



## **CALTECH/MIT VOTING TECHNOLOGY PROJECT**

**A multi-disciplinary, collaborative project of the California Institute of Technology – Pasadena, California 91125 and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology – Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139**

**TITLE        Lessons from the 2012 Election Administration and  
Voting Survey**

**Name         Charles Stewart III  
University    Massachusetts Institute of Technology**

**Name         Daron Shaw  
University    College of Liberal Arts at UT Austin**

This is one of a set of research papers prepared for The Presidential Commission on Election Administration. The research reported in this paper represents the research, inferences and opinions of the authors, and not the Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project nor the individual research members of the VTP.

The author thanks the Democracy Fund for providing financial assistance that enables research associated with producing this paper. The research and opinions in this report are the author's alone.

**VTP WORKING PAPER #113  
August 3, 2013**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Lessons from the 2012 Election Administration and Voting Survey**

Charles Stewart III  
Daron Shaw

August 3, 2013

Since our country's inception, collecting appropriate data on elections and the administration of elections has been somewhat problematic, due to the fact that multiple levels of government are involved in running elections in the U.S. and because of difficulties in obtaining comparable information from the different states and localities. Beginning with the 2004 elections, the Election Assistance Commission has conducted national surveys of election administrators in an effort to facilitate a better understanding of how U.S. elections are run. We rely on these data for the 2012 and 2008 elections to offer some baseline assessments of how (rather than for whom) Americans voted in the most recent presidential elections, as well as how the way in which Americans vote might be changing.

Key points of this analysis are the following:

- The EAVS is the only available, comprehensive data set on election administration that covers the entire United States. Its quality has improved over time, facilitating useful comparisons between states and across elections, especially between 2008 and 2012.
- Draft data from the 2012 EAVS indicate that...
  - Registration was up in 2012, although turnout was down compared to 2008.
  - In-person election day voting was down slightly.
  - Overseas absentee ballots were up, although return rates for such ballots remain lower than for other absentee ballots.
  - Provisional ballots were up in 2012, as were the attendant acceptance rates.
  - The volume of voters in precincts does not much affect wait time on Election Day, but it increases wait times for early voting.

# Lessons from the 2012 Election Administration and Voting Survey

Charles Stewart III<sup>1</sup>  
Daron Shaw

August 3, 2013

## Introduction

The Election Administration and Voting Survey (EAVS), administered biennially since 2004 by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), is the single most comprehensive data resource concerning local election administration in the United States today. The purpose of this white paper is to provide an introduction to the survey and to paint a picture of election administration in the 2012 election (with comparisons to 2008) based on its results.

Using responses to the EAVS, the EAC prepares three reports to Congress: (1) on the implementation of the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA), (2) on the implementation of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA), and (3) on the general administration of the election.<sup>2</sup> In addition, the EAC makes the raw data available to the public on its web site.

The survey instrument itself, which is included as Appendix A to this report, is divided into six sections:

- Section A. Voter Registration
- Section B. UOCAVA
- Section C. Domestic Civilian Absentee Ballots
- Section D. Election Administration
- Section E. Provisional Ballots
- Section F. Election Day Activities

The organization of this report mostly follows the organization of the survey instrument. As a preface to highlighting some high-level findings from the 2012 EAVS, however, we first turn our attention to the location of the EAVS in the larger constellation of data that can be used to assess the quality of elections in the U.S.

---

<sup>1</sup> Stewart is the Kenan Sahin Distinguished Professor of Political Science at MIT and the co-director of the Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project. Shaw is Distinguished Teaching Professor and Frank C. Erwin Chair of State Politics at the University of Texas.

<sup>2</sup> The most recent NVRA report is at [http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Documents/EAC\\_NVRA%20Report\\_lowres.pdf](http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Documents/EAC_NVRA%20Report_lowres.pdf). The most recent UOCAVA report is at [http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Documents/EAC%202010%20UOCAVA%20Report\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Documents/EAC%202010%20UOCAVA%20Report_FINAL.pdf). The most recent report on the administration of elections is at [http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Documents/990-281\\_EAC\\_EAVS\\_508\\_revised.pdf](http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Documents/990-281_EAC_EAVS_508_revised.pdf).

## A Map of Election Administration Data

For data to be useful in improving any area of public administration — not just election administration — it must exhibit two critical characteristics.<sup>3</sup> First, it must conform to the units of government where policy is made and implementation occurs. Second, it must be comparable across units.

In the United States, virtually every level of government is in a position to set policy and pass laws that influence how elections are carried out. With the exception of the federal government, these different levels of government are all intensely involved in implementing laws that affect the convenience and integrity of elections. In addition, precincts are a unit of government where policy is generally not made formally, but in which the implementation of federal, state, and local laws can significantly influence the actual experience of voters.<sup>4</sup> A comprehensive data portrait of election administration in the United States would have indicators of the outcomes of election administration at all these levels.

There are, in fact, data sources that address election administration at all these levels, some of which are noted in Table 1 below.<sup>5</sup> Note that the sources at the finer levels of analysis can be aggregated up, the best example being voting machine totals that can be added up to provide election returns at the precinct, county, state, and national levels.

Level	Name	Agency	Description
State	Current Population Survey, Voting and Registration Supplement	U.S. Census Bureau	Survey data about voter participation and registration patterns
Local (county/municipal)	Election Administration and Voting Survey	U.S. Election Assistance Commission	Counts of the number of voters participating in elections — registration, absentee, UOCAVA, provisional ballot statistics. Counts of precincts, election workers, and voting machine
Precinct	Election returns	State and local election departments	Number of votes cast for candidates and the number of voters who turned out at the polls
Voting machine	Various log files	Local election department	Voting machines record “events” associated with using the equipment.

<sup>3</sup> The characteristics discussed here go beyond general issues of data quality in all scientific disciplines, such as accuracy, validity, and reliability.

<sup>4</sup> The classic study of the influence of implementation at this level across a wide range of policy is Michael Lipsky, *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. Russell Sage: New York, 1980.

<sup>5</sup> For a comprehensive introduction to the use of data from different sources, including levels of government, see “Election Administration by the Numbers: An Analysis of Available Data Sets and How to Use Them,” The Pew Center on the States, February 2012.

([http://www.pewstates.org/uploadedFiles/PCS\\_Assets/2012/Pew\\_Elections\\_By\\_The\\_Numbers.pdf](http://www.pewstates.org/uploadedFiles/PCS_Assets/2012/Pew_Elections_By_The_Numbers.pdf))

Table 1 contains a row for “voting machine,” even though it is not a unit of government. It is included to emphasize the fact that individual items of voting equipment may be the source of data that provides information about the administration of elections, beyond just the vote totals. For instance, some electronic poll books retain the time stamp of when voters checked in, which then can be used to gauge the time of day when precincts were the busiest. In addition, electronic voting machines generate “event logs” that can record the time voters took to cast ballots.

Table 1 also excludes one very useful source of data that is generally maintained in cooperation between state and local governments — voter registration lists. Not only do the registration lists record how many people are registered statewide and in individual jurisdictions, but they can also provide information about the number of people assigned to each precinct, how many people voted in each precinct, and (in some cases) the date and location of voting for early voting.

The second important desired feature of policy-relevant data is that it is comparable across different units. A single data point — such as the number of registered voters in a precinct — is not very informative unless it can be compared to a data point that comes from a similar unit — such as the number of registered voters in another precinct. In addition, comparing two data points is uninformative if the data mean different things in the two places.<sup>6</sup> If the first precinct is in a state that accounts for active and inactive voters in the count of registered voters, while the second precinct is in a state that only accounts for active registrants, the comparison is of limited use.

The issue of comparability is a major one in the field of election administration. For some administrative processes, there sometimes seems to be as many definitions for common terms as there are states or counties. For instance, in the EAVS, counties are asked to report “the total number of people in your jurisdiction who participated” in the most recent federal election,<sup>7</sup> a quantity we can use to define “turnout.” They are also asked to report the method used to reach this quantity. Of the localities responding in 2012, 1,448 based their turnout report on actual ballots counted, 1,071 based their report on the number of voters checked off the voter list plus the number of absentee ballots, 336 used the total number of votes cast for president, 563 ran a report of the number of voters according to the electronic voter history file, and 518 reported using “other” methods. Experience has shown that these methods all yield similar results, but they do not yield *identical* results. Similarly, two states might have procedures that allow all registered voters to appear at a voting station ahead of Election Day to cast a ballot in-person. The first state might call this “early voting” and report statistics related to this activity under the heading of early voting, while the second might call this “in-person absentee voting” and report statistics related to it under the larger heading of absentee voting. Note that in this case, statistics concerning both absentee balloting (including things like rejection rates) and early voting will be incomparable.

Beyond the fact that it is a national survey, the value of the EAVS comes in its comprehensive coverage of *all* local election jurisdictions — that is, the units of government that are the most

---

<sup>6</sup> This is a major part of the issue of data validity that is at the core of data analysis for public policy.

<sup>7</sup> Questionnaire item F1a.

responsible for actually administering elections — and its attention to comparability. Before the EAVS was begun in 2004, the only data available at the level of the local jurisdiction to help inform election policymaking nationwide was the number of votes cast for candidates at the federal level, but that was available only if scholars and policymakers contacted each state elections division separately. Other basic facts, such as the number of absentee ballots mailed out and returned, were simply not known. The EAVS survey instrument collects data for about 618 distinct metrics<sup>8</sup> that are useful in painting a comprehensive portrait of the performance of American elections.<sup>9</sup>

The EAVS experienced growing pains in its earliest years, both in terms of settling on the items to include in the survey and in the ability (or willingness) of local jurisdictions to respond.<sup>10</sup> However, the 2010 EAVS saw nearly universal participation by local governments; based on the draft EAVS data posted on the EAC web site, it appears that participation in 2012 was even greater.

