

**NOVEMBER 4, 2008**

**POST GENERAL ELECTION  
REPORT**



**February 2009**

# **Post General Election Report-November 2008**

## **Disability Rights Center of the Virgin Islands**

The legal staff of the Disability Rights Center of the Virgin Islands (DRCVI) had been retained by the Virgin Islands Election System to monitor voting activity at various polling locations on Election Day- November 4, 2008. The purpose of these site visits was to ascertain compliance with the Help America Vote Act of 2002 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as amended.

DRCVI conducted a series of on-site visits on the islands of St. Croix and St. Thomas.

This report summarizes the perspectives of five individuals, in their own voice, all of whom were involved in the monitoring process.

### **St. Croix District-East and Mid-Island**

The first site survey began at 8:55 a.m. at the **Pearl B. Larsen School**. The first individual that we encountered was Denise Singleton, AARP State Director and registered voter who consented to a brief interview. Ms. Singleton stated that the voting process at the Pearl B. Larsen School is, in her opinion, relatively barrier free for senior citizens and persons with disabilities. During the time of our visit, two individuals who used wheelchairs were reportedly able to

cast their vote without apparent difficulty. We learned from the election judge, Ramona King that an audio/Braille module was made available by the VI Election System on- site, and at every polling station for the use of voters with visual impairments. At the time of our visit there had been no request for the use of this device. It should be mentioned here that while the staff was aware of the existence of the audio/Braille module, the voting public had no way of knowing by way of signage or other written notification that such a device existed.

DRCVI staff visited the **Florence Williams Library** polling station at approximately 9:25 a.m. Voters with mobility impairments are instructed to enter at the rear of the building. We noted along the path of travel, the existence of an elevated manhole cover on the sidewalk. Anyone who travels across that path could conceivably stumble or fall on it on the way to the polling station. Once an individual gains entry into the voting area, they are routinely instructed to exit from another door leading to King Cross Street. That exit leads to an extremely narrow walkway and an approximately one foot drop below. Given the present options, we recommend that voters with mobility impairments should be allowed to exit at the same place from which they entered. One senior citizen we interviewed stated that her experience with the voting machine was, in her words, “bang, bang, no problem.” Upon request, we were shown the audio/Braille device which was installed on a voting machine and ready for use.

At 9:45 a.m., DRCVI staff arrived at the **Juanita Gardine Elementary School** where we learned from voters that their voting experience was “smooth and easy” and that the election system personnel were “kind and gentle”. However, we did receive two complaints. One involved the non-availability of suitable seating for senior citizens. There was a complaint that the chairs that were made available for seniors were too low. Chairs that are suitable for small children are arguably not suitable for adults and particularly, senior citizens. Another complaint concerned the overall lack of cleanliness in one of the polling rooms, which in this instance was one dedicated to voters whose last name begins with the letters A-F. The room was described by one monitor as “filthy” and inappropriate for teaching small children.

We also learned that even if an individual is familiar with the use of electronic voting machines, there may be instances where they will make an error in their voting selection. At that point, they will then require some assistance to ensure that their vote will be counted.

Our staff then met with Judge Patricia Frorup at the **John F. Kennedy Housing Community**. At 10:20 a.m., approximately 194 votes were cast. During our visit we learned that a significant number of voters are unable to read and understand the ballot due to limited English proficiency or other factors. Oftentimes in those instances, people vote by numbers and not by the name of the candidate. More frequent and targeted community-based electronic ballot demonstrations were discussed and recommended as a possible way to expand voter education and participation. At the time of our visit,

there had been no requests for the audio/Braille device. However, we were informed that there were a significant number of voters with disabilities who participated in the voting process, and that such persons were given first preference on the voting lines.

During the course of our brief conversations with individual voters with mobility impairments we learned overall that the Election System staff was very kind, accommodating, and helpful.

The staff continued on to visit the **Elena L. Christian, Junior High School**.

We were unsure as to where to go because directional signage to the voting area was nonexistent. We observed potential voters being routinely re-directed by the Election System staff to the appropriate voting entrance. Posting a sign that directs voters where to vote would be a welcome improvement. DRCVI staff spoke with a couple of voters with mobility impairments. Both persons stated that the voting process was easy, they did not have to wait long, and that the staff was very helpful. We were delighted to learn that the Virgin Islands Election System has two separate paper trails and that voters have the option of voting on a paper ballot either as an absentee or on an Election Day provisional ballot.

