56	42	7	26	42	658	287		-6
10	Ward 26 Precinct 54	2654	370	71	19.19	54	11	26	54	696	326		-6
11	Ward 26 Precinct 60	2660	366	68	18.48	54	4	26	60	560	182		-10
12	Ward 26 Precinct 62	2662	383	102	26.83	88	17	26	62	559	176		-17
13	Ward 29 Precinct 02	2902	530	104	19.62	70	23	29	2	899	369		-11
14	Ward 29 Precinct 06	2906	321	75	23.36	48	19	29	6	550	229		-8
15	Ward 29 Precinct 07	2907	235	89	37.87	63	18	29	7	590	355		-8
16	Ward 29 Precinct 09	2909	352	94	28.7	56	15	29	9	329		-23	-23
17	Ward 29 Precinct 24	2924	210	98	46.67	62	23	29	24	253	43		-13
18	Ward 29 Precinct 30	2930	295	96	32.54	64	19	29	30	158		-137	-13
19	Ward 29 Precinct 32	2932	576	111	19.27	72	24	29	32	780	204		-15
20	Ward 29 Precinct 39	2939	390	98	25.13	74	13	29	39	982	572		-11
21	Ward 29 Precinct 52	2952	374	97	25.94	55	22	29	52	947	573		-20
22	Ward 30 Precinct 02	3002	351	103	29.34	84	15	30	2	482	131		-4
23	Ward 30 Precinct 04	3004	562	72	13.04	55	11	30	4	858	306		-6
24	Ward 30 Precinct 05	3005	481	56	11.64	48	8	30	5	705	224		-2
25	Ward 30 Precinct 06	3006	320	73	22.81	44	23	30	6	609	289		-6
26	Ward 30 Precinct 09	3009	454	167	36.78	37	10	30	9	219		-235	-120
27	Ward 30 Precinct 10	3010	599	88	15.47	63	19	30	10	785	216		-6
28	Ward 30 Precinct 11	3011	335	70	20.9	45	19	30	11	468	133		-6
29	Ward 30 Precinct 12	3012	387	84	21.71	61	12	30	12	616	229		-11
30	Ward 30 Precinct 17	3017	359	78	21.73	46	27	30	17	507	148		-5
31	Ward 30 Precinct 21	3021	704	107	15.2	86	12	30	21	429		-275	-9
32	Ward 30 Precinct 22	3022	716	100	13.97	84	12	30	22	806	90		-4
33	Ward 30 Precinct 24	3024	692	95	15.05	78	10	30	24	873	281		-7
34	Ward 30 Precinct 27	3027	772	131	16.97	86	27	30	27	1130	358		-18
35	Ward 30 Precinct 28	3028	495	104	22.86	71	28	30	28	656	201		-1
36	Ward 30 Precinct 34	3034	485	142	29.28	109	24	30	34	635	150		-9
37	Ward 30 Precinct 35	3035	476	105	22.06	73	23	30	35	836	359		-9
38	Ward 30 Precinct 37	3037	427	100	23.42	71	19	30	37	581	164		-10
39	Ward 30 Precinct 40	3040	668	81	14.26	57	21	30	40	727	159		-3
40	Ward 30 Precinct 41	3041	571	101	17.69	91	2	30	41	836	265		-8
41	Ward 31 Precinct 03	3103	356	105	29.49	83	12	31	3	499	143		-10
42	Ward 31 Precinct 10	3110	268	49	18.28	44	1	31	10	455	187		-4
43	Ward 31 Precinct 12	3112	388	90	23.2	74	8	31	12	716	328		-8
44	Ward 31 Precinct 15	3115	264	50	18.94	32	17	31	15	393	129		-1
45	Ward 31 Precinct 17	3117	340	78	22.94	60	8	31	17	614	274		-10
46	Ward 31 Precinct 20	3120	401	66	16.46	50	13	31	20	609	208		-3
47	Ward 31 Precinct 21	3121	466	112	24.03	81	13	31	21	753	287		-18
48	Ward 31 Precinct 23	3123	264	54	20.45	41	8	31	23	419	155		-5
49	Ward 31 Precinct 24	3124	342	78	22.81	64	7	31	24	562	220		-7
50	Ward 31 Precinct 25	3125	425	100	23.53	79	12	31	25	699	234		-9
51	Ward 31 Precinct 27	3127	392	90	22.96	68	14	31	27	672	280		-8
52	Ward 31 Precinct 29	3129	348	76	21.84	63	9	31	29	462	114		-4
53	Ward 31 Precinct 34	3134	337	56	16.62	50	1	31	34	561	224		-5
54	Ward 31 Precinct 35	3135	349	74	21.2	52	14	31	35	583	234		-8
55	Ward 31 Precinct 36	3136	461	125	27.11	104	12	31	36	679	218		-9
56	Ward 31 Precinct 37	3137	459	94	20.48	74	9	31	37	718	259		-11
57	Ward 31 Precinct 39	3139	376	64	17.02	57	2	31	39	579	203		-5
58	Ward 31 Precinct 40	3140	266	79	29.7	58	10	31	40	488	232		-13
59	Ward 31 Precinct 42	3142	442	102	23.08	84	15	31	42	685	243		-3
60	Ward 31 Precinct 43	3143	476	105	22.06	72	26	31	43	641	165		-7
61	Ward 31 Precinct 44	3144	415	73	17.59	54	14	31	44	688	284		-5
62	Ward 31 Precinct 45	3145	423	83	19.62	59	14	31	45	599	176		-10