One measure of local government participation in the EAVS is the “data completeness” measure that is contained in the Pew Elections Performance Index (EPI).<sup>11</sup> Rather than expect all local jurisdictions to respond to all the minute details of the survey, the data completeness measure identifies seventeen high-level items on the EAVS that are necessary for monitoring the basic performance of elections at the local level.<sup>12</sup> These are items such as the number of new registration forms processed and the number of absentee ballots requested and mailed out to voters. A particular state’s “data completeness score” is simply the percentage of these seventeen items that the jurisdiction reported.<sup>13</sup> The nationwide data completeness score is the weighted average of all the local scores. (The weighting is based on the size of the jurisdiction.)

The nationwide average data completeness scores were 86% in 2008 and 94% in 2010. For 2012, completeness is also 94% for the *draft* data that have recently been released — a statistic that is likely to improve as the draft data are further cleaned.

Comparability is another feature of the EAVS that can be easily overlooked. One way that the EAVS helps to ensure the comparability of the data across jurisdictions is through its Statutory Overview. The Statutory Overview, which is published alongside the quantitative data gathered

---

<sup>8</sup> Not all questions are relevant to all jurisdictions. Therefore, the number of items that a *particular* jurisdiction may be called on to answer is significantly less than 618.

<sup>9</sup> It should be noted that of the 17 individual metrics included in the Elections Performance Index published by the Pew Charitable Trusts, 8 rely on data gathered through the EAVS.

<sup>10</sup> See especially “The 2004 Election Administrator Survey Report” ([http://www.eac.gov/resource\\_library/default.aspx?DocumentId=303](http://www.eac.gov/resource_library/default.aspx?DocumentId=303)).

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.pewstates.org/research/reports/elections-performance-index-85899445029>

<sup>12</sup> The seventeen items are (1) New registrations received, (2) New valid registrations received, (3) Total registered voters, (4) Provisional ballots submitted, (5) Provisional ballots rejected, (6) Total ballots cast in the election, (7) Ballots cast in person on Election Day, (8) Ballots cast in early voting centers, (9) Ballots cast absentee, (10) Civilian absentee ballots transmitted to voters, (11) Civilian absentee ballots returned for counting, (12) Civilian absentee ballots accepted for counting, (13) UOCAVA ballots transmitted to voters, (14) UOCAVA ballots returned for counting, (15) UOCAVA ballots counted, (16) Invalid or rejected registration applications, and (17) Absentee ballots rejected.

<sup>13</sup> If an item is not applicable to a particular jurisdiction — such as items related to voter registration in North Dakota — that item is excluded from the calculation.

via the EAVS, first of all provides a summary of state laws that are relevant to the conduct of federal elections. But the survey also allows states to provide definitions to common terms used in election administration, so that the quantitative information in the EAVS can be better understood. For instance, Section A of the Statutory Overview instrument asks each state to define nine specific election administration terms, and to provide a legal citation to the definition. The terms include “over-vote,” “under-vote,” “absentee,” and “early voting.” Responses to this section provide guidance in moving between state-specific terminology and terminology that is used in national discussions of election administration. For instance, it is through the statutory overview that we learn that states use eight different terms to refer to mail-in voting (including “absentee,” “mail-in voting,” and “early voting”) and eight different terms for early voting (including “early voting,” “absentee in-person,” and “in-person advance voting.”)

In summary, no single data source provides a complete picture of election administration in the United States, documenting gains made in making voting more convenient and secure. Among the major data sources, the EAVS provides the most comprehensive national data, from the perspective of local election officials. No other data project comes close to the comprehensiveness of coverage, both in terms of geography and in terms of facets of election administration itself.

### **What the EAVS Tells Us about the 2012 Election: National Trends**

The remainder of this white paper provides an overview of the 2012 election, as depicted by the 2012 EAVS. The dataset that is used is a *draft* that has been posted on the EAC web site, for the use of the public while the Commission staff engages in some basic data cleaning and prepares the reports that the EAVS provides the information for.

#### **A word about data cleaning**

Before launching into a discussion of the national trends, it is necessary to discuss the quality of the data received from states and localities, especially since the remainder of this white paper takes a glimpse at the 2012 data, which is (as mentioned above) still in draft form. By “draft form” we mean that the data have not been completely subjected to the EAC’s process of (1) identifying gaps and logical problems, and (2) following up with the states and localities to address questions with the data. This process is referred to as “data cleaning.”<sup>14</sup>

As the EAC has noted in its prior reports, the process of gathering EAVS data is complicated by the fact that it is received from states that vary significantly in how they gather and collect data, and how they report that data to the Commission. To start, some states are able to pull together the requested data centrally, in the state elections department, while other states must rely on their counties and local jurisdictions to report data that is held locally. For instance, the 2012 draft dataset contains the identity of the contact person who was responsible for the data received

---

<sup>14</sup> A description of the data gathering process for 2010 is contained in the section on survey methodology of the 2010 EAVS report (pp. 3–5). A similar discussion is contained in the “survey background” of the 2012 NVRA report (pp. 3–5).

for each jurisdiction contained in the dataset.<sup>15</sup> Twenty-one states and the District of Columbia list only one contact person for state data, whereas the remaining 30 states list multiple contacts, generally one per local jurisdiction. The sheer complexity of the data reporting structure surrounding the implementation of the EAVS survey can make resolving data gaps and anomalies a challenge.

Despite the fact that the EAC engages in a process of clarifying data questions and anomalies, gaps and anomalies have remained in the final datasets published by the Commission. To some degree these conditions simply reflect the complexities mentioned above in gathering data from disparate sources. However, the Pew Charitable Trusts, in their process of developing the Elections Performance Index (EPI) engaged in an additional effort that stretched across approximately six months to clean the data further.<sup>16</sup> This process involved both extensive logical checks and contacts with the states to fill in holes and resolve further anomalies. Most of the changes made to the data at this point were relatively minor, for instance, verifying whether quantities listed as missing should better be described as containing the value zero.

This comment is not intended as a criticism of the EAVS dataset, but rather as a caution about the analysis that follows, which relies on data which have not been thoroughly checked for questions and anomalies, either by the EAC or by the authors. In this regard, the following caveat, which appears in the EAC's 2012 NVRA report, is relevant here:<sup>17</sup>

Caution is necessary when interpreting the survey data, particularly when comparing the data from year-to-year or State-to-State, due to changes in State data collection practices across time and the varying levels of completeness in many States' responses. In 2006, EAC began asking States to produce county-level data (or the equivalent) rather than the statewide totals asked for previously. Even in States with centralized [voter registration databases], some data may be kept only at the local level, and the level of integration of information between local and State election offices varies across the country. (p. 4)

---

15 For most states, this is the county. However, a few states administer their elections primarily at the municipality level, and these states report their statistics at this more local level. Two states, New Hampshire and Wisconsin, reported statistics at the ward or precinct level.

16 In the interest of full disclosure, one of the authors of this white paper (Stewart) was the principal investigator who worked with Pew to clean the EAVS data and do general data preparation for the EPI. The comments here pertaining to the EPI are entirely those of the authors, and do not represent the views of the Pew Charitable Trusts.

17 In the analysis that follows, we have engaged in the following basic data cleaning of the draft dataset. First, we have gone through the entire EAVS draft dataset and set to zero quantities of sub-aggregates that were originally listed as missing if the resulting aggregation is unchanged. For instance, the EAVS questionnaire asks the local jurisdiction to break down the number of rejected registrations into the reasons for the rejections. If the jurisdiction had left the quantity blank, but changing the quantity to zero would not change the aggregation, we changed the quantity to zero. We did *not* engage in the opposite process, of verifying whether sub-aggregates are consistent with aggregates. For instance, we have not verified that the number of rejected and counted provisional ballots is less than or equal to the number of provisional ballots issued by a jurisdiction. Second, in much of the analysis that follows, we calculate *rates* that require us to divide one quantity by another, such as the number of provisional ballots counted, expressed as a percentage of provisional ballots submitted. Because the number of jurisdictions reporting how many provisional ballots they received (4,147) is greater than the number of jurisdictions reporting how many provisional ballots they counted (3,975), we cannot simply add up the two quantities and divide the one by the other to calculate the percentage. Rather, we must first verify that we are using data only from localities that reported both parts of the ratio before calculating the percentage.

## The national trends

It would be impossible and uninformative to provide summary statistics about the hundreds of items contained in the EAVS. Rather, we provide some basic high-level counts of core election administration functions (registration, absentee ballots, UOCAVA ballots, etc.), drawing attention to the variability or stability from 2008 to 2010. Because of time and space constraints, we are generally unable to associate this variability with policy or demographic factors in the states and localities. For an example of how this sort of analysis would proceed, see Burden and Stewart, *The Measure of American Democracy*.<sup>18</sup>

### *Voter registration*<sup>19</sup>

- The fifty states and the District of Columbia reported that there were 191.7 million people registered and eligible to vote in 2012, which represents 87% of the citizen voting-age population (CVAP). This compares to 187.9 million in 2008 (89% of CVAP) and 186.8 million in 2010 (87%).
- The fifty states and the District of Columbia reported that approximately 60 million registration forms were processed for the two-year election cycle ending November 2012. Table 2 below shows comparable election registration statistics for the past three election cycles. The table shows how presidential election years tend to see a surge in the processing of registration forms, which is primarily accounted for by an increase in new registrations. In presidential election years, changes of address rival new registrations in volume, while in mid-term years, address changes tend to exceed new registrations. Removals from the rolls tend to be in the range of between 12 and 15 million per election cycle. Removals are much less prone to the saw tooth pattern seen in the processing of new registrations from one election cycle to the next.

---

<sup>18</sup> Forthcoming, Cambridge University Press.

<sup>19</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, registration statistics in this section are taken from the EAC's written 2012 NVRA report, rather from the draft dataset.