Some voters have voiced their frustration about the lack of accessible, reliable and affordable transportation to the polls. A possible solution to this problem was expressed by an Election System staff member who suggested the creation of polling sites in closer proximity to communities that exclusively provide housing to senior citizens and persons with disabilities. Bringing the voting

machine to the voting public would arguably help to improve and expand voter access on Election Day.

Shortly, after our visit to the **Lew Muckle School**, we did receive a complaint from a registered voter by the name of George Anderson. Mr. Anderson is a senior citizen with mobility impairment. He reported that he stood on line before the polls opened and what should have been, in his estimation, a 5 minute voting process took 20 minutes because the monitor was not familiar with their duties. As soon as the judge intervened, everything fell into place. According to Mr. Anderson, “the monitors need training”.

Our staff was shown the audio/Braille device, but as previously noted there was no signage to indicate that such a device was available for use. As of noon approximately 629 votes were cast.

DRCVI staff arrived at the **Ricardo Richards School** at approximately 12:30 p.m. While there, we learned that an individual with a visual impairment had made a request to use the audio/Braille voting device which allowed him to cast his ballot independently. The school is accessible with appropriate signage throughout the voting area to accommodate voters who use a wheelchair, cane, walker, or scooter. While voters have the right to opt for voting by provisional ballot, it appeared to our staff that the election staff does not support this option and may actively discourage it. The provisional balloting process was described as being “too cumbersome”. While the provisional balloting process may be detailed and precise, it is more

egregious to actively discourage an individual from exercising their federal statutory right to vote.

DRCVI staff interviewed three individuals who use a wheelchair and are registered voters at the **Ricardo Richards School**. On each occasion, without incident, the voting machines were lowered to accommodate them. They reported that the voting process was easy and that the Election staff was helpful.

As of 1:40 p.m., approximately 439 votes were cast at the **Alfredo Andrews Elementary School**. During our visit we were told that one person in a wheelchair was able to vote with minimal assistance. One voter, a man with a mental health disability was furious. He was told by a V.I. Elections clerk that his name was not on the list of voters and he was told to go to the **Lew Muckle Elementary School**. The gentleman said that the clerk was so rude that the whole voting experience was frustrating and unpleasant for him. He did not vote as a result.

DRCVI staff then visited the **Charles Emanuel Elementary School** where we learned that two voters who use a wheelchair had encountered no difficulties with the voting process. One individual reported that he was given assistance by a young man who came over to his van, helped him remove his wheelchair from the vehicle, and then escorted him into the school. It is unclear whether the individual who provided this assistance was hired by the V.I. Election System for that purpose. A voter with a visual impairment chose to

cast his ballot with the assistance of another individual in the voting booth.

The temporary entry ramp at the **Eulalie Rivera Elementary School** posed a potential hazard because its slope was not to grade with the walkway. At its point of entry, the ramp was elevated from the permanent flooring or step by approximately 3 inches. As of 2:40 p.m., approximately 624 votes were cast. A considerable number of senior citizens participated in the voting process with a few requesting assistance. One voter with a visual impairment came to the polling station accompanied by a relative to assist him. While there, we again noted that there was no notice or posting of the existence of the Election System's audio/Braille voting device. In fact, we did not observe such postings at any of the other polling stations.

The Elections staff at the **Evelyn Williams School** had reported that three voters with visual impairments had brought along individuals to assist them with the voting process. It is unclear whether these individuals were aware of the availability of the audio/Braille voting device. Two voters with mobility impairments were able to vote without any apparent problems. DRCVI staff also learned that this election had generated a considerable amount of interest and enthusiasm among voters as a result of the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election and Barack Obama's candidacy. We learned that several expectant voters came to the polling station and for the first time learned to their surprise that their name was removed from the voter

list due to their nonparticipation in previous elections. While the territory is regrettably unable to vote in the U.S. Presidential Elections, a number of voters scrawled the name of Barack Obama across the ballot screen (not in the write-in section), requiring the Election staff to repeatedly remove such markings during the course of the day.

