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Foreword

The Democracy Fund is a bipartisan foundation established by eBay founder and philanthropist Pierre Omidyar to help ensure that the American people come first in our democracy. The Democracy Fund was incubated inside Omidyar Network and launched as an independent foundation in 2014.

Believing that well-run elections are essential to public trust in our government, the Democracy Fund has invested approximately $13 million to improve the voter experience over the past four years. Much of this work was recommended by the Presidential Commission on Election Administration (PCEA).

The PCEA and its 2014 report, The American Voting Experience: Report and Recommendations of the Presidential Commission on Election Administration, represent the type of bipartisan collaboration and data-driven results that the Democracy Fund aspires to foster. It is this admiration that drives us to monitor, evaluate, and promote the adoption of the PCEA’s recommendations. This report is intended to give an overview and provide a few detailed examples of progress on this ongoing body of work.

The Democracy Fund would like to thank the team that assembled this information and the numerous individuals with whom they spoke. Extensive research informs this report, including 40 interviews conducted with national, state, and local elections experts, elections officials, elections administrators, and voter advocates from December 2015 to July 2016.

As the nation prepares for another major presidential election, the hope is that this snapshot of progress will provide stakeholders with a key update on the status of the PCEA’s recommendations.
Executive Summary

The United States’ electoral system has always been imperfect – a work in progress. And yet the health of our democracy depends on the quality of our elections. All over the country, we entrust local officials to run elections as smoothly as possible. In fact, we depend on these officials to oversee more than 8,000 election jurisdictions nationwide – verifying the eligibility of voters, designing the ballots, and counting the votes.

The decentralized administration of elections means there are always new challenges to be addressed and new opportunities for improvement. It is for this reason that the Presidential Commission on Election Administration (PCEA) was established by an Executive Order on March 28, 2013, with the goal of confronting problems and institutionalizing processes that allow for improvement.

After an extensive six-month inquiry, the bipartisan PCEA, comprised of experts and practitioners, issued The American Voting Experience report, which stated: “the problems hindering efficient administration of elections are both identifiable and solvable.” In the report, members of the PCEA unanimously agreed on a set of best practices and recommendations they hoped would focus institutional energy on a select number of important policy changes, while spawning experimentation among the thousands of local officials who shared similar concerns.

This update highlights the progress made in several areas, since the reports release, notably in the areas of voter registration, access to voting, polling place management, and voting technology.
The PCEA’s recommendations were organized into four categories of work:

1. **Modernizing voter registration systems**

2. **Expanding early voting and access to voting**

3. **Reducing lines and improving polling place management**

4. **Modernizing voting technology**

In the two years since the report’s release, the impact of the PCEA is clear: elections administrators all over the country benefited from its insights and many have already implemented reforms to improve the voting experience. Officials agree that the PCEA has helped:

- Double the number of states with online voter registration;
- Increase access to early and absentee voting options;
- Replace aging voting equipment;
- Introduce new voting technology; and
- Increase professional standards for election administration.