**Table 2. Voter registration activity across the states, 2007–08 to 2011–12**

	2007–08	2009–10	2011–12
Registration forms processed	60.0 million <sup>a</sup>	45.5 million <sup>d</sup>	59.5 million <sup>e</sup>
New registrations processed	24.5 million <sup>a</sup>	14.4 million <sup>e</sup>	23.6 million <sup>h</sup>
New registrations/ forms processed	42%	34%	33%
Removals from registration lists	12.3 million <sup>b</sup>	15.0 million <sup>e</sup>	13.7 million <sup>i</sup>
Address changes	23.5 million <sup>c</sup>	21.8 million <sup>f</sup>	30.7 million
Address changes/ forms processed*	34%	50%	44%

<sup>a</sup> 9 states did not report this information and 10 states reported partial information

<sup>b</sup> 6 states did not report this information and 12 states reported partial information

<sup>c</sup> 13 states did not report this information and 11 states reported partial information

<sup>d</sup> 1 state did not report this information and 7 states reported partial information

<sup>e</sup> 2 states did not report this information and 10 states reported partial information

<sup>f</sup> 8 states did not report this information and 12 states reported partial information

<sup>g</sup> 1 state did not report this information and 6 state reported partial information

<sup>h</sup> 5 states reported partial information

<sup>i</sup> 2 states did not report this information and 7 states reported partial information

### *Turnout*

- The draft EAVS data records that 129.0 million Americans turned out to vote in 2012, which compares to 130.0 million that are accounted for in the official election returns issued by the states.<sup>20</sup> The discrepancy is due to 43 local jurisdictions not reporting turnout in the EAVS.
- The distribution of turnout by voting modes in 2012 was 65% on Election Day, 25% by absentee or by mail, and 10% early. In contrast, based on responses from the Voting and Registration Supplement of the Current Population Survey, the distribution of voters across modes was reported as 67% on Election Day, 19% absentee or by mail, and 14% early. The discrepancies, especially among the absentee and early voting numbers, appear primarily due to a handful of states with in-person early voting (notably Texas and Georgia) combining early voting statistics with absentee statistics.

### *UOCAVA ballots*

- The draft EAVS data suggest that over 861,000 UOCAVA ballots were mailed out in 2012, with nearly 601,000 returned for counting (70% return rate). This compares with over 960,000 mailed out in 2008, with over 702,000 returned for counting (73%). These return rates are significantly lower than those for civilian absentee ballots (see below).

<sup>20</sup> United States Elections Project, “2012 General Election Turnout Rates,” [http://elections.gmu.edu/Turnout\\_2012G.html](http://elections.gmu.edu/Turnout_2012G.html).

- In both 2012 and 2008, UOCAVA ballots transmitted equaled approximately 0.5% of all registered voters.
- In 2012, 53% of UOCAVA ballots were sent to voters in the uniformed services, compared to 59% in 2008. The rest went to civilian overseas residents.
- Among UOCAVA ballots returned for counting in 2012, 3.5% were rejected. This is in comparison with 4.2% in 2008. Note that these rejection rates are slightly higher than the rejection rates of civilian absentee ballots (see below).
  - Only two categories account for more than 10% of all UOCAVA rejections in 2012: ballot not received on time (42% of rejections) and problem with voter signature (14%). The remaining rejections are uncategorized, or placed in a series of “other” categories. The fraction of rejections due to lateness was down from 53% in 2008, while the fraction rejected due to a signature problem remained virtually unchanged (12%).

#### *Civilian absentee ballots*

- The draft EAVS data suggest that nearly 32.8 million civilian absentee ballots were mailed out in 2012, with over 27.3 million returned for counting (83% return rate). This compares with 29.2 million mailed out in 2008, and over 26.1 million returned for counting (90%).
  - Return rates are strongly associated with whether a state allows voters to register on a permanent absentee list. In 2012, for instance, the return rate for jurisdictions with a permanent absentee list was 77%, compared to 93% for jurisdictions without a permanent list. By comparison, in 2008, the return rate for jurisdictions with a permanent absentee list was 87%, compared to 95% for jurisdictions without a permanent list. In 2012, approximately 59% of all absentee ballots were sent out by jurisdictions reporting they maintained a permanent absentee ballot list. This is only a slight increase from 2008, when 56% of absentee ballots were sent out by jurisdictions with permanent absentee ballot lists. Thus, the decline in the absentee ballot return rate appears to be due to a rise in the fraction of ballots sent to voters on the permanent list that are not returned.
- Among civilian absentee ballots returned for counting in 2012, 2.9% were rejected. This is in comparison with 3.1% rejected in 2008. As noted above, the comparable rejection rates for UOCAVA ballots were 3.5% and 4.2%.
  - Three categories for rejection account for more than 10% of all civilian absentee ballot rejections in 2012: ballot not received on time (33% of rejections), no voter signature (18%), and non-matching signature (18%). As with UOCAVA rejections, the remaining rejections were uncategorized or groups in a series of “other” categories. The comparable distribution of rejections in 2008 was 22% due to lateness, 14% due to no voter signature, and 8% due to non-matching signature. While it appears that many more ballots were rejected due to lateness

or lack of signature, it should be noted that in 2012 many fewer rejections were left uncategorized (31%) compared to 2008 (59%). This is a good example of national statistics being affected by the improving quality of the data over time.

### *Election Day logistics*

- In 2012, local election jurisdictions reported that they had over 171,000 precincts, down from the 189,000 precincts in 2008. In addition, the number of physical polling places used in 2012 was over 99,000, down from over 115,000 in 2008. Finally, the draft 2012 data suggest that the number of early voting locations was approximately the same in 2012 as it was in 2008 (2,500).
- Local jurisdictions report using over 750,000 poll workers in 2012, compared to over 877,000 in 2008.
- The number of Election Day voters per Election Day polling place grew somewhat in 2012, to 689, from 671 in 2008.
- The number of early voters per early voting site actually fell in 2012, to 7,300 from 7,772 in 2008. However, because states vary considerably in the *number* of days in which early voting is conducted, the number of early voters per location is only half the story. A better measure of early voting workload on polling sites is the number of early voters per site *per day*. Nationwide, that ratio was 1,111 in 2012, or roughly twice the number of voters using the average Election Day voting site.

### *Provisional ballots*

- The total number of provisional ballots submitted in 2012 was 2.6 million, up from 2.1 million in 2008. Measured as a percentage of in-person ballots, provisional ballots increased in 2012, from 1.5% of all in-person ballots cast in 2008 to 2.0% in 2012.
- In 2012, 1.7 million provisional ballots were counted fully and 179,000 were counted partially. This represent a total of 1.9 million provisional ballots cast in 2012, which was 74% of all provisional ballots submitted and 1.9% of all ballots cast. In contrast, 1.3 million ballots were counted fully and 116,000 were counted partially in 2008. These 1.4 million ballots represent 68% of all provisional ballots submitted and 1.2% of all ballots cast. In other words, the number of provisional ballots counted increased in 2012, which represented a higher percentage of provisional ballots that were initially cast.

## **Statewide Variability in the 2012 EAVS**

In the previous section, we reported a series of statistics concerning the conduct of the 2012 election, compared to the 2008 election. Although the reports issued by the EAC that are drawn

from the EAVS contain summary statistics reported at the state level, as mentioned above, the actual datasets contain breakdowns at the local level at which elections are administered — generally the county or municipal level, depending on state law. Because of this disaggregation in the dataset, it is also possible to use the EAVS data to construct measures of election performance and compare states and even local jurisdictions.

Pew’s Elections Performance Index takes advantage of this feature of the EAVS, by using it to construct eight of its seventeen measures of statewide electoral performance. These eight measures are described in Table 3 below.

Measure	Numerator	Denominator	Number of states with missing values	
			2008	2010
Absentee ballots rejected	Domestic absentee ballots rejected (Item c4b)	Election turnout (Item f1a)	8	5
Absentee ballots unreturned	Total returned absentee ballots (Item c1b)	Election turnout (Item f1a)	8	4
Data completeness	See note below		0	0
Military and overseas ballots rejected	UOCAVA ballots rejected (Item b13a)	UOCAVA ballots submitted for counting (Item b3a)	14	7
Military and overseas ballots unreturned	Total returned UOCAVA ballots (Item b2a)	UOCAVA ballots transmitted (Item b1a)	7	3
Provisional ballots cast	Total submitting a provisional ballot (Item e1a)	Election turnout (Item f1a)	6	5
Provisional ballots rejected	Rejected provisional ballots (Item e2c)	Election turnout (Item f1a)	9	3
Registrations rejected	Invalid or rejected registrations (Item a5e)	New valid registrations (Item a5b) plus Item a5e	27	21

Note: The “data completeness” measure gauges the percentage of missing data among seventeen EAVS items that are deemed key to describing basic aspects of election administration in the states.


We have calculated these estimates for these indicators for each state using the draft EAVS data and reported them in Appendix B. (Keeping in mind what has already been written in this paper, the figures for 2012 must be treated as preliminary, in light of the fact that the data are in draft form.) Echoing a point made in the white paper on polling place lines,<sup>21</sup> state outcomes suggested by these measures are positively correlated across the three elections for which these indicators have been calculated (that is, one election looks a lot like the others in a given state).

<sup>21</sup> Charles Stewart and Stephen Ansolabehere, “Waiting in Line to Vote.” White paper prepared for the Presidential Commission on Election Administration: July 28, 2013.

This reflects the fact that the behavior of the electoral processes within states change slowly, due to the fact that laws affecting elections generally are stable, as are the demographics of the various voting populations. The most stable of these measures pertain to the use of provisional ballots. The least stable are related to UOCAVA indicators.