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
63	Ward 31 Precinct 51	3151	289	70	24.22	51	12	31	51	450	161		-7
64	Ward 35 Precinct 02	3502	563	105	18.85	77	18	35	2	992	429		-12
65	Ward 35 Precinct 23	3523	507	86	18.96	55	25	35	23	800	293		-8
66	Ward 35 Precinct 35	3535	683	148	21.67	107	25	35	35	999	316		-16
67	Ward 36 Precinct 01	3601	463	153	33.05	94	31	36	1	814	351		-28
68	Ward 36 Precinct 09	3603	513	253	49.32	145	45	36	3	721	208		-83
69	Ward 36 Precinct 04	3604	414	73	17.63	39	22	36	4	578	164		-12
70	Ward 36 Precinct 08	3606	513	137	26.71	8	10	36	6	129		-384	-119
71	Ward 36 Precinct 36	3636	452	127	28.1	71	37	36	36	697	245		-19
72	Ward 36 Precinct 41	3641	445	115	25.84	29	35	36	41	452	7		-51
73	Ward 36 Precinct 51	3651	453	185	40.84	126	35	36	51	966	513		-24
74	Ward 36 Precinct 53	3653	273	117	42.86	65	29	36	53	247		-26	-23
75	Ward 37 Precinct 01	3701	469	101	21.54	73	17	37	1	651	182		-11
76	Ward 37 Precinct 02	3702	679	148	21.8	31	11	37	2	908	229		-106
77	Ward 37 Precinct 11	3711	345	48	13.91	28	16	37	11	662	317		-4
78	Ward 37 Precinct 19	3719	546	126	23.08	98	19					-546	-9
79	Ward 37 Precinct 39	3739	882	164	24.05	113	38	37	39	491		-191	-13
80	Ward 37 Precinct 42	3742	521	96	18.81	64	16	37	42	258		-263	-18
81	Ward 38 Precinct 16	3816	563	145	25.75	78	41	38	16	780	217		-28
82	Ward 38 Precinct 53	3853	146	35	23.97	19	3	38	53	106		-40	-13
83	Official Total-1	34066						Total-2		48794	16648	-2120	-1213
84													
85											31946	34066	
86													
87													
88	Accounting Check							Missing Information					
89	k85 is (Total-2) - 18848							29	53	856			
90	k85 + 2120 is 34066							29	54	596			
91								30	18	272			
92								30	42	584			
93								36	52	1			
94								37	47	277			
95								37	50	892			
96								37	52	643			
97								Total-3		4121			
98													
99								Total (2 & 3)		52915			
100										19849			
101										20969			

Exhibit C

This letter was emailed to Mr. Lance Gough and is now being faxed on August 31, 2006.

August 29, 2006

Mr. Lance Gough
Executive Director
Chicago Board of Elections
69 W. Washington - Rm. 800
Chicago, IL 60602

Dear Lance,

Last month when we met, you had mentioned that you believed all the information for the FOIA request that was submitted back in March, 2006, was already completed. You might recall that Tom was on vacation.