### **St. Croix West End/General Observations**

This observer spent Election Day November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2008 at three polling stations on the Western end of St. Croix. Observations were duly noted for all three locations however I felt the need to preface the report with two stand-out observations that characterized the whole day:

1. During the day, voter turnout was consistently perceived to be a steady trickle and there was never any situation that arose from crowding/ over-crowding. The mood at the polling stations was casual.
2. The Election staff was for the most part congenial and went out of their way to accommodate individuals with disabilities especially senior citizens.

### **ST. GERARDS HALL**

#### On Accessibility

This polling station is not accessible to individuals who use a wheelchair. More specifically, the check-in table and the voting booths are inaccessible. The parking spaces for people with disabilities are clearly marked and located right in front of **St. Gerard's Hall**. There is a curb cut from said parking position allowing such persons to disembark and make their way up the ramp to the door way. The problem is that there is an approximately 5-inch step up from the doorway to the inner Hall that makes it impossible for a person who uses a wheelchair to enter (unless a group of people were to lift the individual and their wheelchair together into the hall). This barrier makes the check-in table and the voting booths inaccessible. There was one incident where a man in a motorized wheelchair met this obstacle. Fortunately for him, his legs had some limited mobility and he was able to make his way inside with the use of a cane. He was ably assisted by the Election staff that was apologetic for the inconvenience yet very accommodating in coming to his assistance.

#### The Audio/Braille Disability Module

The module was available at this polling station, however, there was no sign indicating its availability and the module itself was not in clear view. In order to acquire this equipment you must:

- 1) Know about it, and
- 2) Ask for it.

The judge at this polling station was confident that the equipment was functional based on it having been tested the day before.

### Election Staff service

Polling station staff was friendly and congenial. I had an opportunity to observe them offering senior citizens chairs to sit in while waiting in-line for voter registration verification. These chairs were inside the hall (that is, in a shaded area) and because there was no crowds, there was no long uncomfortable wait to speak of. Those seniors and persons with disabilities who were approached for feedback said their experience was smooth, comfortable and without incident. The only minor negative that I noted involved an incident with an elderly man who was visibly incensed with a badgering electioneer outside **St. Gerard's Hall**. He was gruff and very flippant with the staff by the time he got inside but to their credit, they dealt with him with patience and calm, so that the incidence was nothing but a fleeting annoyance.

## **CLAUDE O. MARKOE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

### On Accessibility

This polling station is fully accessible. There are no physical obstructions preventing an individual with disabilities from accessing the voting booths.

### The Audio/Braille Disability Module

As with **St. Gerard's Hall**, the audio/Braille disability module was available and functional but it was not visible nor were there any signs indicating its availability.

## Election Staff Service

During my time of observation, I noted two senior citizens with mobility impairments who came into the polling station with the assistance of a cane. One of the individuals approached a line at the check-in table but she was quickly permitted - on order of the judge - to the head of the line and from there to the voting booth. On another occasion, a man who appeared to be either drunk or disoriented came in to vote. He produced his identification and his voter registration was verified. He had difficulty in the voting booth however and he could be heard making all kinds of remarks from reading candidates names out aloud to other undecipherable comments. He clearly was at a loss as to how to proceed and the judge had to intervene. I noted that an attempt was made to explain the voting procedure to him using instructional sheets that were taped to each table in the room but despite the explanation, the judge at some point had to go beyond the curtain of the voting booth in order to guide the voter. While in general no one spent more than 5 minutes at the voting booth, this incident lasted about fifteen (15) minutes.

One point of contention was the unavailability of bathrooms for use by the voters. This polling station is a public school and so has bathrooms, however, a decision was made to prohibit voter access to the bathrooms. When I queried the judge about this situation she explained that the custodial worker hired by the Board of Elections had cleaned the bathrooms four times 'before noon' because the children of campaigners (who were set up outside the polling station)

had made a 'mess' (which resulted in clogged bathrooms, etc). Consequently, the judge made the decision to restrict bathroom usage to polling station workers. She made it clear to me that though this action was taken, the bathrooms were still accessible to elderly and disabled voters. *[In the midst of the commotion about this issue it was clear that there was a ban on bathroom access for the general public. What was not clear was that the elderly or disabled voter retained bathroom access privileges.]* There was no change in this adapted practice even after an adult campaigner and a senator came in (on separate occasions) to query the situation. I must reiterate that this was but one minor negative on an otherwise excellent service.