We commend the elections officials who have followed the unanimous, bipartisan recommendations of the PCEA to execute positive reforms. And we challenge all jurisdictions to act quickly to adopt any PCEA recommendations they can in time for the general election in November and for future years.
# Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key PCEA Recommendations</th>
<th>Highlighted Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modernizing voter registration systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt online voter registration</td>
<td>Since the PCEA report was issued, the number of states with online voter registration has doubled. In total, 38 states and the District of Columbia have passed or implemented online voter registration in the United States.¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand interstate exchanges of voter registration information</td>
<td>There are two networks through which states share voter registration data to improve the accuracy of America’s voter rolls.² Inspired by the PCEA recommendations, a number of states now engage in one or both networks: the Interstate Voter Registration Crosscheck program has over 29 states participating and under the direction of The Pew Charitable Trusts, 20 states and the District of Columbia have joined the Electronic Registration Information Center.³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamlessly integrate voter data acquired through DMVs with statewide voter registration lists</td>
<td>In an effort to hold states accountable for their role in the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA), a New York-based public policy organization called Dēmos published a report identifying and ranking states on their compliance with NVRA and offered recommendations for ways states could become compliant.⁴ In parallel, the Department of Justice has pursued cases against Alabama and Connecticut to fix motor-vehicle compliance issues.⁵ Dēmos and other organizations are pursuing efforts to improve compliance in California, Nevada, North Carolina, and other states.⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expanding early voting and access to voting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand opportunities to vote before Election Day</td>
<td>Several states have expanded early voting opportunities thanks to the PCEA. Massachusetts, for example, will now hold a 10-day early voting period rather than limiting voters to casting in-person absentee ballots.⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide ballots and registration materials to military and overseas voters via state websites</td>
<td>To better help military and overseas voters cast ballots, the Council of State Governments’ Overseas Voting Initiative and the Department of Defense’s Federal Voting Assistance Program convened a policy working group that recommended Federal Post Card Applications constitutes a full registration and that absentee ballots be honored for all elections falling within a two-year federal election cycle.⁸ The group also encouraged states with online voter registration to designate a special section of their online voter registration portals for military and overseas voters.⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish vote centers to facilitate voting at convenient locations</td>
<td>California quickly jumped at the recommendation to establish vote centers. Secretary of State Alex Padilla, the California Association of Clerks and Election Officials, and advocacy groups have endorsed legislation authorizing counties to “conduct any election as an all-mailed ballot election” as long as drop-off locations and vote center requirements are met.¹⁰ The legislation was passed by the California Senate and referred to the Assembly.¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY PCEA RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>HIGHLIGHTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop models and tools to assist elections officials in effectively allocating resources across polling places</td>
<td>In 2015, the Voting Technology Project published a robust online <em>Elections Management Toolkit</em> to help officials allocate resources more effectively. The Ohio Secretary of State requires counties to submit pre-election plans and has encouraged the use of the Election Management Toolkit for the voting device and paper ballot allocation calculations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit public- and private-sector employees, as well as students, to become poll workers</td>
<td>Both Rhode Island and Illinois have started programs to recruit student workers, which have been cited as a catalyst for increased voter participation among young people. Simultaneously, the Bipartisan Policy Center and Democracy Works have recruited Spotify, Starbucks, Target, and other large companies to encourage greater civic participation among their employees, many of whom are young.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve professional standards for elections officials</td>
<td>Connecticut worked hard to enact the PCEA recommendation to improve standards for elections officials, launching a professional certification program on September 14, 2015. Each registrar is required to complete an eight-part course administered by the University of Connecticut’s School of Business and to pass a series of examinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform the standard-setting and certification process for voting machines</td>
<td>With help from the PCEA, the Election Assistance Commission approved new voting system certification guidelines and a new program manual for certification and testing, and it established a new web-based clearinghouse of sample Request for Proposals for voting equipment. All of these reforms helped spur voting machine vendors to bring new voting systems to market.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Following the 2012 election, the PCEA was established to identify core issues confronting our elections system and to make key recommendations for improving the voting experience for citizens around the country.¹⁹

Two of the most respected elections lawyers in Washington, D.C., Benjamin L. Ginsberg and Robert F. Bauer, were appointed to co-chair the PCEA. Both are prominent figures within the Republican and Democratic Parties, respectively. Ginsberg served as national counsel to the Bush-Cheney presidential campaign, national counsel to the Romney for President campaign, and counsel to the Republican Governors Association. Bauer served as White House counsel to President Barack Obama, general counsel to the Democratic National Committee, and general counsel to Obama for America. The remaining eight members of the commission include five current and former election officials and three private-sector representatives.²⁰

Under the leadership of Bauer and Ginsberg, a group of bipartisan experts, practitioners, and former elections administrators launched a six-month PCEA inquiry that included public hearings around the country, conferences with state and local policy makers, elections officials, and elections administrators, and meetings with advocacy groups and academic experts. Equipped with extensive research and recommendations, the PCEA released *The American Voting Experience* report in January 2014.²¹

The PCEA report proposed a wide range of improvements in election administration reforms covering many recommended focus areas. These recommendations have been broadly grouped into four categories:

1. Modernizing voter registration systems
2. Expanding early voting and access to voting
3. Reducing lines and improving polling place management
4. Modernizing voting technology

Based on innovations and improvements in election administration, the PCEA recommendations emerged from extensive dialogue with innovators and advocates around the country. The report added significant momentum to ongoing reform efforts. As one expert put it: “The PCEA didn’t plant the seed – but its recommendations were, in places, water and fertilizer.”²²

THE INFLUENCE OF THE PCEA

Although it will take longer than two years to see the full impact of the PCEA, it is clear that its report and the subsequent effort to support election reform have helped a diverse range of states and localities across the country to improve election administration through legislation, administrative action, and state appropriations. Elections officials and advocates alike report the PCEA was very useful in defining policy agendas and advancing pro-voter initiatives. Some of the efforts have produced tangible results to date; others will bear fruit in the years ahead.
The PCEA has been successful and influential in state and national policy debates for several reasons:

1. **The recommendations and best practices were unanimously adopted by the PCEA**, signifying a genuine bipartisan consensus. This unanimity has encouraged consideration by policy makers, elections officials, and elections administrators on both sides of the political aisle.

