

U.S. Election Assistance Commission Urban-Rural Study

Final Report

Prepared for: **U.S. Election Assistance Commission**
1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005

Prepared under: **GS-10F-0087J**
USEAC-11-D-0020

Authors: **Peter F. Ramsberger**
Gwenyth M. Van Trieste

Date: **April 15, 2013**



HumRRO
Human Resources Research Organization

Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO)
66 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 700, Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1591
Phone: 703.549.3611 | Fax: 703.549.9661 | www.humrro.org

U.S. Election Assistance Commission Urban-Rural Study

Final Report

Prepared for: **U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005**

Prepared under: **GS-10F-0087J
USEAC-11-D-0020**

Authors: **Peter F. Ramsberger
Gwenyth M. Van Trieste**

Date: **April 15, 2013**



U.S. Election Assistance Commission Urban/Rural Study Final Report

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Executive Summary | i |
| Background | 1 |
| Methodology | 2 |
| Survey Development..... | 2 |
| Sample Selection..... | 3 |
| Survey Distribution..... | 5 |
| Electronic Distribution and Follow-Up | 5 |
| Distribution of Paper Surveys | 6 |
| Response Rate..... | 6 |
| Results..... | 8 |
| Respondent and Jurisdiction Characteristics | 8 |
| Voter Outreach Activities | 9 |
| Forms of Outreach | 9 |
| Partnerships..... | 11 |
| Outreach to Specific Groups | 13 |
| Costs of Outreach and Sources of Funding..... | 14 |
| Ease/Difficulty of Conducting Outreach..... | 17 |
| Personnel..... | 20 |
| Number of Personnel | 20 |
| Poll Worker Pay | 22 |
| Methods of Poll Worker Recruiting..... | 24 |
| Ease/Difficulty of Poll Worker Recruiting | 27 |
| Split Shifts..... | 30 |
| Summary and Conclusions | 32 |
| References..... | 35 |
| Appendix A. U.S. Election Assistance Commission Urban/Rural Study Questionnaire | A-1 |
| Appendix B. Survey Sample Weights | B-1 |
| Appendix C. EAC Urban/Rural Survey Verbatim Respondent Comments | C-1 |

Table of Contents (Continued)

List of Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1. Frequencies of Elections Jurisdictions by Region and Urban/Rural Status..... | 4 |
| Table 2. Distribution of Sample for the Strata..... | 5 |
| Table 3. Final Survey Response Rate by Survey Mode and Overall..... | 7 |
| Table 4. Expected and Actual Percent of Completed Surveys by Stratum..... | 7 |
| Table 5. Urban/Rural Status as Reported by LEOs and the Economic Research Service..... | 8 |
| Table 6. Percent of Jurisdictions Allowing Alternate Voting Modes..... | 9 |
| Table 7. Forms of Outreach Provided and Languages in Which They are Provided | 10 |
| Table 8. Percent of LEOs engaged in Outreach Activities by Urban/Rural Status | 11 |
| Table 9. Percent of LEOs Engaged in Outreach Activities by Size of Registered Voter Population..... | 11 |
| Table 10. Percent of LEOs who Form Partnerships with Organization Types by Urban/Rural Status..... | 12 |
| Table 11. Percent of LEOs who Form Partnerships with Organization Types by Size of Registered Voter Population..... | 12 |
| Table 12. Percent Partnering in Outreach Activities by Urban/Rural Status..... | 13 |
| Table 13. Percent Focusing on Specific Voter Groups through Outreach Activities in Urban and Rural Jurisdictions | 14 |
| Table 14. Cost of Outreach Activities for 2010 Mid-Term Election..... | 15 |
| Table 15. Cost of Outreach Activities for 2012 General Election..... | 15 |
| Table 16. Cost of Outreach Activities for 2010 Mid-Term Election by Urban/Rural Status | 15 |
| Table 17. Cost of Outreach Activities for 2012 General Election by Urban/Rural Status | 16 |
| Table 18. Cost of Outreach Activities for 2010 Mid-Term Election by Size of Registered Voter Population | 16 |
| Table 19. Cost of Outreach Activities for 2012 General Election by Size of Registered Voter Population | 16 |
| Table 20. Sources of Funding for Outreach Efforts by Urban/Rural Status..... | 17 |
| Table 21. Ease/Difficulty of Voter Outreach Efforts by Urban/Rural Status | 17 |
| Table 22. Ease/Difficulty of Voter Outreach Efforts by Size of Registered Voter Population | 18 |
| Table 23. Ease/Difficulty of Voter Outreach Efforts by Tenure of LEO | 18 |
| Table 24. Sources of Difficulty in Conducting Voter Outreach..... | 19 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 25. Average Ratings of Degree of Problem Posed by Potential Barriers to Voter Outreach by Urban/Rural Status ¹ | 19 |
| Table 26. Average Ratings of Degree of Problem Posed by Potential Barriers to Voter Outreach by Size of Registered Voter Population ^a | 20 |
| Table 27. Average Number of Staff for the 2010 and 2012 General Elections..... | 20 |
| Table 28. Average Number of Staff for the 2010 and 2012 General Elections by Urban/Rural Status..... | 21 |
| Table 29. Average Number of Staff for the 2010 and 2012 General Elections by Size of Registered Voter Population | 21 |
| Table 30. Average Number of Poll Workers/Election Judges for the 2010 and 2012 General Elections by Urban/Rural Status and Size of Registered Voter Population | 22 |
| Table 31. Average and Range of Poll Worker Election Day Pay by Urban/Rural Status | 22 |
| Table 32. Average and Range of Poll Worker Election Day Pay by Size of Registered Voter Population | 23 |
| Table 33. Average and Range of Poll Worker Training Pay by Urban/Rural Status | 23 |
| Table 34. Average and Range of Poll Worker Training Pay by Size of Registered Voter Population | 24 |
| Table 35. Percent of LEOs Using Various Recruiting Resources and Degree of Success Achieved by Those Using Each | 25 |
| Table 36 Percent Using Recruiting Resources by Urban/Rural Status..... | 25 |
| Table 37 Percent Using Recruiting Resources by Size of Registered Voter Population..... | 26 |
| Table 38. Average Ratings of Recruiting Resource Usefulness by Urban/Rural Status | 26 |
| Table 39. Average Ratings of Recruiting Resource Usefulness by Size of Registered Voter Population | 27 |
| Table 40. Difficulty in Recruiting Poll Workers by Urban/Rural Status..... | 28 |
| Table 41. Difficulty in Recruiting Poll Workers by Size of Registered Voter Population..... | 28 |
| Table 42. Sources of Difficulty in Recruiting Poll Workers | 29 |
| Table 43. Average Rating of Poll Worker Recruiting Difficulty by Urban/Rural Status..... | 29 |
| Table 44. Average Poll Worker Recruiting Difficulty Rating by Size of Registered Voter Population | 30 |
| Table 45. Impact of Offering Split Shifts on Poll Worker Recruiting by Whether Split Shifts are Currently Offered..... | 31 |
| Table 46. Impact of Having Split Shifts by Urban/Rural Status..... | 31 |
| Table 47. Impact of Having Split Shifts by Size of Registered Voter Population..... | 32 |

Executive Summary

Background

The 2002 Help America Vote Act (HAVA) created the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) and provided mandates for some of the issues that they should seek to address. One of these was to examine factors that may differentially have an impact on elections administration in urban and rural areas. In May 2010, EAC staff convened a working group made up of Local Election Officials (LEOs) from both rural and urban jurisdictions, as well as researchers who have examined issues pertinent to this topic. After gaining a common perspective on the definition of “urban” and “rural,” the working group members focused on four main areas where there could be significant variance in election administration processes based on urban/rural setting. These were voter outreach, personnel, polling places, and technology. EAC staff examined the input obtained and determined that the two topics that might yield the most salient information were voter outreach and personnel. At the same time, it was acknowledged by working group members that funding issues were likely to be critical to both of these topics.

After considering several methods for obtaining input on the issues of interest, EAC decided that a survey of LEOs would provide the most comprehensive information. They developed a survey that addressed both voter outreach and personnel factors, as well as the resources available for each. EAC then contracted with the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) to implement the survey and analyze the results.

Methodology

HumRRO reviewed and pilot tested the survey, and worked with EAC to incorporate necessary changes. It was then formatted for delivery in both paper-and-pencil and online forms. HumRRO also drafted the package required to obtain permission to conduct the survey from the Office of Management and Budget. This was granted on August 22, 2012.

EAC provided a database containing contact information for some 4,600 LEOs. Email addresses were available for approximately two thirds of the LEOs, and regular mailing addresses for the remainder. HumRRO reviewed the database and made updates and additions where possible, as well as adding codes that designated each district’s urban/rural status using a 9-tier classification system developed by the Economic Research Service (ERS) of the Department of Agriculture. Geographic location was also coded, designating each jurisdiction as being in the Northeast, Midwest, South, or West. The population was then stratified according to these dimensions, yielding 36 strata (4 geographic regions by 9 urban/rural groups). Because the rural portion of the strata was relatively small, all cases in this group were selected for inclusion in the sample. A random sample of 2,000 cases was then selected from the remainder. The final sample included 2,352 cases with email addresses and 390 without, for a total of 2,742 cases.

Sample members were sent, either via email or regular mail, a letter from the Chief Operating Officer and Acting Executive Director of the EAC explaining the purpose and importance of the project. As anticipated given the age of the contact information, a number of the emails were returned as undeliverable. In all, 376 cases were moved to the mail portion of the sample for this

reason. Several days after the first contact, each sample member was sent either a paper version of the survey or an email containing instructions for accessing the instrument and a unique password to allow them to do so. A reminder email was sent to all sample members approximately one week after survey launch thanking those who had already taken part and urging participation for those who had not. Similarly, a reminder postcard was sent to those in the regular mail portion of the sample approximately one week after the surveys were sent.

Results

Response Rate and Background Information. A total of 874 completed surveys were returned for a response rate of 32.25%. Although the percentages in each strata were similar to the population, weights were calculated and applied to ensure that the sample accurately reflected the population of LEOs in terms of urban/rural status and geographic region. The data revealed the following about the sample members and their jurisdictions.

- The average number of years served as a LEO was 13.1, with a range of less than 1 year to 55 years.
- Overall, 52.7% of respondents were elected to their positions, with the remainder having been appointed.
- Just over 92% of LEOs from jurisdictions classified as rural by the ERS indicated that they were, in fact, in rural areas. However, only 7.25% of LEOs from jurisdictions classified by the ERS as urban agreed with that designation, with 59.92% indicating rural and 33.83% saying a mixture of the two.
- As expected, there was a wide range of district sizes as indicated by the number of registered voters, from less than 10 to 1,900,000. For analytic purposes, the sample was divided into three groups based on this variable to represent small ($\leq 5,000$ voters, $n = 302$), medium (5,001-20,000 voters, $n = 271$), and large ($\geq 20,000$ voters, $n = 282$) jurisdictions.
- Over 87% of respondents said that they have full responsibility for the administration of elections, including voter registration, voting machines, and ballots. Of the remainder, 65% indicated that some or all of these were shared state and local functions, and 35% specified some other arrangement (e.g., shared state, county and local responsibility).

Voter Outreach. The results regarding voter outreach can be summarized as follows.

- The most frequently cited forms of voter outreach LEOs reported engaging in were paid print advertising (70.70%), elections office or county website (70.16%), and participation in community events (55.63%).
- A higher proportion of rural LEOs relied on paid print advertising for voter outreach than did those representing urban districts (urban. 68.60%; rural 81.75%), while greater proportions of urban LEOs invested in websites (urban 72.81%; rural. 56.93%), social media (urban 14.23%; rural 3.68%), and participation in community events (urban 57.46%; rural 45.99%).
- Overall, higher percentages of LEOs in large districts used each form of voter outreach than did those in medium-sized districts, and greater proportions of LEOs representing

medium-sized districts engaged in each form of voter outreach than did those from small districts.

- When asked if they partnered with other organizations to conduct outreach, 32.19% indicated that this was the case, including 34.54% of urban LEOs and 19.85% of rural. Approximately 89% of both rural and urban LEOs who formed partnerships did so with school-related groups, and about 60% of both groups did so with political parties. Urban LEOs were more likely to partner with nonprofits (72.58%) than were rural LEOs (48.00%).
- The most common forms of partnering were participating in community events (urban 67.49%; rural 40.00%), maintaining a website (urban 37.30%; rural 8.33%), hard copy direct mail (urban 20.49%; rural 12.00%), and paid print advertising (urban 24.69%; rural 24.00%).
- Higher proportions of LEOs from urban jurisdictions indicated that they target outreach activities to racial/ethnic minorities (urban 17.79%; rural 6.20%) and foreign language speakers (urban 8.90%; rural 1.55%).
- The vast majority of LEOs indicated that they spent \$5,000 or less on voter outreach in both the 2010 midterm (91.07%) and 2012 general elections (88.39%).
- The majority of LEOs from both urban (69.60%) and rural (64.41%) districts fund outreach efforts through local election office budgets.
- There were no differences between LEOs from urban and rural areas or large/medium/small districts in terms of their assessments of the difficulty in conducting voter outreach. Overall, 44.20% said this was very easy or somewhat easy, followed by 37.27% neither easy or difficult, and 18.53% somewhat or very difficult.
- Over two thirds of respondents indicated that staff availability and time were a moderate to big problem in conducting outreach, with 60% responding similarly with regard to cost. Rural LEOs rated travel time and Internet availability as more significant problems than did urban LEOs. LEOs representing large districts indicated that staff availability and time were a bigger problem than did those from small jurisdictions, while the availability of media outlets and Internet reliability were more problematic for LEOS from small and medium districts as compared to large.

Personnel. The results regarding elections office and poll worker personnel can be summarized as follows:

- The average number of personnel available to LEOs for the 2012 general election was 3.16 full-time, 4.48 part-time, and 7.42 paid temporary. In addition, 14.66% of respondents reported that they borrowed staff from other government agencies/departments, with the average number being 5.02 in 2012.
- Taking all types of staff into account, the average number of staff available to LEOs in urban and rural districts in 2012 was 22.66 and 6.18, respectively. Corresponding figures for large, medium, and small districts were 44.63, 7.58, and 6.98, respectively.
- The average number of poll workers in 2012 was 166.10. The average number of poll workers in urban districts (191.61) was significantly higher than in rural districts (33.99). Corresponding figures based on number of registered voters in the district was 442.82 in large districts, 61.77 in medium sized, and 16.31 in small jurisdictions.

- Overall, 95.32% of LEOs said that poll workers are paid for their service in their jurisdictions, with 68.58% saying they are also paid for training, either apart from or in combination with their election-day pay. The average hourly pay amounts reported by LEOs in urban and rural, as well as large medium, and small districts were quite similar at approximately \$9.00 an hour. Overall, LEOs from urban and larger districts reported higher one-time stipends than did those from rural and small districts. Training pay amounts were similar across jurisdictions with an average one-time stipend of \$20-\$25 and an hourly rate of around \$9.00.
- The forms of poll worker recruiting used by the largest proportion of respondents were word of mouth (89.90%) and responding to volunteer inquiries (68.91%). These were also deemed the most successful methods of recruiting. In general, LEOs from urban, large, and medium-sized districts reported using more forms of poll worker recruiting than did those from rural and small districts.
- Overall, 43.82% of LEOs indicated that poll worker recruiting was very or somewhat easy, while 39.47% said it was very or somewhat difficult. No differences were found between urban and rural LEOs in their average rating of recruiting difficulty. However LEOs from small districts had a lower overall average than those from medium or large districts, indicating they rated recruiting as being less difficult.
- The factors that were rated as a moderate or big problem in poll worker recruiting by the largest proportion of LEOs were election day hours being too long (47.60%) and the requirement for having equal numbers of poll workers from each political party (45.40%). Over one third of respondents (36.35%) also felt that volunteers getting time off from work was a significant issue.
- No differences were found based on urban/rural status in the degree to which the various factors were rated as being problematic in recruiting poll workers. However, LEOs from small districts deemed pay, hours, training time, the lack of respect afforded poll workers, and a lack of qualified workers as less problematic than did LEOs from medium or large districts. LEOs in large districts also indicated that poll workers getting time off from work was more of a problem than did LEOs from small districts.
- A higher percentage of LEOs from urban districts (47.68%) said that split shifts are available than did those from rural districts (36.22%). A larger proportion of LEOs from small districts (65.28%) offer split shifts than those from medium-sized (40.00%) or large districts (29.80%).
- Among those who offer split shifts, 68.91% of LEOs agreed that doing so makes recruiting poll workers at least somewhat easier. Only 39.37% of LEOs from jurisdictions that do not offer split shifts agreed that this would be the case.

Conclusions

The fact that the vast majority of LEOs reporting spending \$5,000 or less on voter outreach is likely at least partially a function of limits on local election office budgets which are the main source for these funds. LEOs from rural areas rely more on traditional forms of outreach such as print advertising, while urban LEOs tend to capitalize on a wider array of resources. Although relatively small proportions of respondents indicated that it was difficult to conduct outreach, over two thirds said that staff availability/time was an obstacle in doing so, and half cited cost as an issue.

The biggest obstacles in poll worker recruiting are the long hours on election day, volunteers getting time off from their paying jobs, and the requirement for equal numbers of poll workers from each party. No significant differences were found between rural and urban LEOs in their assessments in this regard. However, LEOs from smaller districts generally felt it was easier to recruit poll workers than did those from medium and large jurisdictions. LEOs from districts that offer split shifts were more positive in their assessment of the impact this has on recruiting poll workers than were those from jurisdictions that do not offer them.

LEOs offered a variety of suggestions for ways to improve election administration including forming partnerships with organizations that already have outreach networks such as Rock the Vote, providing food to poll workers on election day, and establishing methods for emphasizing the importance of poll workers to the democratic process, such as a National Poll Worker Appreciation Day. Overall, the written comments offered by respondents underscored the wide variety of circumstances they face and the need to provide recommendations regarding election administration that take into account this diversity along with suggestions that will allow flexibility in their implementation.

At the conclusion of the Urban/Rural Survey, LEOs were invited to provide contact information if they would be interested in participating in more in-depth interviews regarding the topics addressed. Nearly 250 individuals complied with this request. Therefore, EAC has the opportunity to capitalize on this through the use of online meetings or other technology-based forums to gain greater insight into the wide variety of circumstances faced both between and within rural and urban jurisdictions in the administration of Federal elections.

U.S. Election Assistance Commission Urban/Rural Study Final Report

Background

Historically, election researchers have been interested in the effects of voting legislation on turnout, the expansion of voter rights, voter enfranchisement, partisan alignment, and other voting behavior. Research in this arena was an attempt to understand participation in one of the most fundamental democratic processes. While issues of gender, race/ethnicity, language ability, and minority discrimination in general have historically been the focus of voting participation studies, the question of differences between urban and rural voting behavior has been broadly overlooked. Early studies of the effects of urbanization on participation (Milbrath, 1965; Nie, Powell, & Prewitt, 1969; Verba & Nie, 1972) were inconclusive about correlations between urbanization and participation, contradictory, or they simply assumed there was higher voter turnout in urban areas without much supporting evidence (Monroe 1977).

More recently, while the treatment of urbanization in voting behavior research has been more prevalent, this research has focused primarily on partisan alignment. After the election crisis of 2000, however, scholars have paid more attention to election reform, and with it, issues such as ballot design, the relationship between socioeconomic factors and voting equipment, the factors explaining how election reform is adopted, and voting errors. With the passage of the 2002 Help America Vote Act (HAVA), the issue of urban and rural participation has come under more scrutiny. With respect to the urban and rural effects on participation, Creek and Karnes (2009) found there were differences in relative costs to becoming HAVA compliant, with rural jurisdictions feeling a greater impact due to more restricted resources. They also found that the experiences of election administrators were different depending on the state's centralization of election administration and the level of cooperation between state and local officials. Certainly with HAVA, there has been an increased interdependence among Federal, state, and local governments in determining how Federal elections are administration (Liebschutz & Palazzolo 2005)

With a growing focus on urbanization, what is becoming clearer is that there are differences in urban and rural election officials' abilities to comply with HAVA. These conclusions are echoed in the Pew Center on the States *Make Voting Work* study of 2008, and to a lesser extent in Rachlin's *Making Every Vote Count* (2006). The authors of these works note the challenges facing urban election officials as being different than those facing rural election officials. For example, "Local election officials in jurisdictions with more than a million voters and dedicated information technology staff face entirely different challenges in securing, maintaining and operating voting technology than their brethren in smaller jurisdictions" (Gronke & Caudell-Feagan, 2008, p. 13-14). Election administrators in rural areas, on the other hand, sometimes are relatively less equipped in regard to technology expertise, lack places to store voting equipment (Gronke & Caudell-Feagan, 2008, p.14), have insufficient personnel, and/or insufficient funds to replace equipment (Rachlin 2006).

In addition to establishing the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), HAVA 241(b) (15) also included a requirement that the EAC study matters relevant to administering elections in rural and urban areas. Towards that end, in May 2010 EAC convened a working group comprising local election officials representing both urban and rural jurisdictions, as well as researchers who have examined the differences in election administration in such jurisdictions. The group first spent time considering the characteristics that define “rural” and “urban,” including population density and size. When a common perspective was gained on this distinction, the group then went on to discuss four broad areas where there could be significant variance in election administration processes and procedures based on such characteristics. These were voter outreach, personnel, polling places, and technology.

EAC staff examined the input obtained and decided that the two topics that might yield the most salient information were voter outreach and personnel. They also acknowledged that a constant theme emerging from the discussions of the working group was that of cost. Therefore, they decided this should be a particular focus within each area. After considering various options for obtaining input on these issues, the decision was made to survey local election officials to gather information on current and best practices related to voter outreach and personnel. The results could be used to identify specific issues that arise in rural and urban jurisdictions, as well as processes and procedures that seem to be particularly effective in dealing with such issues. In September of 2011, EAC awarded a contract to the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) to conduct this study. The remainder of this report details the steps that were undertaken to implement the EAC Urban/Rural Study and the results of these efforts.

