

**APPENDIX A: NATIONAL SURVEY
OF
LOCAL ELECTION OFFICIALS'
EXPERIENCES WITH PROVISIONAL VOTING**

Conducted by:

**Eagleton Institute of Politics
Center for Public Interest Polling**

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
RUTGERS

Data Collection:

July-August 2005

**NATIONAL SURVEY
OF
LOCAL ELECTIONS OFFICIALS'
EXPERIENCES WITH PROVISIONAL VOTING**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	i
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Project Background and Objectives.....	1
B. Summary of the Research Methodology.....	1
D. Profile of Study Participants.....	2
C. Organization of the Report.....	2
E. Statistical Tabulations.....	5
 APPENDICES:	
A. SURVEY METHODOLOGY	
B. PRE-NOTIFICATION LETTER	
C. ANNOTATED QUESTIONNAIRE	
D. VERBATIM RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS	

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: NATIONAL SURVEY OF
LOCAL ELECTION OFFICIALS'
EXPERIENCES WITH PROVISIONAL VOTING**

To assess and improve the experiences of local elections officials with provisional voting, the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP) at the Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University conducted a national survey of local elections officials.

Telephone interviews were conducted between July 21 and August 4, 2005 with a random sample of 400 local election officials. The sample of local election officials were drawn from counties, or equivalent election jurisdictions such as boroughs, municipalities, parishes, towns or cities. The sample of local election officials was then stratified according to when the state had enacted provisional voting systems -- before or after the passage of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) -- as well as the population size of the voting jurisdiction. Those states that offered voters lost in the system the opportunity to cast a ballot pre-HAVA (2002) were considered “old provisional voting states”; and the states where voters not found on the registration list were not offered any recourse and thus, were not permitted to vote in the 2000 Election were labeled “new provisional voting states.”

Further adjustments were made to take into consideration the population size of the voting jurisdiction. The “Old” and “New” states were separated into three categories – small, medium, and large – based on the population size of the voting jurisdiction. A voting jurisdiction with a population of 49,999 or less was considered small, 50,000 to 199,999

regarded as medium, and large consisted of 200,000 or more. This sampling frame yielded 400 cases (196 Old; 204 New)¹ consisting of six sample types: New Small (n=83), Old Small (n=71), New Medium (n=83), Old Medium (n=75), New Large (n=38), and Old Large (n=50).

The survey addressed the following topics: experience with the administration of provisional voting system, state guidance for implementing provisional voting, implementing provisional voting, general perceptions, and recommendations for the future. This Executive Summary provides an overview of key findings from the study.

Experiences with Provisional Voting System in Jurisdiction

Survey participants were asked a number of questions regarding their general experience with provisional voting.

- A majority of the “New” states’ election officials (62%), and nearly twice as many as the “Old” (33%), indicated that “100 or less ballots” were cast in the election jurisdiction. A significantly larger percentage (14%) of the “Old” (28%) estimated that “between 100 to just under 500” provisional ballots were cast.
- Most (61%) of the “Old” states reported that “A lot” of these provisional ballots were counted compared to only 19 percent for the “New” states. A

¹ At the studies conclusion it was determined that Rhode Island’s affidavit voting system did not meet the criteria for placement in the Old State status and thus, the state was reassigned as “New.” The reassignment of local election respondents representing Rhode Island resulted in a 49 (Old)/51 (New) split, rather than half of the sample being drawn from “Old” and half from “New.” Unlike the other states (AL, KY, MI, MS, TX) with affidavit voting systems in place pre-HAVA, Rhode Island did not offer voters any real recourse to cast a ballot if the individual’s name was not listed on the registration rolls. Instead, the state allowed voter’s claiming eligibility, but not found on the registration rolls, to sign an affidavit enabling the election official to call the central registrar to verify the voter’s eligibility. Only if the voter’s name was found on the list was he or she permitted to cast a ballot.

much larger percentage of the “New” subgroup felt that only “Some” (32%) or “Very Few” (32%) provisional ballots were actually counted.

- A sizeable majority of both subgroups (Old=64%, New=77%) attributed the most need for the use of provisional ballots in their jurisdiction to “individual’s name not listed on the voter registration rolls.”
- More than 7-in-10 in both subgroups agreed that “individuals who were not registered at the time of casting their provisional ballots” constituted the most important reason that these ballots were not validated and counted in their jurisdiction.

State Guidance for Implementing Provisional Voting

- A sizeable majority of both subgroups (Old=85%, New=83%) received provisional voting instruction from their state governments.
- Appreciable differences in the type of instruction received involved “whether the provisional ballot could be used as an application to update the voter’s registration” (Old=74%; New 59%); “guidelines for determining which provisional ballots were to be counted” (Old=87%; New=94%); and “how to design the structure of the provisional ballot (Old=71%; New 57%).”
- Overall, 98 percent of both subgroups found the voting instructions they received from the state government useful.

Implementing Provisional Voting in Jurisdiction

- When asked to describe the instructions or information provided to poll workers to help determine voters correct precinct or polling place, both

subgroups employed various strategies including access to a list of eligible voters (Old=81%; New 80%), dedicated telephone line for poll workers (Old=93%; New=91%), and additional staff such as “greeters” (Old=46%; New=42%). Very few election officials in both (Old=11%, New=12%) reported the existence of a statewide voter registration database.

- A much larger percentage (70%) of “Old” states’ election officials compared with 50 percent of the “New” used maps to help identify correct polling locations.
- 14 percent of all the election officials said that they did not provide written procedures or training to poll workers for the counting of provisional ballots. However, overall both subgroups felt that the administration of provisional voting in their jurisdiction was a success on all accounts.
- A variety of measures were employed to enable voters to determine if their provisional ballots were counted. In both subgroups the most widely used method was “the main telephone for the local or county election office” with 66 percent of the New compared to 75% of the Old indicating this method was provided.
- The measure least cited for voters to determine if their provisional ballots were counted was “email notification.” Only 10% reported that the election jurisdiction offered voters this opportunity.

General Perceptions

- Close to half (40%) of the election officials felt more training for poll workers was needed.

- 39 percent of the “New” states’ election officials agreed that more information should have been provided to voters about the jurisdiction where provisional ballots must be cast in order to be counted compared to 28% of the “Old”.
- 13 percent more of the election officials from “New” states (39%) reported that more time was needed to implement provisional voting procedures.
- Only about half (56%) of the “New” states’ election officials reported the provisional voting system was easy to implement while 73 percent from the “Old” found this to be the case.
- Seventeen percent more of the “Old” states’ election officials (75%) agreed that the provisional voting system in their polling jurisdiction enabled more people to vote.

Recommendations for the Future

Survey participants were asked a number of questions regarding their general level of agreement with several statements regarding provisional voting.

- More election officials from “Old” states agreed that provisional voting sped up and improved polling place operations on Election Day (Old=53%; New=41%); and that the process helped election officials maintain more accurate registration databases (Old=63%; New=38%).
- 60 percent of the “New” states’ election officials agreed that provisional voting created unnecessary problems for election officials and poll workers, compared with only 42% of the “Old.”

- A majority of both subgroups agreed that “there is a need to offer voters the opportunity to cast provisional ballots.” However, a 19 percent differential exists between the two subgroups (Old=81%; New=62%).
- A slightly larger percentage (9%) of the “Old” states’ election officials (93%) felt that the provisional voting system in their polling jurisdiction was a success.
- Forty percent of the local election officials felt that the most effective way to increase the number of provisional ballots validated and counted in an election would be to administer provisional voting in a central location rather than at individual polling places.
- When asked what would be most effective in reducing the number of provisional ballots cast in an election, most (28%) of the local election officials chose providing a state sponsored website for individuals to check registration status online before going to the polling place. A slightly smaller number (26%) favored having a statewide voter registration database available at polling places.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

A. Project Background and Objectives

To assess and improve the experiences of local election officials with provisional voting, the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP) at the Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University conducted a national survey of local elections officials.

The study was designed to examine the experiences, attitudes, and general impressions of local election officials with implementing provisional voting. Specifically, the study sought to ascertain the type of information, guidance, and training local election officials received from the State government in administering provisional voting, and how the information, guidance, and training was then distributed to poll workers and voters.