## **ALEXANDER HENDERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

### On Accessibility

This polling station was mostly accessible. There was sufficient and well positioned parking; requisite curb cuts and obstruction free movement to the entrance and from the entrance to the voting booth. The path of travel from the voting booth to the exit of the polling station was also obstruction free. Of the three polling stations visited, this was the only one with a closed door building entry (due to it being an air-conditioned building) and this is what disqualifies it from being considered perfectly accessible. I recommend the posting of an election staffer at the door as an easy way of overcoming this problem. It must be further noted that though I did see a few individuals using wheelchairs, they were all accompanied by someone who were on hand to open the door for them.

### The Audio/Braille Disability Module

At this station, the modules - there were two - were in plain sight. Still there was no indication of their function. According to the judges, they had not been used once for the day (as of 5:00 p.m.)

### Election Staff Service

It was at this site, the most populous of the three visited during the course of the day, that on two occasions I was able to observe the procedural adaptations and voting machine adjustments so that a person in a wheelchair can vote. While there may be some assistance required to position the wheelchair in front of voting booth, the voter is able to vote in privacy (like their non-disabled peers) without intervention. The judge indicated that there were several such voters that had made use of this technology since the day began. There was a more festive atmosphere at this location than at the other ones because of the greater amount of people. Still the design of the station (with the exception of the entry door), easily facilitated a smooth operation and all those questioned for feedback gave responses of general contentment with how they were treated.

## **St. Thomas District**

### **An Overview**

From a review of the Joint Board of Elections, "Virgin Islands Elections Plan" (2003) report it appears that several goals were

outlined wherein the Board would set about to provide persons with disabilities the same opportunity for access to polling places and voting booths, (full) participation in the voting process, the privacy to vote alone, independence in voting and the opportunity to preserve one's dignity while voting. All of the above are laudable goals and the Board of Elections has come a long way since 2003 in making headway towards these goals. However, it appears that some intergovernmental agency cooperation is needed in order for all of the goals to be achieved. In particular, some of the architectural barriers to accessible voting will be underscored in this report.

In said 2003 Board of Elections report various elements were set forth which the Board considered essential in achieving its goals. Such positive and definitive actions the Board stated it would take included the following:

- The purchase of new voting machines to accommodate persons with disabilities;

*For the St. Thomas district (St. John has not been observed to date) the purchase of new voting booths has been substantially achieved as later indicated in this report, some polling locations appeared to have all new machines which made the voting booths totally accessible for that location.*

- Purchase of mobile voting machines for persons not able to enter the polling place, or in the alternative to have someone travel to the person's location with a mobile machine.

*Thus far there has been no demonstration that said procedure exists or that a mobile voting machine is available.*

- Train poll workers to understand the new voting equipment

*At all locations poll workers seem very familiar with the new voting machines and could explain to me upon request what the procedure is as to assisting a voter with a disability.*

- Provide sensitivity training so that the workers are more comfortable working with an individual with a disability so that they will better understand how to accommodate him or her.

*This goal has not been fully tested to date-but upon observation many of the workers and Judges are very helpful and accommodating to persons with disabilities when they arrive to vote, many of the individuals are repeat voters at a certain location and at least the Judges seem to know who they are and assure that they can vote when they arrive at the polls.*

- Use all funds provided under Title II to make all polling places accessible to persons with disabilities.

*This is the area that still needs vast improvement, not discounting the fact that there has been much improvement at some locations since the last on site survey of polling locations. The report has outlined what it considers the minimum requirements for a fully accessible location.*

- It was stated under the Board report that if full accessibility is not possible before November 2004. then accommodations should be made for:
  - Curbside voting for persons with disabilities upon request
  - Mobile machines that travels to homes for persons with disabilities

*Neither of these proposed accommodations for inaccessible locations have been observed to date.*

- Absentee voting for persons with disabilities

*From conversations with polling Judges it is my understanding that this alternative voting mechanism is available to persons with disabilities.*

All other aspects of the report regarding outreach and training will not be addressed since the only aspect focused upon in this survey was the actual experience of a person with a disability on Election Day, November 4, 2008.

## **LOCATION REPORTS**

### **Joseph Sibilly School**

Although this is a great polling location for persons who live on the North Side of St. Thomas, the actual building is not architecturally accessible for a person with mobility impairment who needs a wheelchair, crutches, walker or cane. The parking lot for the school building is lower than the school itself and it is an uphill walk to the polling location. When asked about the situation, the polling Judge did indicate that a person could pull into the school yard which would make the location more accessible to persons with mobility problems. The information regarding alternative accessibility to the polling location needs to be more widely distributed to voters, including the elderly voters who seemed to be getting quite a workout in order to go vote for the day.