Methodology

Survey Development

Based on the input of the urban/rural working group, EAC staff developed a draft survey centering on the issues of interest. This instrument was reviewed by individuals experienced in survey design and suggested changes were incorporated. The draft instrument was then circulated to six local election officials (LEOs) identified by the EAC who were asked to complete it and take part in an interview addressing the clarity and comprehensiveness of the questions and suggestions for additional content. The outcomes of this process were reviewed by the project team, and alterations/additions were made where deemed advisable. The survey was formatted for both online and paper-based delivery. The online version was tested by both HumRRO and EAC staff to ensure the instructions were clear, the instrument was easily accessible and user friendly, and the data were being collected accurately. A copy of the paper version of the survey is presented in Appendix A of this report.

Concurrent with survey development, HumRRO completed a draft of the package required by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review under the provisions of the *Paperwork Reduction Act* (44U.S.C. 3501 et seq.). This was reviewed by EAC staff, and adjustments were made as necessary. When the survey instrument was finalized, EAC arranged for the announcement of the data collection in the Federal Register. After the 60-day comment period, the package was submitted to OMB. Approval of the information collection was granted on August 22, 2012 (OMB Control No. 3265-0017).

Sample Selection

EAC staff had previously assembled a database with contact information for some 4,600 LEOs across the country. Included in this list was the official's name (where available), mailing address, and email address. Unfortunately, nine states refused to provide the EAC with email addresses for their local officials, comprising approximately one-third of the population of LEOs. Therefore, only standard mail addresses were available in these locations. HumRRO staff reviewed this database and, using web searches and other means, updated its contents to the extent possible.

The sample design for the survey attempted to accomplish several goals. The first was to distribute the sample sufficiently so that comparisons could be made across different size jurisdictions. This ability to make comparisons by size could be especially important to drawing conclusions about resource availability within counties to encourage and facilitate voting. The second goal was to distribute the sample by region to make the sample truly nationally representative.

The Economic Research Service (ERS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture developed a system of classifying municipal areas and counties along a continuum of rural-urban status with 9 values.¹ Table 1 presents the 9 classifications along with the number of jurisdictions in each. Note that in most states, LEOs are assigned at the county level, and can be directly classified using the ERS system. The exceptions to this rule are the New England states (i.e., Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont), as well as Alaska and Wisconsin, where LEOs generally serve at the municipal/town level. In these instances we assigned rural/urban codes based on the county in which the town or municipality is located.

We used this system to categorize each of the districts represented in the existing LEO database ($N = 4,616$). The first step was to divide the sample into group sizes using the 1 through 9 categorization for counties according to size and urban/rural status. Counties that fell into categories 1 through 7 comprised the urban stratum, and counties that fell into categories 8 and 9 formed the rural stratum. Counties in both of these initial strata were further divided into four geographic regions, forming 36 cells.

¹ <http://ers.usda.gov/Data/RuralDefinitions/>

Table 1. Frequencies of Elections Jurisdictions by Region and Urban/Rural Status

| Code | Geographic Region | | | | Total |
|---|-------------------|---------|-------|------|-------|
| | Northeast | Midwest | South | West | |
| 1. Counties in metro areas of 1 million population or more | 359 | 106 | 211 | 39 | 715 |
| 2. Counties in metro areas of 250,000 to 1 million population | 329 | 83 | 160 | 42 | 614 |
| 3. Counties in metro areas of fewer than 250,000 population | 175 | 104 | 180 | 50 | 509 |
| 4. Urban population of 20,000 or more, adjacent to a metro area | 178 | 65 | 93 | 30 | 366 |
| 5. Urban population of 20,000 or more, not adjacent to a metro area | 71 | 45 | 32 | 24 | 172 |
| 6. Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area | 240 | 184 | 336 | 59 | 819 |
| 7. Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area | 254 | 178 | 163 | 84 | 679 |
| 8. Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, adjacent to a metro area | 68 | 75 | 117 | 33 | 293 |
| 9. Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, not adjacent to a metro area | 30 | 224 | 132 | 63 | 449 |
| Total | 1,704 | 1,064 | 1,424 | 424 | 4,616 |

All counties in the second stratum were sampled, having the effect of drawing in all very rural counties. For the first stratum (categories 1 through 7), a sample final size of 400 was desired so as to be able to make some specific statements either about urban versus rural or comparisons across regions. However, based on our experience with this population, we anticipated a response rate of about 20%. Therefore, a sample size of 2,000 election officials for the rural and urban counties was desired. The sample size distribution is given in Table 2. Note that the sample is distributed proportionately to the size of the stratum for these 36 strata (nine urban/rural categories by four regions).

Table 2. Distribution of Sample for the Strata

| Code | Geographic Region | | | | Total |
|---|-------------------|---------|-------|------|-------|
| | Northeast | Midwest | South | West | |
| 1. Counties in metro areas of 1 million population or more | 185 | 55 | 109 | 20 | 369 |
| 2. Counties in metro areas of 250,000 to 1 million population | 170 | 43 | 83 | 22 | 318 |
| 3. Counties in metro areas of fewer than 250,000 population | 90 | 54 | 93 | 26 | 263 |
| 4. Urban population of 20,000 or more, adjacent to a metro area | 92 | 34 | 48 | 15 | 189 |
| 5. Urban population of 20,000 or more, not adjacent to a metro area | 37 | 23 | 17 | 12 | 89 |
| 6. Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area | 124 | 95 | 173 | 30 | 422 |
| 7. Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area | 131 | 92 | 84 | 43 | 350 |
| 8. Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, adjacent to a metro area | 68 | 75 | 117 | 33 | 293 |
| 9. Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, not adjacent to a metro area | 30 | 224 | 132 | 63 | 449 |
| Total | 927 | 695 | 856 | 264 | 2,742 |

The sample was drawn from the entire local election official database (i.e., including those with and without electronic contact information). The final sample included 2,352 cases with email contact information and 390 without. As detailed below, those cases for which email addresses were no longer active were moved to the mail portion of the sample.

The results from this survey are only representative of the survey respondents and cannot be statistically generalized to all LEOs. EAC designed this survey to obtain insights into practices and problems in rural and urban districts with the additional goals of identifying possible solutions and informing efforts at providing guidance and technical assistance to districts. EAC expects that the results from this survey will be useful for these purposes.

Survey Distribution

Electronic Distribution and Follow-Up

A letter over the signature of the Chief Operating Officer and Acting Executive Director of the EAC was sent to each sample member for whom there was an email address in the database to inform them that they would be receiving a survey invitation in the coming days. The letter provided background on the purpose and importance of the effort. As we anticipated given the age of the information in the local election official database, there were a number of nondeliverable notices. In all, 376 such cases were transferred to the portion of the sample that was to receive a paper copy of the survey.

Approximately one week after the introductory e-mail, a survey invitation was sent via email to election officials in the online portion of the sample. Instructions for accessing the survey and a unique access password were included, as was information on how to obtain a paper copy of the survey. We also attached a pdf version of the instrument, which allowed respondents to preview the content of the questionnaire. They were also instructed that, if they preferred, they could print out the file, complete the paper-based survey, and return it to the address provided.

Approximately 10 days after the initial email invitation, a follow-up email was sent to all election officials, thanking those who had already completed the survey and encouraging non-responders to complete it at their earliest convenience. All information included in the first notification was repeated here.

The unique password to enter the survey allowed respondents to start and stop the survey at their convenience. It also prevented users from completing the survey twice. Contact information was included in both the notifications and on the survey instrument itself for respondents who had questions about the project and/or were experiencing technical difficulties. Electronic inquiries were directed to a project inbox that was accessible to all HumRRO personnel involved in the effort. Inquiries received were responded to within hours of receipt.

Distribution of Paper Surveys

That portion of the sample for whom email addresses were not available, along with those discovered to have invalid email addresses, were sent a paper copy of the questionnaire. In the absence of an actual name, we used an appropriate generic title (e.g., Elections Administrator, XXX County) in conducting the paper mailing. As in the electronic distribution, this process was started by sending an advance letter signed by the Chief Operating Officer and Acting Executive Director of the EAC. Approximately three days later, the survey packet was mailed, including a letter from the survey distribution coordinator, a paper version of the questionnaire printed in booklet format, a postage-paid business reply envelope, and instructions for accessing the survey online along with a password. The cover letter and outside mailing envelope were personalized for each election official to include his or her unique identification number, full name (when available), and mailing address. The unique identification number was also printed on the survey booklet included in the mailing. To ensure that the survey mailing was assembled correctly, envelopes were randomly pulled for review. The cover letter, outside mailing envelope, and the questionnaire booklet were compared to confirm that all information matched. Once the quality assurance check was completed, the survey packets were mailed using first class postage. Approximately one week after the survey mailing, a reminder postcard was mailed to each respondent, thanking those who had already completed the instrument and seeking participation from those who had not.

Response Rate

After accounting for undeliverable returns, the overall final response rate was just over 32% (see Table 3). This was well above the anticipated response rate of 20%. Table 4 presents the expected and actual percentages of respondents by region and jurisdiction size. By geographic region, there is overrepresentation of respondents from the Midwest, with a corresponding but

smaller underrepresentation of LEOs from the Northeast and South. Regarding jurisdiction size, there is a slight overrepresentation of LEOs from rural areas. A Chi-square goodness of fit test was run, and the results suggested that weighting the data would be required to ensure that the sample accurately reflected the population of LEOs in terms of urban/rural and geographic representation. The sample weights are presented in Appendix B.

Table 3. Final Survey Response Rate by Survey Mode and Overall

| | Email | Regular Mail | Total |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Initial Sample | 2,350 | 390 | 2,740 |
| Bad Addresses | 376* | 30 | 30 |
| Final Sample | 1,974 | 736 | 2,710 |
| Number of Responses | 484 | 390 | 874 |
| Response Rate | 24.52% | 52.99% | 32.25% |

*Cases with undeliverable emails were moved to regular mail portion of the sample.

Table 4. Expected and Actual Percent of Completed Surveys by Stratum

| Code | Geographic Region | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Northeast | | Midwest | | South | | West | | Total | |
| | Expected | Actual | Expected | Actual | Expected | Actual | Expected | Actual | Expected | Actual |
| 1 | 7.8 | 6.2 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 0.84 | 1.3 | 15.5 | 13.8 |
| 2 | 7.1 | 6.4 | 1.8 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 0.91 | .69 | 13.3 | 13.5 |
| 3 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 2.2 | 2.9 | 3.9 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 11.0 | 10.4 |
| 4 | 3.9 | 2.9 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 0.80 | 0.65 | 1.0 | 7.9 | 6.3 |
| 5 | 1.5 | 0.46 | 0.97 | 1.4 | 0.69 | 0.34 | 0.52 | 0.46 | 3.7 | 2.6 |
| 6 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 7.3 | 6.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 17.7 | 17.2 |
| 7 | 5.5 | 4.7 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 14.7 | 11.8 |
| 8 | 1.5 | 2.8 | 1.6 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 3.4 | 0.71 | 0.80 | 6.3 | 9.8 |
| 9 | 0.65 | 0.80 | 4.8 | 7.4 | 2.9 | 4.1 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 9.7 | 14.5 |
| Total | 36.9 | 33.2 | 23.0 | 29.2 | 30.8 | 27.3 | 9.2 | 10.3 | 99.8 | 99.9 |

Results

The results presented below focus first on the background information so as to provide a picture of the key characteristics of LEOs and their jurisdictions as captured through the survey instrument. In the next section, we summarize the outreach activities conducted by the respondents, and examine the data to see if there were differences in this regard between LEOs serving urban and rural locations. Next, we examine issues related to personnel, with a specific focus on issues regarding poll workers and the extent to which finding enough qualified individuals is a problem. We conclude with an overview of the written input provided by respondents.

Respondent and Jurisdiction Characteristics

The average number of years respondents had served as a local election official (all locations) was 13.1 ($SD = 9.43$), with a range from less than 1 year to 55 years.² Overall, 52.69% were elected to their current position, while 47.31% were appointed. As might be expected, there was a great deal of variance in the number of registered voters in the jurisdictions served, with an average of 41,353 ($SD = 12,092$), and a range of less than 10 to 1,900,000.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether their jurisdiction is primarily rural, urban, or a mix of both. These results are shown in Table 5 in conjunction with the urban/rural designation gleaned from the ERS. It shows that 731 of the LEOs who responded to the survey were in districts classified by the ERS as urban (first row of table). Among these, only 7.25% indicated that they were from an urban district, while 59.92% said rural, and 33.83% indicated a mixed district containing both rural and urban areas. There was, however, strong agreement on the part of those representing areas classified by the ERS as rural ($n = 140$) with 92.14% saying that their jurisdictions are in fact rural. We can only speculate that this disparity arises because of a common view of “urban” as referring to downtown, highly developed areas, while the ERS definition includes abutting jurisdictions in this category. For the remainder of this report we will present urban/rural differences using the ERS designation given that it is based on more objective criteria. We will also present results based on the number of registered voters in the jurisdiction. For this purpose, we divided the sample into three fairly even categories of small ($\leq 5,000$, $n = 302$), medium (5,001 – 20,000, $n = 271$) and large ($\geq 20,001$, $n = 282$).

Table 5. Urban/Rural Status as Reported by LEOs and the ERS

| ERS Designation | LEO Self Report | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | % Indicating Urban ($n = 53$) | % Indicating Rural ($n = 567$) | % Indicating Mixed ($n = 251$) |
| % Designated Urban ($n = 731$) | 7.25 | 59.92 | 33.83 |
| % Designated Rural ($n = 140$) | 0.00 | 92.14 | 7.88 |

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Overall, 15.13% of respondents said they are required to provide language assistance under Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act, with 84.49% of these LEOs representing urban

² SD signifies standard deviation, a measure of the amount of dispersion that exists in the data. A larger standard deviation indicates greater variance in the responses.

jurisdictions. Spanish was the most frequently reported required language (87.60% of those required to provide such assistance), followed by Asian languages (5.43%), Alaskan/Native American languages (3.10%), and Other (10.85%). The most often cited “other” language was French, mentioned by eight respondents.

Two final pieces of background information were sought in the survey, each covering administrative matters. The first of these questions asked if the respondent’s office has full responsibility for all aspects of elections, including registration, voting machines, and ballots. In all, 87.43% indicated that this was the case. Of the remaining 12.56%, nearly two-thirds (65.00%) said that this responsibility was a shared state and local function, with the remaining 35.00% indicating that some other arrangement was in place. Among those who entered a written explanation of their “other” response, the most frequent comment was that this responsibility is shared with other entities at the state, county and/or local levels. In many cases, multiple local-level offices cooperate in administering elections, including combinations of Town Clerk, Registrar of Voters, Tax Assessors/Collectors, and others. (See Appendix C, page C-3, Q5a. for full text of “other” responses to this question.)

Finally, LEOs were asked to indicate which forms of alternative voting are allowed in their jurisdictions. As can be seen in Table 6, the majority of respondents represented districts in which excuse-free absentee voting (55.46%), and early voting (50.96%) are allowed. A much smaller percentage (19.89%) allow all vote-by-mail.

Table 6. Percent of Jurisdictions Allowing Alternate Voting Modes

| | % Allowing |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Absentee Voting (excuse required) | 42.05 |
| No-excuse Absentee Voting | 55.41 |
| Early Voting | 50.96 |
| All vote-by-mail | 19.89 |

Note: Approximately 20% of respondents indicated that they allow both absentee voting with and without an excuse. These respondents are included in the “no-excuse” category in this table.

Voter Outreach Activities

The next section of the survey focused on voter outreach activities conducted by LEOs. The questions asked about types of outreach undertaken, partnerships formed in doing so, outreach to specific populations, costs involved, and the ease or difficulty in implementing outreach activities.

Forms of Outreach

The survey listed seven forms of outreach, and LEOs were asked to indicate which they conduct in their district and whether such efforts are in English only, English and other languages, or other languages only. These results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Forms of Outreach Provided and Languages in Which They are Provided

| | Percent Providing (n = 860) | Languages Provided (Percent of Those Providing) | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| | | English Only | English and Other Languages | Other Languages Only |
| Paid Print Advertising (n = 599) | 70.70 | 86.68 | 12.95 | 0.37 |
| Paid TV/Radio Advertising (n = 72) | 8.64 | 86.70 | 12.36 | 0.94 |
| Elections Office/County Website (n = 581) | 70.16 | 87.44 | 12.56 | 0.00 |
| Hard Copy Direct Mail to Voters (n = 252) | 30.00 | 80.61 | 19.39 | 0.00 |
| Toll-Free Telephone Line (n = 112) | 13.84 | 79.99 | 18.62 | 1.39 |
| Social Media (n = 104) | 12.57 | 92.39 | 7.61 | 0.00 |
| Participate in Community Events (n = 454) | 55.63 | 87.71 | 12.29 | 0.00 |

Note: Language percent rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

The three forms of outreach conducted by the largest percentage of respondents were paid print advertising (70.70%), elections office or county website (70.16%), and participating in community events (55.63%). Relatively small but stable percentages of LEOs reported providing such outreach in languages other than English, and almost none said they only provide the outreach in other languages.

Approximately one out of ten LEOs indicate that their office provides one or more types of voter outreach other than those listed in the survey. Most frequently mentioned were free advertising via newspaper, radio and/or television. Other types of voter outreach included postings in public places in the jurisdiction, postings on local websites, school-based outreach, and voter registration drives. (See Appendix C, page C-4, Q7. for the full text of the “other” responses.)

Table 8 shows the types of outreach engaged in by LEOs in urban and rural jurisdictions. Chi-square tests revealed a significantly higher proportion of LEOs representing rural districts relying on paid print advertising (68.60% urban; 81.75% rural), while LEOs in urban areas were more likely to engage in paid television/radio outreach (9.82% urban; 2.21% rural), websites (72.81% urban; 56.93% rural), social media (14.23% urban; 3.68% rural), and participation in community events (57.46% urban; 45.99% rural).

A similar breakdown is given by size of jurisdiction in Table 9. In all cases there was a progression in which larger jurisdictions were most likely to engage in the form of outreach, followed by medium sized, and smaller districts.

Table 8. Percent of LEOs engaged in Outreach Activities by Urban/Rural Status

| | % Rural (n = 137) | % Urban (n = 723) |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Paid Print Advertising | 81.75 | 68.60 |
| Paid Television/Radio Advertising | 2.21 | 9.82 |
| Elections Office/County Website | 56.93 | 72.81 |
| Hard Copy Direct Mail to Voters | 33.09 | 29.42 |
| Toll-Free Telephone Line | 10.22 | 14.52 |
| Social Media | 3.68 | 14.23 |
| Participate in Community Events | 45.99 | 57.46 |

Table 9. Percent of LEOs Engaged in Outreach Activities by Size of Registered Voter Population

| | % Small (n = 295) | % Medium (n = 268) | % Large (n = 279) |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Paid Print Advertising | 53.22 | 78.36 | 81.36 |
| Paid Television/Radio Advertising | 2.71 | 10.49 | 13.62 |
| Elections Office/County Website | 45.08 | 73.13 | 94.62 |
| Hard Copy Direct Mail to Voters | 20.00 | 32.84 | 39.43 |
| Toll-Free Telephone Line | 6.78 | 12.69 | 22.58 |
| Social Media | 5.76 | 8.21 | 24.37 |
| Participate in Community Events | 32.20 | 58.21 | 79.57 |

Partnerships

Respondents were also asked to indicate if they formed partnerships with third-party or civic organizations in conducting voter outreach activities. In all, 32.19% of respondents indicated that they did form such partnerships, including 34.54% of LEOs representing urban jurisdictions and 19.85% of LEOs in rural areas. A similar progression was seen based on number of registered voters, with 10.40% of LEOs in small, 37.36% of LEOs in medium, and 50.54% of LEOs in large districts forming third-party partnerships.

When asked to indicate the types of organizations with which they formed partnerships, 89.64% of LEOs who formed partnerships said they do so with school-related groups, 70.25% with non-

profit organizations, and 61.59% with political parties. Other organizations mentioned included government offices, departments and agencies, including Department of Motor Vehicles, Department of Human Services, and Social Services offices. (See Appendix C, page C-8, Q8a. for the full text of the “other” types of partnering organizations.)

Table 10 presents the results regarding types of partnerships formed in outreach activities by whether the LEO represents a jurisdiction that is classified by the ERS as urban or rural. Although the percentages citing school-related organizations and political parties were very similar, a significantly higher proportion of LEOs representing urban jurisdictions indicated that they formed partnerships with non-profits (72.58%) than did those from rural areas (48.00%).

Table 10. Percent of LEOs who Form Partnerships with Organization Types by Urban/Rural Status

| | % Rural (N = 26) | % Urban (n = 248) |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| School-Related Organizations | 88.46 | 89.52 |
| Non-Profit Organizations | 48.00 | 72.58 |
| Political Parties | 60.00 | 61.69 |

Table 11 shows, for those LEOs who indicated they partnered with other organizations in conducting voter outreach, the percent who did so with schools, non-profits, and political parties by size of their registered voter populations. Although the proportions partnering with school-related organizations were similar across jurisdiction size, a significantly higher proportion of respondents representing large voting districts formed partnerships with non-profits and political parties.

Table 11. Percent of LEOs who Form Partnerships with Organization Types by Size of Registered Voter Population

| | % Small (n = 30) | % Medium (n = 98) | % Large (n = 139) |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| School-Related Organizations | 83.33 | 89.80 | 90.65 |
| Non-Profit Organizations | 56.67 | 56.57 | 82.73 |
| Political Parties | 43.33 | 57.14 | 70.50 |

An additional voter outreach question asked respondents to indicate the types of activities they carry out in conjunction with partnering organizations. These results are shown in Table 12. It should be noted that the number of LEOs representing rural districts who partnered with outside organizations on outreach activities was small ($n = 25$); therefore the percentages in the table for this group are not particularly meaningful. Having said that, it seems clear that, among those who partner with outside organizations in conducting outreach, participating in community events and paid print advertising are the most common ways of doing so. No differences were found in regard to the types of activities engaged in with partners based on size of jurisdiction. Many of those who indicated that they provided some “other” type of outreach with partners cited

activities that fell in the categories specified in the survey. (See Appendix C, page C-10, Q8b. for a complete list of “other” responses to this question.)