B. Summary of the Research Methodology

The survey involved telephone interviews conducted between July 21 and August 4, 2005 with a random sample of 400 local election officials. The sampling error for this total sample of 400 is ± 4.9 percent at a 95 percent confidence level. Of these local election officials, 196 were selected to represent “old provisional voting states” and 204 for “new provisional voting states.”² These subgroups have a sampling error of ± 6.9 percent for the “New” and ± 7.0 for the “Old” at a 95 percent confidence level.

Sampling error is the probability difference in results between interviewing everyone in a population versus interviewing a scientific sample taken from that population. Sampling error does not take into account any other possible sources of error inherent in any study of

² See footnote 1.

public opinion. A more comprehensive description of the research methodology is included in Appendix A.

C. Profile of Survey Participants

Table 1.1 provides a profile of survey participants by status including the entire sample of counties or equivalent and the subgroups within the “Old” or “New” status. The subgroup definitions of “Old” and “New” were provided by a report released by Election Line titled “The Provisional Voting Challenge” (December, 2001). The “New” states include: Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, and Vermont; and the “Old” states include: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Washington D.C., Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia.

D. Organization of the Report

The next chapter of this report examines the substantive survey results illustrated by statistical tables. The exact question wording precedes the table summarizing the percentages of the actual responses provided by the local election officials. In most cases the percentages on the tables read from top to bottom with the total equal to a 100 percent. In instances where there is statistical rounding, the total may be more or less than 100 percent.

The tables will also report the sample size “(n)” for each group referenced in the table. The “(n)” is the actual number of people in the group upon which the percentages are

based. Readers should be aware of the “(n)” when referencing the percentages on a table. Smaller subgroups will have a higher margin of sampling error. Therefore, in some cases what may appear to be a large difference between groups is a result of the larger sampling error and may not be statistically significant.

Following the statistical tables there are four appendices. Appendix A provides additional information about the survey methodology so that interested readers may have a better understanding of the process used to obtain the data. Appendix B consists of the pre-notification letter explaining the purpose of the study and inviting local election officials to participate in the study if called. The text of the questions asked in the survey and used in the analysis of the data is contained in Appendix C. The verbatim responses (as recorded by the interviewers) to open-end questions included in the survey are found in Appendix D.

TABLE 1.1
PROFILE OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS BY STATUS

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>OLD PV STATES</u>	<u>NEW PV STATES</u>
<u>Gender</u>			
--Male	29%	30%	28%
--Female	71	71	72
<u>Title</u>			
Administrator of Elections	10	5	14
Chairman of Elections	3	5	1
Clerk of Court	2	1	4
Commissioner of Elections	7	15	--
County Clerk	17	16	18
Director of Elections	16	20	12
Registrar of Elections	8	8	8
Secretary of Elections	3	1	5
Supervisor of Elections	7	7	8
Town Clerk	4	2	6
Other	25	23	27
<u>Position</u>			
--Hired	14	16	12
--Appointed	42	41	44
--Promoted	2	1	3
--Elected	42	42	42
--Other	1	1	1
<u>Years Worked</u>			
--Less than one year	1	2	1
--1-10 years	49	49	50
--11-20 years	34	37	32
--21-30 years	12	11	14
--31-43 years	3	3	4
<u>Region</u>			
--West	17	14	20
--South	29	28	30
--Midwest	46	48	44
--Northeast	9	11	7
<u>Statewide Registration</u>			
--Yes	34	20	48
--No	66	81	52
<u>Battleground State</u>			
--Yes	17	19	14
--No	84	81	86

TABLE 2.1
EXPERIENCE WITH
PROVISIONAL VOTING SYSTEM
IN JURISDICTION [Q.3-6]

3. What is your best estimate of the total number of provisional ballots cast in the 2004 election in your jurisdiction, whether they were ultimately counted or not? Your best estimate is fine.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
1 to less than 100	33%	62%	(191)
Between 100 to just under 500	28	14	(82)
Between 500 to just under 1000	12	5	(35)
1000 or more	19	9	(57)
(VOL) None/Zero	7	9	(31)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	1	(4)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	100	(400)

*****statistically significant at the .000 level.**

4. In your opinion, how many of these provisional ballots were counted – a lot, some, very few, or none at all?

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
A lot	61%	19%	(146)
Some	17	32	(90)
Very few	18	32	(91)
None at all	4	17	(38)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	1	(4)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	101	101	(369)

*****statistically significant at the .000 level.**

5. In your opinion, which one of the following, if any, created the most need for the use of provisional ballots in your jurisdiction on Election Day, 2004?

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Individual's name not listed on the voter registration rolls	64%	77%	(260)
FIRST TIME voters couldn't provide the proper identification	5	7	(21)
Voter's eligibility challenged	12	5	(30)
Registered voters could not provide the proper identification	4	7	(19)
(VOL) Other (SPECIFY)	14	4	(32)
(VOL) Don't Know	2	2	(6)
(VOL) Refused	1	---	(1)
	102	102	(369)

***statistically significant at the .01 level.

6. In your opinion, which one of the following, if any, was the most important reason that provisional ballots cast in your jurisdiction were not validated and ultimately not counted in the 2004 Election?

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Individual failed to provide the identification required to validate the provisional ballot	2%	3%	(10)
Signature on the provisional ballot did not match the signature on the registration form	1	---	(1)
Provisional ballot cast in the incorrect voting precinct	16	10	(48)
Individual was not registered	75	76	(280)
(VOL) All provisional ballots were validated and counted in 2004 Election	2	4	(12)
(VOL) Other (SPECIFY)	3	4	(13)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	2	(5)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	99	(369)

TABLE 2.2
 PRE-ELECTION EXPERIENCE:
 STATE INSTRUCTION AND INFORMATION [Q.7-13]

7. Were provisional voting instructions provided by the state government for the 2004 Election?

	Old versus New		
	Old	New	(n)
Yes	85%	83%	(335)
No	14	17	(63)
(VOL) Don't know	1	---	(2)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	100	(400)

8. Which of the following provisional voting instructions, if any, did you receive from the state government?

	Old versus Old	New New	(n=335)
How to administer the provisional voting system	90%	91%	(303)
Who is eligible to vote using a provisional ballot	93	92	(310)
How individuals vote using a provisional ballot	90	85	(292)
The jurisdiction where individuals can vote by provisional ballot	78	80	(265)
Whether the provisional ballot could be used as an application to update the voter's registration*** ***statistically significant at the .01 level.	74	59	(222)
How to train poll workers to process provisional ballots	89	88	(295)
How to provide voters with the opportunity to verify if their provisional ballot was counted	92	90	(304)
Guidelines for determining which provisional ballots are to be counted*** ***statistically significant at the .05 level.	87	94	(304)
Strategies to reduce the need for voters to use provisional ballots	54	54	(182)
How to design the structure of the provisional ballot*** ***statistically significant at the .05 level.	71	57	(213)
Other (VOL)	---	---	(---)
All of the above (VOL)**	---	---	(22**)
None of the above (VOL)	---	---	(---)
Don't Know (VOL)	1	2	(5)
Refused (VOL)	---	---	(---)

**included in totals above.

9. You said that you received provisional voting instructions from the state government. Please tell me how useful the instructions were on the jurisdiction where individuals can vote by provisional ballot -- very useful, somewhat useful, not very useful, or not useful at all?

[ASKED ONLY AMONG THOSE WHO SAID RECEIVED STATE INSTRUCTION ON THE JURISDICTION WHERE INDIVIDUALS CAN VOTE BY PROVISIONAL BALLOT IN Q8]

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not useful	2%	3%	(6)
Useful	96	95	(253)
(VOL) Don't Know	2	2	(6)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(--)
	100	100	265

10. You said that you received provisional voting instructions from the state government. Please tell me how useful the instructions were on how to provide voters with the opportunity to verify if their provisional ballot was counted -- very useful, somewhat useful, not very useful, or not useful at all?