It was noted that the polling site had 2 accessible voting machines and from a review of the area adjacent to the polling locations, there appears to be a need to have lights in the yard area for access to the location when the evening darkness descends upon the school yard area. Otherwise, the location appears to be accessible from the school yard with appropriate ramping for persons using wheelchairs. At the time visited, (mid-day) the location had 2 requests for assistance from persons with disabilities.

## **Joseph Gomez School**

A visit to this location revealed that it had at least one accessible voting machine and in general there is ample parking, with a parking space for a person with a disability within a reasonable close proximity to the path to the polling location. The polling location was fairly large and once on the walkway to the polling location it appears readily accessible for persons with mobility impairment. There had been at least 5 persons with a disability who had voted by 12:30 p.m. on voting day.

## **Curriculum Center**

This location had at least 8 accessible voting machines and 55 persons with disabilities had reportedly voted by 1:00 p.m. at said location. The front entrance to the Center had persons to direct voters to the voting location within the building. There was also a direct entrance to the voting location from the outside parking lot to the actual room for voting within the building. There was no outside signage to direct voters to the polling location. The parking lot was not monitored, but it did have a parking space for a person with a disability adjacent to the front entrance to the Center.

## **Eudora Kean High School**

The school actually has 2 separate parking lots and thus 2 separate entrances to the school, which made it confusing to determine where the voting was taking place. There were no signs to direct voters to the polling location upon arrival to the school and one just had to follow other persons to the voting location which amounted to following the lineup of campaign workers of the various candidates. There was a ramp for accessibility at the back entrance to the school from a parking lot, but nothing in the front entrance to indicate an accessible route to the voting location. The polling Judge indicated that only 2 persons with physical disabilities and one person with a visual impairment had voted by 2:30 p.m. on Election Day.

There were 3 accessible voting booths and everyone seemed generally helpful for all who came to vote. I think I entered the polling location based upon where the party volunteers were handing out election materials for their candidates. This leads me to believe that signs are definitely needed for this location since a person with a disability would be generally directed to the front entrance, which is clearly not accessible, and thus a potential voter would be deterred from the voting process upon seeing only stairs at the front entrance of the school. There must be some clear indication that an accessible entrance and parking space are available at the **Eudora Kean High School**.

**Charlotte Amalie High School**

### Lower Campus Polling Location

This is a class room location which is closer to the street and has ample ramping and parking very close to the polling location. The location is accessible and by 4:45 p.m. 12 persons with disabilities had voted at said location. The question of certification forms for persons with disabilities came into question and the Judge did not have any forms and no such forms were completed. While it remains unclear whether such forms are a territory-wide practice, we have come to learn that these documents have been used (at least in the St. Thomas district), to document the number of voters with disabilities who had voted at a polling location.

### CAHS Cafeteria Location

This location is disturbing because it is not on level with the parking lot and the ramp adjacent to the polling location was locked off from use on Election Day. The only other entrance for persons with mobility impairment is from the main parking lot and enabling directions are available and nothing is clearly marked with directional signage for persons with disabilities. The ground-level ramp entrance to the polling location is quite far, approximately 50 yards. Again, there is no signage available for any casual observer to enable them to determine how they could access the polling location. I was only able to do so since I have visited the school previously and was familiar with the location of the ground level ramp since I did site survey years ago for students with disabilities.

The Judge reported that at least 4 persons with a disability had voted, 2 who were mobility impaired and 2 visually impaired. Other individuals with a disability had voted but came with relatives or friends for assistance with voting and did not seek assistance from the polling volunteers. This was actually reported at other locations as well. At least 3 of the voting booths were accessible and all seemed to be running smoothly once you gained entrance to the location.

### **Adelita Cancryn School/ Ulla Muller School**

This has always been one of the more upbeat polling locations, lots of activity by the time that I arrived. Although I think I had noted signage upon the last survey I cannot say if I missed it this time or if it was just too dark for me to see any signs giving direction to the polling location.

The entrance to the polling location is on ground level and is accessible. The location is large and all of the Election workers were very friendly to voters and eager to assist.