   “To achieve progress in these areas of election administration, it is important to have partisans buying into this and agreeing. It is not a subject for the mushy middle if you want to get solutions. It really is much more having partisans come to agree on the common cause of getting rid of barriers for all legally qualified voters to be able to vote.”

   **BENJAMIN L. GINSBERG, PCEA CO-CHAIR**

2. **The report is unquestionably authoritative.** The PCEA recommendations are recognized as well-researched and grounded in strong evidence, reflecting best practices promulgated by experts from around the country and readily applicable to ongoing state policy debates. The recommendations speak directly to the concerns and challenges of elections administrators. They also underscore how technology can be used to streamline election administration and manage voter registration data while still maintaining integrity and reliability. Notably, the report discussed “the wonky stuff that no one wants to talk about.”

   Its treatment of technical issues in election administration speaks directly to elections directors in a way that the prior presidential commissions on elections had not. As Marci Andino, the Executive Director of the South Carolina State Election Commission put it, “Not only did the Commission provide a powerful voice for election officials and raise the national awareness of the problems facing voters but it also provided academic analysis and scientific techniques to help election professionals address those issues.”

3. **The Commission included five current and former elections officials and administrators.** Commissioners Trey Grayson, Larry Lomax, Ann McGeehan, Tammy Patrick, and Christopher Thomas are all well-known and widely respected in the elections community. Their inclusion earned immediate credibility for the PCEA.

4. **The co-chairs and commissioners engaged in extensive outreach.** Policy makers, elections officials, and elections administrators have appreciated the listening sessions arranged by commissioners and co-chairs at meetings of the National Conference of State Legislatures, National Association of Secretaries of State, National Association of State Election Directors, the Election Center, and the International Association of Clerks, Recorders, Elections Officials, and Treasurers. The commissioners’ fieldwork after the release of the PCEA report was an important layer of support for elections officials. Co-chair Ginsberg’s outreach to fellow Republicans in Republican-majority states was also particularly impactful. His imprimatur underscored the truly bipartisan consensus behind the PCEA’s recommendations.

5. **The report defines policy agendas and advances pro-voter initiatives.** As a candidate for office, Rhode Island Secretary of State Nellie Gorbea found the report extremely helpful. Released just as she was preparing for her 2014 campaign, the report informed her policy prescriptions. Once sworn into office in January 2015, she used the PCEA recommendations to identify areas where Rhode Island could improve its administration of elections.

6. **The report demonstrates the nonpartisan nature of improved election administration.** Advocates and elections officials have been able to cite the PCEA as evidence that improvements in election administration should not be seen as partisan. Common Cause New Mexico and its allies distributed the report to every state legislator in New Mexico and reported positive feedback from both sides of the aisle.

7. **The commission lives on.** Through the Bipartisan Policy Center, the PCEA co-chairs have agreed to promote the PCEA recommendations by continuing their balanced approach. As a result, there is value in measuring the progress made on the recommendations as a way to demonstrate the effectiveness of the commission and to encourage the elections community to continue to improve election administration nationally.
Modernizing Voter Registration Systems

Accurate voter registration rolls are critical to the administration of elections in the United States. As such, the PCEA recommended that states modernize their voter registration systems by adopting online voter registration, participating in interstate data exchanges, and integrating voter data acquired from motor vehicle departments with state voter registration lists.

A. ONLINE VOTER REGISTRATION

One of the PCEA’s key recommendations was to expand the number of states offering online voter registration. Pioneered by Arizona in 2002, online voter registration had gained slow but steady support by 2014. With online voter registration in the works in many states prior to the release of the PCEA report, the bipartisan recommendations and support from PCEA commissioners has helped the number of states with online voter registration double in the last two years. As of June 2016, a total of 38 states plus the District of Columbia have adopted or implemented online voter registration.