[ASKED ONLY AMONG THOSE WHO SAID RECEIVED STATE INSTRUCTION ON HOW TO PROVIDE VOTERS WITH THE OPPORTUNITY TO VERIFY IF THEIR PROVISIONAL BALLOT WAS COUNTED IN Q8]

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not useful	2%	1%	(4)
Useful	97	96	(293)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	3	(7)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(--)
	100	100	(304)

11. You said that you received provisional voting instructions from the state government. Please tell me how useful the instructions were for establishing guidelines for determining which provisional ballots are to be counted -- very useful, somewhat useful, not very useful, or not useful at all?

[ASKED ONLY AMONG THOSE WHO SAID RECEIVED STATE INSTRUCTION FOR ESTABLISHING GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING WHICH PROVISIONAL BALLOTS ARE TO BE COUNTED IN Q8]

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not useful	2%	3%	(8)
Useful	97	96	(293)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	1	(3)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(--)
	100	100	(304)

12. You said that you received provisional voting instructions from the state government. Please tell me how useful the instructions were for establishing strategies to reduce the need for voters to use provisional ballots -- very useful, somewhat useful, not very useful, or not useful at all?

[ASKED ONLY AMONG THOSE WHO SAID RECEIVED STATE INSTRUCTION FOR ESTABLISHING STRATEGIES TO REDUCE THE NEED FOR VOTERS TO USE PROVISIONAL BALLOTS IN Q8]

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not useful	7%	8%	(13)
Useful	90	92	(166)
(VOL) Don't Know	3	---	(3)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(--)
	100	100	(182)

13. Thinking generally, overall how useful were the provisional voting instructions you received from the state government -- very useful, somewhat useful, not very useful, or not useful at all?

[ASKED ONLY AMONG THOSE WHO SAID RECEIVED STATE INSTRUCTION IN Q8]

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not useful	1%	1%	(4)
Useful	98	98	(324)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	1	(2)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	100	(330)

TABLE 2.3
IMPLEMENTATION OF INSTRUCTIONS AND
DISTRIBUTION OF INFORMATION TO ELECTION EMPLOYEES [Q.14-21]

14. Please tell me which of the following, if any, was provided in your jurisdiction for the 2004 Election to help poll workers determine voters' assigned precinct and polling place?

	Old versus New		(n=400)
	Old	New	
Access to a list of eligible voters in the jurisdiction	81%	80%	(322)
Telephone line for poll workers to speak immediately to an election official with access to the list of eligible voters in the jurisdiction	90	93	(365)
Maps of adjacent precincts for poll workers to help voters locate their residence and corresponding polling place***	70	50	(239)
***statistically significant at the .001 level.			
Additional staff such as "greeters" at polling places to direct voters to the correct polling location	46	42	(176)
Statewide voter registration database available at polling places	11	12	(46)
Other (VOL)	1	---	(1)
None of the above (VOL)	2	1	(6)
Don't Know (VOL)	---	1	(2)
Refused (VOL)	---	---	(---)

When implementing provisional voting in your jurisdiction, please tell me how successfully you think the following activities were performed: [PROBE: Would you say that activity was performed very successfully, somewhat successfully, not very successfully, or not successfully at all?]

(READ AND ROTATE Q.15 – Q.21)

15. Providing training to poll workers on how to administer provisional ballots.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not successfully	1%	2%	(5)
Successfully	96	95	(382)
(VOL) Didn't perform this activity	3	3	(11)
(VOL) Don't Know	---	1	(2)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	101	(400)

16. Providing written procedures to poll workers on how to administer provisional ballots.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not successfully	2%	2%	(7)
Successfully	93	94	(373)
(VOL) Didn't perform this activity	4	3	(14)
(VOL) Don't Know	2	1	(5)
(VOL) Refused	---	1	(1)
	101	101	(400)

17. Providing your local election officials with written procedures on the casting of provisional ballots.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not successfully	2%	1%	(4)
Successfully	95	94	(378)
(VOL) Didn't perform this activity	2	4	(13)
(VOL) Don't Know	2	1	(4)
(VOL) Refused	---	1	(1)
	101	101	(400)

When implementing provisional voting in your jurisdiction, please tell me how successfully you think the following activities were performed: [PROBE: Would you say that activity was performed very successfully, somewhat successfully, not very successfully, or not successfully at all?] (cont'd.)

18. Providing your local election officials with written procedures on the counting of provisional ballots.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not successfully	2%	1%	(5)
Successfully	81	85	(333)
(VOL) Didn't perform this activity	16	12	(56)
(VOL) Don't Know	2	1	(4)
(VOL) Refused	---	1	(2)
	101	100	(400)

19. Providing your local election officials training for the counting of provisional ballots.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not successfully	1%	3%	(7)
Successfully	80	87	(334)
(VOL) Didn't perform this activity	18	10	(56)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	---	(2)
(VOL) Refused	---	1	(1)
	100	101	(400)

20. Making information available to help poll workers determine voters' assigned precinct or polling place.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not successfully	2%	3%	(11)
Successfully	92	91	(367)
(VOL) Didn't perform this activity	5	5	(20)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	1	(2)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	100	(400)

When implementing provisional voting in your jurisdiction, please tell me how successfully you think the following activities were performed: [PROBE: Would you say that activity was performed very successfully, somewhat successfully, not very successfully, or not successfully at all?] (cont'd.)

21. Providing training to help poll workers determine voters' assigned precinct or polling place.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not successfully	2%	2%	(7)
Successfully	92	88	(360)
(VOL) Didn't perform this activity	6	8	(27)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	2	(6)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	101	100	(400)

TABLE 2.4
 POST-ELECTION EXPERIENCE:
 COUNTING BALLOTS [Q.22-25]

22. After the 2004 Election, which of the following, if any, did your jurisdiction offer voters to determine if their provisional ballot was counted?

(ACCEPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES; READ AND ROTATE LIST)

	Old versus New		(n=400)
	Old	New	
Notification by mail	50%	45%	(188)
Dedicated Toll-Free Telephone Hotline	42	36	(156)
Email notification	13	9	(43)
Website confirmation	21	24	(90)
Main telephone number for the local or county election office	75	66	(281)
All of the above (VOL)	**	**	**
None of the above (VOL)	3	6	(17)
Other (VOL)	1	1	(2)
Don't Know (VOL)	1	1	(3)
Refused (VOL)	---	---	(---)

**included in the totals above.

23. How confident are you that poll workers properly distributed provisional ballots to voters?

[Q23-25 - ASKED ONLY AMONG THOSE WHO GAVE BEST ESTIMATE OF TOTAL NUMBER OF PROVISIONAL BALLOTS CAST IN THE 2004 ELECTION (Q3=1-4)]

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not confident	4%	6%	(18)
Confident	93	93	(344)
(VOL) Don't Know	3	1	(7)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	100	(369)

24. How confident are you that election officials accurately assessed and validated provisional ballots?

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not confident	2%	2%	(7)
Confident	95	95	(350)
(VOL) Don't Know	3	3	(10)
(VOL) Refused	1	1	(2)
	101	101	(369)

25. How confident are you that the validated provisional ballots were accurately included in the final vote count?

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Not confident	1%	---	(1)
Confident	99	98	(363)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	2	(5)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	101	100	(369)

TABLE 2.5
GENERAL PERCEPTIONS [Q.26-35]

26. Now I am going to read you a list of items, please tell me which one you believe presented the biggest challenge in implementing provisional voting in your jurisdiction for the 2004 Election. (POSSIBLY BIGGEST PROBLEM)

(READ AND ROTATE 1-4)

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Training of poll workers	38%	42%	(160)
Length of time provided before the election to implement the provisional voting process	13	14	(53)
Clarity of instruction received from your State Government	5	8	(27)
Having enough staff at the polling place	9	14	(46)
(VOL) Other (SPECIFY)	5	3	(15)
(VOL) All of the above	2	3	(9)
(VOL) None of the above	26	16	(83)
(VOL) Don't Know	3	1	(7)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	101	101	(400)

Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about Provisional voting in your jurisdiction for the 2004 Election. [IF AGREE OR DISAGREE, ASK:] Would you say you agree/disagree strongly or agree/disagree somewhat?