The polling Judge indicated that 5 voters had completed the so-called certification forms indicating that they were a person with a disability and needed assistance. There were 5 accessible voting booths. I think that the parking lot needs more lighting for the evening voters who come to the polling location. I personally observed individuals

who parked out near the front entrance of the school (this may have occurred since the campaign workers for the candidates set up their tables and stand right outside of the fence to the school entrance) and then traveled by foot around to the back of the building where the polling station is located. This situation indicated to me that there is still a lack of adequate signage as to the exact location of the polling station.

While attempting to catch the further west polling site on St. Thomas, I bypassed the **Dober** and the **Winston Raymo Schools**. Based upon my last review, the Dober School had a favorable review.

The **Uller Muller School** had two serious problems: extremely poor outdoor lighting and nonexistent signage.

### **Gladys Abraham School**

At around 6:00 p.m. the Judge reported that 5 certification forms were completed by persons who certified that they needed assistance and others had come with their own helpers or assistants. There were 8 accessible booths and all spaced out for easy access and easy voting. This is another dark location in the night especially the front entrance. The back entrance is easily accessible for persons with disabilities but no signage. At night I could not even verify where the ramp was located for entrance into the school.

**ELECTION DAY NOVEMBER 4, 2008**  
**INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTS OF VOTERS WITH DISABILITIES**

DRCVI staff also conducted a small random survey of individual voters in the St. Croix and St. Thomas/St. John districts. The following is a summary of some of their remarks:

**Voter #1** is a registered voter who has a visual impairment. The individual votes at the Ulla Muller School. She said that her voting experience was “excellent” and that a close family member routinely assists her in the voting booth.

**Voter #2** is a registered voter who has a visual impairment whose polling station is at the Charlotte Amalie High School. Her voting experience was, in her words, “horrible”. She had asked to use the audio/Braille voting device and she was told by the poll worker that they did not have one. She was then told that her name did not appear on the voter registry. When it became apparent that she could vote at the Charlotte Amalie High School, her sister had to assist her in the voting booth. The voter voiced her strong preference for using an audio/Braille voting device. She indicated that she would be happy to promote its usage by similarly situated voters.

**Voter #3** is a registered voter with mobility impairment. She votes at the Ricardo Richards School and she stated that her voting experience was a very positive one.

**Voters #4 and 5** are registered voters whose polling locations are the Elena Christian Junior High School and the Evelyn Williams Elementary School. They both reported that they had very positive voting experiences at their polling stations.

**Voter # 6** is an individual with a visual impairment. She stated that an absentee ballot was brought to her home by a Mr. Nick Richards and that is how she voted.

**Voter # 7** is a registered voter at the Ricardo Richards School. When he arrived at the polling station, the voting machine was not set up to accommodate him and that it took about 20 minutes to set it up correctly but then he said, "It was easy from there on."

## **Conclusion**

The Virgin Islands Election System, as outlined in its 2003 Elections Plan, has made significant progress in moving toward their stated goal for a more inclusive voting process for persons with disabilities. Most notable accomplishments have been:

- The purchase and utilization of voting machines to accommodate voters with disabilities and other adaptive equipment to facilitate the voting process.
- Training poll workers on the use of such adaptive equipment.

- Hosted a series of training events that showed voters how to use the newly acquired adaptive voting equipment.
- Engaging in ongoing efforts to build the capacity skills of poll workers as it relates to assisting voters with disabilities.
- Making absentee ballot voting available for persons with disabilities.

In keeping with the goal for a more inclusive voting process, we make the following recommendations:

- Conduct more frequent and targeted community-based electronic ballot demonstrations at such locations as long-term care facilities and places that house a high concentration of persons with disabilities and senior citizens.
- Work to ensure that the architectural and safety barriers that have been identified in this report are removed by the government entity that is charged with the responsibility to address such matters.
- Work to provide more sensitivity training for poll workers as it relates to provisional balloting protocol and other voter procedures.
- Provide more directional signage at every voting station, along with posted and verbal notices of the existence and availability of the audio/Braille voting devices.
- Institute curbside voting and mobile voting machines. The availability of these devices would be a welcome community service for the many individuals in the disability community who do not have easy access to transportation.

- Produce and disseminate promotional material on adaptive voting equipment for people with disabilities and increase access to such material by writing at appropriate literacy levels, and creating alternative formats.

Disability Rights Center of the Virgin Islands

February 5, 2009