### *Provisional ballot usage*


Figures 1A and 1B help to illustrate the stability of provisional ballot statistics. The first graph plots the percentage of ballots cast provisionally in 2012 against the percentage cast in 2010. The second graph plots the percentage of provisional ballots rejected in 2012 against the percentage rejected in 2010. (To help with legibility, the axis scales are expressed as logarithms.) States generally issued and rejected more provisional ballots in 2012, compared to 2010, which is due to more registration problems arising at the polls in presidential election years than in off-year elections.



Close scrutiny of the graphs reveals the consequences of policy choices made by states about the use of provisional ballots in the context of other state election laws. States with high rates, for instance, often use provisional ballots for reasons other than as a “fail safe” — for instance, as the mechanism that allows people who have changed their address within the state to record the address change and vote. In other cases, state have a high number of provisional ballots because of the second-order effects of permanent absentee ballot lists. (A voter who had been sent an absentee ballot might show up instead to vote in person on Election Day. That voter would likely be given a provisional ballot, to ensure that the absentee ballot had not already been cast.)

### *UOCAVA ballots*

UOCAVA statistics have not been stable at the state level, as is illustrated in Figures 2A and 2B. The first plots the percentage of UOCAVA ballots that were unreturned in 2008 and 2012; the second graph plots the percentage of UOCAVA ballots that were rejected for counting in 2008 and 2012.<sup>22</sup>



First, note that roughly half the states had higher non-return rates in 2012 compared to 2008, with Texas being notably higher.<sup>23</sup> However, a few states — notably Indiana, D.C., and Nevada — saw dramatically lower non-return rates. We have not been able to engage in research to ascertain why a few states saw a significant change in non-return rates across the past two presidential elections. We acknowledge that these changes could be due to changes in reporting patterns. Most likely, changes in the non-return and rejection rates also reflect different ways in which the states have reacted to the MOVE Act. It is certainly the case that among the major

<sup>22</sup> The year 2008 has been chosen as the comparison in these graphs because the non-return rates in 2010 were significantly higher than those for 2008 and 2012. This no doubt reflects the fact that turnout in midterm federal elections tends to be significantly lower in these elections, due to a lower degree of interest. In this case, comparing 2010 and 2012 would clearly not be an apples-to-apples comparison.


<sup>23</sup> It is unclear why Texas saw higher rates of unreturned and rejected UOCAVA ballots between 2008 and 2012. The 2009 Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment (MOVE) Act required states to send out ballots to military personnel no later than 45 days before an election and required states to use fax, e-mail or online delivery to speed things up. In 2010, the Pentagon also initiated a program that prioritizes ballots for delivery to elections officials. A number of states, including Florida, Ohio, Virginia, and Texas have instituted a tracking program that lets military personnel know whether their ballots were received back home and, in Ohio, actually confirm that it was counted. It is possible that Texas simply issued more absentee ballots in 2012 because of the federal law, but saw a relatively lower return rate.

categories of policy reflected in the EAVS, UOCAVA voting is the most in flux; thus, it should be unsurprising that statistics associated with implementing UOCAVA ballots should also be in flux.

### *Waiting times and precinct load*

One final topic we touch on in this section illustrates how one can combine the EAVS data with other data sources to help inform investigations of topics in election administration. This topic is waiting times to vote and the relationship with the number of voters at polling places.

Below in Figures 3A and 3B, the left hand graph shows the relationship between the average wait time on Election Day (measured using the CCES and the SPAE) and the average number of Election Day voters in polling places (measured using the EAVS). The right hand shows the relationship between wait times in early voting and the average number of early voters *each day* in early voting sites. The left-hand graph illustrates the lack of a relationship between the number of voters in particular polling places on Election Day and waiting times, while the right-hand graph show a fairly strong positive relationship between daily loads on early voting sites and the average time voters waited in line.



These graphs are not intended to settle any questions about the cause of long lines on Election Day, only to show that the EAVS can be valuable in beginning to untangle some of the high-level policy questions associated with long lines at the polls.

### **Concluding Observations**

The purpose of this paper has been to provide an introduction to the EAC's Election Administration and Voting Survey from the perspective of the larger set of issues associated with the availability of data necessary to assess the performance of election administration in the United States. We conclude with the following observations.

1. Despite the mountain of data that is generated in the process of administering and conducting elections, only a limited range of that data has heretofore been brought to bear in the evaluation of the state of election administration and in guiding the reform process. That is changing, but we are only in the infancy of grounding election administration policy in performance-related metrics.
2. The EAVS is the only program dedicated to collecting and disseminating comprehensive data about election administration that is national in scope. Without such a program, it is simply impossible to make comparisons across states, and thus for policymakers and the public to benchmark performance against comparable jurisdictions.
3. The quality of the EAVS data has improved steadily over time. The stability of the EAVS questionnaire has assisted states and localities to adjust their own administrative processes so that they can be responsive to EAC data requests. States and localities are the most successful in reporting the highest-level aggregates, such as the number of civilian absentee ballots transmitted and returned for counting. The greatest challenges remain in gathering data about sub-aggregates, such as the *reasons* for the rejection of new registrations, civilian absentee ballots, UOCAVA ballots, and provisional ballots.
4. The uncertainty about the future of the EAC undoubtedly presents barriers to the further improvement of the EAVS program.

## **Appendix A**

### **2012 EAVS Questionnaire**

Note: Begins on next page.



## U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION 2012 Election Administration & Voting Survey

The ongoing process of improving America's election systems relies in part on having accurate data about the way Americans cast their ballots. In 2002, Congress chartered the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to collect information on the state of American elections and make it widely available to policy makers, advocates, scholars, journalists and the general public. Since 2004, the Commission has sponsored a biennial survey as its primary tool for fulfilling that mission. We are pleased to present the 2012 Election Administration and Voting Survey, and we ask for your help in making it the most complete and accurate survey in its history.

The questions below ask for information about ballots cast; voter registration; overseas and military voting; Election Day activities; voting technology; and other important issues. The section concerning the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Voting Act (UOCAVA) serves as the EAC's standardized format for state reporting of UOCAVA voting information as required by 42 U.S.C. §1973ff-1. States that complete and timely submit this section to the EAC will fulfill their UOCAVA reporting requirement under 42 U.S.C. §1973ff-1(c). Additionally, EAC is mandated by the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) to collection information from states concerning the impact of that statute on the administration of Federal elections. With this information EAC is required to make a report to Congress and provide recommendations for the improvement of Federal and State procedures, forms, and other NVRA matters. States that timely respond to all questions in this survey concerning voter registration related matters will meet their NVRA reporting requirements under 42 U.S.C. § 1973gg-7 and EAC regulations.

The EAC recognizes the burden that asking for this data places on state and local election officials, and we have worked to minimize that burden as much as possible.

In advance, we thank you for your cooperation and look forward to answering any questions you might have.

### Information supplied by:

Name		Title	
Office/Agency name			
Address 1			
Address 2			
City		State	Zip Code
E-mail address			
Telephone (area code and number)	Extension	Fax number (area code and number)	

**Instructions for Completing the 2012 Election Administration & Voting Survey**

1. This survey collects information on election administration issues in local election offices (typically counties or townships) that are responsible for the administration of the November 2012 general election. As such, all data should be reported at the level of the local jurisdiction. However, the State or Territorial level election office may fill out any or all of the information on behalf of the local election offices under its jurisdiction.
2. Do not leave items blank - always provide an answer to the question asked using the “Data not available” or “Other” categories discussed below, if needed.
3. Use the “Data not available” box if the question asks for details that are not required by your state law or the question asks for information that is not currently collected.
4. You may find it helpful to read an entire section before answering any of the questions in that section.
5. Please attempt to record data according to the categories as they are defined in the question. If your jurisdiction uses a different data classification scheme (for instance, collects data in such a way that combines two or more categories listed in a question), you can use the space provided for “Other” to provide numbers and details on these categories. Use as many “Other” categories as you need to adequately report the relevant statistics for your jurisdiction. If you enter information into the “Other” field, please use the comments field to provide an explanation for the answer.

In the example below, the jurisdiction does not collect separate statistics on the number of duplicate and rejected registration forms, but instead has only one number that represents the total number of registration forms that are either duplicated/or rejected.

**EXAMPLE:**

**A5. In order to evaluate the workflow of your office over the last election cycle, enter the total number of registration forms your jurisdiction received from all sources during the period from the close of registration for the November 2010 general election until the close of registration for the November 2012 general election.** Include here any Election Day or Same Day registrations, if applicable. Also include any special categories of voters who may have extended deadlines, such as returning military personnel, if applicable.

**A5a.** Total .....   Data not available

**Next, divide the total number of registration application forms received (as entered in A5a) into the following categories.**  
The amounts should sum to the total provided in A4a.

		Data not available ▼
<b>A5b.</b> New registrations .....	<input type="text" value="4000"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>A5c.</b> Invalid or rejected (other than duplicates) .....	<input type="text"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>A5d.</b> Duplicate of existing registration .....	<input type="text"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>A5e.</b> Changes to name, party or within-jurisdiction address change .....	<input type="text" value="500"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>A5f.</b> Moved into jurisdiction but was registered elsewhere in the state .....	<input type="text" value="200"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>A5g.</b> Other→ comments: <u>duplicate and invalid registrations combined</u> .....	<input type="text" value="300"/>	
<b>A5h.</b> Other→ comments: .....	<input type="text"/>	
<b>TOTAL</b> .....	<input type="text" value="5000"/>	

**SECTION A**

**VOTER REGISTRATION**

EAC is mandated by the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) to collect information from states concerning the impact of that statute on the administration of Federal elections. With this information EAC is required to make a report to Congress and provide recommendations for the improvement of Federal and State procedures, forms, and other NVRA matters. States that timely respond to all questions in this survey concerning voter registration related matters will meet their NVRA reporting requirements under 42 U.S.C. § 1973gg-7 and EAC regulations.