(READ AND ROTATE Q.27 –Q.35)

27. More training was needed on how to administer the provisional voting process.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	54%	46%	(200)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	5	(22)
Agree	38	49	(174)
(VOL) Don't Know	2	---	(4)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	100	(400)

28. More funding was needed to educate voters about their rights to cast a provisional ballot.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	50%	43%	(185)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	11	12	(45)
Agree	39	45	(168)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	1	(2)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	101	101	(400)

29. More information should have been provided to voters about the jurisdiction where provisional ballots must be cast in order to be counted.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	62%	50%	(222)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	8	8	(32)
Agree	28	39	(133)
(VOL) Don't Know	3	4	(13)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	101	101	(400)

*****statistically significant at the .05 level.**

30. More information was needed for poll workers to determine the voter's assigned precinct and polling place.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	68%	63%	(261)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	7	5	(25)
Agree	23	29	(104)
(VOL) Don't Know	2	3	(10)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	100	(400)

31. More time was needed to implement provisional voting procedures.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	66	55	(242)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	7	5	(24)
Agree	26	39	(130)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	1	(4)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	100	(400)

*****statistically significant at the .05 level.**

32. The provisional voting system was easy to implement.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	24%	35%	(117)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	9	(25)
Agree	74	56	(258)
(VOL) Don't Know	---	---	(---)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	101	100	(400)

*****statistically significant at the .01 level.**

33. The provisional voting system in my polling jurisdiction enabled more people to vote.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	19%	29%	(97)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	12	(32)
Agree	75	58	(266)
(VOL) Don't Know	2	1	(5)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	100	(400)

*****statistically significant at the .01 level.**

34. I feel that voters in my jurisdiction were provided adequate information to successfully cast a provisional ballot.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	3%	5%	(17)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	2	4	(12)
Agree	93	91	(368)
(VOL) Don't Know	2	---	(3)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	100	(400)

35. Adequate support was provided to me to assist in the implementation of provisional voting.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	7%	11%	(37)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	2	8	(20)
Agree	91	81	(343)
(VOL) Don't Know	---	---	(---)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	100	(400)

*****statistically significant at the .01 level.**

TABLE 2.6

RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE FUTURE [Q.36-46]

36. Now I am going to read you a list of items. Please tell me which one you believe is the most important change needed in the implementation of provisional voting.

(RANDOMLY ROTATE 1-4)

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
More funding for poll worker training	24%	34%	(116)
More time for poll worker training	18	18	(72)
Clearer instruction from the Federal Government	19	18	(75)
Clearer instruction from the State Government	14	9	(47)
(VOL) Other (SPECIFY)	6	3	(19)
(VOL) All of the above	1	3	(7)
(VOL) None of the above	15	12	(55)
(VOL) No changes needed	2	1	(6)
(VOL) Don't Know	---	2	(3)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	99	100	(400)

In general, please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about provisional voting. [IF AGREE OR DISAGREE, ASK:] Would you say you agree/disagree strongly or agree/disagree somewhat?

(READ AND ROTATE Q.37–Q.44)

37. A statewide voter registration database, accessible to poll workers on Election Day, would decrease the need for voters to cast provisional ballots.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	43%	35%	(155)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	7	6	(26)
Agree	49	56	(210)
(VOL) Don't Know	2	3	(9)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	101	100	(400)

38. A state-sponsored website designed for individuals to check registration status online, before going to the polling place on Election Day, would decrease the need for voters to cast provisional ballots.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	24%	23%	(93)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	5	(22)
Agree	68	70	(277)
(VOL) Don't Know	2	2	(7)
(VOL) Refused	1	---	(1)
	101	100	(400)

In general, please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about provisional voting. [IF AGREE OR DISAGREE, ASK:] Would you say you agree/disagree strongly or agree/disagree somewhat? (cont'd.)

39. Provisional voting speeds up and improves polling place operation on Election Day by resolving disputes between voters and poll workers.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	40%	55%	(190)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	3	(18)
Agree	53	41	(188)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	1	(3)
(VOL) Refused	1	---	(1)
	101	100	(400)

40. Provisional voting helps election officials maintain more accurate registration databases.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	31%	49%	(161)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	11	(31)
Agree	63	38	(201)
(VOL) Don't Know	2	2	(7)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	100	(400)

*****statistically significant at the .000 level.**

41. Provisional voting creates unnecessary problems for election officials and poll workers.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	52%	34%	(171)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	5	(20)
Agree	42	60	(206)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	1	(3)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	100	(400)

*****statistically significant at the .01 level.**

In general, please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about provisional voting. [IF AGREE OR DISAGREE, ASK:] Would you say you agree/disagree strongly or agree/disagree somewhat? (cont'd.)

42. Provisional voting can be avoided by simplifying registration procedures.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	55%	43%	(195)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	5	(23)
Agree	38	50	(176)
(VOL) Don't Know	2	2	(6)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	101	100	(400)

43. There is a need to offer voters the opportunity to cast provisional ballots.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	17%	31%	(98)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	2	6	(15)
Agree	81	62	(285)
(VOL) Don't Know	---	1	(2)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	100	(400)

*****statistically significant at the .001 level.**

44. The provisional voting system in my polling jurisdiction was a success.

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Disagree	5%	8%	(27)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	2	7	(18)
Agree	93	84	(353)
(VOL) Don't Know	1	1	(2)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	101	100	(400)

*****statistically significant at the .05 level.**

45. Which one of the following do you think would be the most effective in increasing the number of provisional ballots validated and ultimately counted in an election?

(RANDOMLY ROTATE 1-3)

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
In-precinct provisional voting only	21%	18%	(79)
Provisional voting from a central location rather than in individual polling places	37	44	(161)
In-jurisdiction provisional voting only	21	18	(77)
(VOL) Other (SPECIFY)	1	3	(7)
(VOL) All of the above	1	1	(2)
(VOL) None of the above	15	8	(47)
(VOL) Don't Know	4	9	(27)
(VOL) Refused	---	---	(---)
	100	101	(400)

46. Which one of the following do you think would be the most effective in reducing the number of provisional ballots cast in an election?

(RANDOMLY ROTATE 1-5)

	Old versus New		(n)
	Old	New	
Having a statewide voter registration database available at polling places	22%	30%	(105)
Providing additional staff such as “greeters” at polling places to direct voters to the correct polling location	6	6	(24)
Providing a state sponsored website to enable individuals to check registration status online before going to the polling place	30	27	(113)
Providing poll workers access to an updated printed list of eligible voters in the jurisdiction	5	5	(20)
Providing a dedicated telephone line for poll workers to speak immediately to an election official with access to the list of eligible voters in the jurisdiction	14	18	(63)
(VOL) Other (SPECIFY)	---	1	(2)
(VOL) All of the above	4	3	(14)
(VOL) None of the above	16	9	(51)
(VOL) Don't Know	2	2	(7)
(VOL) Refused	---	1	(1)
	99	102	(400)

APPENDIX A:
SURVEY METHODOLOGY

I. INTRODUCTION

This survey represents a joint venture of two programs – the Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University and the Eagleton Institute’s Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP). This survey was designed to assess and improve the experiences of local elections officials with provisional voting.

II. QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT

The questionnaire was developed for telephone administration by ECPIP researchers in consultation with Eagleton staff. The draft questionnaire was pretested with a random group of local election officials that yielded five completes. Only minor changes were made from that version and no further pretest was needed.

The questionnaire interview length averaged 18.4 minutes. An annotated version of the final survey instrument is included in this report (see Appendix C).

The questionnaire was programmed into a CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviews) software system known as Quancept. The system facilitates the loops, rotations, randomization, and complex skip patterns found in this survey instrument. The programming was extensively checked and all logical errors were corrected.

III. SAMPLE DESIGN

A random national sample was compiled based on information acquired from the State Board of Elections in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. In all, 3,820

local election officials were eligible to participate in the study. To enhance compliance rates, pre-notification letters were sent to 2,471 of the local election officials. These letters explained the study's objectives and asked for the officials' participation in the study if contacted by an interviewer. Overall, 1,018 were contacted by telephone to participate in the study and among these, a total of 400 local election officials agreed to participate in the study.