Table 12. Percent Partnering in Outreach Activities by Urban/Rural Status

| | % Rural (n = 25) | % Urban (n = 243) |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Paid Print Advertising | 24.00 | 24.69 |
| Paid Television/Radio Advertising | 0.00 | 8.20 |
| Elections Office/County Website | 8.33 | 37.30 |
| Hard Copy Direct Mail to Voters | 12.00 | 20.49 |
| Toll-Free Telephone Line | 8.33 | 6.17 |
| Social Media | 0.00 | 8.20 |
| Participate in Community Events | 40.00 | 67.49 |

LEOs were asked to provide further information about their experiences in partnering with other organizations on voter outreach efforts. In all, 43.84% of LEOs who partner on voter outreach provided a comment. Nearly half (46.28%) of them mentioned voter registration efforts. Other frequently-mentioned topics included outreach involving community or civic organizations (42.97%), school-based or student-focused outreach (42.15%), and attendance at community or local events (23.97%). Less-frequently reported efforts involved outreach to senior citizens and disabled populations, mock elections and demonstrations of voting equipment, media outreach, and partnering with political parties. (See Appendix C, page C-11, Q8c. for the verbatim comments offered about performing voter outreach.)

Outreach to Specific Groups

Respondents were asked if they target their outreach activities to particular groups within their constituencies. Over half of LEOs cited students (57.88%) and voters in long-term care facilities (51.75%) as subjects of specific outreach, followed by voters with disabilities (49.09%), racial ethnic minorities (15.97%), and foreign language speakers (7.75%). These results are presented in Table 13 broken out by urban/rural jurisdiction. The data indicate that a significantly higher percentage of LEOs in urban districts focus outreach activities on racial and ethnic minorities and foreign language speakers than do those in rural areas. This is most likely due to a higher concentration of such voters in urban settings.

Table 13. Percent Focusing on Specific Voter Groups through Outreach Activities in Urban and Rural Jurisdictions

| | % Rural (n = 129) | % Urban (n = 697) |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Students | 51.94 | 58.96 |
| Racial/Ethnic Minorities | 6.20 | 17.79 |
| Foreign Language Speakers | 1.55 | 8.90 |
| Voters in Long-Term Care Facilities | 47.66 | 52.51 |
| Voters With Disabilities | 45.74 | 49.71 |

Respondents were given the opportunity to specify groups on which voter outreach efforts are focused other than those listed in the survey. A small number of LEOs (3.75%) provided a response. Frequently-mentioned focal groups include civic and community organizations, the elderly and homebound populations, and military and overseas populations. However, the most frequent response was that all voters are focused on equally. (See Appendix C, page C-19, Q9. for the verbatim comments in this regard.)

Costs of Outreach and Sources of Funding

As mentioned in the introduction to this report, the EAC Urban/Rural working group highlighted funding as a factor that has an impact on many aspects of Federal election administration. Correspondingly, respondents to this survey were asked to indicate how much their voter outreach efforts cost. They were asked to select from 14 (\$0 - \$1,000 through \$200,000 or more) cost ranges for the 2010 mid-term elections, and 17 (\$0 to \$1,000 through \$500,001 or more) cost ranges for 2012 general elections. Table 14 shows the percentage of LEOs who selected each of the categories in reference to 2010, while Table 15 shows corresponding figures for 2012. In both cases, the vast majority of LEOs indicated that they spent \$5,000 or less (91.07% for the 2010 and 88.39% for the 2012 elections).

For the purposes of further analyses, we collapsed the reporting categories into five groups, representing the original four lowest cost ranges and combining those in the \$20,000 and above groups. The results for the 2010 and 2012 elections broken out by urban/rural status are shown in Tables 16 and 17, respectively. Although higher percentages of LEOs from urban districts reporting spending amounts in the \$10,000 and \$20,000 ranges, there were no significant differences between the urban and rural groups overall in either year. Tables 18 and 19 provide parallel results for small/medium/large jurisdictions. As might be expected, there was significantly higher proportion of LEOs from large districts in the upper cost ranges.

Table 14. Cost of Outreach Activities for 2010 Mid-Term Election

| Cost 2010 | n | % | Cost 2010 | n | % |
|--------------------|----------|----------|---------------------|----------|----------|
| \$0 – 1,000 | 618 | 76.72 | \$50,001 – 60,000 | 0 | 0.00 |
| \$1,001 – 5,000 | 116 | 14.35 | \$60,001 – 70,000 | 0 | 0.00 |
| \$5,001 - \$10,000 | 29 | 3.64 | \$70,001 – 80,000 | 0 | 0.00 |
| \$10,001 – 20,000 | 21 | 2.60 | \$80,001 – 90,000 | 2 | 0.19 |
| \$20,001 – 30,000 | 5 | 0.68 | \$90,001 – 100,000 | 2 | 0.24 |
| \$30,001 – 40,000 | 4 | 0.54 | \$100,001 – 200,000 | 6 | 0.70 |
| \$40,001 – 50,000 | 0 | 0.00 | \$200,001 or more | 3 | 0.33 |

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 15. Cost of Outreach Activities for 2012 General Election

| Cost 2012 | n | % | Cost 2012 | n | % |
|--------------------|----------|----------|---------------------|----------|----------|
| \$0 – 1,000 | 575 | 71.40 | \$70,001 – 80,000 | 2 | 0.20 |
| \$1,001 – 5,000 | 137 | 16.99 | \$80,001 – 90,000 | 0 | 0.00 |
| \$5,001 - \$10,000 | 29 | 3.66 | \$90,000 – 100,000 | 1 | 0.12 |
| \$10,001 – 20,000 | 23 | 2.82 | \$100,001 – 200,000 | 8 | 0.94 |
| \$20,001 – 30,000 | 13 | 1.67 | \$200,001 – 300,000 | 1 | 0.17 |
| \$30,001 – 40,000 | 7 | 0.92 | \$300,001 – 400,000 | 0 | 0.00 |
| \$40,001 – 50,000 | 3 | 0.40 | \$400,001 – 500,000 | 1 | 0.08 |
| \$50,001 – 60,000 | 3 | 0.37 | \$500,001 or more | 1 | 0.17 |
| \$60,001 – 70,000 | 1 | 0.08 | | | |

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 16. Cost of Outreach Activities for 2010 Mid-Term Election by Urban/Rural Status

| Cost 2010 | % Rural (n = 129) | % Urban (n = 678) |
|--------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| \$0 – 1,000 | 79.84 | 75.96 |
| \$1,001 – 5,000 | 14.73 | 14.31 |
| \$5,001 – \$10,000 | 3.88 | 3.69 |
| \$10,001 – 20,000 | 0.78 | 2.95 |
| \$20,001 or more | 0.78 | 3.10 |

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 17. Cost of Outreach Activities for 2012 General Election by Urban/Rural Status

| Cost 2012 | % Rural (n = 127) | % Urban (n = 678) |
|--------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| \$0 – 1,000 | 75.59 | 70.50 |
| \$1,001 – 5,000 | 18.11 | 16.81 |
| \$5,001 – \$10,000 | 3.94 | 3.54 |
| \$10,001 – 20,000 | 1.57 | 3.10 |
| \$20,000 or more | 0.79 | 6.05 |

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 18. Cost of Outreach Activities for 2010 Mid-Term Election by Size of Registered Voter Population

| Cost 2010 | % Small (n = 280) | % Medium (n = 250) | % Large (n = 261) |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| \$0 – 1,000 | 90.00 | 76.40 | 62.07 |
| \$1,001 – 5,000 | 8.57 | 15.60 | 19.54 |
| \$5,001 – \$10,000 | 1.07 | 3.20 | 7.28 |
| \$10,001 - 20,000 | 0.36 | 3.60 | 4.21 |
| \$20,001 or more | 0.00 | 1.20 | 6.90 |

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 19. Cost of Outreach Activities for 2012 General Election by Size of Registered Voter Population

| Cost 2012 | % Small (n = 279) | % Medium (n = 251) | % Large (n = 259) |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| \$0 – 1,000 | 88.17 | 72.11 | 51.74 |
| \$1,001 – 5,000 | 10.04 | 18.73 | 23.17 |
| \$5,001 – \$10,000 | 1.43 | 3.59 | 6.56 |
| \$10,001 – 20,000 | 0.36 | 2.39 | 5.79 |
| \$20,001 or more | 0.00 | 3.19 | 12.74 |

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

LEOs were asked to indicate the source(s) of funds for their outreach efforts, and were allowed to select all applicable options. These results are shown in Table 20. A majority of respondents in both urban and rural districts said that funding came from local election office budgets. A slightly higher percentage of LEOs representing rural districts selected county or state budget as a source, while LEOs from urban districts were more likely to indicate that some other funding arrangement was in place. Of these, more than one-third (35%) noted that their jurisdiction does not engage in voter outreach, and about one-quarter indicated that their jurisdiction does not spend money on voter outreach. Among LEOs who specified a different funding source than

those listed in the survey, grants/HAVA grants and town/municipal budgets were mentioned most often. (See Appendix C, page C-20, Q12. for the verbatim responses to this question.)

Table 20. Sources of Funding for Outreach Efforts by Urban/Rural Status

| | % Rural | % Urban |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| Local Election Office Budget Only | 64.41 | 69.60 |
| Line Item Appropriation in County or State Budget Only | 10.79 | 19.20 |
| Other Source Only | 13.25 | 5.60 |
| Local and County/State | 6.93 | 3.20 |
| Local and Other Source | 4.01 | 1.60 |
| State and Other Source | 0.62 | 0.80 |

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Ease/Difficulty of Conducting Outreach

LEOs were asked to indicate how difficult it was for them to conduct voter outreach efforts. Overall, 19.64% said such efforts were very easy, followed by 24.56% somewhat easy, 37.27% neither easy or difficult, 11.82% somewhat difficult, and 6.71% very difficult. These results are presented in Tables 21 and 22 by urban/rural status and size of registered voter population, respectively. Within urban/rural and small/medium/large groups, around 45% of respondents indicated that voter outreach was very or somewhat easy, while 14-22% indicated it was difficult. There were no significant differences between LEOs based on urban/rural status or size of jurisdiction.

Table 21. Ease/Difficulty of Voter Outreach Efforts by Urban/Rural Status

| | % Rural (n = 124) | % Urban (n = 654) |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Very Easy | 20.16 | 19.57 |
| Somewhat Easy | 27.42 | 24.01 |
| Neither Easy nor Difficult | 38.71 | 37.00 |
| Somewhat Difficult | 9.68 | 12.23 |
| Very Difficult | 4.03 | 7.19 |

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 22. Ease/Difficulty of Voter Outreach Efforts by Size of Registered Voter Population

| | % Small (n = 258) | % Medium (n = 248) | % Large (n = 264) |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Very Easy | 21.32 | 20.56 | 18.18 |
| Somewhat Easy | 23.64 | 24.19 | 24.62 |
| Neither Easy nor Difficult | 39.15 | 37.50 | 34.85 |
| Somewhat Difficult | 7.36 | 13.31 | 14.77 |
| Very Difficult | 8.53 | 4.44 | 7.58 |

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 23 presents a breakdown of responses to the item assessing ease of voter outreach by the tenure of respondent as a LEO, including all positions held. For this purpose, we divided the sample into four groups based on the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles of the range of tenure years. No significant differences were found between these groups in their assessment of how easy or difficult it is to conduct voter outreach efforts.

Table 23. Ease/Difficulty of Voter Outreach Efforts by Tenure of LEO

| | % 0-6 years (n = 235) | % 7-12 years (n = 180) | % 13-19 years (n = 157) | % 20 or more years (n = 200) |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Very Easy | 17.87 | 21.67 | 16.56 | 22.50 |
| Somewhat Easy | 22.55 | 22.22 | 33.12 | 23.00 |
| Neither Easy nor Difficult | 42.13 | 36.67 | 35.03 | 33.50 |
| Somewhat Difficult | 11.49 | 9.44 | 10.19 | 15.00 |
| Very Difficult | 5.96 | 10.00 | 5.10 | 6.00 |

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

The final question regarding voter outreach presented LEOs with a series of potential hurdles in conducting such activities and asked that they indicate how much each is a problem for them on a 4-point scale (1 = not a problem, 2 = small problem, 3 = moderate problem, 4 = big problem). These results are presented in Table 24 for the entire sample. Over two-thirds of respondents indicated that staff availability and time were a moderate to big problem, with 60.62% responding similarly regarding cost. These were followed by travel distance for in-person contact (37.66%), availability of media outlets (34.45%), Internet limitations (27.84%), and variety of languages spoken (17.91%).

Table 24. Sources of Difficulty in Conducting Voter Outreach

| | % Not a Problem | % Small Problem | % Moderate Problem | % Big Problem |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Cost (<i>n</i> = 770) | 24.32 | 15.06 | 30.70 | 29.92 |
| Staff availability/time (<i>n</i> = 773) | 17.55 | 15.15 | 29.40 | 37.91 |
| Availability of Media Outlets (<i>n</i> = 750) | 43.26 | 22.30 | 21.33 | 13.12 |
| Travel distance required for in-person contact (<i>n</i> = 756) | 36.46 | 25.87 | 23.10 | 14.56 |
| Limitations on Internet access or reliability (<i>n</i> = 751) | 49.89 | 22.27 | 17.49 | 10.35 |
| Variety of languages spoken (<i>n</i> = 751) | 64.87 | 17.22 | 5.47 | 12.44 |

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

To ascertain whether there were difference between LEOs serving in urban and rural areas in regard to the types of problems experienced, we calculated the average rating for each group for each of the problems listed and ran tests to determine if there were significant differences between them (Table 25). Significant differences were found between LEOs representing urban and rural districts on two factors; availability of media markets and travel distance required for in-person contact. In both cases, LEOs from rural districts rated these factors as more of a problem. We also examined difficulty ratings by LEO tenure, and no significant differences were detected.

Table 25. Average Ratings of Degree of Problem Posed by Potential Barriers to Voter Outreach by Urban/Rural Status¹

| | Rural (<i>n</i> = 122) | Urban (<i>n</i> = 648) |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Cost | 2.53 | 2.69 |
| Staff availability/time | 2.80 | 2.89 |
| Availability of Media Outlets ^a | 2.35 | 1.98 |
| Travel distance required for in-person contact ^a | 2.41 | 2.11 |
| Limitations on Internet access or reliability | 2.04 | 1.85 |
| Variety of languages spoken | 1.69 | 1.65 |

Note: Ratings given on a 4-point scale: 1 = Not a problem at all, 2 = A small problem, 3 = A moderate problem, 4 = A big problem. Therefore, a higher average rating indicates a bigger problem.

^aSignificant difference between urban and rural jurisdictions, *p* < .01.

Table 26 presents the average rating of how problematic each factor was for small, medium, and large jurisdictions as indicated by the size of the registered voter populations. Cost and staff availability/time were deemed bigger problems by LEOs in large districts as compared to small, while availability of media outlets and Internet reliability were seen as larger problems by LEOs from small and medium districts as compared to large jurisdictions.

Table 26. Average Ratings of Degree of Problem Posed by Potential Barriers to Voter Outreach by Size of Registered Voter Population ^a

| | Small (n = 245) | Medium (n = 242) | Large (n = 260) |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Cost | 2.49 | 2.75 | 2.73 |
| Staff availability/time | 2.75 | 2.90 | 2.97 |
| Availability of Media Outlets | 2.20 | 2.08 | 1.87 |
| Travel distance required for in-person contact | 2.23 | 2.18 | 2.08 |
| Limitations on Internet access or reliability | 1.92 | 2.01 | 1.74 |
| Variety of languages spoken | 1.60 | 1.70 | 1.66 |

Note: Ratings given on a 4-point scale: 1 = Not a problem at all, 2 = A small problem, 3 = A moderate problem, 4 = A big problem. Therefore, a higher average rating indicates a bigger problem.

^a Average ratings shown in bold significantly different from one another, $p < .01$. Average ratings shown in boxes significantly different from one another, $p < .01$.

Personnel

A second set of issues that emerged from EAC's Urban/Rural working group centered on personnel, including the costs associated with finding, retaining, and training the individuals needed to effectively administer Federal elections. Therefore, the next series of survey items asked specifically about experiences in this regard, both in general and in the last two national elections.

Number of Personnel

Table 27 shows the average number of full-time, part-time, and temporary staff, as well as poll workers/election judges reported by LEOs for the 2010 and 2012 general elections.

Table 27. Average Number of Staff for the 2010 and 2012 General Elections

| | 2010 | 2012 |
|--|--------|--------|
| Paid Full-Time Staff (n = 824) | 3.18 | 3.16 |
| Paid Part-Time Staff (n = 822) | 4.28 | 4.48 |
| Paid Temporary Staff (n = 818) | 6.05 | 7.42 |
| Poll Workers/Election Judges (n = 806) | 160.41 | 166.10 |

In addition to the staff shown in Table 27, 14.66% of respondents reported borrowing staff from other government departments in 2010, as did 17.07% in 2012. The average number of borrowed staff was 4.61 in 2010 and 5.08 in 2012.

Table 28 shows the average number of staff for the two election years by the urban rural status of the jurisdictions. As might be expected, LEOs in urban districts employed more staff of each type than did those in rural areas.

Table 28. Average Number of Staff for the 2010 and 2012 General Elections by Urban/Rural Status

| | Rural | Urban |
|----------------|-------|-------|
| 2010 | | |
| Paid full-time | 1.98 | 3.40 |
| Paid part-time | 0.84 | 4.94 |
| Temporary | 0.66 | 7.07 |
| Borrowed | 2.56 | 4.90 |
| 2012 | | |
| Paid full-time | 1.99 | 3.38 |
| Paid part-time | 0.83 | 5.18 |
| Temporary | 0.61 | 8.71 |
| Borrowed | 2.75 | 5.39 |

Table 29 presents the results regarding staffing levels for districts based on their size as indicated by the number of registered voters. The only notable difference across the two years is the increase in temporary workers in larger districts in 2012 as compared to 2010.

Table 29. Average Number of Staff for the 2010 and 2012 General Elections by Size of Registered Voter Population

| | Small | Medium | Large |
|----------------|-------|--------|-------|
| 2010 | | | |
| Paid full-time | 1.41 | 2.37 | 5.95 |
| Paid part-time | 1.28 | 1.10 | 10.94 |
| Temporary | 1.28 | 1.25 | 16.34 |
| Borrowed | 3.18 | 2.35 | 6.32 |
| 2012 | | | |
| Paid full-time | 1.40 | 2.39 | 5.87 |
| Paid part-time | 1.25 | 1.03 | 11.59 |
| Temporary | 1.33 | 1.50 | 20.31 |
| Borrowed | 3.00 | 2.66 | 6.86 |

One personnel issue of particular importance raised by the EAC working group was that of obtaining and training poll workers. The EAC Urban/Rural Survey contained several questions in this regard. Overall, the average number of poll workers per jurisdiction in 2010 was 160.41, with a slight increase in this number for the 2012 general election to 166.10. Table 30 presents the average number of poll workers in rural/urban and small/medium/large districts for the 2010 and 2012 elections. As might be expected, urban districts had significantly higher numbers of poll workers in each year, and there was a clear progression from small to large districts in the number of poll workers employed.

Table 30. Average Number of Poll Workers/Election Judges for the 2010 and 2012 General Elections by Urban/Rural Status and Size of Registered Voter Population

| | Rural (n = 131) | Urban (n = 675) | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Poll Workers—2010 | 34.21 | 184.98 | |
| Poll Workers--2012 | 33.99 | 191.61 | |
| | Small (N = 287) | Medium (n = 250) | Large (n = 257) |
| Poll Workers--2010 | 15.58 | 57.84 | 426.26 |
| Poll Workers—2012 | 16.31 | 61.77 | 442.82 |

Poll Worker Pay

Respondents were asked to indicate whether poll workers in their jurisdictions were paid for their time on election day. The vast majority of respondents (95.32%) indicated that they were. Further, the percentages responding in this way were similar across jurisdiction type (urban 95.59%; rural 93.87%) and size (small 94.61%; medium 93.69%; large 97.45%).

When asked how much poll workers were paid, LEOs were given the option of indicating a one-time amount or an hourly rate. These results are presented in Table 31 by urban/rural status of the jurisdiction. No significant differences were found regarding hourly rate. However the average one-time stipend for urban poll workers (\$115.75) was found to be significantly higher than that for rural poll workers (\$99.92).

Table 31. Average and Range of Poll Worker Election Day Pay by Urban/Rural Status

| | One-Time Stipend | |
|---------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| | Rural (n = 49) | Urban (n = 315) |
| Average | \$99.92 | \$115.75 |
| Range | \$15.00 - \$200.00 | \$15.00 - \$275.00 |
| | Hourly Rate | |
| | Rural (n = 64) | Urban (n = 304) |
| Average | \$8.63 | 8.98 |
| Range | \$6.50 - \$12.50 | \$5.50 - \$17.71 |

Table 32 presents the poll worker pay results by size of jurisdiction in terms of number of registered voters. No differences were detected in the hourly rate paid to poll workers in small, medium, and large jurisdictions, however the average amount of the one-time stipend paid in large districts (\$123.33) was significantly higher than medium (\$110.63) and small (\$87.65) districts.

Table 32. Average and Range of Poll Worker Election Day Pay by Size of Registered Voter Population

| One-Time Stipend | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Small (n = 52) | Medium (n = 130) | Large (n = 179) |
| Average | \$87.65 | \$110.63 | \$123.33 |
| Range | \$15.00 - \$170.00 | \$30.00 - \$200.00 | \$60.00 - \$275.00 |
| Hourly Rate | | | |
| | Small (n = 212) | Medium (n = 88) | Large (n = 60) |
| Average | \$8.93 | \$8.90 | \$8.79 |
| Range | \$6.50 - \$17.71 | \$5.50 - \$15.00 | \$7.00 - \$15.00 |

The final question regarding poll worker pay concerned whether payment was given for training. Overall, 68.58% said that payment was provided for training, with 11.24% of these saying that the training amount was included in the overall pay addressed in the previous question. The amount paid separately for training is presented in Table 33 by urban/rural status of jurisdictions. Although the upper range of the one-time training stipend was notably higher in urban districts, no significant differences were found in the hourly rate paid.