**Roadmap to Section A:**

- **A1, A2 and A3** ask for information about the number of registered voters in your jurisdiction and how you calculate those statistics.
- **A4** asks for information about registration activity on days in which it was possible for a person to both register and vote on the same day.
- **A5** asks for information on all registration forms for all types of registration transactions (successful and unsuccessful) received by your office.
- **A6** asks for the sources of all registration forms (both successful and unsuccessful).
- **A7** asks for the sources of new registrations.
- **A8** asks for the sources of duplicate registrations.
- **A9** asks for the sources of invalid or rejected registrations.
- **A10** asks for information on removal notices sent under NVRA Section 8(d) 2.
- **A11** asks for the number of voters removed from the voter registration rolls and the reason for their removal.

**A1. Enter the total number of persons in your jurisdiction who were registered and eligible to vote in the November 2012 general election.** Include all persons eligible to vote in the election including special categories of voters with extended deadlines (such as returning military). Do not include any persons under the age of 18 who may be registered under a "pre-registration" program.

A1a. Total  .....  Data not available

**A1 Comments**

**A2. When you report the number of registered voters in your jurisdiction for the November 2012 general election (as in A1a) do you include both active and inactive voters in the count, or does your jurisdiction only include active voters? (Select only one)**

A2a. Jurisdiction uses both active and inactive registered voters .....

A2b. Jurisdiction only uses active registered voters .....

A2c. Other → comments: .....

**A2 Comments**

**A3. Enter the total number of persons who were registered and eligible to vote in the November 2012 general election into the following categories.** Do not include any persons under the age of 18 who may be registered under a "pre-registration" program.

Data not available  
▼

**A3a.** Active..........

**A3b.** Inactive..........

**A3 Comments**

**A4. If your state's laws allowed any voters to register and then to vote on the same day, enter the total number of registration forms received on those days in which it was possible to both register for and vote in the November 2012 general election on the same day.** This question includes jurisdictions in states that have formal Election Day Registration or Same Day Registration and those states that have other situations that provide Election Day Registration or Same Day Registration. This question includes jurisdictions in states that permit Election Day Registration for voting for office of President, such as Connecticut and Rhode Island.

**A4a.** Total new Same Day registrations........ Data not available

..... Not applicable

**A4b. Are the numbers you provided for question A4a because your state allows Election Day Registration or Same Day Registration for all voters, or does your answer come from a different circumstance?**

- .....Yes, our state has Election Day Registration or Same Day Registration.
- .... No, our state does not have formal Election Day Registration or Same Day Registration, but some voters were able to register and vote on the same day for the 2012 election.
- .... Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- .... Not applicable.

**A4 Comments**

**A5. In order to evaluate the workflow of your office over the last election cycle, enter the total number of forms your jurisdiction received from all sources during the period from the close of registration for the November 2010 general election until the close of registration for the November 2012 general election.** Include any forms that were processed, such as changes to name, party or address, duplicates, or pre-registrations. Include here any Election Day or Same Day registrations, if applicable. Also include any special categories of voters who may have extended deadlines such as returning military personnel, if applicable.

**A5a.** Total .....   Data not available

**Next, divide the total number of registration application forms received (as entered in A5a) into the following categories.** The amounts should sum to the total provided in A5a.

Data not available  
▼

**A5b.** New valid registrations (excluding pre-registrations of persons under 18) ...  .....

**A5c.** New "pre" registrations of persons under age 18 .....  .....

**A5d.** Duplicate of existing valid registration .....  .....

**A5e.** Invalid or rejected (other than duplicates) .....  .....

**A5f.** Changes to name, party or within-jurisdiction address change .....  .....

**A5g.** Address changes that cross jurisdiction borders .....  .....

**A5h.** Other → comments: .....

**A5i.** Other → comments: .....

**A5j.** Other → comments: .....

**A5k.** Other → comments: .....

**A5l.** Other → comments: .....

TOTAL .....

**A5 Comments**

**A6a through A6o: Divide the total number of all registration forms received (as entered in A5a) into the following sources.**  
**A7a through A7o: Divide the total number of new registration forms received (as entered in A5b) into the following sources.**  
**A8a through A8o: Divide the total number of duplicate registration forms received (as entered in A5d) into the following sources.**  
**A9a through A9o: Divide the total number of invalid or rejected registration forms (as entered in A5e) received into the following sources.**

\*Sub-question "e" should include all forms handled through the public assistance agency process (i.e., paper, online).

	<i>(from A5a)</i>		<i>(from A5b)</i>		<i>(from A5d)</i>		<i>(from A5e)</i>	
	A6. Total forms received	NA ▼	A7. New registrations	NA ▼	A8. Duplicate of existing registrations	NA ▼	A9. Invalid or rejected	NA ▼
a. <u>Individual voters</u> submitting applications by mail, fax, or email .....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <u>Individual voters</u> registering in person at the election/registrar's office .....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. <u>Individual voters</u> submitting registration forms via the Internet.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Motor vehicle offices or other offices that issue drivers licenses.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Public assistance offices mandated as registration sites under NVRA .....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. State funded agencies primarily serving persons with disabilities.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Armed forces recruitment offices.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other agencies designated by the State not mandated by NVRA.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Registration drives from advocacy groups or political parties .....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Other → comments: .....	<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>	
k. Other → comments: .....	<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>	
l. Other → comments: .....	<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>	
m. Other → comments: .....	<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>	
n. Other → comments: .....	<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>	
o. Other → comments: .....	<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>	
<b>TOTAL.....</b>	<b>A5a</b>		<b>A5b</b>		<b>A5d</b>		<b>A5e</b>	

**A6, A7, A8, and A9 Comments**

**A10. Enter the total number of confirmation notices sent to voters in the period between the close of registration for the November 2010 general election and the close of registration for the November 2012 general election, because the person had not voted or appeared to vote in the two previous federal elections (per NVRA Section 8 (d) (2)).**

**A10a.** Total  .....  Data not available

**Next, divide the total number of confirmation notices mailed (as entered in A10a) into the following categories.** The amounts should sum to the total provided in A10a.

		Data not available ▼
<b>A10b.</b> Received back from voters confirming registration .....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>A10c.</b> Received back confirming registration should be invalidated .....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>A10d.</b> Returned back as undeliverable.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>A10e.</b> Status unknown (neither received confirmation nor returned undeliverable).....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>A10f.</b> Other → comments: .....	<input type="text"/>	
<b>A10g.</b> Other → comments: .....	<input type="text"/>	
<b>A10h.</b> Other → comments: .....	<input type="text"/>	
<b>TOTAL</b> .....	<b>A10a</b>	

**A10 Comments**

**A11. Enter the total number of voters removed from the voter registration rolls in your jurisdiction in the period between the close of registration for the November 2010 general election and the close of registration for the November 2012 general election. Note this question asks for those ineligible to vote, not merely those moved into an "inactive" status.**

**A11a.** Total  .....  Data not available

**Next, divide the total number of voters removed (as entered in A11a) into the following categories. The amounts should sum to the total provided in A11a.**

Data not available  
▼

**A11b.** Moved outside jurisdiction.....  .....

**A11c.** Death.....  .....

**A11d.** Disqualifying felony conviction .....  .....

**A11e.** Failure to respond to notice sent and failure to vote in the two most recent federal elections.....  .....

**A11f.** Declared mentally incompetent.....  .....

**A11g.** Voter requested to be removed for reasons other than felony conviction, mental status, or moved outside jurisdiction .....  .....

**A11h.** Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**A11i.** Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**A11j.** Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**A11k.** Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL**.....

**A11 Comments**

**SECTION B**

**UNIFORMED & OVERSEAS CITIZENS ABSENTEE VOTING ACT (UOCAVA)**

Section B serves as the EAC's standardized format for the state reporting of UOCAVA voting information as required by 42 U.S.C. §1973ff-1. States that complete and timely submit this section to the EAC will fulfill their UOCAVA reporting requirement under 42 U.S.C §1973ff-1(c).

Pursuant UOCAVA, this section collects various data elements needed to determine: (1) the combined number of absentee ballots transmitted to UOCAVA voters; (2) the combined number of ballots returned by UOCAVA voters; and (3) the combined number of returned ballots cast by UOCAVA voters (the number of cast ballots is practically determined by collecting data concerning the total votes counted and rejected).

**Roadmap to Section B:**

- **B1 and B2** ask for information about the number and type of UOCAVA absentee ballots transmitted.
- **B3** asks for the number and type of all UOCAVA ballots returned and submitted for counting.
- **B4, B5, B6, and B7** asks for information on the type of UOCAVA ballot returned by type of UOCAVA voter.
- **B8** asks for the number and type of all UOCAVA ballots counted.
- **B9, B10, B11, and B12** asks for information on the type of UOCAVA ballot counted by type of UOCAVA voter.
- **B13** asks for the number and type of all UOCAVA ballots rejected.
- **B14** asks for information on reasons why UOCAVA ballots were rejected.
- **B15, B16, B17, and B18** asks for information on the type of UOCAVA ballot rejected by type of UOCAVA voter.

**B1. Enter the total number of absentee ballots transmitted to UOCAVA voters for the November 2012 general election.**

**B1a.** Total  .....  Data not available

**Next, divide the total number of absentee ballots transmitted to UOCAVA voters (as entered in B1a) into the following categories.** The amounts should sum to the total provided in B1a.