On August 17, 2006 Mrs. Preski wrote, "The information is ready and waiting to be picked up. This is a box-full of information. Please be prepared to transport it."

On Friday, August 18, 2006, I wrote back to Mrs. Rose Preski informing her that I made arrangements to have the "box-full" of data picked up Monday morning, between 9:00 - 9:15 AM. The letter specifically stated the date and time I would have people available to pick up this data. This information was detailed in an email sent at 11:33 am on August 18, 2006.

On Monday, August 21, 2006 I received an email at 2:15 pm informing me where to go and pick up the data. This was clearly more than 5 hours after we had picked up the data. I would recommend that someone talk to the computer people over there regarding their email server for Mrs. Preski claims she sent this email on Friday, even though it was not received by me until Monday afternoon. The probability of my email server having a problem is nil, for I received at least 50 emails that day and sent several without any problems. Did your email server receive an "undeliverable" message on your end?

This box-full of data amounted to two file folders with a CD.

I was going to write back later that day to inform Mrs. Preski that the data had problems but after the phone conversation with her I thought I would just wait. She apparently had to meet with someone else to see whether this data can be put to CD. Part of what I was going to talk about was written by Mrs. Preski and it went like this, "Also, I went over your letter of request, and we still owe you four of your requests. I will begin working on that on Monday." I assume the Monday that is referred to is August 28. How is it that everything in the FOIA request could be ready for pickup, a whole box-full, and then not be available?

Now for the problems with the data I did receive.

I originally requested, as per other requests made in the past, to have the information on CD. In the past the Board would put such data requests in CD format with an mdb database structure. Contained within those databases were pretty much the exact same thing I had requested in this current FOIA request. Very little has changed from request to request. Yet now, the file received on August 21, itself is a text file; not a problem although a little extra work on my part. Also, the CD is missing information:

- 1). No voter history,
 - 2). List of judges that were scheduled to serve at the polls,
 - 3). List of judges that actually served,
- etc.

The information that was compiled and printed really was an unnecessary chore. All I needed was the original file, in digital format. I could easily create and run my own SQL statements on the dataset. Items 2 and 3 were printed versions that I received but admittedly have not had the time necessary to analyze. I think it is quite a useless and laborious chore to re-enter that data into the computer when a file exists that already has this information available in a usable format.

When I called the Board back in April of this year, I was told that I couldn't receive any information because of pending cases. This was after you received the FOIA request. After looking over the data on the CD, the voter data, I can unequivocally state that this data would not have had any impact whatsoever with any cases anywhere. It has a few more "fields" than a typical address book. That's all.

Other problems.

The dataset itself (text file received on August 21) is questionable. According to the last database I received when I ran for the office of State Representative, when compared to this current one given by the Board, there are nearly 20,000 people that have apparently moved out of the 3rd District. That means that more than 40+% of the entire voter population has just left the District. I would expect some disparity of perhaps a few percent but 40+% tells me something is definitely wrong.

Due to the extended length of time that has transpired from election day, March 21, 2006, the dataset received does not reflect an accurate picture of who was actually able to vote on that election date. Data has no doubt been added, modified and perhaps even deleted from the file. The dataset I need to work with is a "freeze" of the voters that could vote on March 21. Obviously, with nearly 20,000 people missing from the District, any meaningful analysis of the data would necessarily find many errors and perhaps be construed as a voting irregularity. I need a copy of the dataset as it appeared in the Board records on March 21, or a copy of the dataset used to compile the binders that went out to the precincts. I assume there is a backup lying around somewhere that can be restored to some temporary directory on a system and then copied to CD. Had the FOIA be responded to in a timely fashion then that would have been the dataset I could have worked with. Indeed, it would have been a more accurate picture of what transpired on election day, from a dataset point of view.

In the last email I wrote to you I mentioned, "On another issue, what is usually done with people that circulated a petition and forged others names? Is that matter handled by your office, Devine or the Attorney General or? In case you're wondering, yes I do want to go after this type of illegal act." I still await a reply.

Thus far the Board has had approximately 5.5 months to respond to the FOIA request and I still await an accurate reply to any item of the request.

Your attention to this matter would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Wayne A. Strnad