Table 33. Average and Range of Poll Worker Training Pay by Urban/Rural Status

| One-Time Stipend | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Rural (n = 48) | Urban (n = 238) |
| Average | \$23.36 | \$21.76 |
| Range | \$5.00 - \$100.00 | \$5.00 - \$60.00 |
| Hourly Rate | | |
| | Rural (n = 33) | Urban (n = 147) |
| Average | \$8.83 | \$8.90 |
| Range | \$7.25 - \$12.29 | \$5.00 - \$15.00 |

Table 34 presents the poll worker pay results broken out by size of jurisdiction. No significant differences were found in average training pay based on size of jurisdiction.

Table 34. Average and Range of Poll Worker Training Pay by Size of Registered Voter Population

| | <i>One-Time Stipend</i> | | |
|-------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Small (n = 36) | Medium (n = 115) | Large (n = 133) |
| Mean | \$25.17 | \$20.53 | \$22.61 |
| Range | \$5.00 - \$55.00 | \$5.00 - \$100.00 | \$5.00 - \$60.00 |
| | <i>Hourly Rate</i> | | |
| | Small (n = 83) | Medium (n = 49) | Large (n = 44) |
| Mean | \$8.92 | \$8.94 | \$8.65 |
| Range | \$7.00 - \$15.00 | \$7.25 - \$15.00 | \$5.00 - \$12.00 |

Methods of Poll Worker Recruiting

Because of the importance of recruiting sufficient, capable poll workers to the smooth administration of elections, several questions on the EAC Urban/Rural Survey were devoted to this topic. The first presented LEOs with a series of recruiting resources and asked them to indicate which they have used. For those used, they were also asked to indicate how successful each was in recruiting poll workers. The overall results are presented in Table 35.

The forms of poll worker recruiting used by the largest percentage of LEOs and that were judged to have the most success were those requiring the least effort, with 77.22% indicating that word of mouth was successful or very successful and 69.58% rating responding to volunteer requests in the same manner. The least successful methods included recruiting through local businesses, at colleges, and using classified advertisements, which were judged to be not successful by 27.97%, 34.75%, and 18.79%, respectively. These were also the recruiting techniques used by the smallest percentage of LEOs, suggesting that they focus their efforts on recruiting avenues that have worked in the past.

Respondents were given the opportunity to identify other recruiting sources not listed in the survey, and approximately 15.90% did so. Nearly a third (29.50%) of these reported that political parties are involved in poll worker recruitment. Other frequently mentioned recruiting sources were phone calls, advertising through mailings or media, notices on voter registration applications, sign-up sheets and postings at polling places, and town and precinct officials. (See Appendix C, page C-24, Q21. for the verbatim responses regarding other recruiting resources.)

Table 35. Percent of LEOs Using Various Recruiting Resources and Degree of Success Achieved by Those Using Each

| Recruiting Resource | % Used (n = 798) | Successfulness (% of those who used resource) | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|------------|---------------------|----------------|
| | | Very Successful | Successful | Somewhat Successful | Not Successful |
| Classified Ads (n = 78) | 9.78 | 4.89 | 22.35 | 53.97 | 18.79 |
| Recruiting—Colleges (n = 89) | 11.13 | 8.03 | 18.26 | 38.96 | 34.75 |
| Recruiting—High schools (n = 220) | 27.52 | 27.72 | 19.14 | 35.00 | 18.13 |
| Recruiting—Website (n = 191) | 23.98 | 8.53 | 23.76 | 54.57 | 13.15 |
| Recruiting—Businesses (n = 65) | 8.17 | 7.77 | 10.89 | 53.36 | 27.97 |
| Recruiting—Volunteer organizations (n = 215) | 27.02 | 15.41 | 25.20 | 52.50 | 6.90 |
| Recruiting—Government agencies (n = 195) | 24.45 | 14.07 | 31.71 | 45.00 | 9.22 |
| Recruiting—Word of mouth (n = 716) | 89.80 | 41.10 | 36.12 | 21.83 | 0.95 |
| Responding to Volunteer requests (n = 550) | 68.91 | 30.89 | 38.69 | 28.99 | 1.44 |

Note: Successfulness ratings may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

The percentages of LEOs from urban/rural and small/medium/large districts who indicated they employed the various poll worker recruiting methods are presented in Tables 36 and 37, respectively. In all cases except classified ads, recruiting at local businesses, and word of mouth, significantly higher percentages of LEOs representing urban districts indicated that they employed the recruiting strategies than did those from rural districts. Similarly, in all cases there were differences in the percentages of LEOs representing small, medium, and large jurisdictions who used the recruiting resources, with the smaller districts employing them less. In all likelihood, these outcomes are related to the earlier results showing the significantly higher numbers of poll workers needed in urban and larger districts, thus requiring the need to employ a more varied array of recruiting resources.

Table 36 Percent Using Recruiting Resources by Urban/Rural Status

| | % Rural (n = 128) | % Urban (n = 670) |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| Classified Ads | 7.81 | 10.15 |
| Recruiting—Colleges ^a | 1.56 | 12.99 |
| Recruiting—High schools ^a | 17.97 | 29.40 |
| Recruiting—Website ^a | 4.69 | 27.65 |
| Recruiting—Businesses | 3.88 | 9.10 |
| Recruiting—Volunteer organizations ^a | 15.63 | 29.25 |
| Recruiting—Government agencies ^a | 10.16 | 27.20 |
| Recruiting—Word of mouth | 84.50 | 90.75 |
| Responding to Volunteer requests ^a | 57.03 | 71.19 |

^a Significant urban/rural difference, p < .01

Table 37 Percent Using Recruiting Resources by Size of Registered Voter Population

| | % Small (n = 289) | % Medium (n = 246) | % Large (n = 248) |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Classified Ads ^a | 5.19 | 13.41 | 12.10 |
| Recruiting—Colleges ^a | 1.73 | 4.47 | 28.23 |
| Recruiting—High schools ^a | 12.11 | 31.30 | 42.34 |
| Recruiting—Website ^a | 7.61 | 17.55 | 49.60 |
| Recruiting—Businesses ^a | 2.43 | 4.88 | 18.47 |
| Recruiting—Volunteer organizations ^a | 11.07 | 23.58 | 49.19 |
| Recruiting—Government agencies ^a | 10.38 | 23.58 | 42.34 |
| Recruiting—Word of mouth ^a | 86.16 | 90.24 | 93.95 |
| Responding to Volunteer requests ^a | 50.87 | 80.00 | 80.24 |

^a Significant difference, $p < .01$.

Table 38 presents the average successfulness ratings given by LEOs from urban and rural jurisdictions for the various forms of poll worker recruiting. Statistical tests revealed no significant differences between the averages. Analyses comparing jurisdictions based on the size of their registered voter populations (Table 39) also revealed no significant differences.

Table 38. Average Ratings of Recruiting Resource Usefulness by Urban/Rural Status

| | Rural | Urban |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Classified ads | 2.67 (n = 10) | 2.90 (n = 65) |
| Recruiting—College campuses | 3.00 (n = 2) | 3.00 (n = 86) |
| Recruiting—High schools | 2.57 (n = 21) | 2.42 (n = 190) |
| Recruiting—Website | 3.02 (n = 6) | 2.71 (n = 180) |
| Recruiting—Businesses | 2.70 (n = 5) | 3.04 (n = 58) |
| Recruiting—Volunteer organizations | 2.59 (n = 18) | 2.50 (n = 189) |
| Recruiting—Government agencies | 2.58 (n = 13) | 2.49 (n = 176) |
| Recruiting—Word of mouth | 1.84 (n = 98) | 1.82 (n = 571) |
| Responding to volunteers | 1.95 (n = 69) | 2.02 (n = 452) |

Note: Ratings given on a 4-point scale: 1 = Very Successful, 2 = Successful, 3 = Somewhat Successful, 4 = Not Successful. Therefore, a lower average rating indicates a greater degree of success using that poll worker recruiting resource.

Table 39. Average Ratings of Recruiting Resource Usefulness by Size of Registered Voter Population

| | Small | Medium | Large |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Classified ads | 2.76 (n = 14) | 2.99 (n = 32) | 2.78 (n = 29) |
| Recruiting—College campuses | 3.29 (n = 5) | 2.88 (n = 11) | 3.03 (n = 69) |
| Recruiting—High schools | 2.43 (n = 31) | 2.47 (n = 73) | 2.42 (n = 104) |
| Recruiting—Website | 2.83 (n = 20) | 2.90 (n = 42) | 2.65 (n = 122) |
| Recruiting—Businesses | 2.85 (n = 6) | 2.88 (n = 11) | 3.07 (n = 45) |
| Recruiting—Volunteer organizations | 2.25 (n = 30) | 2.70 (n = 54) | 2.50 (n = 120) |
| Recruiting—Government agencies | 2.37 (n = 29) | 2.50 (n = 55) | 2.54 (n = 104) |
| Recruiting—Word of mouth | 1.83 (n = 220) | 1.85 (n = 212) | 1.79 (n = 227) |
| Responding to volunteers | 1.94 (n = 133) | 1.97 (n = 190) | 2.09 (n = 192) |

Note: Ratings given on a 4-point scale: 1 = Very Successful, 2 = Successful, 3 = Somewhat Successful, 4 = Not Successful. Therefore, a lower average rating indicates a greater degree of success using that poll worker recruiting resource.

Ease/Difficulty of Poll Worker Recruiting

LEOs were asked to indicate, in general, how difficult it is for them to recruit poll workers. Overall, 15.81% of respondents indicated that recruiting was very easy, followed by 28.01% somewhat easy, 16.71% neither easy nor difficult, 32.73% somewhat difficult, and 6.74% very difficult. Results by urban/rural status and size of jurisdiction are shown in Tables 40 and 41. Significance tests revealed no differences between LEOs from urban and rural districts, for whom the average ratings were 2.88 and 2.80, respectively in this regard. However, the average difficulty rating for LEOs from small districts (2.57) was significantly lower than the average ratings of LEOs representing medium sized (3.10) and large (3.01) districts.

Table 40. Difficulty in Recruiting Poll Workers by Urban/Rural Status

| | % Rural (n = 126) | % Urban (n = 667) |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Very Easy | 13.49 | 16.19 |
| Somewhat Easy | 34.13 | 26.84 |
| Neither Easy nor Difficult | 16.67 | 16.79 |
| Somewhat Difficult | 30.16 | 33.28 |
| Very Difficult | 5.56 | 6.90 |

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 41. Difficulty in Recruiting Poll Workers by Size of Registered Voter Population

| | % Small (n = 287) | % Medium (n = 243) | % Large (n = 245) |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Very Easy | 20.56 | 10.29 | 15.10 |
| Somewhat Easy | 36.59 | 23.87 | 21.63 |
| Neither Easy nor Difficult | 13.24 | 18.52 | 18.78 |
| Somewhat Difficult | 24.04 | 39.92 | 36.33 |
| Very Difficult | 5.57 | 7.41 | 8.16 |

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

LEOs were asked to indicate the degree to which various factors present problems in recruiting poll workers. These results are presented in Table 42 for the overall sample. The issues indicated as at least a moderate problem by the largest proportions of LEOs were election day hours being too long (47.60%) and the requirement for having equal numbers of poll workers from each political party (45.40%). Over one third of respondents (36.35%) felt that poll workers getting time off from work was also a significant issue. On the other hand, low pay and a lack of qualified workers were only deemed a problem by about one quarter of respondents, and only 12.15% felt that training time was an issue.

Table 42. Sources of Difficulty in Recruiting Poll Workers

| | % A Big Problem | % A Moderate Problem | % A Small Problem | % Not a Problem at all |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Payment is too low (<i>n</i> = 782) | 7.26 | 19.53 | 23.91 | 49.30 |
| Election day hours too long (<i>n</i> = 783) | 19.66 | 27.94 | 25.93 | 26.47 |
| Little respect for poll workers (<i>n</i> = 778) | 4.65 | 8.42 | 17.05 | 69.88 |
| Training is too long (<i>n</i> = 772) | 1.97 | 10.18 | 22.46 | 65.39 |
| Poll workers cannot get off from work on election day (<i>n</i> = 785) | 15.11 | 21.24 | 29.80 | 33.85 |
| Requirement for equal numbers of poll workers from political parties (<i>n</i> = 783) | 17.84 | 27.56 | 24.56 | 30.04 |
| Lack of skilled or qualified workers (<i>n</i> = 779) | 9.45 | 19.09 | 30.74 | 40.73 |

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Approximately 5% of respondents identified problems other than those listed on the survey. The age and/or health of poll workers was the most frequently mentioned problem. Other issues raised were the bilingual requirements, increased use of technology, and lack of interest. (The full text of these responses is provided in Appendix C, page C-28, Q23.)

Table 43 shows the average difficulty ratings given by LEOs representing rural and urban jurisdictions for each factor. They are generally quite similar across the various issues, and no significant differences were detected between the rural and urban groups.

Table 43. Average Rating of Poll Worker Recruiting Difficulty by Urban/Rural Status

| | Rural (<i>n</i> = 126) | Urban (<i>n</i> = 656) |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Payment is too low | 1.77 | 1.86 |
| Election day hours too long | 2.30 | 2.43 |
| Little respect for poll workers | 1.38 | 1.50 |
| Training is too long | 1.40 | 1.50 |
| Poll workers cannot get off from work on election day | 2.24 | 2.16 |
| Requirement for equal numbers of poll workers from political parties | 2.31 | 2.34 |
| Lack of skilled or qualified workers | 1.88 | 1.99 |

Note: Ratings given on a 4-point scale: 1 = Not a problem at all, 2 = A small problem, 3 = A moderate problem, 4 = A big problem. Therefore, a higher average rating indicates a bigger problem.

Table 44 presents the average difficulty ratings given by LEOs representing small, medium, and large jurisdictions. No significant differences were found between respondents from medium and

large districts. However, the average rating for LEOs from small districts was significantly lower than those from medium and large jurisdictions (meaning they rated it as less of a problem) in regard to pay, hours, respect, training time, and a lack of qualified workers. The averages for small and large districts were also significantly different regarding volunteers getting time off from work.

Table 44. Average Poll Worker Recruiting Difficulty Rating by Size of Registered Voter Population

| | Small (n = 280) | Medium (n = 244) | Large (n = 245) |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Payment is too low | 1.53 | 2.06 | 2.02 |
| Election day hours too long | 1.97 | 2.64 | 2.68 |
| Little respect for poll workers | 1.20 | 1.65 | 1.65 |
| Training is too long | 1.26 | 1.61 | 1.64 |
| Poll workers cannot get off from work on election day | 2.05 | 2.19 | 2.33 |
| Requirement for equal numbers of poll workers from political parties | 2.29 | 2.39 | 2.32 |
| Lack of skilled or qualified workers | 1.59 | 2.14 | 2.25 |

Note: Ratings given on a 4-point scale: 1 = Not a problem at all, 2 = A small problem, 3 = A moderate problem, 4 = A big problem. Therefore, a higher average rating indicates a bigger problem. Bolded average ratings significantly different, $p < .01$. Average ratings shown in boxes significantly different, $p < .01$.

Split Shifts

Finally, LEOs were asked to indicate if poll workers are offered split shifts in their jurisdictions. Overall, 45.81% indicated that this was the case. A significantly higher percentage of respondents from urban districts (47.68%) said their jurisdictions offer this option than did those from rural areas (36.22%). Paradoxically, a significantly higher percentage of those from small jurisdictions (65.28%) said split shifts were an option offered than did those from medium (40.00%) or large (29.80%) districts.

LEOs in localities that offer split shifts were asked what impact this had on poll worker recruiting. Those representing jurisdiction that do not have this option were asked to speculate about its potential impact. These results are presented in Table 45. They appear to suggest that those who have experience with split shifts assess their value in easing the task of poll worker recruiting much more positively than those speculating as to the likely impact. While less than one-third of those LEOs representing jurisdictions offering this option indicated that it had no impact on recruiting, well over half of those who do not offer the option suggested this would be the result.

Table 45. Impact of Offering Split Shifts on Poll Worker Recruiting by Whether Split Shifts are Currently Offered

| | % Make Recruiting Much Easier | % Make Recruiting Somewhat Easier | % No Impact on Recruiting |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Split Shifts Offered (<i>n</i> = 360) | 29.05 | 39.76 | 31.19 |
| Split Shifts not Offered (<i>n</i> = 411) | 4.67 | 34.70 | 60.63 |

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

This outcome is mirrored when the results are examined by urban/rural status (Table 46) and size of jurisdiction (Table 47). In both cases, significantly higher percentages of LEOs from jurisdictions that do not offer split shifts predicted that doing so would have no impact on poll worker recruiting than LEOs assessing the actual impact. Within each of these groups, there were no significant differences between LEOs representing urban and rural districts. However among districts offering split shifts, LEOs from medium-sized districts were somewhat more positive in their evaluation of their impact. Among districts not offering this option, LEOs from smaller jurisdictions were somewhat more circumspect about their potential impact.

Table 46. Impact of Having Split Shifts by Urban/Rural Status

| | Split Shifts Offered | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | % Rural (<i>n</i> = 46) | % Urban (<i>n</i> = 314) |
| Make Recruiting Much Easier | 34.78 | 28.34 |
| Make Recruiting Somewhat Easier | 32.61 | 40.76 |
| No Impact on Recruiting | 32.61 | 30.89 |
| | Split Shifts Not Offered | |
| | % Rural (<i>n</i> = 76) | % Urban (<i>n</i> = 335) |
| Make Recruiting Much Easier | 2.63 | 5.07 |
| Make Recruiting Somewhat Easier | 25.00 | 37.01 |
| No Impact on Recruiting | 72.37 | 57.91 |

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 47. Impact of Having Split Shifts by Size of Registered Voter Population

| | Split Shifts Offered | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| | % Small (n = 185) | % Medium (n = 98) | % Large (n = 73) |
| Make Recruiting Much Easier | 36.22 | 25.51 | 16.44 |
| Make Recruiting Somewhat Easier | 32.43 | 49.98 | 46.58 |
| No Impact on Recruiting | 31.35 | 25.51 | 36.99 |

| | Split Shifts Not Offered | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| | % Small (n = 98) | Medium (n = 138) | Large (n = 166) |
| Make Recruiting Much Easier | 5.10 | 5.80 | 3.61 |
| Make Recruiting Somewhat Easier | 19.39 | 37.68 | 39.76 |
| No Impact on Recruiting | 75.51 | 56.52 | 56.63 |

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Summary and Conclusions

One of the difficulties inherent in attempting to study differences between geographic entities such as “rural” and “urban” lies in how those terms are defined and the wide array of differences between jurisdictions within each, whatever definition is applied. This was made obvious by the disparity between the categorizations that emerged from the application of the Department of Agriculture’s Economic Research Service classification scheme and the judgments of the LEOs who took part in this survey. It was further evidenced by many of the written comments offered by respondents that underscore the variety of situations they face and which prompted several to comment that when it comes to administering elections, “one size doesn’t fit all.” And yet, despite this wide array of circumstances, there were relatively few large differences between LEOs representing urban and rural or large, medium, and small jurisdictions in their responses to the EAC Urban/Rural survey.

Perhaps the most surprising result was the lack of variance between urban and rural LEOs in terms of costs associated with voter outreach, with the vast majority of both groups reporting spending \$5,000 or less on such activities. Although it is true that more subtle differences may have been masked within the reporting categories, it does seem clear that there is a restricted range overall in the amount of money spent reaching out to the voting public in advance of elections. This may be explained by the finding that, in large part, these efforts are funded from local election office budgets which may simply not accommodate larger expenditures. It was clear that there were differences in spending levels by size of jurisdiction, so the urban/rural result may also be an artifact of the fact that LEOs from small, urban districts skewed the overall urban results downward.

The results regarding types of outreach activities performed indicated that in rural areas there is a greater reliance on more traditional avenues such as paid print advertising, while LEOs in urban

districts reported significantly higher rates of use of TV, Internet, and social media. As might be expected, larger districts with greater numbers of potential voters employed a wider range of outreach methods. Approximately one third of LEOs reported partnering with other organizations in conducting outreach, with school-based groups being the most common partners overall, and nonprofits being more common in urban and large jurisdictions where there are likely to be more nonprofits operating to meet community needs. Approximately one half of LEOs indicated that they target students, voters in long-term care facilities, and those with disabilities in their outreach efforts. Efforts to specifically reach ethnic/minority groups and foreign language speakers were less common overall and much more likely to be cited by LEOs representing urban areas.

Relatively small proportions of LEOs indicated that it was difficult to conduct voter outreach, however over two thirds cited staff availability/time as an obstacle, and approximately half said that cost was an impediment. For LEOs representing rural areas, a lack of available media markets and travel distance required to reach voters were rated as significantly greater problems than was the case for their urban counterparts. So although their assessment of the difficulty of performing this function is generally upbeat, it appears that there are obstacles that they have to overcome to do so.

Differences between urban and rural districts in terms of elections office staffing were in the expected direction, with rural jurisdictions often being 1-2 person operations. Across the board, and particularly in urban and large districts, there appears to be a strong reliance on part-time, temporary, and borrowed staff during the election season. Nearly all LEOs reported that poll workers are paid for their election day service. When paid an hourly rate, no differences were detected based on urban/rural status or jurisdiction size. However, one-time stipends were found to be higher in urban and large districts.

The biggest problems cited in recruiting poll workers centered on the long hours they are expected to serve on election day, the difficulties associated with getting time off from work to serve, and the requirement that there be equal numbers of poll workers from the two political parties. Overall, LEOs from urban and large districts employed a wider range of poll worker recruiting methods, a result that may reflect their need to cast a wider net to obtain the necessary numbers of volunteers. This may also account for the fact that LEOs representing smaller districts rated such factors as pay and hours as less significant problems than did those in medium and large jurisdictions. The need for fewer workers makes recruitment a less difficult task.