The "Old" and "New" states were separated into three categories – small, medium, and large – based on the population size of the voting jurisdiction. A voting jurisdiction with a population of 49,999 or less was considered small, 50,000 to 199,999 regarded as medium, and large consisted of 200,000 or more. The sample was designed to make sure that each of the six sample types: New Small (n=83), Old Small (n=71), New Medium (n=83), Old Medium (n=75), New Large (n=38), and Old Large (n=50) were represented in the study. Overall, the survey yielded a response rate of 30 percent for the "Old" state sample and 53 percent for the "New" state sample.

APPENDIX B:

PRE-NOTIFICATION LETTER

DATE

NAME

TITLE

ADDRESS

CITY STATE ZIP

Dear NAME,

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, is conducting a national survey of elections officials' experiences with provisional voting in the 2004 national election. Through this survey we will learn the perspective of those who administer elections. It will improve our understanding of the process as we complete a broad research project on provisional voting in the context of effective election administration, voter access, and ballot security. The findings of the project will be the basis for recommendations to the U. S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to consider in the development of its guidance to the states in 2006.

The EAC was established by the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002. It is an independent, bipartisan, federal agency that provides federal funds to states to upgrade voting systems and improve election administration. The EAC publishes voluntary guidelines for the states and serves as a national clearinghouse of information regarding election administration. The EAC is funding the research project.

Participants in this study will be selected randomly and asked to share their experiences administering the provisional voting process in the 2004 election. The study will be conducted July 18th through August 5th. During that period a survey researcher may call you if you are, in fact, chosen at random from a national list of election officials. The researcher will ask you questions about your experience with provisional voting, your evaluation of the process, and your recommendations to improve it. The survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes. All of your answers will be completely confidential, and no statement or comment you make will be ascribed to you.

At the conclusion of the research project, we will present a report to the EAC including analysis of provisional voting procedures as well as recommendations for future practices and procedures. The guidance document based on our research will be published by the EAC in the Federal Register for public review and comment, and the EAC will hold a hearing on the guidance document this fall before adopting it.

Your participation in the survey will assure that we understand the views of election officials who have direct experience with provisional voting. We hope you will participate if called. Thank you for your consideration and interest.

Sincerely,

[scanned signature]

Ruth B. Mandel

Director

Board of Governors Professor of Politics

APPENDIX C:

ANNOTATED QUESTIONNAIRE

PROVISIONAL VOTING SURVEY

Sample: Local Elections Officials
National sample: 400 telephone interviews

Draft Version: July 19, 2005

Initial Screener

Hello, my name is _____ and I'm calling on behalf of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University. Rutgers University is conducting a study on provisional voting based on experiences from the 2004 election. May I please speak to [INSERT NAME FROM SAMPLE]?

[IF UNSURE WHO THIS INDIVIDUAL IS – ASK:]

May I please speak to the individual who was responsible for overseeing voting procedures for the 2004 election at the county, borough, municipality, or parish level such as the Registrar of Elections, County Clerk, Commissioner of Elections, Director of Elections, Administrator of Elections, or Clerk of Court?

[SKIP TO “CONSENT OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENT FROM SAMPLE CONTACT”]

Consent

Hello, my name is _____ and I'm calling on behalf of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University. Rutgers University is conducting a study on provisional voting based on experiences from the 2004 election. We recently sent you a letter requesting your participation in the confidential survey we are conducting with elections officials. Your participation in the survey will assure that we understand the views of election officials who have direct experience with provisional voting. We would very much like to include your opinions and would really appreciate it if you could assist us by providing as much information as you can to the best of your knowledge. You were randomly selected for the survey from a nationally representative list of election officials. We are not selling anything, and not asking for money.

The information you will be sharing today will be the basis for recommendations to the U. S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to consider in the development of its guidance to the states in 2006. This information will be maintained at a secure site and your name will not be identified in the report. All your answers are completely confidential.

The survey should take no more than 10 or 15 minutes to complete.

Consent of Individual Different from Sample Contact

Hello, my name is _____ and I'm calling on behalf of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University. Rutgers University is conducting a study on provisional voting based on experiences from the 2004 election. We recently sent a letter to your office requesting participation in a confidential survey we are conducting with elections officials. Your participation in the survey will assure that we understand the views of election officials who have direct experience with provisional voting. We would very much like to include your opinions and would really appreciate it if you could assist us by providing as much information as you can to the best of your knowledge. You were randomly selected for the survey from a nationally representative list of election officials. We are not selling anything, and not asking for money.

The information you will be sharing today will be the basis for recommendations to the U. S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to consider in the development of its guidance to the states in 2006. This information will be maintained at a secure site and your name will not be identified in the report. All your answers are completely confidential.

The survey should take no more than 10 or 15 minutes to complete.

IF NECESSARY: If you should have any questions about the study, you may contact the Research Project Coordinator, April Rapp, at the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling at 732-932-9384 ext. 261.

IF RESPONDENT DECLINES TO PARTICIPATE, ADDITIONAL PRODDING NEEDED:

--Your participation is very important because only 400 election officials have been randomly selected for this survey and your views will be used to provide provisional voting policy recommendations. We would be happy to fax you a letter outlining the study objectives. [If yes, can I please have your fax number?] (RECORD FAX NUMBER)

Screener

1. On Election Day, November 2nd, 2004 was it your responsibility to supervise the election at the county, borough, municipality, or parish level?

(n=400)

100%	YES	GO TO Q2
--	NO	GO TO Q1a
--	DON'T KNOW	TERMINATE
--	REFUSED	TERMINATE

- 1a. May I please have the name and phone number of the individual who was responsible for supervising the 2004 election at the county, borough, municipality, or parish level?

[RECORD NAME/PHONE NUMBER OF REFERRAL] (THANK AND TERMINATE)

Jurisdiction

2. What was your job title on Election Day, November 2nd, 2004?

(DO NOT READ – VOLUNTEER RESPONSE)

(n=400)

10%	Administrator of Elections
3	Chairman of Elections
2	Clerk of Court
7	Commissioner of Elections
17	County Clerk
16	Director of Elections
8	Registrar of Elections
3	Secretary of Elections
7	Supervisor of Elections
4	Town Clerk
25	Other (specify)
--	Don't Know
--	Refused

General: Provisional Voting

Now, I would like to ask you some questions about provisional voting in your jurisdiction.

3. What is your best estimate of the total number of provisional ballots cast in the 2004 election in your jurisdiction, whether they were ultimately counted or not? Your best estimate is fine.

(n=400)

48%	Less than 100
21	Between 100 to just under 500
9	Between 500 to just under 1000
14	1000 or more
8	None/Zero
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

(GO TO Q7)

(ASK ONLY IF Q3=1-4)

4. In your opinion, how many of these provisional ballots were counted – a lot, some, very few, or none at all?

(n=400)

40%	A lot
24	Some
25	Very few
10	None at all
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

5. In your opinion, which one of the following, if any, created the most need for the use of provisional ballots in your jurisdiction on Election Day, 2004?

(READ AND ROTATE 1-4)

(n=369)

71%	Individual's name not listed on the voter registration rolls
6	<u>First time</u> voters couldn't provide the proper identification
8	Voter's eligibility challenged
5	Registered voters could not provide the proper identification
9	Other (specify)
2	Don't Know
--	Refused

6. In your opinion, which one of the following, if any, was the most important reason that provisional ballots cast in your jurisdiction were not validated and ultimately not counted in the 2004 Election?