The report was critical in conveying the clear advantages of online voter registration and states have affirmed those benefits. Online voter registration:

- **Generates cost savings**: The cost per registration plummeted from 83 cents to 3 cents in Arizona after the state adopted online voter registration. Other states have also realized cost savings, according to a statement from the National Conference of State Legislatures. In January 2014, Pew released a brief on online voter registration stating that 12 of the 13 states surveyed on their implementation of online voter registration reported that cost savings were one of the greatest benefits of the system.

- **Reduces voter registration errors**: With online registration portals, voters provide their registration data directly to elections officials, reducing the likelihood of misspellings, incorrect addresses, and other data errors that may go undetected until Election Day. Clean voter rolls create less demand for the time and attention of poll workers, promote the orderly movement of voters through polling places, and reduce the likelihood of long lines at the polls. Clean voter rolls also reduce the use of provisional ballots and the attendant risk that such votes will be rejected. Iowa Secretary of State, Paul D. Pate, noted that “Even though Iowa has little problem with long lines at the polls, we believe that EVR [Electronic Voter Registration] will make waiting at the polls almost non-existent, as voters will not only use EVR to register in advance of the election, but also update their voting address.”

- **Promotes voter participation**: Studies of online voter registration show marked usage by younger voters. With at-home access to registration, online voter registration also promotes the participation of voters with limited mobility. A recent Government Accountability Office report noted that “voters benefit from the added convenience online registration provides … and convenience can translate to a decrease in the time cost to voters for participating in the voting process.”

With so many states moving to online voter registration, it is the most successfully and quickly adopted election reform recommended by the PCEA. Although the spread of online voter registration is the result of multiyear efforts that predated the PCEA, elections officials, elections experts, and voter advocates nonetheless credit the PCEA’s bipartisan support as an important factor in securing additional support.

Elections administration leaders in Alabama, Florida, Ohio, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin all point to the report’s influence on their consideration of online voter registration. The following examples showcase that influence.
FLORIDA

In Florida, online voter registration gained widespread support thanks to the growing momentum toward adoption in states across the country and the active endorsements of nationally respected elections experts. The Florida State Association of Supervisors of Elections (FSASE), the trade association of county elections administrators, championed online voter registration in 2014 and rated the legislation as its top legislative priority in 2015.

The PCEA report and recommendations energized online voter registration policy debates in Florida adding academic rigor to those discussions. County supervisors in Florida, including Republican Election Supervisors Brian Corley (Pasco County) and Paul Lux (Okaloosa County), used the report to educate legislators in their efforts to bring online voter registration to the state: “The PCEA report was crucial in our efforts with this issue and led to a bipartisan and overwhelming support of online voter registration in the state of Florida.”

State Voices and America Votes, two voter advocate “organizations” in Florida, also incorporated the PCEA endorsement into their talking points on online voter registration. The Bipartisan Policy Center was particularly helpful in reaching out to state leaders, like Republican Governor Rick Scott. The organization provided vital information about the bipartisan support for – and nonpartisan benefits of – online voter registration, including realistic cost estimates for implementation of an online system, as well as perspective on the security and accuracy of online registration. The legislation was adopted with overwhelming bipartisan support in the Florida Legislature and Governor Scott signed online voter registration into law on May 15, 2015.

“It's hard to make a case for delaying a convenience already available in almost half the nation. Indeed, in January 2014, the Presidential Commission on Election Administration recommended that every state create online voter registration.”

SUN SENTINEL EDITORIAL BOARD, MARCH 16, 2015

OHIO

The data-driven, bipartisan nature of the recommendations and the unanimous consensus of those who served on the Commission carried real weight in Ohio's elections community. The PCEA recommendations resonated with Republican Secretary of State Jon Husted, driving much of his thinking about future improvements in election administration in the state.
By Secretary Husted’s calculation, county boards of elections in the state stood to benefit greatly from online
voter registration, saving jurisdictions between 50 cents and $1 per registration.56 He estimated that, had online
voter registration been available, counties could have saved between $1.5 million and $3 million in the cost of
processing 3 million voter registration applications between 2010 and 2012.57

With encouragement from Husted, the Ohio legislature passed online voter registration legislation before
adjourning for summer recess in June 2016. As the bill was signed into law, Husted lauded the effort saying,
“Online voter registration is easy for voters, effective in fighting voter fraud, and less costly than paper
registrations alone.” Voters will be able to register online beginning in 2017.58