The data suggest that individuals who have experience with split shifts feel they positively affect poll worker recruiting. However those who have not instituted this practice are leery of doing so. Perhaps because questions regarding split shifts were at the conclusion of the survey, there were quite a few comments offered about them in the final open-ended section where respondents were invited to offer additional thoughts. Several LEOs suggested that split shifts would be problematic given the need to recruit more workers and the difficulties associated with scheduling. This may well be another example of one size not fitting all.

The additional comments offered by respondents to the survey are instructive on two levels. (See Appendix C, page C-30, Q25. for the complete comments.) First, several offered suggestions based on their experience for innovative ways to address different aspects of the voting administration process. These included: forming partnerships with Rock the Vote and the Public Interest Research Group to conduct voter outreach and heighten interest in the process, conducting curbside voting to assist those who may have difficulty accessing the voting center, providing catered food for poll workers, conducting voting demonstrations in schools, and establishing a National Poll Worker Day to acknowledge the importance of their work to the elections administration process.

Perhaps the most striking aspect of the open-ended responses, however, was that they highlight the diversity of circumstances under which LEOs operate. These include an official whose district is an island and for whom one form of voter outreach is placing a large sign seen by those coming onto the island that highlights an approaching election. Another stated that his/her district is considered “frontier,” and covers 7,000 square miles and has 4,500 voters. Others from more rural jurisdictions highlighted the fact that their election day volunteers are typically retirees, and expressed concern that as their numbers dwindle, recruiting replacements will be a major challenge. And still others mentioned that they know most of the people in their jurisdiction, so recruiting volunteers is done relatively easily through personal acquaintances.

With the diversity of situations comes a diversity of perspectives. For instance, several respondents from rural areas commented that they are forced to comply with requirements intended to address issues found in more urban centers, and are ill-staffed to do so. As mentioned, there were also strongly held opinions both for and against instituting split shifts for poll workers. And while one LEO stated that, “Same-day voter registration is very helpful to getting new people to vote,” another commented that, “Same-day voter registration causes the biggest headaches for a small staffed town.”

With this in mind, it seems clear that any attempt to identify and publicize best practices regarding the administration of elections in urban and rural areas must take into account the wide array of circumstances facing LEOs, even within these two groups. This suggests a menu of possible approaches to the various challenges faced, along with ideas for how they can be adapted to fit given the possible barriers that might be faced (e.g., cost, staffing) in their implementation.

At the conclusion of the Urban/Rural Survey, LEOs were invited to provide contact information if they would be interested in participating in more in-depth interviews regarding the topics addressed. Nearly 245 individuals complied with this request, representing 28% of respondents. EAC has the opportunity to capitalize on this through the use of online meetings or other technology-based forums to gain greater insight into best practices and innovative ideas in such areas as voter outreach and poll worker recruitment. A discussion group could be created via use of a blog or website, or by employing existing networks such as LinkedIn. Such forums could also provide an avenue for discussions regarding the possibility of cross-jurisdictional efforts in these areas that would allow for a pooling of resources in the face of limited resources.

References

- Creek, H. M. & Karnes, K. A. (2009). Federalism and election law: Implementation issues in rural America. *Publius*, 40 (2):275-295.
- Gronke, P., & Caudell-Feagan, M. (2008). *Data for democracy: Improving elections through metrics and measurement*. Washington, DC: Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Liebschut, S., & Palazzolo, D. J. (2005). HAVA and the states. *Publius*, 35 (4), 497-514.
- Milbrath, L. W. (1965). *Political participation: How and why do people get involved in politics?* Chicago: Rand McNally
- Monroe, A. D. (1977). Urbanism and voter turnout: A note on some unexpected findings. *American Journal of Political Science*, 21 (February 1977): 71-78.
- Nie, N. H., Bingham Power, G., & Prewitt, K. (1969). Social structure and political participation; Development relationships, part I. *American Political Science Review*, 63 (June): 361-378.
- Rachlin, A. (Ed.) (2006). *Making every vote count: Federal election legislation in the states*. Princeton, NJ: Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs.
- Verba, S., & Nie, N. H. (1972). *Participation in America: Political democracy and social equality*. New York: Harper and Row.

Appendix A
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
Urban/Rural Study Questionnaire



***United States Election Assistance Commission
Urban/Rural Study***

Local Election Officials Survey

ABOUT THIS SURVEY

The United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) was created as part of the *Help America Vote Act* (HAVA) to assist State and local election officials with the administration of Federal elections. HAVA (b)(15) requires EAC to study “[m]atters particularly relevant to voting and administering elections in rural and urban areas.” The purpose of the *Survey of Rural and Urban Election Administration* is to determine the ways in which election officials conduct voter outreach, secure personnel, and handle any cost-related challenges associated with administering general elections in rural and urban jurisdictions. You will be asked questions about your jurisdictions; however, they are for research purposes only and are not connected to any enforcement activity on the part of other Federal agencies.

Over the past two years, EAC conducted two working groups with election officials from rural and urban communities and with social science researchers. The purpose of the working groups was to gain perspective and feedback on how EAC might approach this study. The working group members spent their time considering challenges related to administering elections in urban and rural areas. The issues they identified included voter outreach and personnel (along with costs related to these factors). Voter outreach and personnel are examples of areas in which jurisdictions are demonstrating creativity and innovation and may present interesting contrasts when considered in the context of urban and rural election administration. These are also areas where cost savings can be realized. Highlighting these topics in EAC’s report will provide a greater understanding of how urban and rural areas differ on these issues and might help to provide best practices information for election officials around the country.

Your input in this study is very important. This survey should take no more than 30 minutes to complete. Please respond to all applicable questions. In addition, we ask that if you would be willing to participate in an in-depth interview regarding the topic of this survey, please indicate this at the end of the survey.

Background

1. How long have you served as an election official? (include total experience in all jurisdictions)

_____ number of years

- 1a. Were you elected or appointed to your current position?

- Elected
 Appointed

2. Approximately how many registered voters reside in the jurisdiction you currently serve?

_____ approximate number of registered voters

3. How would you describe your jurisdiction? Is it primarily rural or primarily urban?

- Rural
 Urban
 Both. My jurisdiction includes both rural and urban areas.

4. Is your jurisdiction required to provide language assistance under Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act?

- Yes – Go to question 4a
 No – Skip to question 5

- 4(a). If yes, for which languages or language groups is your jurisdiction required to provide assistance? (Check all that apply)

- Spanish
 Asian languages
 Alaskan / Native American languages
 Other (please specify) _____

5. Does your office have full/ultimate responsibility for all aspects of elections in your jurisdiction (e.g., voter registration, voting machines, ballots, vote counting, etc.)? Please note that your office may have full/ultimate responsibility for an election-related activity even if it is not actually performed in your office (e.g., computer-related support).

- Yes – Skip to question 6
 No – Go to question 5a

5(a). (If no) Is full/ultimate responsibility for all aspects of elections in your jurisdiction...

- A state function only
- A shared state and local function
- Other (please specify) _____

6. Please indicate whether or not each of the following is allowed in your jurisdiction.

| | Yes | No |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Absentee voting (excuse required) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| No-excuse absentee voting | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Early voting | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| All vote-by-mail | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Voter Outreach

The next series of questions is about voter outreach activities. For purposes of this survey, please consider voter outreach to be any activity that your office engages in to provide information to the voting public. This includes information your office is required to provide and responses to information requests from individuals and/or organizations.

7. For each of the following, please indicate whether your office provides this type of outreach to the voting public. If your office provides this outreach, please indicate the language(s) in which it is provided.

| Type of Outreach | Does your office provide this type of outreach? | | If YES, in what languages is the outreach provided? | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Yes | No | English only | English and other languages | Other languages only |
| Paid print advertising (e.g., newspaper) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Paid television/radio advertising | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Elections Office/County website | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Hard copy direct mailing to voters (e.g., voter's guide, sample ballot) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Toll-free telephone line | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, blogs) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Participating in community events | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

8. Does your jurisdiction form partnerships with any third-party or civic organizations on voter outreach efforts?

- Yes – Continue to question 8a
- No – Skip to question 9

8a. Please indicate whether your jurisdiction forms partnerships with each of the following types of organizations on voter outreach efforts.

| Types of Organization(s) | Conduct with this type of organization | Do not conduct with this type of organization |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| School-related organization(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Non-profit organization(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Political parties | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

8b. For each of the following, please indicate whether your jurisdiction forms partnerships with other organizations on this type of voter outreach effort.

| Types of Outreach | Conduct with other organizations | Do not conduct with other organizations |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| Paid print advertising (e.g., newspaper) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Paid television/radio advertising | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Elections Office/County website | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Hard copy direct mailing to voters (e.g., voter's guide, sample ballot) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Toll-free telephone line | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Blogs) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Participating in community events | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

8c. We are particularly interested in voter outreach efforts that jurisdictions have provided in partnership with other organizations. Please provide further information about these efforts.

No further information

9. For each of the following, please indicate whether your jurisdiction has voter outreach initiatives or activities that focus on this group.

| Voter Outreach Focus | Focus on this group | Do not focus on this group |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Students | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Racial/ethnic minorities | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Foreign language speakers | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Voters in long-term care facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Voters with disabilities | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

10. Approximately how much did voter outreach efforts for **the 2010 Mid-Term Election** cost your jurisdiction?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$0 – 1,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$50,001 – 60,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 – 5,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$60,001 – 70,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$5,001 – 10,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$70,001 – 80,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 – 20,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$80,001 – 90,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$20,001 – 30,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$90,001 – 100,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$30,001 – 40,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 – 200,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$40,001 – 50,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$200,001 or more |

11. Approximately how much do you estimate voter outreach efforts for **the 2012 General Election** cost your jurisdiction?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$0 – 1,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$70,001 – 80,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 – 5,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$80,001 – 90,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$5,001 – 10,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$90,001 – 100,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 – 20,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 – 200,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$20,001 – 30,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$200,001 – 300,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$30,001 – 40,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$300,001 – 400,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$40,001 – 50,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$400,001 – 500,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$50,001 – 60,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$500,001 or more |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$60,001 – 70,000 | |

12. How are your jurisdiction’s voter outreach efforts paid for? (Check all that apply)

- From the local election office budget
- From line item appropriation in the county or state budget
- Other (please specify) _____

13. In general, how easy or difficult is it for your jurisdiction to engage in voter outreach for general election cycles?

- Very easy
- Somewhat easy
- Neither easy nor difficult
- Somewhat difficult
- Very difficult

14. How much of a problem is each of the following in engaging in voter outreach for general election cycles?

| | A big problem | A moderate problem | A small problem | Not a problem at all |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Cost | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Staff availability/time | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Availability of media outlets | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Travel distance required for in-person contact | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Limitations on Internet access or reliability | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Variety of languages spoken | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Personnel

2010

15. Please indicate how many of each of the following types of **paid** staff you had **in 2010**.
- a. In **2010**, approximately how many **paid full-time (permanent)** staff did you have?
_____ number of paid full-time (permanent) staff
 - b. In **2010**, approximately how many **paid part-time (permanent)** staff did you have?
_____ number of paid part-time (permanent) staff
 - c. In **2010**, approximately how many **paid temporary** staff did you have (e.g., workers who come in around election time to help with administrative tasks such as data entry for voter registration, work the customer service hotline, etc.)? Please do NOT include poll workers.
_____ number of paid temporary staff
 - d. In **2010** did you “borrow” staff from other departments within your local/municipal government to supplement your full-time, part-time, and temporary staff?
 - Yes (please indicate approximate number of staff) _____
 - No
16. For the **2010 General Election**, approximately how many poll workers/election judges did your office use?
_____ number of poll workers/election judges

2012

17. Please indicate how many of each of the following types of **paid** staff you had **in 2012**.
- a. In **2012**, approximately how many **paid full-time (permanent)** staff did you have?
_____ number of paid full-time (permanent) staff
 - b. In **2012**, approximately how many **paid part-time (permanent)** staff did you have?
_____ number of paid part-time (permanent) staff

- c. In **2012**, approximately how many **paid temporary** staff did you have (e.g., workers who come in around election time to help with administrative tasks such as data entry for voter registration, work the customer service hotline, etc.)? Please do NOT include poll workers.

_____ number of paid temporary staff

- d. In **2012** did you “borrow” staff from other departments within your local/municipal government to supplement your full-time, part-time, and temporary staff?

- Yes (please indicate approximate number of staff) _____
 No

18. For the **2012 General Election**, approximately how many poll workers/election judges did your office use?

_____ number of poll workers/election judges

NOTE: For Questions 19 and 20, “poll workers” does NOT include Chief, Assistant Chief, Judges of Elections, Captains, or Supervisors; only poll workers.

19. Are your poll workers paid for their work on Election Day?

- Yes – Continue to question 19a
 No – Skip to question 20

- 19a. How much are your poll workers paid for their work on Election Day?

- One-time set stipend of \$ _____
 Hourly rate in the amount of \$ _____ per hour

20. Are your poll workers paid for training?

- Yes – Continue to question 20a
 No – Skip to question 21

- 20a. How much are your poll workers paid for training?

- One-time set stipend of \$ _____
 Hourly rate in the amount of \$ _____ per hour
 Payment in question 19a includes training pay

21. Please indicate which recruiting sources you use to obtain poll workers for General Elections. For each source used, please indicate how successful the source has been for you in obtaining poll workers.

| Recruiting Source | Do you use this source? | | If YES (you use this source), rate successfulness | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | YES | NO | Very Successful | Successful | Somewhat Successful | Not Successful |
| Classified ads | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Recruiting at college campuses | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Recruiting at high schools | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Recruiting through website | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Recruiting through local businesses | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Recruiting through volunteer organizations | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Recruiting through other government agencies/departments | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Recruiting through word of mouth (e.g., current poll workers encourage friends/coworkers to volunteer) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Responding to requests from individuals or groups regarding becoming poll workers | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

22. In general, how easy or difficult is it for your jurisdiction to obtain a sufficient number of poll workers for general election cycles?

- Very easy
- Somewhat easy
- Neither easy nor difficult
- Somewhat difficult
- Very difficult

23. For each of the following, please indicate how much of a problem it presents in obtaining a sufficient number of poll workers for general election cycles?

| | A big problem | A moderate problem | A small problem | Not a problem at all |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Payment is too low | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Election Day work hours are too long | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Little respect for poll workers | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Training is too long/takes too much time | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Potential poll workers cannot get off from work to serve | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Requirement for equal numbers of poll workers from different political parties | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Lack skilled or qualified workers | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

24. Does your jurisdiction offer split shifts for poll workers on Election Day? That is, can poll workers sign up to work less than a full day at the polls on Election Day?

- Yes – Go to question 24a
- No – Go to question 24b

24a. (If split shifts are offered) What impact does the ability to offer split shifts have on your recruiting poll workers?

- Makes it much easier to recruit poll workers.
- Makes it somewhat easier to recruit poll workers.
- Has no impact.

24b. (If split shifts are not offered) What impact would the ability to offer split shifts have on your recruiting poll workers?

- Would make it much easier to recruit poll workers.
- Would make it somewhat easier to recruit poll workers.
- Would have no impact.

25. Please provide any additional comments you may have about administering elections in urban and rural jurisdictions. In particular, we are interested in any ideas and/or experience you have regarding voter outreach and personnel that you feel had a positive impact on your ability to administer general elections.

No additional comments

Thank you for participating in this survey.

EAC is planning to conduct in-depth follow-up interviews regarding the topics addressed in this survey. If you would be willing to take part in an in-person interview concerning the same topic, check this box and provide your contact information below. **Please note that your contact information will be separated from the answers you have provided in the survey and will be used only to contact you for a follow-up interview.**

Name: _____

Phone: _____

E-mail: _____

Instructions for Returning the Survey

After you have completed the survey, please place the questionnaire in the postage-paid envelope provided and return it in the mail to:

**HumRRO
P.O. Box 6640
Lawrenceville, NJ 08648**

If you prefer, you may fax the completed survey to HumRRO at (703) 549-9025. Please be sure to fax **both sides** of each page, including the front cover page.

Appendix B
Survey Sample Weights

The following weights were applied to the data in order to bring the sample percentages in line with the population in terms of urban/rural classification and geographic region.

| Metro Counties | Northeast | Midwest | South | West |
|---|------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|
| 1. Counties in metro areas of 1 million population or more | 1.25877 | 1.254387 | 0.998776 | 0.671301 |
| 2. Counties in metro areas of 250,000 to 1 million population | 1.112381 | 0.561262 | 1.081951 | 1.32539 |
| 3. Counties in metro areas of fewer than 250,000 population | 1.068863 | 0.78766 | 1.549157 | 0.728236 |
| NonMetro Counties | | | | |
| 4. Urban population of 20,000 or more, adjacent to a metro area | 1.348111 | 0.879085 | 2.515536 | 0.631138 |
| 5. Urban population of 20,000 or more, not adjacent to a metro area | 3.36081 | 0.71003 | 2.019642 | 1.136049 |
| 6. Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area | 0.96685 | 0.94159 | 1.156704 | 1.015559 |
| 7. Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area | 1.172993 | 0.991258 | 1.714592 | 1.590468 |
| 8. Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, adjacent to a metro area | 0.515009 | 0.591692 | 0.738432 | 0.89261 |
| 9. Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, not adjacent to a metro area | 0.811463 | 0.6525 | 0.694252 | 0.627816 |

Appendix C
EAC Urban/Rural Survey
Verbatim Respondent Comments

VERBATIM COMMENTS

Q4a. If yes, for which other languages or language groups is your jurisdiction required to provide assistance? – Other (specify) [Source Variable: Other Language Assistance Required-Specified]

Few LEOs indicated that their jurisdiction was required to provide assistance in languages other than the prelisted ones – Spanish, Asian languages, and Alaskan/Native American languages. French was the only other language specified by LEOs. -

All as necessary

As required

French (9x)

Language assistance has never been needed.

No one ever asks for this!

Not specified

Q5a. (If no) Is full/ultimate responsibility for all aspects of elections in your jurisdiction...? – Other (specify) [Source variable: Entity Fully Responsible for Elections-Specified]

While most LEOs report that their office has full/ultimate responsibility for all aspects of elections in their jurisdiction, some report that this responsibility is shared with other entities at the state, county and/or local levels. In many cases, multiple local-level offices cooperate in administering elections, including combinations of Town Clerk, Registrar of Voters, Tax Assessors/Collectors, and others.

Administered at municipal level; very de-centralized. However, county & state also involved.

All local, the tax assessor is the voter registrar, my office is responsible for the election.

Between the County Clerk's office (me) and the Tax Collector's office.

City clerk and registrar of voters

County and local

County and local function

County clerk and voter registrar share local functions.

County election commission

County Recorder handles voter registration and early voting

It is shared between the County Clerk, CBEC and the Election Coordinator

R.O.V.'s

Registrar of Voters responsibility

Registrar of voters/moderator

Separate local VR office

Separate voter registrar and election official offices

Shared between 2 offices

Shared county and local function

Shared county/municipal

Shared state and local function. And county probate office-machines, oversees election process. Our office registers, updates, posts votes, etc.

Shared State-County-Local. County prepares ballot and coordinates with local clerks, as well as compiling the canvass. Locals are responsible for voter registration, precincts and precinct workers.

Shared town clerk & registrar of voters

Shared Town Clerk/Registrar of Voters

Shared w/ registrars of voters

Shared with County Recorder's Office

Shared with municipality

Shared with Selectmen and Supervisors of the Checklist

Shared with Superintendent of Elections

Shared with voter registrar

Tax Assessor/Collector is Voter Registrar

Town clerk absentee ballots

Treasurer's office

Twps

Voter Registrar

Voter registrar currently hiring a joint elec admin

Voter registration is handled by the tax assessor/collector office

Voter registration is in Tax Asses/Coll office

Voter Registration is responsibility of Tax Office

Voter registrar & clerk

We handle all aspects re: absentee ballots, certification of candidates, appropriate paperwork with Secretary of State's office re: list of offices to be filled, cert. of ballots, & legal notices

Q7. For each of the following, please indicate whether your office provides this type of outreach to the voting public – Other (specify). *[Source variable: Other Type of Outreach Provided-Specified]*

Approximately one in ten LEOs indicate that their office provides one or more types of voter outreach other than those listed in the survey. Most frequently mentioned is free advertising via newspaper, radio and/or television, Other types of voter outreach include postings in public places in the jurisdiction, postings on local websites, school-based outreach, and voter registration drives.

Cable access
Cable ATAV announcements
Cable TV-local access
Channel 5 (local) free broadcasting
City website
Community display boards, free radio chat
County public access television
Election Legal Notice
Email and non-paid print
Flyers on voting centers
Free advertising in newspaper
Free local TV free newspaper and radio
Public service announcements
Free paper/radio advertising
Free print advertising
Free radio public service announcements
Free radio/newspaper ads
Go to local schools register youth, do presentations, questions/answers and provide voter guides.
Voter guides are always available at my office.
Go to nursing homes and hospital.
Handouts to public
Hard copy posted in five public places in town
High school & college
High school government classes
High school outreach
High school senior registration drive
High school voter registration drives
Legal warrants, marquis sign posting
Local access TV
Local cable
Local High School outreach and voter registration drive. and
Local newspapers at no charge, local cable at no charge, announcements at select board meetings which are televised on local cable
Local TV channel (no charge)

Mailing to all 18 year olds
Media interviews, guest speaking, open house
Most done by state elections office
Municipal clerks may provide addt'l. outreach
N/A
Newsletter
Newspaper (2x)
Newspaper articles (2x)
Newspaper not paid
None (2x)
Notices in town office & post offices
Outreach to residential facilities: university, residential care facilities, jails, etc.
Participate in voter registration drives
Physical notices at town office
Posted information material
Posted warrant-online website
Posters and signs around town
Posters/notices at polling place
Posting of all voting ballots, warrants, times & locations of polling places at town office building, town hall & voting times and placed on board at entrance to island
Posting on town hall
Posting sample ballots in public places
Postings in businesses
Postings in public buildings
Postings throughout town.
Precinct info cards for new voters and precinct changes
Provide election materials for other events.
Public forums when requested
Public notice posting
Public service ads
Public service announcement, press releases
Publicize in local newspaper
Radio public service announcements
Registering at schools

Registrations forms are in libraries, post offices, banks, schools, town/village clerks offices, senior living centers, nursing homes, etc. within the county

Roadside sign & town website

School government class

Schools, colleges, service orgs

Sign outside of office

Speaker at meetings (e.g. Rotary Club)

Speeches/ information sessions

State and Federal postings in town office

Student countywide voter registration drive

Swearing in new deputy registrars at various functions

The Registrar of Voters in our town handles the actual election and hiring of workers, etc.