(READ AND ROTATE 1-4)

(n=369)

3%	Individual failed to provide the identification required to validate the provisional ballot
--	Signature on the provisional ballot did not match the signature on the registration form
13	Provisional ballot cast in the incorrect voting precinct
76	Individual was not registered
3	All provisional ballots were validated and counted in 2004 election
4	Other (specify)
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

Pre-Election Experience: Instructions and Information Received (Content and Quality)

7. Were provisional voting instructions provided by the state government for the 2004 Election?

(n=400)

84%	Yes	(GO TO Q8)
16	No	(GO TO Q14)
1	Don't Know	(GO TO Q14)
--	Refused	

STATE GOVERNMENT INSTRUCTIONS AND INFORMATION

(ASK ONLY IF Q7=1)

8. Which of the following provisional voting instructions, if any, did you receive from the state government?

(ACCEPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES; ROTATE LIST)

(n=335)

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
How to administer the provisional voting system	90%	10%
Who is eligible to vote using a provisional ballot	93	8
How individuals vote using a provisional ballot	87	13
The jurisdiction where individuals can vote by provisional ballot	79	21
Whether the provisional ballot could be used as an application to update the voter's registration	66	34
How to train poll workers to process provisional ballots	88	12
How to provide voters with the opportunity to verify if their provisional ballot was counted	91	9
Guidelines for determining which provisional ballots are to be counted	91	9
Strategies to reduce the need for voters to use provisional ballots	54	46
How to design the structure of the provisional ballot	64	37
Other (specify)	--	--
All of the above	7	93
None of the above	--	--
Don't know	2	99
Refused	--	--

(ASK ONLY IF Q8=4)

9. You said that you received provisional voting instructions from the state government. Please tell me how useful the instructions were on the jurisdiction where individuals can vote by provisional ballot -- very useful, somewhat useful, not very useful, or not useful at all?

(n=265)

73%	Very useful
23	Somewhat useful
2	Not very useful
--	Not useful at all
2	Don't know
--	Refused

(ASK ONLY IF Q8=7)

10. You said that you received provisional voting instructions from the state government. Please tell me how useful the instructions were on how to provide voters with the opportunity to verify if their provisional ballot was counted -- very useful, somewhat useful, not very useful, or not useful at all?

(n=304)

77%	Very useful
20	Somewhat useful
1	Not very useful
--	Not useful at all
2	Don't know
--	Refused

(ASK ONLY IF Q8=8)

11. You said that you received provisional voting instructions from the state government. Please tell me how useful the instructions were for establishing guidelines for determining which provisional ballots are to be counted -- very useful, somewhat useful, not very useful, or not useful at all?

(n=304)

80%	Very useful
16	Somewhat useful
2	Not very useful
1	Not useful at all
1	Don't know
--	Refused

(ASK ONLY IF Q8=9)

12. You said that you received provisional voting instructions from the state government. Please tell me how useful the instructions were for establishing strategies to reduce the need for voters to use provisional ballots -- very useful, somewhat useful, not very useful, or not useful at all?

(n=182)

60%	Very useful
31	Somewhat useful
5	Not very useful
2	Not useful at all
2	Don't know
--	Refused

(ASK ONLY IF Q8=1-10)

13. Thinking generally, overall how useful were the provisional voting instructions you received from the state government -- very useful, somewhat useful, not very useful, or not useful at all?

(n=330)

76%	Very useful
22	Somewhat useful
1	Not very useful
--	Not useful at all
1	Don't know
--	Refused

Implementation of Instructions and Distribution of Information to Election Employees

Now I'm going to ask you some questions about poll worker training.

14. Please tell me which of the following, if any, was provided in your jurisdiction for the 2004 Election to help poll workers determine voters' assigned precinct and polling place?

(ACCEPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES; READ EACH ITEM; AND ROTATE LIST)

(n=400)

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Access to a list of eligible voters in the jurisdiction	81%	20%
Telephone line for poll workers to speak immediately to an election official with access to the list of eligible voters in the jurisdiction	91	9
Maps of adjacent precincts for poll workers to help voters locate their resident and corresponding polling place	60	40
Additional staff such as "greeters" at polling places to direct voters to the correct polling location	44	56
Statewide voter registration database available at polling places	12	89
Other (specify)	--	--
None of the above	2	99
Don't know	--	--
Refused	--	--

When implementing provisional voting in your jurisdiction, please tell me how successfully you think the following activities were performed:

(READ AND ROTATE Q15-Q21)

[PROBE: Would you say that activity was performed very successfully, somewhat successfully, not very successfully, or not successfully at all?

15. Providing training to poll workers on how to administer provisional ballots.

(n=400)

69%	Very successfully
27	Somewhat successfully
1	Not very successfully
1	Not successfully at all
3	Didn't perform this activity
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

16. Providing written procedures to poll workers on how to administer provisional ballots.

(n=400)

71%	Very successfully
22	Somewhat successfully
1	Not very successfully
1	Not successfully at all
4	Didn't perform this activity
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

17. Providing your local election officials with written procedures on the casting of provisional ballots.

(n=400)

68%	Very successfully
27	Somewhat successfully
1	Not very successfully
--	Not successfully at all
3	Didn't perform this activity
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

18. Providing your local election officials with written procedures on the counting of provisional ballots.

(n=400)

65%	Very successfully
18	Somewhat successfully
1	Not very successfully
--	Not successfully at all
14	Didn't perform this activity
1	Don't Know
1	Refused

19. Providing your local election officials training for the counting of provisional ballots.

(n=400)

66%	Very successfully
17	Somewhat successfully
1	Not very successfully
1	Not successfully at all
14	Didn't perform this activity
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

20. Making information available to help poll workers determine voters' assigned precinct or polling place.

(n=400)

70%	Very successfully
22	Somewhat successfully
2	Not very successfully
1	Not successfully at all
5	Didn't perform this activity
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

21. Providing training to help poll workers determine voters' assigned precinct or polling place.

(n=400)

64%	Very successfully
26	Somewhat successfully
2	Not very successfully
--	Not successfully at all
7	Didn't perform this activity
2	Don't Know
--	Refused

Post-Election Experience: Counting Ballots

22. After the 2004 Election, which of the following, if any, did your jurisdiction offer voters to determine if their provisional ballot was counted?

(ACCEPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES; READ AND ROTATE LIST)

(n=400)

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Notification by mail	47%	54%
Dedicated Toll-Free Telephone Hotline	39	62
Email notification	10	90
Website confirmation	22	78
Main telephone number for the local or county election office	70	30
All of the above	--	--
None of the above	4	96
Other (specify)	1	99
Don't Know	--	--
Refused	--	--

(ASK Q23-Q25 ONLY IF Q3=1-4)

23. How confident are you that poll workers properly distributed provisional ballots to voters?

(n=369)

63%	Very confident
30	Somewhat confident
4	Not very confident
1	Not at all confident
2	Don't Know
--	Refused

24. How confident are you that election officials accurately assessed and validated provisional ballots?

(n=369)

75%	Very confident
20	Somewhat confident
2	Not very confident
--	Not at all confident
3	Don't Know
1	Refused

25. How confident are you that the validated provisional ballots were accurately included in the final vote count?

(n=369)

95%	Very confident
3	Somewhat confident
--	Not very confident
--	Not at all confident
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

General Perceptions

26. Now I am going to read you a list of items, please tell me which one you believe presented the biggest challenge in implementing provisional voting in your jurisdiction for the 2004 Election. (POSSIBLY BIGGEST PROBLEM)

(READ AND ROTATE 1-4)

(n=400)

40%	Training of poll workers
13	Length of time provided before the election to implement the provisional voting process
7	Clarity of instruction received from your State Government
12	Having enough staff at the polling place
4	Other (specify)
2	All of the above
21	None of the above
2	Don't Know
--	Refused

Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about Provisional voting in your jurisdiction for the 2004 Election.

(READ AND ROTATE Q27 –Q35)

[IF AGREE OR DISAGREE, ASK:] Would you say you agree/disagree strongly or agree/disagree somewhat?

27. More training was needed on how to administer the provisional voting process

(n=400)

18%	Agree strongly
25	Agree somewhat
6	Neither agree nor disagree
22	Disagree somewhat
29	Disagree strongly
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

28. More funding was needed to educate voters about their rights to cast a provisional ballot.

(n=400)

24%	Agree strongly
18	Agree somewhat
11	Neither agree nor disagree
22	Disagree somewhat
24	Disagree strongly
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

29. More information should have been provided to voters about the jurisdiction where provisional ballots must be cast in order to be counted.