The bipartisan recommendations of the Commission vouch for this as a common sense
way to improve accuracy, reduce lines, and most importantly, better serve voters as we
continue our work to make it easy to vote and hard to cheat.”59

JON HUSTED, OHIO SECRETARY OF STATE

NEW MEXICO

Following unanimous votes in the State House and Senate, Republican New Mexico Governor Susana
Martinez signed online voter registration legislation (SB 643) into law on April 10, 2015.60 New Mexico’s state
association of county clerks had actively pursued online voter registration since the 2011 legislative session.61
Those efforts were met with only limited success. The state opted to allow voters to update existing voter
registration records through an online portal.62

Democratic Bernalillo County Clerk Maggie Toulouse Oliver credits the PCEA report as a tool that contributed
to the final passage of online voter registration legislation four years later.63 The PCEA’s bipartisan nature
and expert-based approach to election administration carried particular weight. Toulouse was able to invoke
its merits in numerous conversations with New Mexico policy makers.64

Voter advocates voiced similar feedback about the PCEA report. According to Common Cause New Mexico,
the imprimatur of a presidential commission energized the local advocacy community to press for online
voter registration.65

PENNSYLVANIA

Bipartisan efforts to bring online voter registration to the Keystone State had been underway for several years
prior to the release of the PCEA report. Democratic Governor Tom Wolf championed online voter registration
from the executive office, while Republican State Senator Lloyd Smucker sponsored a bill in the legislature.66

Online voter registration was a plank in Wolf’s campaign platform, and members of the governor’s transition
team incorporated the PCEA report into their recommendations for new policy initiatives.67 Democratic
Secretary of the Commonwealth Pedro Cortés also referenced the report in his confirmation hearing.68 State
elections officials and voter advocates invoked the report in conversations with state legislators.69

The state launched online voter registration by administrative action on August 27, 2015, with the strong
support of the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania.70 The data on online voter registration
usage in Pennsylvania have been a strong testament to its utility. More than 50,000 state residents used the
new system to either register to vote or to update their existing registration records in the first four months of
operation.71 Approximately 1,800 Pennsylvanians logged in on the first day.72
RHODE ISLAND

Newly-elected Democratic Secretary of State Nellie Gorbea used the PCEA report to define her four-part 2016 policy agenda: online voter registration, interstate exchange of voter registration data, voting machine replacement, and youth civic engagement. With her active support, the State House of Representatives passed legislation to adopt online voter registration in June 2015. In March 2016, the legislation was approved by the Rhode Island Senate and in early April, the governor signed it into law. Gorbea hopes the online portal “will be up and running before the fall.”

WISCONSIN

Online voter registration legislation was first introduced in Wisconsin in 2011. The next three years, proponents helped allay partisan suspicions and build a coalition of support. Their work paid off with Governor Scott Walker signing online registration into law in March 2016. Kevin Kennedy, then the state’s chief elections official, credits the PCEA and its report as a major factor in the developing bipartisan consensus for online voter registration. The testimony of PCEA Co-Chair Ginsberg and the PCEA report were “the last piece of the puzzle.”

B. INTERSTATE VOTER REGISTRATION DATA EXCHANGES

Given high mobility rates and the decentralized nature of election administration in the United States, the PCEA identified the maintenance of accurate, up-to-date voter registration records as a major challenge for elections officials. On Election Day 2012, there were 191 million voter registration records and 130 million voters to manage across 8,000 election jurisdictions. The PCEA recommended an expansion of existing interstate voter registration exchanges to improve the accuracy of voter registration records, reduce administrative costs, increase registration rates, and enhance the ability to detect and prosecute voter fraud.

Two such exchanges exist — the Interstate Voter Registration Crosscheck Program (IVRC) and the Electronic Registration Information Center (ERIC). The IVRC was established in 2005 by a consortium of four Midwest states, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska with Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach expanding and enhancing the program since that time to at least 29 states.

ERIC was launched in 2012 with assistance from the Pew Charitable Trusts and has expanded from nine to 20 states and the District of Columbia over the past three years. A number of elections officials interviewed for this report expressed a clear preference for ERIC, which requires member states to reach out and offer voter registration to would-be voters identified by the system as eligible but unregistered.
Several interviewees cited the PCEA as a significant factor in ERIC’s growth.