The state provides all of the above

Town clerk website

Town election webpage

Town email notifications

Town newsletter (2x)

Town notices

Town website (2x)

Town website and town column in local newspaper

Town/local website

Trainings for voters and candidates as requested by the public

TV local channel for information

Unpaid newspaper ads, unpaid tv/radio ads (local, public), post signs throughout community

Unpaid radio

Unpaid radio-interviews & PR

Unpaid TV/radio advertising

Voter reg. forms to town clerks, post offices

Voter registration drive at senior high school

Voter registration drives at business locations, 'fresh markets', high schools, colleges.

Voting in schools

Voting system public demonstrations

VR drives in high schools and naturalization ceremonies

We do direct mail to individuals items upon request but prefer to email (voter lists,etc)

Website

WI statutes require publication of election notices

Working on social media

Yards signs at office with Info

Q8a Please indicate whether your jurisdiction forms partnerships with each of the following types of organizations on voter outreach efforts. – Other (specify)

Approximately one third of LEOs report partnering with other organizations on voter outreach efforts. While approximately 20% to 30% of jurisdictions partner with school-related organizations, non-profit organizations, and political parties, some report other types of partnerships. Government offices, departments and agencies are most frequently reported as other outreach partners, including Department of Motor Vehicles, Department of Human Services, Social Services offices and others. A variety of community-based organizations and those with a minority-group focus also partner with LEOs on voter outreach efforts.

[Source variable: Other #1 Type of Partner Organization-Specified]

Attend annual caucus

Chamber of Commerce

Civic associations

Clubs in the community

Community TV

Community based organizations - language

Contract with Democratic Party

Dept of Human Services

Dept of Motor Vehicles

Dept of Revenue-DMV

Fairs, etc.

Hispanic Institute at university

Hospital

Human Services Agency

Indian Tribes, Pueblos and Nations

Language minority outreach groups

Language speaking groups

League of Women Voters (4x)

Local civic organizations

Local Dept of Social Services

Local municipalities

Local radio stations
Lyons Club
NAACP
Non-partisan community organizations
Other local government
Portuguese & Spanish organizations
Public library
Local event
Senior center (2x)
Senior centers/nursing homes
Senior citizen groups
State
Tribal
Universities
Veterans of Foreign War
We have booths at the local fair & anywhere that asks us to set up
We instruct political parties on what is acceptable

[Source variable: Other #2 Type of Partner Organization-Specified]

Accessibility
Organizations
Advocates for voters with disabilities
Business women's club
Church and community-based groups
Contract with Republican Party
Dept of Family Services
Federal court-naturalization ceremonies
Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Hospitals, Jails
Joint advertising with surrounding towns
Kiwanis
Local Dept of Revenue -license office
Local newspaper
Nursing homes
Senior citizen groups

Social Services
Town hall
Women's empowerment

Q8b For each of the following, please indicate whether your jurisdiction forms partnerships with other organizations on this type of voter outreach effort. – Other (specify)

Much of the voter outreach provided by LEOs in partnership with other organizations falls in the categories specified in the survey. However, a small number of LEOs mentioned other types of outreach, including free TV or radio, voter registration drives, and school-based outreach.

[Source variable: Other #1 Type of Partner Outreach Provided-Specified]

Attend annual Caucus
Civic clubs etc.
Elections and voter registration at schools
Free radio/TV time
Hard copy posted in 5 public places in town
High schools
Local cable gives free time for ads
Local radio-live election night results & PSA
News releases to another state 30 miles from our county
Newspaper no paid
Offering transportation
Personal appearances
Portuguese and Spanish media
Provided DVD to public cable to promote new photo ID law
Local event
Senior centers
Travel to schools
Voter registration drive (3x)
Voter registration drives at school
Working with government teachers

[Source variable: Other #2 Type of Partner Outreach Provided-Specified]

Cooperation with League of Women Voters
Guest speaking, observer panel

Joint advertising with surrounding towns
Local newspaper-informational articles
Women's empowerment

Q8c We are particularly interested in voter outreach efforts that jurisdictions have provided in partnership with other organizations. Please provide further information about these efforts. [Source variable: Further Information About Outreach Partnerships-Code1 through -Code6]

LEOs were asked to provide further information about their experiences in partnering with other organizations on voter outreach efforts. Approximately 44% of LEOs who partner on voter outreach provided a comment. Nearly half (46%) of them mentioned voter registration efforts. Other frequently-mentioned topics include outreach involving community or civic organizations (43%), school-based or student-focused outreach (42%), and attendance at community or local events (24%). Less-frequently reported efforts involve outreach to senior citizens and disabled populations, mock elections and demonstrations of voting equipment, media outreach, and partnering with political parties.

Any facility with disabled people like nursing homes, group homes, etc. Go to high schools and colleges to register voters. And also local Ruritan clubs.

As clerk, I have meet with the high schools civics classes to encourage voter registration, student judges, etc. Also work with the political parties to present election information at their meetings and with the senior citizen meal centers to encourage participation in the elections.

At local forums we provide voter registration and absentee ballot requests.

Chamber of Commerce provides e-mail blast to their members of Early Voting locations and dates. Local school system allows flyers to be sent home with students announcing advance voting dates/locations/times.

Civic organization. University family life center. Various churches in the city. High school. Veterans of Foreign Wars. Women's Forum. Black Arts Heritage Festival. Fourth of July Hispanic Arts Festival. Community college. Nursing homes. Disability Resource Center. Apartment Complexes

Community law fair-voter registration and demo of voting device and mock ballots. Health fairs-voter registration. Civic organizations-voter registration & education. Community special events-voter registration & education. Schools-tours of our facility, voter education, voter registration. Assisted living & nursing home facilities-voter registration and absentee voting education. Disabled community-voter registration & voting device demo.

Conducted about 50 meetings with civic clubs, college students at the local university, and other community groups to tell them about voting procedures, absentee voting, and photo I.D.'s needed for voting in person.

Conducted citizen information meetings with League of Women Voters. Partnered with a nonpartisan organization whose major goal is to organize and mobilize grassroots organizations such as neighborhood associations.

County Advisory Committee, LULAC - League of United Latin American Citizens, county fair, high school career day

County nursing home residents

Dem & Rep Party Chairs submit list to County Clerk for judges and poll workers

Each of the organizations gather the audience for the voter outreach efforts, whether by mail, phone, newspaper, etc.

Fair booth

Fairs or local community events

Have conducted mock elections at all grade levels (elementary, middle school, high school). Have gone to high schools and conducted Homecoming Queen and Sadies elections for the students using the voting machines.

High schools, senior citizens agency, disabilities & special needs, nursing home

Hispanic Chamber-Cinco De Mayo Festivals. Hispanic Institute-Class presentations on voting, community events sponsored by the college. Nations Association-various community activities like toy give-aways at Christmas, food baskets for Thanksgiving, etc. Martin Luther King Jr. Celebrations

I speak at functions to which I am invited to speak. I also make myself available at the County 4-H fair to answer questions.

I speak at Rotary clubs, Democratic party and Republican party meetings, high schools, community events, and any other organizations that ask.

I volunteer to hold a mock election and provide historic information on the election process to promote voting to the youth.

If an organization contacts us to help with Voter Registration at an event they are having we send someone to help.

Just with schools registering voters

League of Women Voters debates, registration information, signage

League of Women Voters, Bar Association (lawyers), events for disabled community (Blind Expo, Disability fairs etc), churches, sororities and service clubs, naturalization ceremonies, PSAs on local access TV, public interest TV and radio shows

League of Women Voters-voter registration and information providers. Auditors Office-goes on local talk radio and do public service TV spots when requested. Library System-disseminates sample ballots and voter information, maps and ballot initiative questions/explanations.

A few surrounding towns put an advertisement in the local newspaper announcing absentee voting dates and times.

Local college effort to register new voters. State agencies register voters.

Mainly help with voter registration and mock elections

Met with various community organizations to swear in deputy registrars. Assisted us with increased voter participation. Participants of Student Government Day which educates future voters.

Mock elections. Meeting w/Boy and Girl Scouts

Much of our attention has been focused on recruitment of bilingual election officials, but we also attend a number of community events hosted by Spanish language groups.

My office partners with local high schools to reach out to young voters. We explain our voting process and help them get registered. We also provide assistance with voter registration drives conducted by our deputy voter registrars.

NAACP 3rd Party Registration Training. Public schools (elementary, high). Area college voter information. Voting machine demo. Mock elections. League of Women Voters. Political parties.

Organizations: Republican Party reps and Democratic Party reps. Pollwatchers.

Our involvement has largely been with the League of Women Voters local branch. There are some student organizations at the university that we work with on a more random basis.

Our office publishes an informational sheet on how to conduct a voter registration session which we give to Student Groups and the League of Women Voters when they conduct voter registration drives to ensure that voter registration forms are filled out correctly.

Outreach to health care facilities

Partnered with area transit to provide transportation during early voting

Partnered with local libraries and post offices to educate public of new photo id laws that went into effect 1/1/12. Regularly speak to all civic groups and senior citizen groups.

Partnering with city's agency for homeless

Please contact the Registrar of Voters of our town for further information.

Political parties. Community events, Cities and towns. Political activists etc,

Present registration procedures and forms at naturalization ceremonies bimonthly

Press releases, info signage at poll sites, town clerks offices and the county office building, communications with high school participation in government staff

Provide training for conduct of voter drives w/3rd party orgs. Upfront training of this type keeps our problems to a minimum.

Registrars of voters have a compiled list of people interested in having any upcoming vote/election be emailed a reminder of such to them.

School voter registration

Schools are a point of contact. We want to encourage the seniors to get involved. They assist as election day 'pages' also (at the polls).

Send each graduating high school senior a graduation card with a voter registration form and info on how to receive a ballot when away to college. Disability advisory committee to search for better ways to serve our disabled voters. Assists the League of Women Voters with voter registration drives and candidate forums.

Senior Citizen Center asked me to talk about elections, political party has asked me to talk about elections.

Set-up voting booths and boxes for local schools mock elections. Town website with voting information.

Simply that DHS provides voter registration applications

Social science class at a local high school requested a registration drive

Speaking engagements with civic groups.

The election office provides registration forms to non profit organizations and political parties who are trying to promote Voter Registration for upcoming elections or during community events. Upon request the Administrator speaks to organizations during organized meetings to educate on the election process and requirements to run for an elected position.

The extent of outreach is primarily based upon their request for information and that which we are required by law to provide.

The Town and City Clerk's Association developed a PSA to be aired on local radio stations. Local community college students recorded it for free. Stations aired it for free.

The Chamber of Commerce and Business Women's Club put on Candidates Forums that is televised on the local radio station. Different groups do voter registration drives.

The office has worked with schools on MOTV initiatives, registering students in school, participating in election seminars for students, etc. We do serve and reference & partner with the League of Women Voters.

The Registrar of Voters office has worked in partnership with the League of Women Voters and the local PTO and school district.

The Secretary of State coordinates and pays for all state & federal election outreach

Training of individuals and organizations on how to register voters. Election information sheet to media and general public candidate information packets

Twp Ass'n Session & League of Women Voters

Typically an organization will invite us to their meeting/event to discuss current election information they believe their members would be interested in

Upon request verbal or written by any Tribe, Nation or Pueblo our office will conduct voter registration drives at a location of their choice, we provide voter registrations, personnel and a computer to be able to enter information as it is received.

Visit high school to register any voters.

Voter outreach is often done in partnership with other canvassing authorities or the state election offices

Voter outreach with civic groups and help conduct the mock elections with the schools in our county.

Voter registration drives at local colleges. Election training at local jurisdictions/local organizations.

Voter Registration drives, speaking before groups in regard to various functions of the Board, demonstrations of the optical voting system

Voter registration drives, voter registration tables at community events, participation whenever and wherever asked by another organization

Voter registration drives. Voter training with sample materials (sample ballots, etc). Training with local township officers to better help with elections.

Voter Registration, voter education, voter awareness

We conduct the high school student body elections

We do not ask organizations to distribute our materials for us. We do partner with organizations to conduct outreach AT the organization for membership and guests where we DO distribute materials ourselves. We often do public speaking with organization memberships (Rotary, League of Women Voters, Kiwanis Club, Center for Peace and Justice, Community Lawyers Group, etc.) and work with these organizations to inform them of our 'Team Up for Democracy' Poll worker program. We will take any free radio and television we get (no longer can government afford to pay the outrageous prices for paid print or television/radio time). We have formed an Observer Panel that consists of members of organizations who observe activities and provide the Department feedback on all aspects of the election. We work with the League of Women Voters to conduct a MOCK election for

students, in 2012 we worked with high-schools and colleges for our first youth poster contest (A.I.M. to Vote! means Art Inspires Me to Vote!), and have begun to partner with S.C.O.R.E. (South County Out-Reach Efforts) to share election information for broader dissemination. Each year, work with local Congressman on new citizenship registration drive.

We do voter registration drives at senior functions that are sponsored by the area hospitals as well as senior functions sponsored by religious organizations. We also participate in community events such as women's expos.

We go to high school & local junior college to register voters and answer questions. We go to festivals during election years. We have registrations available at the court houses, library and political headquarters - where we regularly pick up. We have gone to the nursing home to assist in filling out forms.

We have a Disability Access Committee that works with the disabled community and many associated agencies.

We have a Field Registrar in one outlying area of the county.

We have a local school that we try to get together with once a year before elections to help the students register to vote.

We have also reached out to Retired Teachers Assoc. for possibility of recruiting poll workers.

We have had a booth at the local County Fair when introducing new voting equipment. The Elections Department and Recorder have gone to local civic organization meetings to try and gather more names for potential election workers and to speak about the local elections. We have also gone 'live' on the local radio station to discuss upcoming elections and to try and increase voter turnout.

We have partnered with the city public library to bring instructional information by setting up a voting machine and letting non-English speaking organizations become familiar with the voting process.

We have partnered with other gov't agencies for paid advertising and voter pamphlet information

We have partnered with the high schools to provide a history of voting class, as well as a hands on demonstration of our voting machines. We have designed a program where students can campaign for and then vote for their favorite cookie. This gives them experience with filing out the ballot and inserting it into the optical scan. We also offer voter registration forms to those students who are or will soon be 18 years old. Since starting this program 10 years ago, our % of 18 - 26 year old registered voters has doubled.

We have partnership with the school system providing voter registration drive for teenage kids. And, also with local churches and civic organizations in providing voter education.

We have provided voting machines for school student body elections and conduct voter registration drives at schools.

We help do demonstrations on how to vote using voting machines

We hold voter registration sessions at the high school, at the event at the beach during the summer, at the Health and Wellness Fair, at the Women's Empowerment Meetings. etc. Anytime there is an event in the city we set up a voter registration booth and provide information in English and Spanish.

We meet with school superintendents & principals to recruit precinct election officials.

We often call the community event and ask if we can attend to offer voter registration.

We participated in the National Voter Registration Day 2012. If we are asked to work at a registration booth for a nonprofit organization, we will normally agree to - particularly if it is a school event. We do not participate in partisan or 'issue' driven events, but offer registration materials to all groups.

We participate by having a voter registration booth at the local summer festivals in all the towns in the county.

We partner with community organizations, the League of Women Voters, political parties, other governmental agencies, our school board and non-profit organizations

We partner with Portuguese newspapers, TV and organizations including Spanish churches to get the information out and recruit poll workers

We partnered with the local school system to reach out to the high school seniors to educate them on the voting process, and to all the high school students by way of a mock election conducted on the county's voting system using the same processes as at the polls on election day. This seemed to do more to reach out to the community than anything else we had tried because the students talked about it for us to everyone!

We post links to Rock the Vote and CalPIRG online voter registration tools. Participated in CalPIRG voter registration events, and National Voter Registration Day. Participated in new citizen registrations at swearing in ceremonies. We work closely with our local university and all of our high schools doing voter outreach on campuses, registering voters and recruiting poll workers. We have an active outreach program with our residential care facilities and coordinate voter registration and voting efforts with them. We work closely with all of our political parties on coordinating voter registration. We have participated in county fairs, parades, community events to promote voter engagement. We also have a great program we coordinate where early voting is conducted during the 29 days before an election including the weekend before the election. We also have an active Voting Accessibility Advisory Group we work with to provide outreach and services for voters with disabilities and voters who speak a language other than English. Most of our language services have been for Spanish speaking voters, but we may add Tagalog and Chinese in the near future if data supports the need for these language services.

We provide sample ballots and registrations to political parties and candidates. We placed information in the utility bill about voter ID laws and election dates.

We provide voter registration forms, pamphlets, and custom voter registration or election materials. We also will attend community events for voter registration drives.

We provided additional opportunities for voters to obtain free voter identification, check voter registration status and apply for absentee ballots on the three Saturdays immediately preceding voter registration deadline for the general election. These services were submitted and precleared by the US DOJ.

We set up with voter registrations at the local fair & festivals. We also have voter guides, absentee applications, candidate guides, and various other items.

We use the newspaper, election website and radio to get information to the voters.

We work with are town clerk offices to put ads collectively in a local newspaper.

We work with civic organizations to obtain poll workers for our precincts

We work with Native Vote coordinators, local GOTV coordinators for the Tribes as well as for empowerment groups for voters with disabilities, Hispanic community leaders, City and Town Clerks, and a variety of non-profits to be present at their events, demonstrate voting equipment, and conduct voter education presentations. We have a Community Network group which meets monthly and has a designated page on our website.

We work with the League of Women voters to provide registration services at new citizen naturalization ceremonies. We also conduct school elections at high schools and sometimes mock elections at the middle school leve.

We work with the local high school, branch university, and community action agency to participate in job fairs, voter registration drives, etc. The local radio stations and newspaper work with us to provide PSA's regarding voter registration deadlines, absentee ballot application deadlines, procedures, etc.

We work with the county bar association with the 'So you are 18' program and the League of Women voters assists with voter registration in the county.

When contacted, our office has provided civic organizations with the necessary information required to conduct successful voter registration drives.

When organizations notify our office of events they are sponsoring, we set up tables/booths with information on becoming a registered voter and voting practices as well as dates of upcoming elections, voter registration deadlines and absentee/early voting dates, times and procedures. We have also been to speakers at our local Rotary Clubs, party meetings.

When requested for information from other organizations we help out by providing the information requested. The hospital obtained information for anyone going into the hospital prior to election day. Election judges go out to nursing homes and assisted living facilities prior to election day to help voters vote absentee.

When Voter ID was on track for implementation in Pennsylvania, I held more than a dozen public forums and partnered with groups like the League of Women Voters, Area Agency on Aging and AARP for some of them to provide the information. While the attendance was mixed, I was fortunate to get coverage from four TV stations, a radio station and a trio of local newspapers that got the word out to many of our voters.

Work closely with League of Women Voters and other election-related non-profits ,as well as working with the political parties.

Work with local high schools, go to service groups

Work with local schools to conduct voter registration drive

Work with political parties to have voter reg at annual town fair. Go yearly to high school to register new voters.

Q9 For each of the following, please indicate whether your jurisdiction has voter outreach initiatives or activities that focus on this group – Other (specify)

LEOs were asked to specify groups on which voter outreach efforts are focused other than those listed in the survey – students, racial/ethnic minorities, foreign language speakers, voter in long-term care facilities, and voters with disabilities. A small number of LEOs (4%) provided a response. Frequently-mentioned focal groups include civic and community organizations, the elderly and homebound populations, and military and overseas populations. However, the most frequent response was that all voters are focused on equally.

[Source variable: Other #1 Voter Outreach Focus-Specified]

Available upon request to any group

Civic organizations

Civic organizations upon request

Civic organizations-Rotary & Kiwanis

Community groups

Elderly

Focus on all that are interested

Home bound voters

Indian tribes, pueblos, nations

Jails

Military and overseas voters

Military personnel

Military/overseas

Municipal clerks, esp. urban, provide much of above outreach focus

N/A

New citizens

Nursing home facilities that meet state requirements

Our outreach is to all voters regardless of their differences

Our town works with all groups equally

Shut ins

This is a small community, and friends and neighbors & the human resources committee are active in helping anyone who wants to vote vote

Treat all voters equally

Various festivals

Voters in jail

Voting information

Brochures printed for general distribution

We assist wherever we are asked

We do not have voter outreach

When requested

[Source variable: Other #2 Voter Outreach Focus-Specified]

Apartment Complexes

Churches

Clubs & associations

Community organizations

Have ADA specs in place for those needing assistance

Hospitals

New citiizens

Voter education program available and conducted by request for all above-mentioned groups

Q12. How are your jurisdiction's voter outreach efforts paid for? Other (specify) *[Source variable: Other Source-Outreach Costs Paid From-Specified]*

When asked how voter outreach efforts in their jurisdiction are paid for, fewer than two in ten LEOs (14%) specified a source other than the local election office budget or a line item appropriation in the county or state budget. More than one-third of those LEOs (35%) noted that their jurisdiction does not engage in voter outreach and one-quarter (25%) indicated that their jurisdiction does not spend money on voter outreach. Among LEOs who specify a funding source, grants/HAVA grants and town/municipal budgets were mentioned most often.