	<input type="checkbox"/> Data not available ▼
<b>B1b.</b> Uniformed services voters – domestic or foreign .....	<input type="text"/> ..... <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>B1c.</b> Non-military/civilian overseas voters .....	<input type="text"/> ..... <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>B1d.</b> Other → comments: .....	<input type="text"/>
<b>B1e.</b> Other → comments: .....	<input type="text"/>
<b>TOTAL</b> .....	<input type="text" value="B1a"/>

**B1 Comments**

**B2. Of the UOCAVA absentee ballots transmitted (as entered in B1a) how many were:**

Data not available  
▼

<b>B2a.</b> Returned by voter and submitted for counting (include both those that were counted and those that were rejected).....		.....	
<b>B2b.</b> Returned as undeliverable .....		.....	
<b>B2c.</b> Spoiled or replaced ballots.....		.....	
<b>B2d.</b> Status unknown (neither returned undeliverable nor returned from voter) ...		.....	
<b>B2e.</b> Other → comments: .....			
<b>B2f.</b> Other → comments: .....			
<b>B2g.</b> Other → comments: .....			
<b>TOTAL</b> .....	B1a		

**B2 Comments**

**B3. Enter the total number of all UOCAVA ballots (including regular UOCAVA absentee ballots and Federal Write-in Absentee Ballots (FWAB)) returned by UOCAVA voters and submitted for counting for the November 2012 general election. Please include both those ballots that were later counted and those that were rejected. Do not include ballots that were returned undeliverable.**

B3a. Total  .....  Data not available

**B3 Comments**

**B4a through B4c. Divide the total number of UOCAVA ballots returned by UOCAVA voters and submitted for counting (as entered in B3) into each category of UOCAVA voter below.**

Next, for each type of UOCAVA voter, enter the number of:

- B5a through B5c: Regular UOCAVA absentee ballots returned and submitted for counting.
- B6a through B6c: FWAB returned and submitted for counting.
- B7a through B7c: Other type of ballots returned and submitted for counting.

*Of the total UOCAVA ballots returned (as entered in B3), how many were ballots of each of the following ballot types:*

	B4. All UOCAVA ballots		B5. Absentee ballots		B6. FWAB		B7. Other type of ballot →	
		NA ▼		NA ▼		NA ▼		NA ▼
<b>Type of UOCAVA voter:</b>								
a. Uniformed services voters – domestic or foreign	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Non-military/civilian overseas voters .....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Other type of voter → .....	<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>	
comments: _____								
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>B3</b>						

**B4, B5, B6, and B7 Comments**

**B8. Enter the total number of all UOCAVA ballots (including regular UOCAVA absentee ballots and FWAB) counted in the November 2012 general election.**

B8a. Total  .....  Data not available

**B8 Comments**

**B9a through B9c. Divide the total number of UOCAVA ballots counted (as entered in B8) into each category of UOCAVA voter below.**

**Next, for each type of UOCAVA voter, enter the number of:**

- **B10a through B10c: Regular UOCAVA absentee ballots counted.**
- **B11a through B11c: FWAB counted.**
- **B12a through B12c: Other type of ballots counted.**

		<i>Of the total UOCAVA ballots counted (as entered in B8), how many were ballots of each of the following ballot types:</i>													
		<b>B9. All UOCAVA ballots</b>		<b>B10. Absentee ballots</b>		<b>B11. FWAB</b>		<b>B12. Other type of ballot →</b>							
			NA ▼		NA ▼		NA ▼		NA ▼		NA ▼		NA ▼		NA ▼
<b>Type of UOCAVA voter:</b>															
<b>a.</b>	Uniformed services voters – domestic or foreign.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>b.</b>	Non-military/civilian overseas voters.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>c.</b>	Other type of voter →..... comments: _____	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>TOTAL.....</b>		<b>B8</b>		<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**B9, B10, B11 and B12 Comments**

**B13. Enter the total number of UOCAVA ballots (including regular UOCAVA absentee ballots and FWAB) rejected in the November 2012 general election.**

B13a. Total  .....  Data not available

**B13 Comments**

**B14. Please divide the total number of all UOCAVA ballots rejected (as entered in B13a) into the following categories indicating the reason the absentee ballots were rejected.** The amounts should sum to the total provided in B13a.

	Data not available	▼
<b>B14a.</b> Ballot not received on time/missed deadline .....		<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>B14b.</b> Problem with voter signature.....		<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>B14c.</b> Ballot lacked a postmark .....		<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>B14d.</b> Other → comments: .....		
<b>B14e.</b> Other → comments: .....		
<b>B14f.</b> Other → comments: .....		
<b>TOTAL</b> .....	<b>B13a</b>	

**B14 Comments**

**B15a through B15c. Divide the total number of UOCAVA ballots rejected (as entered in B13) into each category of UOCAVA voter below.**

Next, for each type of UOCAVA voter, enter the number of:

- **B16a through B16c: Regular UOCAVA absentee ballots rejected.**
- **B17a through B17c: FWAB rejected.**
- **B18a through B18c: Other type of ballots rejected.**

		Of the total UOCAVA ballots rejected (as entered in B13), how many were ballots of each of the following ballot types:						
B15. All UOCAVA ballots		B16. Absentee ballots		B17. FWAB		B18. Other type of ballot →		
		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
		▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	
<b>Type of UOCAVA voter:</b>								
a. Uniformed services voters – domestic or foreign .....		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Non-military/civilian overseas voters .....		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Other type of voter → .....								
comments .....								
<b>TOTAL</b> .....	<b>B13</b>							

**B15, B16, B17, and B18 Comments**

**SECTION C**

**Domestic Civilian Absentee Ballots**

**Roadmap to Section C.**

- **C1** asks for information about absentee ballots transmitted and the status of the transmitted ballots.
- **C2** and **C3** ask for information on any voters who may be registered as permanent absentee voters.
- **C4** asks for information on the status of absentee ballots returned and submitted for counting.
- **C5** asks for information on the reasons absentee ballots were rejected.

**C1. Enter the total number of domestic civilian absentee ballots transmitted to voters for the November 2012 general election.** Do not include absentee ballots transmitted to UOCAVA voters

**C1a.** Total  .....  Data not available

**Next, divide the total number of absentee ballots transmitted to voters (as entered in C1a) into the following categories.** The amounts should sum to the total provided in C1a.

Data not available  
▼

**C1b.** Returned by voters and submitted for counting (include both those that were later counted and those that were rejected) .....  .....

**C1c.** Returned as undeliverable .....  .....

**C1d.** Spoiled or replaced ballots .....  .....

**C1e.** Status unknown (neither returned undeliverable nor returned from voter)....  .....

**C1f.** Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_ .....

**C1g.** Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_ .....

**C1h.** Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_ .....

TOTAL .....

**C1 Comments**

**C2. Does your jurisdiction have a permanent absentee voter registration list in which voters may apply to receive an absentee (or mail) ballot for subsequent elections without further application?** Do not include UOCAVA voters.

..... Yes → Continue to question C3.

..... No → Skip to question C4.

**C2 Comments**

**C3. Of the total number of domestic civilian absentee ballots transmitted (as entered in C1) how many ballots were sent to voters in your jurisdiction because they appear on a permanent absentee (or mail) ballot voter registration list?**

Total  .....  Data not available

**C3 Comments**

**C4. Of the total number of absentee ballots returned by voters and submitted for counting (as entered in C1b) how many ballots were:**

Data not available  
▼

**C4a.** Counted in the November 2012 general election.....  .....

**C4b.** Rejected in the November 2012 general election.....  .....

**C4c.** Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_ .....

**C4d.** Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_ .....

TOTAL ..... **C1b**

**C4 Comments**

**C5. Please divide the total number of domestic civilian absentee ballots rejected (as entered in C4b) into the following categories indicating the reason why the absentee ballots were rejected.** The amounts should sum to the total provided in C4b.

Data not available  
▼

<b>C5a.</b> Ballot not received on time/missed deadline.....		.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C5b.</b> No voter signature.....		.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C5c.</b> No witness signature.....		.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C5d.</b> Non-matching signature.....		.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C5e.</b> No election official's signature on ballot.....		.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C5f.</b> Ballot returned in an unofficial envelope.....		.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C5g.</b> Ballot missing from envelope.....		.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C5h.</b> Envelope not sealed.....		.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C5i.</b> No resident address on envelope.....		.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C5j.</b> Multiple ballots returned in one envelope.....		.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C5k.</b> Voter deceased.....		.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C5l.</b> Voter already voted in person.....		.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C5m.</b> First-time voter without proper identification.....		.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C5n.</b> No ballot application on record.....		.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C5o.</b> Other → comments: .....		.....	
<b>C5p.</b> Other → comments: .....		.....	
<b>C5q.</b> Other → comments: .....		.....	
<b>C5r.</b> Other → comments: .....		.....	
<b>C5s.</b> Other → comments: .....		.....	
<b>C5t.</b> Other → comments: .....		.....	
<b>C5u.</b> Other → comments: .....		.....	
<b>C5v.</b> Other → comments: .....		.....	
<b>TOTAL</b> .....	<b>C4b</b>		

**C5 Comments**

**SECTION D**

**Election Administration**

- **D1** asks for information on the number of precincts in your jurisdiction
- **D2** asks for information on the number and type of polling places in your jurisdiction
- **D3, D4, and D5** ask for information on poll workers utilized in the November 2012 general election.

**D1. Enter the total number of precincts in your jurisdictions for the November 2012 general election.**

D1a. Total  .....  Data not available

**D1 Comments**

**D2. Enter the total number of physical polling places in your jurisdiction for the November 2012 general election.**

Please include physical polling places in operation on Election Day and physical polling places in operation before Election Day (such as early vote centers).

D2a. Total  .....  Data not available

**Next, divide the total physical polling places in your jurisdiction (as entered in D2a) into the following categories.** The amounts should sum to the total provided in D2a. If you do not include election offices in your count of polling places, enter 0.

Data not available  
▼

**Election Day voting**

D2b. Physical polling places other than election offices .....  .....

D2c. Election offices .....  .....

D2d. Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_ .....

**Early voting**

D2e. Physical polling places other than election offices .....  .....

D2f. Election offices .....  .....

D2g. Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_ .....

TOTAL.....

**D2 Comments**

**D3. Enter the total number of poll workers used in your jurisdiction for the November 2012 general election.**

- Poll workers may include election judges, booth workers, wardens, commissioners, or other similar terms that refer to persons who verify the identity of a voter; assist the voter with signing the register, affidavits or other documents required to cast a ballot; assist the voter by providing the voter with a ballot or setting up the voting machine for the voter; and serving other functions as dictated by State law.
- Include all people recruited specifically for the purposes of working at physical polling places in operation on and/or before Election Day, but, do not include observers stationed at the polling places or regular office staff.