- **Florida** Elections Supervisors have lobbied for ERIC membership for some time.\(^8^5\) The highly transient nature of the state’s population results in many duplicate, multistate registrations. The PCEA’s endorsement of interstate voter registration data exchanges helped encourage county supervisors to renew their push for ERIC membership in 2016.\(^8^6\)

- **New Mexico** incorporated legislation, supported by the then-Republican Secretary of State Dianna Duran, authorizing ERIC membership as part of an omnibus bill that enacted online voter registration and other innovations in election administration in March 2015.\(^8^7\) The Bernalillo County clerk and lobbyist for the statewide clerks association identified the PCEA report as helpful in gaining additional support for the system.\(^8^8\)

- **Ohio** enacted legislation in December 2013 authorizing interstate agreements to share voter registration data, without specifying any particular interstate exchange system.\(^8^9\) PCEA research and its interstate data exchange recommendation helped strengthen arguments for using technology to streamline election administration.\(^9^0\) PCEA Co-Chair Ginsberg weighed in on behalf of the legislation.\(^9^1\) The state later joined IVRC and is expected to become an ERIC member state if online voter registration is adopted.\(^9^2\)

- **Pennsylvania** joined ERIC in 2016.\(^9^3\) State leaders credit the PCEA report for buttressing state interest in ERIC membership.\(^9^4\)

- **Rhode Island’s** newly-elected Secretary of State, Nellie Gorbea, pursued ERIC membership as one of her first initiatives in 2015.\(^9^5\) Legislation allowing for the exchange of information or data with other states was signed into law in March 2016, allowing Rhode Island to join ERIC.\(^9^6\)

**C. NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT COMPLIANCE**

The PCEA also highlighted the disparate treatment of NVRA’s “Motor Voter” provision across the states, noting that noncompliance by some departments of motor vehicles has led to systematic problems and confusion for would-be voters.\(^9^7\) Because the vast majority of eligible voters interact with their DMVs, noncompliance represents a missed registration opportunity for most potential voters, especially new drivers and individuals who have recently moved.

In response to the PCEA’s recommendation, a New York-based public policy organization called Dēmos published a report identifying and ranking states on their NVRA compliance and offered recommendations for ways to modernize the systems, which is critical for states to become NVRA compliant.\(^9^8\)

The Dēmos report prompted national associations and voting advocacy groups to focus on integration systems and information that assists agencies in providing registration services to their customers. In 2015, the Department of Justice settled a case against the State of Alabama to assist and fix motor-vehicle compliance – something the state had not been able to do in years.\(^9^9\) As a result, Alabama will “fully integrate a voter registration opportunity into all applications for driver’s licenses and other identification documents, including renewal applications, both in person and online.”\(^1^0^0\) Similarly, the Department of Justice recently notified the State of Connecticut that it was out of compliance with the law.\(^1^0^1\) The Connecticut secretary of the state and the head of the motor vehicle administration are examining changes to their procedures that might aid their compliance with the law and have referenced the low ranking of the state as a rationale for fixing the system.\(^1^0^2\)

More directly, Dēmos, working with local and national partners, notified California of serious problems with the state’s compliance with the NVRA.\(^1^0^3\) In response, the state worked collaboratively to develop and implement a modernized system of voter-registration through the Department of Motor Vehicles.\(^1^0^4\) That effort has begun to bear fruit and Dēmos continues to work with state officials on further improvements. In North Carolina, after initial settlement discussions were unsuccessful, Dēmos initiated litigation to compel the state to come into compliance with the NVRA and ensure voters who interact with the DMV will be offered the voter registration services to which they are entitled.\(^1^0^5\)
Expanding Early Voting and Access to Voting

The PCEA underscored the importance of offering Americans the opportunity to participate in the electoral process beyond the traditional 12-hour Election Day. Elections officials from both parties acknowledge that early voting relieves congestion at the polls on Election Day and responds to voters’ demand for more options.

The PCEA spurred several states to adopt early voting and a handful of others to expand early voting opportunities within their states. While progress in expanding access to early voting is not making the same headway as online voter registration, many states are eager to share best practices about the length of early voting periods, the process of administering early voting, and other methods of improving voting access.

There are still 13 states in which early voting is not available, and an excuse is required to vote absentee. As more information becomes available, early voting is likely to take root in these remaining states.