Administration budget

By school or city in school and city elections

By school staff

Chapter 19 (state funds)

Clerk does any outreach efforts

Did not do outreach
Divided between entities on the ballot
Do not do voter outreach
Do not have
Do not have outreach
Do not pay
Do not pay for this
Do not spend money
Do only free outreach
Does not apply
Don't pay
Done by voter registration for free
Each participating subdivision
Federal funds
Federal grant and election office budget
Federal grant funds
Forfeited filing fees
Free public service ads in local newspaper and local radio station
Free speaking engagements by Clerk
From line item appropriation in town budget
Grants (3x)
Grant opportunities, if any
Grants, HAVA
Handouts from state election office
HAVA
HAVA funds
HAVA funds when available
HAVA grant
HAVA grant funds (2x)
In our small community voter outreach is mostly done through local organizations churches and schools
Just me at my regular pay
Line appropriation in the city budget
Local and state funding
Many hours of the secretary are voluntary

Most everything we do is free of costs and much of the staff time is volunteer or paid for through already existing compensations

N/A (4x)

N/A - free

No cost other than time

No costs \$0

No expenditures made

No funding for outreach

No outreach

No outreach efforts

No outreach paid for

None (2x)

None used

Not applicable (2x)

Not budgeted - unfunded

Nothing is spent on voter outreach

Office expenses

Office workers hold voter registrations

Our employees get paid hrly so if they drive to the center they are on the clock. We don't spend on materials

Our municipality

Personal

Personal time/gas/mileage

Previously through grant award

Shared costs with local units.

SOS brochures

Special elections are billed to the district with the measure or candidate on the ballot

Stamps

State election board

Taxes

The local paper and radio station do not charge us.

The organization is responsible for cost

The organizations carry the costs involved

Town budget (2x)

Town clerk budget

Town committees (Rep & Dem)
Town
Travel
Volunteer time
Volunteer basis
Voter organizations
Voter registration at high schools
We did not spend money
We do not have outreach
We do not have voter outreach
We don't have anything that costs money for outreach efforts
We try to take advantage of free outreach

Q14 How much of a problem is each of the following in engaging in voter outreach for general election cycles? Other (specify)

LEOs were asked to rate various issues in terms of how much a problem each posed to voter outreach efforts. In addition, LEOs were asked to specify and rate other issues affecting voter outreach. While most LEOs commented that their office did not engage in voter outreach, a few identified issues including lack of interest and logistic issues particular to their jurisdiction.

[Source variable: Other #1 Problem Engaging in Voter Outreach-Specified]

Do not do outreach
Lack of community interest or 'buy in' to continuing efforts
No county newspaper
Not applicable
Our town is located mostly in a farming community with most of our voters living in the rural part of our county. Our newspaper is issued weekly so outreach efforts are somewhat difficult.
Physical distance between the islands of our county
Support of county officials
This office employs two people, we are limited on time and work
This is part of ROV job
Voter outreach not applicable
We do not engage in voter outreach
We have a few voters who are deaf

[Source variable: Other #2 Problem Engaging in Voter Outreach-Specified]

Do not do outreach
Few voters who are blind
This is part of ROV job

**Q21 Please indicate which recruiting sources you use to obtain poll workers for General Elections.
Other (specify)**

LEOs were asked to indicate which sources they use to recruit poll workers, and to identify other recruiting sources not listed in the survey. Approximately 16% of LEOs identified another source. Nearly 30% reported that political parties are involved in poll worker recruitment. Other frequently-mentioned recruiting sources are phone calls, advertising through mailings or media, notices on voter registration applications, sign-up sheets and postings at polling places, and town and precinct officials.

[Source variable: Other #1 Pollworker Recruiting Source Used-Specified]

Ad in newspaper
Advertising campaign
All vote by mail state
BCA recruits workers
By Telephone
Call
Call individuals
Call my list
Calling people
Caucus
Caucus election nominations (Rep & Dem)
Caucus list
Caucuses
Census Blurb
Committee members from each party get to pick workers. We have no say.
Contact past poll workers from large database of previous workers
County does not recruit or use poll workers. Done at the municipal level in Wisconsin
County fair
Dem party gets workers
Democrat chair
Direct mail with voter notification cards

DMV

During elections post 'Poll workers Needed'

Each precinct captains party

Elected at town meeting

Elected justices of the peace

Executive committees (2x)

Facebook

For volunteer organizations, most use our 'Team Up for Democracy' program to collect funds for organization

From a list of justices of the peace and others who have worked before

Going through voter registration and calling people.

I am a County Clerk

Indicated on voter registration applications

Justices of the Peace

Let the parties find them

List of experienced poll clerks

Local parties

Local party committees

Local political parties

Mailings (2x)

Media - radio & print

Media community service advertising

New registered voter

Newspaper articles

No polls. All vote-by-mail

Notice on back of our registration cards.

Notices posted in office

Office recruitment

On application

On registration form

Other town employees

Partisan caucus

Party appointments

Party central committee

Party chairman

Party chairpersons
Party chairs
Party precinct caucuses
Party selection
Past poll workers
Past workers (2x)
Personal knowledge
Personally call
Phone
Phone calls
Political parties (4x)
Political parties are to supply our office with persons interested in becoming an Election Judge
Political parties give me a list
Political parties submit
Political party nominations
Political party recruitment
Posters at poll worker tables on Election Day
Posting sign in office
Precinct caucus
Precinct committee men and women select poll workers
Precinct committee persons
Precinct committeemen
Precinct committeemen appoint
Previously worked
Elections
Publish notice of election worker training in local newspaper and on local radio
Questionnaire included with annual street list form
Recruit by asking interested individuals to sign sheets at precincts on Election Day
Recruited through sample ballot
Recruiting at polls on election day
Recruiting through political parties for balance at polls
Rely on political parties for recommendations
Republican and Democratic Chairpersons selections
Request for election workers on the annual census

Request on voter registration card
ROV pick
Sample book
Scrambling 2 wks prior to election recruiting friends and family to take the place of dropouts
Sec. of State office
Sign-up sheets at the polls on Election Day
Staff
The parties (Rep/Dem)
Through party apparatus
Town committees
Town Democratic Committee
Town email
Town news
Town newsletter
Town political committees
Town Rep/Dem Committee
Township/city officials
Voter applications
Voter cards
Voter information card
Voter registration applications
Voter registration card
Voter registration card application for serving as judge
Walk-ins wanting to help
We are a County so we do not hold the elections. We only print ballots and supply all the supplies the municipalities need to hold the elections.
We ask the people personally
We call them
We contact the workers
We do not recruit the poll workers. The party chairpeople do.
We have a group of volunteers who regularly work our elections.
We make phone calls
We submit articles to our local papers asking for poll workers, not in the classified ads.
We use current county employees

We used trained individuals for the issuance of presidential ballots, and pre-election absentee ballot preparation

[Source variable: Other #2 Pollworker Recruiting Source Used-Specified]

At election office counter

Celebrity poll workers or recruitment messages

Central committee recommendations

Committee people

Do not employ poll workers

Elected officials

I go through my voter list and make phone calls. I also have a list I use and update every 2 yrs.

Mail all voters voter registration card with attachment recruiting Election Day workers

Posters at polls

Posters in municipal offices

Precinct captains recruit

Precinct committeeman

Recruit in-house

Rep party gets workers

Republican chair

ROV pick

Signs placed in public buildings

Town Republican Committee

Voter list

Voter's guide

Workers indicate on their voter registration card interest in helping with elections

Q23 For each of the following, please indicate how much of a problem it presents in obtaining a sufficient number of poll workers for general election cycles. Other (specify)

LEOs were asked to rate various issues in terms of how much a problem each posed in obtaining a sufficient number of poll workers. In addition, LEOs were asked to specify and rate other issues affecting poll worker recruitment. Approximately 5% of LEOs identified problems other than those listed on the survey. The age and/or health of poll workers was the most frequently-mentioned problem. Other issues raised were the bilingual requirements, increased use of technology, and lack of interest.

[Source variable: Other #1 Problem in Obtaining Pollworkers-Specified]

Again, you would need to ask municipal clerks these questions. Counties do not hire poll workers.

Age

Age of poll workers (2x)

Aging workers becoming ill and having to back out after selection

All vote by mail state

Apathy

Bilingual requirements

Bilingual

Complicated technology

Cost of travel for training & poll sites

Counters

County party chair is difficult to work with

Don't want to come in after working a full-time job

Fear

Fear of technology

Gender balance

Hearing & visual impairments

Hired but don't show up

Lack of bilingual workers

Lack of interest

Lack of interest in being a poll worker.

Language requirements

Largely elderly population

Most young people have full time jobs and older ones want to retire and not do it anymore.

Need to 'promote' to lead poll worker from internal poll worker list

No interest

Only older people apply

Small labor pool in area

This problem is primarily the job of the Registrar of Voters of our town.

Too many elections within the calendar year

Too dependent on retirees

Too many election laws

Transportation

We do not need that many

We don't have polling places
We have had same poll workers for over 30 yrs
Workers age 18-30
Workers cannot switch parties for two years before election

[Source variable: Other #2 Problem in Obtaining Pollworkers-Specified]

Bilingual workers in certain areas
Health of poll workers
Interest in a single specific position (i.e. not interested in working as poll inspector)
Our most loyal officers are leaving because they are not comfortable with electronic pollbooks
Rural areas of county
Technology skills
Workers age 50+
Workers comfortable with technology

Q25 Please provide any additional comments you may have about administering elections in urban and rural jurisdictions. In particular, we are interested in any ideas and/or experience you have regarding voter outreach and personnel that you feel had a positive impact on your ability to administer general elections. [Source variable: PE25]

At the conclusion of the survey, LEOs were asked to provide additional comments, ideas, and experiences related to administering elections, with particular emphasis on voter outreach and personnel issues. Some LEOs who completed the survey on paper wrote notes in the margins next to other survey questions. These notes were entered as comments to this survey item and appear below in bracketed italics [].

Nearly one-quarter (23%) of LEOs provided a comment. Of those who commented, approximately 13% indicated that they do not hire poll workers and/or that elections in their jurisdiction are done entirely by mail. One-third of LEOs commented on poll worker recruitment and training. Poll worker pay or voter outreach were the topic of approximately one quarter of LEO comments. Many of the comments did not fit easily into broad, general categories. The richness of detail provided by many LEOs are best appreciated by a review of the individual comments.

(1) We are going to try E-Poll books next election. (2) We did a survey of polling locations looking at ADA issues and simple access issues that affect everyone. (3) We put pre-election information in a local free distribution 'Shopper's News' with a wide distribution. We have not way of quantifying it's success.

[At Q16 & Q18 noted, 'N/A. We are the county. Townships provide poll workers.' Q19 through Q24b N/A.]

[At Q16 & Q18, note to contact Registrars of Voters'. At Q19a & Q20a, hourly rate ranges from \$11 to \$13.]

[At Q16 & Q18, noted 'local clerks hire poll workers.' At Q19 noted 'N/A' & left Q19-Q24b blank]

[At Q16 & Q18, noted that number was election judges only. Noted N/A for Q19 through Q24b]

[At Q16, noted '25 judges & 25 counters. We manually count.'] Long hours are hard on elderly poll workers. Split shifts would mean finding more workers and, in a small rural community, that is not easy.

[At Q18 & Q20, noted 'This is not a responsibility of my office.' For Q19 through Q24b, noted 'N/A; responsibility of individual municipalities; not county.']

[At Q19a, indicated that poll workers are paid \$8.00/hr plus \$25.00 one-time stipend to come in and count after polls close.]

[At Q19a, noted a 3-tier pay scale for stipend. At Q24 noted that split shifts are offered for clerks only.]

[At Q20a noted '\$25 for gen mtg. \$20 for equipment. Equipment is hands-on training using expresspal & DRE open/closing - only those assigned to these areas attend.' At Q24 noted 'We don't encourage it, but do on occasion do this.']

[At Q22 noted 'Each year varies. Some years have too many, other years everyone has other commitments.' At Q24a noted 'Has no impact but workers are fresher when time to count. We do not have machines.']

[At Q6, noted 'County - vote in twp/city']

[At Q7 noted, 'for state elections the Commonwealth of MA send out voter info booklets.']

[For Q16 & Q18 noted that this is 'done at local level.' At Q20, noted 'Some yes/some no.' At Q20a, noted 'all different depending on location.' At Q24, noted 'Some yes.']

[For Q18 and Q20, noted 'N/A-hired by local clerks'] Reaching out to high schools to educate/recruit poll workers/register voters has been successful. With more staff time & larger budget, this office would like to expand outreach to other demographic targets.

[For Q19 through Q24b, noted that this is done at the township level.]

[For Q19a & Q20a, noted hourly rate is minimum wage.]

[Hourly rate in Q19a & Q20a is 'minimum wage.' In Q24a, noted 'Not enough workers for split shift'] Elections are very difficult time to find workers, as everyone has jobs. It would be best if Federal and State law was mail ballot. This survey is confusing. Not sure what you mean by 'outreach.'

[Hourly rate in Q19a & Q20a ranges from \$8.00 to \$9.00]

[Hourly rate in Q19a is 'minimum wage']

[In Q16 & Q18 noted '7 poll workers per shift' but didn't indicate how many shifts.]

[In Q16 & Q18, noted 'Selectmen's Office.' In Q19a, stipend is \$150 for warden, \$130 for clerk, and \$100 for inspectors.]

[In Q16 & Q18, noted that they are countywide numbers. In Q19a, noted that hourly rate 'varies by precinct, \$8-\$12/hr.' In Q20a, noted 'unknown, varies by jurisdiction.' In Q24, noted, 'some jurisdictions do offer-some work the whole day.'] I am a county jurisdiction, so it is hard to answer some of the questions that seem to be based more at a township or city level.

[In Q19, noted 'They are paid by the local municipalities. Amount varies.' In Q20, noted 'This is up to local boards.' In Q21, noted 'This is done by local clerks.' The rest of the survey is blank.]

[In Q19a & Q20a, hourly rate ranges from \$8.00 to \$12.00] Remember, I am answering these questions as a county clerk and not a local clerk (township/city).

[In Q19a, noted that 'hourly rate differs by job description']

[In Q19a, one-time stipend is \$100 for primary and \$150 for general election] The needs of a BOE to be effective are of very low priority to County Administration

[In Q19a, rate ranges from \$7 to \$12/hr]

[In Q19a, stipend ranges from \$70 to \$85]

[In Q19a, stipend ranges from \$75.00-\$80.00]

[In Q19a, stipend ranges from \$98 for clerk to \$125 for inspector. In Q22, noted 'Somewhat easy' except for 'Somewhat difficult in Avenal and finding bilingual'.]

[In Q20a noted, 'varies/paid by local units.']

[In Q20a, mileage is also reimbursed at \$0.37 per mile]

[In Q22, noted that it is 'Somewhat easy' to obtain poll workers, but 'Somewhat difficult' to obtain a Spanish interpreter.]

[In Q24b, noted 'A negative impact.']

[Left Q16 & Q18 blank, noted 'Local level only'. At Q20a, noted that stipend varies from city to township.]

[Noted 'Does not apply' for Q10 through Q14.]

[Noted 'N/A' for number of poll workers in Q16 & Q18]

[Noted 'N/A' for Q10 through Q14] (2x)

[Noted N/A for Q16, Q18, Q19a, Q20a.]

[Noted N/A for Q9 through Q14.]

[Noted that Q16 & Q18 are county-wide numbers. Q19a and Q20a hourly rates range from \$8 to \$10.]

[On Q15 & Q18, noted 'Does not apply. These come from the probate judges' office. On Q17d, noted 'We did utilize volunteers heavily.' On Q20a through Q24b, noted 'Check w/probate office.']

[On Q20a, noted reimbursement for mileage]

[Q19a & Q20a hourly rate ranges from \$10-\$12] Voters in entire state need to be better educated regarding how CT is different from other states. For example, closed vs. open primaries and the need to re-register if moving from one town to another. We are notified by DMV that someone has moved to another town so we remove them. They move back and we don't know, so they can't vote.

[Q19a & Q20a hourly rates are minimum wage.] (2x)

[Q19a and Q20a rate ranges from \$8.00 to \$8.50]

[Q19a hourly rate is minimum wage.] (2x)

[Q19a hourly rate ranges from \$8.25 to \$9.25]

[Q19a rate ranges from \$8.00 to \$10.00. Counters (8pm to early morning hrs) get \$10.00]

[Q19a response is an average of \$200, \$175, or \$130 stipends.]

[Q19a stipend is average of \$193.75 for wardens, \$142.50 for clerks, \$116.00 for inspectors, and \$137.75 for others.]

[Q19a stipend ranges from \$100 to \$150]

[Q19a stipend ranges from \$102 for judge to \$110 for presiding judge.]

[Q19a stipend ranges from \$80 to \$90]

[Q19a stipend ranges from \$80-\$100]

[Q19a stipend ranges from \$82.00 to \$85.00]

[Q20a stipend ranges from \$20 to \$25]

1.) We offer 'Curbside Voting' at our Polling site for those who are unable to leave their cars due to injury, mobility limitations or other conditions. This is a very successful and welcome addition in our community. 2.) Members of our community offer to shuttle voters who cannot drive to the Polling Site.

As a note: This survey was completed on behalf of our County Recorder who is out of the office today.

As county clerk we do not send out ballots or provide election materials to voters or provide poll workers. We train and certify poll workers every 2 years. We advertise the elections.

As I am new in this position, I do intend to change/improve on what has been done historically. I'm working on a website for our office and will be recruiting poll workers and doing more outreach to the community, including assisted living facilities.

At the county level, I do not have poll workers. Each township has their own. The biggest problem we have is because we are so small, we wear numerous hats and the election laws and processes change so much, we can't keep up! It is the most stressful time of the year for our 2-person office. We do county clerk, register of deeds, circuit and district courts, payroll, paying bills, etc. Elections just about pushed me over the edge.

At this time we have a pool of available workers. At times we have struggled with getting Spanish speaking workers but at this time that seems to be covered.

Be advised Oregon doesn't have polling places except for the elections office itself. So the answers regarding poll workers were based on the staff we use in our office at election time.

Being a small rural town, we have not residents that don't speak English. We put our posters up in French also because we have French-speaking residents but they also speak English. We have special voting equipment to be used by disabled but have no disabled that have wanted to use it. We go to schools that request it for their students. We also go to nursing homes and long term care facilities to enable anyone who wants to vote.

Biggest problem in hiring poll workers is to have equal Dems and Reps. This is a Republican County and it is almost impossible to find Dems to work.

Certainly the type of election will impact our ability to get people involved from voting to serving in the polls. Presidential General elections bring out the most interest and support, primaries the least. I believe our student poll worker program has been extremely successful in helping us fill our polls and developing civic minded young people who are going to register and vote in the future. June elections are hard to recruit student workers because of finals and busy end of year school schedules. November general elections are much more successful. Online voter registration has had a huge impact on increasing our voter registration numbers. Partnerships with PIRG and Rock the Vote have also been very positive. Finding ways to make voting and serving in the polls cool and exciting are key to increasing civic engagement. We have had celebrities serve in the polls or do public service announcements and we have seen a direct increase in participation. Getting more rock stars, movie stars, sports stars, delivering messages about voting and serving in the polls through twitter, Facebook, PSAs, or incorporated into tv/movie scripts would go a long way. Rock the Vote is amazing at doing this and have had a huge impact on the younger voter. The more we do to educate voters about voting options, accessibility of voting, ways to register, and ease of voting (it's not a test!) the more people will get engaged. We also need to simplify voting materials. The League of Women Voters does a great Easy Reader Voter Guide that makes navigating through the propositions and issues much easier than the State Voter Guide. However, there have been some wonderful improvements to the State Voter Guide to make it more usable as well.

City and Township Clerks hire poll workers. We are a County Clerk's office. Questions 19 through 24 are not applicable. We do not hire poll workers.

Combined response of Town Clerk and Registrar of Voters

Each year there are new requirements. It is hard to keep staff up to date on new regulations. As a small county we were not required to have Spanish ballots. What we have done is sample ballot in Spanish this last year. The Spanish sample ballots were in our office and set to each polling location and posted. We will continue to so Spanish sample ballots but plan on having them on our web page also. We do not have any Spanish groups or newsletters in our county so have not found a better way to provide this information.

Elections personnel are not respected as professionals who work year-round, not just Election Day, therefore support is low, and pay is low. It is difficult to keep trained staff. Additionally, people don't understand the complexity of the job and once they become involved and realize, they resign from serving as assistants or poll workers.

Enjoy administering the elections. It is a challenge to find poll workers. The long day, low pay and increasing technology are sometimes challenging as most of our workers are retired. Most young people cannot get off work.

Feed the election workers. The pay is low so offering a nice meal makes up for it.

For my position as Registrar I get paid \$585.00 per year. Our town is putting my position into town office. Will be difficult to train new position on CVR. Our election bureau needs more basic training available for new clerks.

For the most part, election workers are very dedicated & take the responsibility very seriously. Many have said they enjoy the work and look at it as doing their civic duty. I do not believe that a split shift would make it easier at all. Poll workers travel several miles and I feel they wouldn't be interested in 1/2 the hours. It would be difficult to find 44 additional workers for the split shift.

Funding is the number one issue with outreach and currently it is done on a volunteer bases and with very limited staff. Our in house staff is dedicated to English and Spanish outreach, however additional financial support would be more than helpful for our county. Our biggest outreach effort is with our local non-profit organizations.

Generally precinct workers are elderly. Somewhat afraid of change and electronics. Need to recruit younger workers. Local schools by law are to be closed on election day. Teachers recruited to work then the school system schedules them for in-service training and they cannot work the election.

Hard enough to find enough poll workers without having to deal with split shifts

Have a comfortable site with good lighting. I feed my workers well with catered meals. Four hour shifts. I also plan my ballot clerks as to the expected turnout i.e. more check-in clerks for high use elections so there is less stress per clerk.

Having a split shift for election day would make it easier to get judges but would cause a whole new set of problems.

Having an Election Administrator would allow for our small jurisdiction and the other entities holding elections to have a trained and knowledgeable individual to focus on elections. This would help with better voter education and outreach. As the District and County Clerk, this office does not have the time and resources to do better outreach.

Having sample ballots on the web site help greatly. When people call we can just refer them to our site or we mail when needed.

I am a county. Most questions pertain to local township & city govt. County election is responsible for training election workers, programming election software and I publish appropriate notices although publishing is responsibility of locals, but it's less expensive to publish as a group.

I am a newly-elected county clerk so I have not completed an election yet. I do however believe in educating the public whenever possible & to try recruiting younger generation to get involved in working - plan on going to schools/colleges.

I am interested in looking at vote centers (if Commissioners could provide us with the needed equipment). I am REALLY interested in looking at all-mail elections.

I am the County Clerk, therefore do not have to find and hire the poll workers. Your survey is intended for municipal clerks.