D3a. Total  .....  Data not available

**D3 Comments**

**D4. If your jurisdiction has data on the ages of its poll workers (for example, from voter registration records, payroll records or from poll worker applications), enter the total number of poll workers in each age category.**

- D4a. Under 18 years old .....
- D4b. 18 to 25 .....
- D4c. 26 to 40 .....
- D4d. 41 to 60 .....
- D4e. 61 to 70 .....
- D4f. 71 years old and over .....

Data not available

**D4 Comments**

**D5. How difficult or easy was it for your jurisdiction to obtain a sufficient number of poll workers for the November 2012 general election?**

- ..... Very difficult
- ..... Somewhat difficult
- ..... Neither difficult nor easy
- ..... Somewhat easy
- ..... Very easy
- ..... Not enough information to answer

**D5 Comments**

**SECTION E**

**Provisional Ballots**

- **E1** asks for the information on the number and status of provisional ballots submitted.
- **E2** asks for the information on reasons why provisional ballots were rejected.

**E1. Enter the total number of voters who submitted provisional ballots in the November 2012 general election.**

**E1a.**Total  .....  Data not available

**Next, divide the total number of voters who submitted provisional ballots in the November 2012 general election (as entered in E1) into the following categories.**

Data not available  
▼

**E1b.** Counted the full ballot.....

**E1c.** Counted part of the ballot.....

**E1d.** Rejected ballot.....

**E1e.** Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**E1f.** Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL** .....  **E1a**

**E1 Comments**

**E2. Please divide the total number of provisional ballots rejected (as entered in E1d) into the following categories indicating the reason the provisional ballots were rejected.** The amounts should sum to the total provided in E1d.

Data not available  
▼

- E2a. Voter not registered in the state .....
- E2b. Voter registered in state but attempted to vote in the wrong jurisdiction .....
- E2c. Voter registered in state but attempted to vote in the wrong precinct.....
- E2d. Failure to provide sufficient identification .....
- E2e. Envelop and/or ballot was incomplete and/or illegible .....
- E2f. Ballot missing from envelope .....
- E2g. No signature.....
- E2h. Non-matching signature .....
- E2i. Voter already voted .....
- E2j. Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- E2k. Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- E2l. Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- E2m. Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- E2n. Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- E2o. Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- E2p. Other → comments: \_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL ..... E1d

**E2 Comments**

**SECTION F**

**Election Day Activities**

- **F1** and **F2** ask for turnout figures for the November 2012 general election and the source used to arrive at this number.
- **F3** asks for the number of first time voters who registered to vote by mail and, under HAVA 303(b), were required to provide identification in order to vote.
- **F4** asks for information on electronic poll books or electronic lists of voters that may have been used.
- **F5 and F6** ask for information on printed poll books or printed lists of voters that may have been used.
- **F7** asks for the type of primary voting equipment used.
- **F8** solicits any additional comments jurisdictions may wish to share regarding their Election Day experiences.

**F1. Enter the total number of people in your jurisdiction who participated in the November 2012 general election.**

Include all type of voters (civilian and military) by all types of ballots. Include rejected provisional ballots only if your jurisdiction credits the person's vote history even though the provisional ballot was rejected.

**F1a.** Total  .....  Data not available

**Next, divide the total number people who participated in the November 2012 general election (as entered in F1a) into the following categories.** The amounts should sum to the total provided in F1a.

Data not available  
▼

**F1b.** Voted at a physical polling place on Election Day (not including provisional ballots or absentee ballots dropped off at the polls).....

**F1c.** UOCAVA voters who voted via absentee or FWAB (as in B2a) .....

**F1d.** Voted using a domestic civilian absentee ballot (as in C1b).....

**F1e.** Voted using a provisional ballot (as in E1).....

**F1f.** Voted at an early vote center (as in D2e,f,g).....

**F1g.** Voted by mail in a vote by mail jurisdiction.....

**F1h.** Other → comments: .....

**F1i.** Other → comments: .....

**F1j.** Other → comments: .....

TOTAL .....

**F1 Comments**

**F2. Indicate the source used to arrive at the total number of voters entered in F1a. (Select only one source.)**

- ..... Number of voters checked off by poll workers or who signed poll books at physical polling places plus the number of UOCAVA and other absentee or early voters.
- ..... Number of ballots counted at precincts and/or at a central location (including UOCAVA and other absentee or early vote ballots)
- ..... Number of voters generated after "vote history" has been added.
- ..... Number of votes cast for the highest office on the ballot.
- ..... Other:→ comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**F2 Comments**

**F3. HAVA 303(b) states that all first-time voters in a State who registered to vote by mail are required to provide identification in order to vote and have their ballot counted. Enter the number of first-time voters who provided identification and were able to vote in the November 2012 general election in your jurisdiction.**

Total ..... Data not available ..... Not applicable

**F3 Comments**

**F4. Were electronic poll books or electronic lists of voters used at the polling place for the November 2012 general election in your jurisdiction to (select either Yes or No for each item):**

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
a. Sign voters in .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Update voter history .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Look up polling places.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Other → comments: _____.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Information unavailable .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**F4 Comments**

**F5. Did your jurisdiction use printed lists of registered voters at the polls in the November 2012 Federal general election?**

Yes .....  → Continue to F6

No.....  → Skip to F7

Information unavailable .....  → Skip to F7

**F5 Comments**

**F6. Did your state print and ship the printed poll books to your local jurisdiction or did your jurisdiction arrange for the printing of the poll books? (Select only one.)**

State printed poll books and shipped to jurisdiction.....

Jurisdiction arranged for printing of poll books .....

Combination of printing by the state and local jurisdiction .....

Information unavailable .....

**F6 Comments**

**F7. Enter information on the number and type of voting equipment used for the 2012 November general election. Then, for each type of voting equipment, please identify how the machines were used in the voting process and where the ballots from that machine type were tallied. Do not include backup systems that were not actually used.**

Type of Equipment	Number used	Make	Model	Version	Vendor	Machine use (select all that apply)	Location of Vote Tally (select all that apply)
<b>F7a.</b> Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) (Not Equipped with Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail (VVPAT))	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> In-Precinct regular ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available				
						<input type="checkbox"/> Special Device accessible to disabled voters	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Early Vote Site voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	
<b>F7b.</b> Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) (Equipped with VVPAT)	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> In-Precinct regular ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available				
						<input type="checkbox"/> Special Device accessible to disabled voters	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Early Vote Site voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	

Type of Equipment	Number used	Make	Model	Version	Vendor	Machine use (select all that apply)	Location of Vote Tally (select all that apply)
<b>F7c.</b> Electronic system that prints voter choices on an optical scan ballot (hybrid of a DRE and an optical scan system)	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> In-Precinct regular ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Special Device accessible to disabled voters	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Early Vote Site voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	
<b>F7d.</b> Optical/Digital Scan	Number of counters:  _____  Number of booths:  _____  <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> In-Precinct regular ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available				
						<input type="checkbox"/> Special Device accessible to disabled voters	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Early Vote Site voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Absentee	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	

Type of Equipment	Number used	Make	Model	Version	Vendor	Machine use (select all that apply)	Location of Vote Tally (select all that apply)
<b>F7e. Punch Card</b>	Number of counters: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> In-Precinct regular ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available			
	Number of booths: _____					<input type="checkbox"/> Special Device accessible to disabled voters	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available					<input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Early Vote Site voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available Place
						<input type="checkbox"/> Absentee	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	
<b>F7f. Lever</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> In-Precinct regular ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available				
						<input type="checkbox"/> Special Device accessible to disabled voters	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Early Vote Site voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	

Type of Equipment	Number used	Make	Model	Version	Vendor	Machine use (select all that apply)	Location of Vote Tally (select all that apply)
<b>F7g.</b> Hand-counted paper ballots (not optical scan system)	Number of booths:  _____  <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available					<input type="checkbox"/> In-Precinct regular ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available Place
						<input type="checkbox"/> Special Device accessible to disabled voters	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available Place
						<input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available Place
						<input type="checkbox"/> Early Vote Site voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Absentee	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	
<b>F7h.</b> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	<input type="checkbox"/> In-Precinct regular ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Special Device accessible to disabled voters	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Early Vote Site voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available Place
						<input type="checkbox"/> Absentee	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	
OMB Control No. 3265-0006					27	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available Expiration Date 5/31/2013	

Type of Equipment	Number used	Make	Model	Version	Vendor	Machine use (select all that apply)	Location of Vote Tally (select all that apply)
F7i. Other						<input type="checkbox"/> In-Precinct regular ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Special Device accessible to disabled voters	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Ballot voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Early Vote Site voting	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Precinct/Polling Place <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available Place
						<input type="checkbox"/> Absentee	<input type="checkbox"/> A Central Location <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available
						<input type="checkbox"/> Not Available	

**F8. The U.S. Election Assistance Commission welcomes any general comments the jurisdiction may wish to share regarding its Election Day experiences (e.g., problems with voting system anomalies\*, recounts, staffing, challenges to eligibility, long lines, etc.), or note worthy success in administering the November 2012 general election. Please feel free to attach additional pages as necessary.**

\* An anomaly is defined as an irregular or inconsistent action or response from the voting system or system component resulting in some disruption to the election process. Incidents resulting from administrator error or procedural deficiencies are not considered anomalies for purposes of this survey question (*EAC Voting Systems Testing and Certification Program Manual*).