(n=400)

16%	Agree strongly
17	Agree somewhat
8	Neither agree nor disagree
22	Disagree somewhat
33	Disagree strongly
3	Don't Know
--	Refused

30. More information was needed for poll workers to determine the voter's assigned precinct and polling place.

(n=400)

8%	Agree strongly
18	Agree somewhat
6	Neither agree nor disagree
26	Disagree somewhat
39	Disagree strongly
3	Don't Know
--	Refused

31. More time was needed to implement provisional voting procedures.

(n=400)

16%	Agree strongly
17	Agree somewhat
6	Neither agree nor disagree
27	Disagree somewhat
33	Disagree strongly
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

32. The provisional voting system was easy to implement.

(n=400)

33%	Agree strongly
32	Agree somewhat
6	Neither agree nor disagree
15	Disagree somewhat
14	Disagree strongly
--	Don't Know
--	Refused

33. The provisional voting system in my polling jurisdiction enabled more people to vote.

(n=400)

40%	Agree strongly
27	Agree somewhat
8	Neither agree nor disagree
9	Disagree somewhat
15	Disagree strongly
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

34. I feel that voters in my jurisdiction were provided adequate information to successfully cast a provisional ballot.

(n=400)

70%	Agree strongly
22	Agree somewhat
3	Neither agree nor disagree
3	Disagree somewhat
2	Disagree strongly
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

35. Adequate support was provided to me to assist in the implementation of provisional voting.

(n=400)

57%	Agree strongly
29	Agree somewhat
5	Neither agree nor disagree
6	Disagree somewhat
3	Disagree strongly
--	Don't Know
--	Refused

Recommendations for the Future

36. Now I am going to read you a list of items. Please tell me which one you believe is the most important change needed in the implementation of provisional voting.

(RANDOMLY ROTATE 1-4)

(n=400)

29%	More funding for poll worker training
18	More time for poll worker training
19	Clearer instruction from the Federal Government
12	Clearer instruction from the State Government
5	Other: specify
2	All of the above
14	None of the above
2	No changes needed
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

In general, please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about provisional voting.

(READ AND ROTATE Q37-Q44)

[IF AGREE OR DISAGREE, ASK:] Would you say you agree/disagree strongly or agree/disagree somewhat?

37. A statewide voter registration database, accessible to poll workers on Election Day, would decrease the need for voters to cast provisional ballots.

(n=400)

34%	Agree strongly
19	Agree somewhat
7	Neither agree nor disagree
20	Disagree somewhat
20	Disagree strongly
2	Don't Know
--	Refused

38. A state-sponsored website designed for individuals to check registration status online, before going to the polling place on Election Day, would decrease the need for voters to cast provisional ballots.

(n=400)

45%	Agree strongly
25	Agree somewhat
6	Neither agree nor disagree
9	Disagree somewhat
15	Disagree strongly
2	Don't Know
--	Refused

39. Provisional voting speeds up and improves polling place operation on Election Day by resolving disputes between voters and poll workers.

(n=400)

25%	Agree strongly
23	Agree somewhat
5	Neither agree nor disagree
18	Disagree somewhat
30	Disagree strongly
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

40. Provisional voting helps election officials maintain more accurate registration databases.

(n=400)

27%	Agree strongly
24	Agree somewhat
8	Neither agree nor disagree
16	Disagree somewhat
24	Disagree strongly
2	Don't Know
--	Refused

41. Provisional voting creates unnecessary problems for election officials and poll workers.

(n=400)

31%	Agree strongly
21	Agree somewhat
5	Neither agree nor disagree
19	Disagree somewhat
24	Disagree strongly
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

42. Provisional voting can be avoided by simplifying registration procedures.

(n=400)

28%	Agree strongly
16	Agree somewhat
6	Neither agree nor disagree
20	Disagree somewhat
29	Disagree strongly
2	Don't Know
--	Refused

43. There is a need to offer voters the opportunity to cast provisional ballots.

(n=400)

44%	Agree strongly
28	Agree somewhat
4	Neither agree nor disagree
8	Disagree somewhat
17	Disagree strongly
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

44. The provisional voting system in my polling jurisdiction was a success.

(n=400)

59%	Agree strongly
30	Agree somewhat
5	Neither agree nor disagree
3	Disagree somewhat
4	Disagree strongly
1	Don't Know
--	Refused

45. Which one of the following do you think would be the most effective in increasing the number of provisional ballots validated and ultimately counted in an election?

(RANDOMLY ROTATE 1-3)

(n=400)

20%	In-precinct provisional voting only
40	Provisional voting from a central location rather than in individual polling places
19	In-jurisdiction provisional voting only
2	Other (specify)
1	All of the above
12	None of the above
7	Don't Know
--	Refused

46. Which one of the following do you think would be the most effective in reducing the number of provisional ballots cast in an election?

(RANDOMLY ROTATE 1-5)

(n=400)

26%	Having a statewide voter registration database available at polling places
6	Providing additional staff such as “greeters” at polling places to direct voters to the correct polling location
28	Providing a state sponsored website to enable individuals to check registration status online before going to the polling place
5	Providing poll workers access to an updated printed list of eligible voters in the jurisdiction
16	Providing a dedicated telephone line for poll workers to speak immediately to an election official with access to the list of eligible voters in the jurisdiction
1	Other (specify)
4	All of the above
13	None of the above
2	Don’t Know
--	Refused

Demographics (ASK ALL)

I only have a few more questions for statistical purposes....

D1. As election official were you hired, appointed, promoted, or elected to the position?

(n=400)

14%	Hired
42	Appointed
2	Promoted
42	Elected
1	Other/Specify
--	Don't know
--	Refused

D2. For how many years have you served as the election official? [CODE IN WHOLE NUMBERS – IF LESS THAN 1 YEAR RECORD AS “LESS THAN ONE YEAR”]

(n=400)

LESS THAN 1 YEAR	1%
1	4
2	7
3	5
4	5
5	7
6	4
7	5
8	3
9	3
10	7
11	2
12	5
13	3
14	5
15	7
16	4
17	1
18	4
19	2
20	3
21	1
22	2
23	2
24	1
25	1
26	1
27	2
28	2
29	1
30	1
31	--
32	--
33	1
34	1
35	1
36	--
38	--
43	--

D3. Interviewer please record gender.

71%	Female
29	Male

That completes our survey. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

APPENDIX D:
VERBATIM RESPONSES

*****VERBATIM EAGLETON NATIONAL SURVEY OF LOCAL ELECTIONS OFFICIALS'*****

2. What was your job title on Election Day, November 2nd, 2004?

Q2 ACCESSOR/RECORDER/COUNTY CLERK\REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
Q2 ADMISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SUPERVISOR ELECTIONS
Q2 ASSISTANT ADMIN
Q2 ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ELECTION COMMISSION
Q2 ASSISTANT REGISTRAR
Q2 asst rgiter of voters
Q2 Asst. Registrar of Elections
Q2 auditer
Q2 auditor
Q2 chairwoman
Q2 chief clerk
Q2 Chief Elections Officer
Q2 clerk of county commisions
Q2 Clerk of Elections
Q2 CO-MANAGER
Q2 COLLECTOR |
Q2 county auditer
Q2 county auditor
Q2 county clerk election authority
Q2 COUNTY COMM CLERK
Q2 county election officer
Q2 COUNTY ELECTION OFFICER
Q2 county of registrar
Q2 democrat comissioner
Q2 DEPUPTY COMISSIONER
Q2 DEPUTY CLERK IN CHARGE OF ELECTIONS
Q2 DEPUTY CLERK SUPERVISOR
Q2 DEPUTY ELECTION OFFICER
Q2 DEPUTY ELECTIONS COMMISSIONER
Q2 Deputy General Register
Q2 dir of voter registration and elections
Q2 DIRECTION COMISSIONER
Q2 electioin supt.
Q2 ELECTION BOARD ADMIN

Q2 election board secretary
 Q2 election deputy
 Q2 ELECTION DIVISIONS MGR
 Q2 election officer
 Q2 ELECTION OFFICER
 Q2 election official
 Q2 ELECTION SUPER
 Q2 election superintendant
 Q2 election superintendent
 Q2 ELECTION SUPERINTENDENT
 Q2 election superitendent
 Q2 Elections Admin
 Q2 elections administrater
 Q2 ELECTIONS SUP
 Q2 EXEC DIRECTOR BOARD OF ELECTIONS
 Q2 FULTON COUNTY CLERK AND RECORDER
 Q2 General REgistar
 Q2 general registrar
 Q2 GENERAL REGISTRAR
 Q2 IN CHARGE OF PROVISIONAL BALANCE
 Q2 judge
 Q2 Local Election Official
 Q2 overseeres
 Q2 Rebgistrar
 Q2 Region 2 Election Supervisor
 Q2 regisrtar of voters
 Q2 registrar of voter
 Q2 registra of voters
 Q2 registrar of voters
 Q2 Registrar of Voters
 Q2 REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
 Q2 Republican election commishioner
 Q2 Republican Elections Commisioner
 Q2 Republican Registrar of Voters
 Q2 SEC OF TULSA COUNTY ELECTION BOARD
 Q2 senior clerk register assistant
 Q2 sherriff
 Q2 SPECIALIST /ELECTIONS COORDINATOR
 Q2 SUPERINTENDENT
 Q2 SUPERINTENDENT OF ELECTIONS
 Q2 supt, of elections
 Q2 voter of registrar
 Q2 voter register
 Q2 VOTER REGISTRATION ADMINISTRATOR

5. In your opinion, which one of the following, if any, created the most need for the use of provisional ballots in your jurisdiction on Election Day, 2004?