A. MILITARY AND OVERSEAS VOTERS

The PCEA report also informed nascent, interagency initiatives to improve voting opportunities for military and overseas citizens. It is estimated that six million Americans of voting age serve in the military or are family to service members, or live abroad. Because of their geographic distance from local elections officials – not to mention the time required to transmit ballots and the patchwork of rules and regulations required by the varying election laws of the states – military and overseas voters confront unique challenges in registration and voting. Voter registration and absentee ballot application rules may be unclear, and absentee ballots may not be received or returned in time to be counted.

The PCEA highlighted best state practices for handling the form used to register to vote and request an absentee ballot (Federal Post Card Application), as well as an emergency ballot (Federal Write-In Absentee Ballot). The PCEA recommended that states provide ballots and registration materials via their websites.

The report also served as an information springboard for a policy working group created by the Department of Defense’s Federal Voting Assistance Program and the Council of State Governments Overseas Voting Initiative. The working group, comprised of elections officials, was directed to build on the PCEA’s recommendations and best practices. The group released recommendations on December 17, 2015. Notably, it recommended that states treat the Federal Post Card Application as a permanent request for voter registration and develop a standard default validity period of not less than one federal election cycle for Federal Post Card Application ballot requests, ensuring that military and overseas voters would be sent absentee ballots for all elections during that two-year period. The working group also encouraged states with online voter registration to designate a special section of their online voter registration portals for military and overseas voters. Many states are actively examining these recommendations for the next set of legislative sessions.

B. EARLY VOTING

When the PCEA report was published, 32 states had some form of early voting (including no-excuse absentee and mail voting). The PCEA recommended that states with early voting expand opportunities for voters to cast ballots before Election Day. And in states without early voting, there were several recommended options for states to consider.

After the release of the PCEA report, several new states have adopted early voting, and a handful of states have developed early voting programs or expanded their current programs, tapping the PCEA as a resource to do so. There are still 13 states in which early voting is not available, and an excuse is required to vote absentee.
Massachusetts invited the Bipartisan Policy Center to help draft regulations and implementation procedures for the state’s first year of early voting in 2016.117 The Commonwealth previously provided for in-person absentee voting only for individuals unable to cast a ballot on Election Day. Under the new provisions, voters will be able to complete and submit a ballot at the offices of town clerks during a 10-day early voting period in any even-year general election.118

3 Reducing Lines and Improving Polling Place Management

The PCEA noted that a well-managed polling place can be the most important factor contributing to the quality of the voter experience. Recommendations include keeping lines short and moving, minimizing the number of provisional ballots, and ensuring that voting machines work properly.119

Many of the PCEA’s recommendations are best utilized when elections officials have the capacity and tools to actually put these policies into practice. For this reason, the PCEA urged the integration of election administration into a university curriculum of public administration that includes training in technology, data collection, and management.120

A. PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS FOR LOCAL ELECTION ADMINISTRATION

The call for increased professionalism has resonated in states across the country.

In Connecticut, elections are extremely decentralized and administered by partisan registrars of voters in each of the state’s 169 towns. Though efforts to increase professionalism were afoot for years, no training requirements or competency standards were required of elections administrators.

In July 2015, Connecticut enacted a statute mandating the training and certification of all registrars.121 Secretary of the State Denise Merrill cites the PCEA report as particularly helpful in that success. The statute not only reinforced the training imperative for local elections administrators, but also framed it as an apolitical, administrative imperative.

“This is a national issue. President Obama’s commission on election administration, led by prominent election law attorneys from both parties, recommended the highest professional standards for election administrators in their final report. I could not agree more.”122

DENISE MERRILL, Connecticut Secretary of State

Connecticut launched its new professional certification program on September 14, 2015.123 The state requires each registrar to complete an eight-part course administered by the University of Connecticut’s School of Business and to pass a series of examinations. The curriculum includes instruction on state and federal voting regulations, the maintenance of accurate voter lists, services to voters, preparations for elections, and post-election audits. In addition to certification, registrars will receive yearly training on new elections-related legislation or regulations related to their duties.124
In Minnesota, the Humphrey School of Public Affairs has developed an innovative method for practical training in election professionalization via online training “in direct response” to the PCEA. The Humphrey Program aims to recruit from three groups: 1) current elections administrators looking to expand their skills, 2) public administration specialists who want to work on or with elections, and 3) professionals in other fields (law, design, information technology, journalism) seeking to improve knowledge of elections. Students can choose to earn a Certificate in Election Administration.