## END OF SURVEY

### THANK YOU FOR RESPONDING TO THIS SURVEY

\* This information collection is required for the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to meet its statutory requirements under the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15301), the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-1 et seq.), and the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voters Act (UOCAVA) (42 U.S.C. 1973ff-1). Respondent's obligation to reply to this information collection is mandatory as required under NVRA (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-1 et seq.) and UOCAVA (42 U.S.C. 1973ff-1); respondents include the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Territories. This information will be made publicly available on the EAC Web site (<http://www.eac.gov>). According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is OMB Control No. 3265-0006 (expires 5/31/2013). The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 88 hours per State response. This estimate includes the time for reviewing the instructions, gathering information, and completing the form. Comments regarding this burden estimate should be sent the U.S. Election Assistance Commission – 2012 Election Administration and Voting Survey, 1201 New York Avenue, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20005.

## Appendix B

### Values of Pew Elections Performance Index Indicators Using 2012 Draft EAVS Data

State	Absentee ballots rejected			Absentee ballots not returned			EAVS data completeness		
	2008	2010	2012	2008	2010	2012	2008	2010	2012
AL							48.6%	59.4%	58.2%
AK	2.1%	2.9%	3.2%	16.5%	15.6%	15.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
AZ	0.6%	0.8%	0.8%	6.4%	23.1%	19.7%	98.9%	99.1%	99.1%
AR		5.5%	3.2%		9.7%	9.1%	70.8%	97.7%	96.9%
CA	2.2%	1.4%	0.9%	16.2%	30.9%	29.4%	96.8%	98.5%	98.3%
CO	0.5%	0.6%	0.9%	9.0%	22.0%	12.5%	94.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CT	2.1%	1.9%	2.0%		6.5%	8.7%	77.7%	94.4%	77.8%
DE	1.6%	1.2%	1.2%	3.6%	4.5%	7.6%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DC	8.6%	8.6%	3.5%	3.7%	32.7%	28.2%	77.8%	100.0%	100.0%
FL	1.0%	1.4%	0.9%	14.1%	29.0%	18.2%	100.0%	88.9%	100.0%
GA	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	1.6%	2.6%	1.7%	99.9%	99.3%	83.1%
HI	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	8.9%	7.7%	9.8%	90.1%	92.6%	98.2%
ID	0.5%	1.6%	0.6%	3.3%	6.6%	3.3%	94.4%	94.4%	83.3%
IL	0.6%	2.0%	0.0%	7.4%	17.3%	0.7%	63.9%	93.8%	81.9%
IN		3.3%	2.2%	3.7%		0.7%	94.4%	98.3%	99.3%
IA	0.7%	1.2%	1.2%	5.1%	6.0%	7.0%	94.4%	99.9%	100.0%
KS	1.4%	2.7%		6.6%	16.3%		88.6%	100.0%	93.2%
KY	1.7%	1.7%	5.4%	6.2%	3.2%	0.0%	72.2%	100.0%	100.0%
LA	0.7%	0.6%	5.4%	2.6%	6.1%	21.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ME	0.8%	0.8%	1.2%	2.8%	3.7%	3.2%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MD	1.0%	1.3%	1.1%	9.3%	14.6%	12.5%	88.9%	100.0%	100.0%
MA	1.0%		1.0%	9.1%	5.9%	8.2%	66.7%	87.6%	100.0%
MI	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	2.5%	4.6%	2.9%	96.3%	100.0%	100.0%
MN	3.0%	5.9%	2.9%		7.1%	4.3%	96.8%	97.5%	100.0%
MS							73.6%	78.5%	64.4%
MO	1.7%	1.8%	2.0%	4.3%	3.7%	4.6%	95.7%	97.6%	99.5%
MT	0.9%	0.5%	0.3%	4.1%	9.2%	9.3%	99.6%	99.9%	100.0%
NE	1.1%	1.3%	1.9%	4.0%	8.2%	10.6%	100.0%	97.4%	98.2%
NV	6.3%	1.7%	1.5%	8.8%	14.1%	15.0%	99.7%	98.7%	99.8%
NH	1.8%	2.3%	2.6%	4.7%	5.3%	4.7%	68.8%	81.3%	100.0%
NJ	4.3%	2.9%	2.3%	43.4%	21.9%	15.6%	89.5%	100.0%	100.0%
NM					0.0%	6.2%	81.2%	89.6%	82.2%
NY							0.0%	66.5%	58.9%
NC	11.9%	1.4%	1.1%	14.5%	11.8%	10.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ND	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%	6.4%	6.1%	5.5%	93.3%	86.7%	73.3%
OH	1.6%	1.7%	1.0%	5.1%	8.3%	6.4%	97.5%	99.1%	99.2%
OK	2.7%	1.3%	3.1%	17.0%	8.1%	15.6%	94.4%	94.2%	94.4%
OR		1.8%	2.3%		42.8%	27.5%	48.7%	90.2%	94.4%
PA	0.7%	1.9%	0.7%	11.3%	10.8%	12.1%	94.4%	100.0%	100.0%
RI	0.4%	1.1%	1.3%	2.8%	10.8%	9.9%	50.0%	94.4%	94.4%
SC	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%	2.6%	3.3%	3.2%	88.0%	88.9%	81.8%
SD		0.3%	0.2%	2.5%	2.5%	2.2%	82.0%	96.9%	97.3%
TN	2.5%	0.8%	1.1%		6.6%	7.4%	88.4%	98.0%	99.0%
TX	4.6%	1.6%		8.7%	8.3%	6.3%	97.4%	100.0%	94.3%
UT	2.0%	1.3%	1.1%	25.0%	30.8%	22.6%	97.4%	100.0%	94.4%
VT	1.4%	1.2%		3.1%	7.0%	4.4%	99.1%	90.8%	92.4%
VA	1.3%	0.5%	0.5%	7.3%	3.7%	4.0%	99.8%	89.5%	99.3%
WA	0.9%	1.3%	1.0%	13.5%	27.4%	18.1%	88.7%	96.5%	99.0%
WV			0.2%		51.6%	8.8%	76.8%	81.4%	96.0%
WI	0.4%	1.2%	0.6%	5.3%	5.8%	6.7%	86.7%	87.5%	100.0%
WY	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	2.8%	4.5%	2.7%	90.5%	93.8%	93.8%

Appendix B, continued.

State	UOCAVA ballots rejected			UOCAVA ballots not returned		
	2008	2010	2012	2008	2010	2012
AL		19.2%		31.0%	76.4%	
AK	4.3%	4.2%	8.2%	15.5%	48.3%	19.3%
AZ	1.9%	3.6%	1.0%	36.6%	67.3%	28.6%
AR		4.2%	10.0%	29.5%	52.5%	28.2%
CA	5.7%	4.5%	8.5%	37.3%	72.2%	46.0%
CO	5.8%	3.0%	3.7%	26.2%	57.0%	30.4%
CT		1.6%	1.0%		36.0%	11.5%
DE	7.4%	4.3%	9.8%	22.6%	63.9%	28.5%
DC		10.9%	1.5%	53.5%	71.2%	18.6%
FL	2.4%	4.1%	3.1%	21.6%	59.6%	25.0%
GA	2.3%	4.5%	2.4%	31.3%	79.9%	34.5%
HI		6.2%	0.0%		34.1%	32.6%
ID	12.8%	20.9%	13.6%	22.7%	52.9%	18.5%
IL	3.0%	4.7%		30.6%	78.2%	
IN		6.8%	20.6%	47.2%	73.7%	13.5%
IA	8.1%	3.7%	5.9%	25.0%	55.1%	21.6%
KS	10.1%	3.6%	5.7%	24.5%	70.2%	22.8%
KY		6.6%	8.1%	25.0%	26.5%	22.4%
LA	6.9%	10.1%	4.3%	29.1%	86.8%	38.8%
ME	5.6%		7.9%		51.1%	25.5%
MD	8.6%	15.6%	11.2%	17.4%	74.6%	25.8%
MA	7.4%	7.9%	0.5%	26.1%	32.5%	18.1%
MI	9.1%	8.9%	8.7%	27.3%	32.8%	25.1%
MN	6.4%	7.3%	7.6%	27.8%	35.0%	21.1%
MS						
MO	4.6%	7.7%	3.8%	19.1%	61.0%	21.7%
MT	6.7%	3.8%	1.0%	32.5%	60.8%	33.0%
NE	7.9%	11.6%	4.6%	18.8%	63.9%	14.6%
NV	12.9%	12.4%	4.3%	37.4%	26.9%	17.9%
NH	4.4%	4.3%	7.3%	18.0%	47.2%	12.7%
NJ	2.9%	4.5%	1.4%	31.6%	75.0%	29.0%
NM	2.0%			25.5%		
NY		25.4%			60.3%	
NC	7.9%	8.4%	0.9%	33.0%	78.2%	20.9%
ND	2.3%	0.5%	1.4%	23.4%	33.8%	18.3%
OH	4.9%	5.6%	2.3%	18.5%	61.7%	20.6%
OK	6.0%	8.3%	5.5%	27.7%	72.0%	31.1%
OR		7.7%	2.1%		65.3%	34.3%
PA	0.7%	1.9%	1.9%	20.6%	64.7%	30.7%
RI		0.0%	0.2%	20.5%	35.9%	33.2%
SC	3.1%	2.0%		26.3%	27.3%	22.3%
SD			5.6%	14.7%	25.8%	21.8%
TN	5.4%	3.9%	5.9%	17.4%	29.3%	22.1%
TX	6.4%	4.2%	16.4%	30.7%	74.8%	51.5%
UT	4.2%	2.2%	1.6%	31.2%	72.2%	28.3%
VT	6.0%		1.8%	15.5%		21.2%
VA	7.8%		1.7%	29.9%	69.9%	16.9%
WA	1.2%	1.3%	1.1%	28.2%	60.5%	36.7%
WV			0.2%		33.3%	20.8%
WI	3.9%	12.1%	7.1%	31.0%	64.1%	33.6%
WY		3.4%	3.3%	23.4%	48.3%	28.5%