- Q5 a lot of ppl have moved from one town to another and they weren't registered
- Q5 ADDRESS CHANGES
- Q5 change of address
- Q5 college students (ellab) registered voters couldnt get home to vote!!
- Q5 fail to change the address
- Q5 FAILED TO REPORT ADDRESS CHANGE SO IN WRONG PRECINCT
- Q5 inspector error
- Q5 MOST HAD MOVED OUT OF A DIFERENT JURISDICTION
- Q5 moved and no address change
- Q5 MOVING FROM ONE PRECINCT TO ANOTHER
- Q5 not registered
- Q5 NOT REGISTERED IN PROPPER PLACE - ADDRESS CHANGES
- Q5 NOT REGISTERED WITHIN 5 YEARS
- Q5 OUT OF PRECINCT
- Q5 they have moved within the county
- Q5 they sd they didn't get their ballot and some were military
- Q5 Unreported Move - their name does not show on their new address' voting precinct
- Q5 voter fail to update their registration
- Q5 Voter going to wrong polling place
- Q5 VOTER WENT TO INCORECT POLLING PLACE
- Q5 voters moved
- Q5 VOTERS MOVED
- Q5 VOTERS MOVING FROM ONE COUNTY TO ANOTHER OR WITHIN THE COUNTY AND NOT UPDATING THEIR REGISTRATION
- Q5 voters not registered
- Q5 voters showed up to wrong precinct
- Q5 voters voting in the wrong precinct
- Q5 voters were at wrong precinct
- Q5 wrong precient

6. In your opinion, which one of the following, if any, was the most important reason that provisional ballots cast in your jurisdiction were not validated and ultimately not counted in the 2004 Election?

- Q6 b/c they were not voters..
- Q6 Combination of not being registered, also individual voted incorrect precinct (else)no
- Q6 Individual registered in wrong county
- Q6 individual was not registered in the right state
- Q6 judge did not put provisional envelopes in ballot box
- Q6 MEDIA DID NOT UNDERSTAND WHAT PROVISIONAL VOTING
- Q6 NO SIGNATURE AT ALL
- Q6 none
- Q6 pirch for 10 year skip and voting
- Q6 POLL WORKER DID NOT COMPLETE FORM CORRECTLY(ELSE)NO
- Q6 There was confusion due to the newness of the provisional ballot procedure
- Q6 THEY WERE IN THE WRONG COUNTY COLLEGE STUDENTS REGISTERED IN OTHER COUNTRIES
- Q6 were not completed properly\

14. Please tell me which of the following, if any, was provided in your jurisdiction for the 2004 Election to help poll workers determine voters' assigned precinct and polling place?

Q14 NO POLL WORKERS IN OREGON

22. After the 2004 Election, which of the following, if any, did your jurisdiction offer voters to determine if their provisional ballot was counted?

Q22 THERE WAS ONLY ONE AND HE WAS INFORMED IN PERSON

Q22 voters were given written documents informing them on how to inquire about their votes

26. Now I am going to read you a list of items, please tell me which one you believe presented the biggest challenge in implementing provisional voting in your jurisdiction for the 2004 Election. (POSSIBLY BIGGEST PROBLEM)

Q26

Q26 access to the voters after the election

Q26 age of the poll workers

Q26 getting the poll workers to understand what I was explaining. Implementing the provisional ballot and the purpose of a provisional ballot was the biggest challenge in getting the poll workers to understand what this meant.

Q26 having enough ballots

Q26 having the voter get and understand the information

Q26 lack of awareness of voter's opportunity for provisional voting

Q26 MISREPRESENTATION OF PROVISIONAL BALLOTING WAS THE KEY PROBLEM

Q26 NOT ENOUGH TIME TO VALIDATE THE BALLOT AFTER ELECTION OFFICE

Q26 people saying go anywhere and get a provisional ballot.. it was falsified information given through newspapers and political parties

Q26 POLL WORKERS MISUNDERSTOOD WHAT PROVISIONAL BALLOTS WERE FOR / PUBLIC EDUCATION

Q26 state worker getting back to us

Q26 the staff, not enough

Q26 to verify that they were a valid provisional voter after the election the research was quite involved and time consuming

Q26 verification

36. Now I am going to read you a list of items. Please tell me which one you believe is the most important change needed in the implementation of provisional voting.

- Q36 accessibility for the voters
- Q36 CHANGES IN STATE LAW
- Q36 clearer instructions from both state and federal on who can vote provisional ballots
- Q36 clearer instruction to the voter
- Q36 Elimination of provisional voting should be dumped
- Q36 ELIMINATE IT
- Q36 MAKING THE FEDERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS TO AGREE ON WHO SHOULD AND WHERE THEY CAST PROVISIONAL BALLOTS
- Q36 more correct information from the media
- Q36 MORE EDUCATION FOR VOTERS...GENERAL INFO EDUCATION
- Q36 more funding in every aspect in provisional voting, it has become very costly and time consuming (else) if the polls have to close for any reason, anyone who has not voted has to use a provisional vote, it is very costly, at 40
- Q36 more simpler
- Q36 more technical work force (ellab) if we could provide a laptop.. we did not have this, we need help in recruiting... what I would like to see is vote centers for provisional ballots..
- Q36 NOT ENOUGH TIME TO VALIDATE VOTE AFTER THE ELECTION
- Q36 PUBLIC EDUCATION ON PROVISIONAL VOTING
- Q36 REGISTRATION OF THE VOTERS, AND THE VOTERS BEING MORE AWARE OF THE VOTING PROCESS
- Q36 they need to look at the whole system... the system does not allow enough time from the time the provisional ballots are cast and the time they are actually counted is 3 days... therefore we dont have enough time to inquire more
- Q36 VOTER AND PUBLIC EDUCATION - VOTER NEEDS TO KNOW WHAT A PROVISIONAL BALLOT IS
- Q36 voters need to be trained
- Q36 VOTERS SHOULD EDUCATE THEMSELVES BETTER. THE INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE TO THEM.

45. Which one of the following do you think would be the most effective in increasing the number of provisional ballots validated and ultimately counted in an election?

Q45 DON'T WANT TO INCREASE

Q45 how to correct provisional to educate the public.

Q45 INCREASE PROVISIONAL VOTING IN REGULAR VOTING PLACES (ELSE)NO

Q45 NOT ENOUGH TIME FOR VALIDATION AFTER ELECTION

Q45 they need to have provisional voting in BOTH a central location and in-precient location as well

Q45 UPDATE REGISTRATION BEFORE DEADLINE

Q45 VOTERS TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR REGISTRATION

46. Which one of the following do you think would be the most effective in reducing the number of provisional ballots cast in an election?

Q46 advanced voting

Q46 VOTERS UPDATE REGISTRATION

D1. As election official were you hired, appointed, promoted, or elected to the position?

D1 elected then turned out to be appointed

D1 I WAS ELECTED AS A PROBATE JUDGE PART OF THAT JOB IS SUPERVISING ELECTIONS

D1 INHERITTED