I apologize for not responding sooner. I assumed the survey was going to include detailed statistics; I should have opened it & responded sooner!

I assigned two individuals from my staff to do our voter outreach programs several years ago. They were charged with recruiting individuals to act as 'patriots' representing the office at various events in the community. They received the proper training, and interned with staff members until they were proficient enough to do events on their own. This gave us the ability to be in a number of places at the same time. With the vast amount of community events we have in this state, having the additional workers gave us a much larger footprint in the community. I also allowed staff to become members of our local Public Relations Association. This helped provide the staff members with invaluable contacts for events and the media, how to reach out to capture the interest of the public, how to present their information so it would have a stronger more lasting impact and how to be creative in planning events.

I believe that urban problems prompt legislation that is unnecessary or cumbersome in the rural jurisdictions.

I believe that voter registration drives are very important, however, I also believe a lot of information may be put on a county website or in the news media that may educate voters and help keep the public informed on election matters. I also believe that it is essential to have the correct number of personnel in order to get the job of elections done correctly and efficiently.

I believe that voter registration drives are very important, however, I also believe a lot of information may be put on a county website or in the news media that may educate voters and

help keep the public informed on election matters. I also believe that it is essential to have the correct number of personnel in order to get the job of elections done correctly and efficiently.

I did not answer any questions related to poll workers because my jurisdiction is all-mail voting. Your survey does not structure its questions for that type of voting environment.

I don't have enough help. It is just me, the County Clerk, and my Deputy Clerk in my office.

I go to any extreme for anyone who wants to vote. I'll deliver registration card directly to their home in person. I would like to see if a poll watcher attends our poll to identify their self with first and last name or provide ID of who they are. I had a problem with someone showing up at my poll and refusing to identify herself as to whom she was. She just walked right in accusing myself and my clerks that she had been hired by the Secretary of State which was false and she was in a hurry to leave the poll. All I know is she is involved with a Republican Tea Party. This took place Nov 6 2012 Presidential Election.

I have found in a rural setting is we have mostly retired people who are available to work but not truly capable. They are intimidated by computers and the strict election laws that must be followed. Everyone here works. I have had over 20 cancel on me the night before an election. I have trained people at their kitchen tables at 10PM the night before because I was desperate to find someone last minute. Getting workers is a huge problem.

I have had requests to move to a split shift for working the election day but scheduling would be a nightmare because my judges have situations that occur without notice and I would have to find replacements.

I know most of the people in the County, so I have been able to fill the positions. Because many of my precinct workers are older, and I fear that they will retire when I retire and that will make it harder for the next secretary to solicit future precinct officials.

I live in a small town. Very few people vote during primary elections. I am here all day - on average - & other workers take one 2-3 hour shift. Then I get more to help count at night. My workers are justices of the peace & one of my friends. The JP are elected officials.

I think if emphasis was applied to all mail in voting, with limited voter sites on Election Day we would experience a higher voter turn-out and it would make our task of finding voting locations and judges much better.

I think petitioners and candidates should be banned from their activities on election day - no petitions for them to 'hawk' at voters to try to get to sign. Also re: candidates, people have heard enough prior to the election. I have heard complaints from voters that they don't like them there on election day, even if all they can do is shake hands.

I think there has been too much of a push for absentee voting by the candidates/political parties. The parties (especially the Democratic party) go door to door to solicit votes and some voters actually felt that they were expected to vote absentee. There is substantially more cost involved to the county governments who have to pay postage for mailing (and return of) ballots, plus cost of envelopes for mailing ballots out.

I train 5 poll workers to do early vote and machines so that on election day everything is under control. One or two people do provisional ballots to help keep order and staff is always in place to handle any and all questions.

I work very closely with the city and township clerks who actually administer election day processes, keeping in mind that not every method works in every community. They also work well together and share ideas with each other.

The State needs to address the political way election judges are selected. As far as voter outreach I do not know how to deal with voter apathy.

In 2012 I visited the County's two main retirement homes to offer absentee vote application assistance and had a good response and reduced needing to process applications with mistakes

In 2012, we implemented Vote Centers in our county. This was very well received and helped alleviate many problems faced on Election Day, such as long lines and changing polling locations. Since we have a mixture of urban and rural locations, we used a mixed model Voter Center approach with Ballot on Demand printers and increased number of touch screens in urban locations and pre-printed ballots and fewer touch screens in rural locations. The plan worked very well and was well received by both the voters and the political parties.

In this state, elections are administered locally with some responsibilities also given to the county clerk. As a county clerk I do not hire poll workers, absentee ballots etc. I do prepare the ballots, buy the precinct materials and publish the election notices as well as collect all of the results on election night.

In the past, we have successfully used a high school student poll worker program. Students, voters, and poll workers loved it. It was a challenge to administer. The Secretary of State's Office provides an interactive website that will provide voters with the location of their polling place, driving directions, sample ballots, district assignments, absentee tracking information and more. We advertise this site as much as we possibly can. We print voting information brochures and distribute them to many civic and special interest groups. We have voter educations that are available to citizens by request.

In the rural setting, voting centers seem to be a good idea for the future --Cost savings, convenient, and would be easier for office workers to go by and check on polling locations.

It is all volunteer - small towns - hard getting younger people as they need to work.

It is hard to find workers and even harder to train them. I would offer split shifts but I don't have enough workers.

It is hard to recruit younger election judges and the older judges are set in their ways and not always willing to make changes in their election day routine as instructed. It is a long day for the Judges but if we were to split it up we would need twice as many and would need to monitor who's coming and who's going and who didn't show up

It is somewhat harder to find poll workers who live in rural areas. Using high school and college students has been good and has given students a prospective to voting they did not

know. Also using retired school teachers for poll workers has been an excellent device for recruiting very capable and responsible poll workers.

It would save small rural counties a lot of money to eliminate the requirement of working 2 Saturdays before the primary and general. We have very little if any traffic.

Last question about split shifts might make it easier to obtain poll workers, but then you would have to find twice as many and then coordinate shifts. So not a real great solution.

Like going to the schools and inform the students but need something to get schools and teachers more motivated.

Majority of county poll workers are retired. In our economy, most individuals have a full time occupation. With the unemployment rate in the county, people who are unemployed don't have the knowledge to want to be a pollworker, and are more than likely not registered to vote. I believe if we have maybe (opinion) a couple of locations or to limit work (poll worker) costs and close polls at a reasonable time, which would limit costs or may absentee only (early vote) by mail and only hire an absentee team would limit costs.

Majority of poll workers are over 70 years of age. 13 hours at the polls is a long day. Most younger people have children or are in school and cannot work full hours.

Many of the questions on this survey are geared to large, less integrated communities. We had close to 80% voter turnout for the 2012 presidential election. Getting the word out on an island with a big sign coming onto the island for the use of the town, the fire department, and community association is how we start our outreach. Our town office staff is only three people who are not available full-time - but we also have three selectmen - and all have a strong sense of integrity about serving the island's people. Staff and elected officials come in any time if needed. Additionally, neighbors and the Human Resources Committee assist when needed.

Many poll workers are advanced in years. I am concerned about replacing this generation of workers since most adults work full-time jobs and aren't available on election day. *[Hourly rate in Q19a and Q20a is \$7.50, \$8.00, or \$8.50]*

Most of these questions need to be directed toward Municipal Clerks, not County Clerks. I don't mean to be uncooperative but I can't really answer for 36 different municipalities of varying sizes.

My main comment is 'One size does not fit all'. What works for the larger cities is not needed in the rural areas. We spend a lot of money to comply with regulations that are not an issue in our area. I may have a total of 1 - 20 absentee voters on the Saturday we are open prior to an election. Requiring me to be open for 4 weeks prior or even one additional day would be a huge expense to my county that is not needed. One handicap accessible machine at the courthouse would be more than adequate. One in every polling place is a waste of tax payers money.

Need more funding from someplace.

None

Offering split shifts has helped however most of our poll workers would prefer to work the AM shift. I have found that word of mouth is the best way to find qualified poll workers. It is quite difficult to let a poll worker know that they can no longer complete the work. Training can sometimes be cumbersome.

This is a Vote by Mail state. Poll workers are not used.

Our area churches are very good to post our flyers on their bulletin boards. We get a lot of our poll workers from church organizations and civic groups of age groups that are retirees. However, it seems people are not retiring as early these days and it is becoming more difficult to attract younger, healthier individuals who can put in a very long (14 hour +) day for less than minimum wage.

Our biggest problem is all the extra CVR requested information that is unnecessary for a small rural area.

Our County has been vote by mail for 18 years. We have not had polling place in all those years. We only have a half time permanent employee for elections. We only hire temporary staff for feeding and opening envelopes.

Our county is a 'Medium Sized' county, therefore we have some of the problems of big counties and some of the problems for small counties. While uniformity seems great, it can create havoc since one size does not fit all.

Our county is blessed with a lot of individuals that take the election process very seriously. It is a pleasure to work with these people. We rarely get turned down if we ask one of them to work. It is a privilege to work with them. For outreach we just use the phone and call the individual. We are a small county - population 1537 with average age of 48 years. Thank you.

Our county is considered frontier, not even rural. We have 7,000 square miles and only 4500 voters. We have nine polling places plus the Clerk's office for early voting. We have a large percentage of early and absentee voters.

Our county is very rural and the pool of potential poll workers is small. Most people have to work well up into their 70s and do not have an interest when they retire. The ones that are interested are not technology-savvy enough to work the equipment.

Our election poll workers and judges are becoming an aging population. Most of them are in their later 60's and over many of whom are in their 70's. Folks who do work do not wish to take vacation time to work the elections as the pay is not enough.

Our election workers are older people. I am not sure that we will be able to replace them as they retire from serving.

Our older judges don't like the machines/computerization and younger ones are hard to find because they have jobs or need to take care of kids.

Our outreach to schools and nursing homes is passive. My office makes sure to contact schools to be sure they have voter registration application available and we contact nursing home before each election to offer assistance if needed. Your questions do not allow for the degree of outreach that is done to be quantified.

Our success is due in part to the fact that the personnel in the election office have been on the job for several years and can handle problems that someone who is new to the department would have a problem. The Election Supervisor has had her position 30+ years, which also helps to have successful elections.

Our tech support for voting machines, sign-in pollbooks (Android tables, etc) is provided by our other elected officials in our county. We get 1 person from the other offices, as possible, who remain on county-paid time during their normal hours. We then pay their before & after hours of election day. We have trained these individuals and repeatedly use the same people to learn new equipment, then help teach election judges. This has proven to be a very reliable & cost effective source of manpower.

Our town is very small and rural (population 261) and the population is aging rapidly. I'm worried that it will be difficult to recruit the next generation of poll workers because of demographics and declining civic participation.

Partnered with the local Boys and Girls Club. The Board of Directors manned a call center on Election Day. They answered the general questions, what time polls open/close, am I registered to vote, where do I vote. In exchange for manning the phones the Election Commission made a \$1,000 payment to the club to aid in some of their endeavors.

Pay for poll workers varies based on responsibility. Your system only allowed me to enter one amount.

Please be advised that this correspondence was sent to the County Clerk and I was recently appointed Elections Administrator for the county

Poll workers are paid mileage to attend training; the election judge is paid mileage to return ballots and other election supplies. In our rural area, voter outreach is by publishing notices in the legal paper. Split shifts would be a bigger problem--for training and for getting enough capable people to work. Central counting of the ballots at the Courthouse has been a tremendous help. That has cut costs and helped to find willing poll workers.

Poll workers are usually elderly because they are the ones at home. People who work don't want to be out all night counting ballots. This is not a problem now because we have a machine.

Regarding pay: Reimbursement from the state does not pay election works enough. Our county had pick up the tab and upped the pay in order to attract people to work the elections. Regarding outreach: Because we are a mostly rural community word of mouth works well and this year I was able to post it on Facebook and got a great response and influx of voters to the polls. Kept it real basic and just posted that it was indeed 'election day'.

Respect your help. I have great respect for my poll workers. Hence, they respect me and do the job to the best of their ability. They feel important and helpful. Of course, they like the pay but I believe most work the polls because they want to help out in the community.

Same day voter registration is very helpful to getting new people to vote.

Same-day voter registrations cause the biggest headaches for a small staffed town.

Since I am a county clerk, I do not get involved with poll workers at the municipal level. Since I could not skip these questions, I answered them with as little information as possible.

SOTS does outreach. Municipality puts on election. ROV staff (elected) appoints what staff it needs to address workload. (register voters, obtain poll workers etc). TC prepares ballots, supports process, administers absentee process.

Split shifts are popular, but we tend to lose the second shift personnel, who don't show up. And we need them the most. Introducing more technology at the poll site and additional language assistance complicates the whole recruitment process.

Split shifts would make it easier to recruit some but we would need more and that would pose another problem.

State workers should be encouraged to work at polls and get their regular full pay. No income tax on \$ earned as poll workers. Not required to pay for overtime to workers from other county offices.

The answers to your survey are from a small town with a town clerk & 2 registrars. We do everything with exception of election days, when poll workers are hired. As far as voter outreach, we average 75% turnout in all major elections.

The Department has initiated two programs that greatly assist in recruiting poll workers. 'Team Up for Democracy' is a poll worker program that many non-profits see as a way of earning funds for their organization. They can have as many from their organization as they want, they can have split shifts, they can organize it to suit the number they have as long as they keep within our minimum and agree to the pay. The County's Board of Supervisors has blessed a 'County Employee Election Official' program where employees of the county can work for the elections department as poll workers, field inspectors, couriers, or in the Department on election day and the Department pays their salary and the Elections Department covers any overtime or stipend they make. Both programs, in addition to our successful Student Poll Worker program, have been very key in making it easy for us to meet our needs with poll workers. We might add that, due to this partnership, we have also been able to expand community education - when a non-profit worker/volunteer or another county employee works on election day, they actually learn something about voting and this leads to a higher level of participation. When a young student works at the polls, their parent(s) most likely are affected.

The elections are run by the Municipalities. The County Office does not run the elections so does not use poll workers.

The hours are way too long for warden, town clerk, and registrar of voters.

The majority of our election workers are older and do it mostly out of loyalty to the party, the process or the community. I would like to have a more diversified group but the younger voters who would work are employed full time. I have used high school students and the main problem with them is they become bored with inactivity between voters

The Republican elections commissioner does not believe in voter outreach. He does everything possible to make it difficult for people to register to vote. I believe that the move

by the state to have the DMV office electronically transmit voter reg forms will help tremendously. Our county legislature cut our staff and salaries by 15% two years ago. There is no commitment to our Board of Elections by elected officials.

The Supervisors of the Checklist have taken on the responsibility of recruiting poll workers, and they also produce the tally sheets that we use for hand-counting ballots.

The Town Clerk's offices played a much larger role, which is now being done by the Registrar of Voters office. Our office does register voters, but primarily are involved in the public function of educating voters as to process, notify the Secretary of State's office as to qualification of voter, certification of results after election, and the entire absentee ballot process.

There needs to be a National Poll Worker Day. Poll Workers understand that their work is considered 'volunteer' although they receive a small stipend. I have worked in two different counties. There is a huge difference in recruitment of Election Workers between the two counties, due primarily to size. In larger counties more incentives needs to be granted to those who assist with elections. Federal recognition is a beginning.

There's the quadrennial problem of everyone being interested in Presidential elections, but then interest drops off in other years. We don't have many problems in Presidential years but our state has elections EVERY year, and it's hard to get people engaged during the off years. This in turn is frustrating for election workers at all levels, because we work so hard to make it happen yet there is so much apathy.

This is a very rural area, with most of the voters out of town. The cost of maintenance on the voting machines is high, training enough poll workers is a problem due to the small population and distance to travel. The pool of workers to choose from is limited, some are too old and intimidated by the voting machines, some workers are at home with small children and don't have day care available, those in the age group that can work, usually have another job and take time off from that to work the polls. Since we are rural, we have 13 precincts, 4 of which are in the small town. All others are miles away, so have to close the polls and return to the courthouse with the ballots, supplies, etc, some are more than an hour away. When those arrive here, we then start counting those precincts, this year we had 10 extra hired for election night and we were still here until 8 a.m. the next day and we are a very small county.

This survey is for twp and city clerks, not for county clerks.

This survey seemed to me directed at the municipal level more than the County Level. County Level does not deal with recruiting poll workers, we are the 'administrative part'. The County publishes all of the election notices in the local newspapers, makes sure the election materials are available and delivered to the municipalities, we hold election trainings for the municipality poll workers and instruct them on election issues. I am not sure how this survey portrays an accurate picture of the County Level regarding the Elections.

This year we received a HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT accessibility grant; we used those funds to hire a temporary Accessibility Coordinator to perform voter registration within a 4 county region. It also brought attention to our positive efforts in the past and identified areas where we could improve in the future.

Time Time Time with absentee voting, mailing, tracking, computer filing - box up for election, taking to election - 4 people just to open and put in machine takes a ton of time only 1.5 person that work full-time. Long days and nights. Plus all other duties of a town office.

Training closer to election day is essential for remembering details. Wardens and deputy wardens need training for several years before they feel confident.

Understaffed! Underpaid!

Utilizing split shifts for poll workers is not popular for retirement age poll workers however quality versus quantity improves the accuracy of checklist documentation. Finding workers in the 30, 40, 50 year old age range is extremely difficult due to hourly pay versus working their regular job and people with families have other more pressing obligations.

Vote by mail only! Have in house voters scan their own ballot! This protects the voter ballot cast even more!

Vote by mail would get a higher participation.

Voter outreach for an election official is necessarily neutral and is therefore limited to educating voters concerning when, where, and how. Laws even limit the extent to which an election official can explain questions on the ballot. Parties and candidates bear the lion's share of the responsibility for voter turnout. Sadly, neither candidates nor political parties appear to be very focused about voter turnout. The major focus has been and continues to be voter registration, an honorable goal by itself. However, there are far more registered voters who do not vote than there are persons not yet registered to vote. In 2012, we added fewer than 2,000 to the voter rolls. In 2012, over 33,000 registered voters did not vote! Simple logic tells us that candidates and political parties could gain significantly if they focused their energies on getting registered voters to vote! Voter apathy is a major problem and the blame for that lies at the feet of political parties and candidates who are unable to generate any excitement or motivation for voters to vote. Quit blaming election officials for this problem - we are already doing everything we can legally do and remain neutral.

Voter outreach made a big difference in preparing our voters for bringing the correct form of required ID for the November General.

We also contact the local party chairs to ask people in each party to work.

We are a small county, so most things aren't issues. It is hard for a small county to hold elections because of costs.

We are a small town and elections are pretty easy.

We are a very small community. Putting up posters at the voting place and the local diner seems to suffice.

We are a very small county and I have had excellent poll workers that are dedicated to their jobs. All residents in our county know each other so the election process at the polls goes very smoothly.

We are a vote by mail state - no poll workers

We are all vote-by-mail. No polling places. We found that by conducting all mail ballot elections the voter turnout went up. We have no newspaper, no media coverage (radio-local) cell phone and internet connection spotty. On election night I use a central count crew of 4. We count votes in open view of the public. We have a high voter confidence in the integrity of the election process.

We are an all vote by mail state. We have no polls so there is no need for poll workers.

We are in a rural area and have 16 precincts and 11 polling locations. Since we are spread out it is hard to combine more precincts to have less poll locations because where do you draw the line - we have approx 75% perm mail-in in our county and it would greatly benefit if the state would allow us to do all mail-in for all elections.

We are not interested in providing split shifts for poll workers, as it decreases the consistency and would provide for too much confusion.

We conduct elections by mail and do not have poll sites or poll workers.

We did extensive free advertising (PSA's) on cable TV and local newspapers. Our Council on Aging van was used to take poll workers to training sessions and to bring elderly voters to the polls. Voter turnout was awesome and there were no problems at the polls. E-mail was used extensively to assist overseas voters and college-age absentee voters.

We do not have enough staff to handle the added work during election time. We do not have the needed staff because of lack of money.

We don't have money in budget for extra staff, administering an election is hard with just one person running the election. The fact that committee members from each area pick poll workers is hard they usually use the same people that we have problems with it would be much better if we chose the workers

We encourage poll workers (who are all election judges) to self-recruit. They often bring new workers to our attention. We focus on recently retired teachers who have great tech skills are 'customer service' oriented and are young enough to handle the hours and issues of election day.

We happen to have a great town (rural) and have high voter participation.

We have a very civic minded community. Most of the time we have more people ask to serve than positions to fill. We have people who will volunteer and don't care about being paid.

We have no fault absentee in this State and we strongly promote that. We have a central poll within the city limits and six rural polls to accommodate our voters that would have to travel.

We have no problems with elections even not being online. The only problem I see we would like to change is it's a very long day with not many people showing up. We are lucky to have 20 people vote. That's a big show for us.

We really don't think the idea of the split shift for poll workers would work in our area. Small counties & large counties cannot be run the same! It is very different when you have a large

staff & one person does one job! In a small County such as ours 2 people do it all. We HATE the idea of voting on the last weekend before the election. By this time our minds & bodies are over worked & we still have to set the polling locations up. We need time to complete our jobs. It doesn't matter when you set the last day of early voting the people will wait until the last day to vote.

We sent a mailer before the General Election letting voters know of the option to sign up as a permanent mail-in voter (PMIV). The response was very positive, likely due to the large number of employees who work odd hours/split shifts. Not only did it directly offer the voter the option to vote by mail, it eased the offices election load by having more people vote early.

We think split shifts would be confusing. 2nd shift would not know what happened on 1st shift. May be harder to get twice as many poll workers.

We utilize the vote center concept; the accessibility for voting before election day has been an increasingly popular option with voters; we establish satellite locations in small towns in the county, long-term care facilities, college campus, and community centers for a few hours to a full day depending on the size and voter concentration.

When I go into schools, it is as a volunteer on my day off. We are a paper town. Getting enough people to come in at 8pm to count is difficult.

Would be interested in using all county staff as election judges instead of required political party appointments. The majority of staff personnel are people oriented and technologically competent.

Your questions about other languages really do not apply to us in a very rural community. We are not an urban area with multi-cultural backgrounds. We are just country folks.