B. POLLING PLACE MANAGEMENT

Elections officials around the country have embraced the PCEA’s recommendations and resources for improving voters’ polling place experience. Alabama, New Mexico, New York, and Ohio illustrate this point.

- In Alabama, Republican Secretary of State John Merrill credits the PCEA recommendations with helping legislators pass a bill allowing ePollbooks. According to Merrill, county officials were previously using more than 800 iPads as voter lookup tools. Today, many of these counties can use the devices as ePollbooks, which “is a tremendous savings.”

- In New Mexico, Maggie Toulouse Oliver of Bernalillo County proposed a maximum 30-minute wait time for voters on Election Day in her remarks to the PCEA on August 8, 2013. The Commission subsequently adopted it as a national standard. Toulouse Oliver has successfully invoked the 30-minute standard in state funding requests, as well. New Mexico requires ballots-on-demand in any county operating vote centers on Election Day. (Bernalillo and 23 other counties ran vote centers in the 2014 election.) Printing a ballot-on-demand and moving voters out of the vote centers within a half-hour requires the use of one of two software packages, in addition to laptops and printers. Toulouse Oliver asked for state funding to purchase the software. The secretary of state later used the 30-minute benchmark in the budget justification before the legislature.

- The New York State Board of Elections “cites the PCEA report all the time” when communicating to county elections boards about the importance of collecting and evaluating data on voter activity in each poll site to inform the allocation of voting resources, according to Douglas Kellner of the New York State Board of Elections. The state stresses good data collection and evaluation to avoid ballot shortages on Election Day.

- In Ohio, Secretary of State Jon Husted incorporated PCEA recommendations into his directive to county boards of election in their mandatory pre-election plans. At a minimum, county boards should use the election toolkit to allocate voting devices and paper ballots for each precinct. Husted also invoked the PCEA’s 30-minute wait time as a standard for voting. Counties must provide detailed plans for mitigating wait times in any polling place that did not meet the 30-minute standard in the 2012 general election.

In its biennial budget approved on June 20, 2015, Ohio appropriated $12.7 million for county ePollbook purchases. This was the first time that the state made a county appropriation of this kind. The executive director of the Ohio Association of Election Officials credits the PCEA endorsement of ePollbooks, which ease long lines and reduce costs. Secretary of State Husted supported the expenditure.

Line Management Tools

Spurred by the recommendations of the PCEA, teams of researchers have been active in polling places where long lines have impacted prior elections. Such research is essential to understanding the causes of long lines and to expanding the tools for reducing their incidence. The Bipartisan Policy Center collaborates with five counties around the country to provide on-the-ground analysis and advice about factors contributing to long polling place lines. Partners for this effort include the Voting Technology Project and the Humphrey School.
Vote Centers

Some jurisdictions have turned to vote centers as optimal polling place locations — an innovation recommended by the PCEA. Vote centers may help increase voter participation if located in convenient places. Centrally-located vote centers can also eliminate voter confusion about their correct precinct and polling place locations, a common occurrence that drives the need for provisional ballots. Elections administrators benefit as well. When precincts are consolidated into a smaller number of vote centers, balloting is more efficient, requiring fewer poll workers on Election Day.142

In several states, proponents of vote centers have cited the PCEA’s recommendation to validate their position. For example, that recommendation has figured prominently in California, where legislation (SB 450) authorizing county use of vote centers has passed the state senate and been referred to the assembly.143 Secretary of State Alex Padilla, the California Association of Clerks and Election Officials, and advocacy groups have endorsed the bill for the reasons cited by the PCEA. By switching from precincts to vote centers, polling place costs could be reduced by 75 percent.144

It should be noted that vote centers alone will not solve all problems on Election Day. Like any other policy innovation, vote centers should be carefully planned, and contingency plans should be developed. For example, Arizona had problems in the 2016 primaries, in which the new vote centers apparently did not meet voter demand.145 As with any innovation, implementation and iteration is key. For those jurisdictions that are trying something new, appropriate fail safes can avoid problems on Election Day.

C. POLL WORKERS

• The PCEA recognized that finding a sufficient number of poll workers on Election Day is one of the most difficult challenges confronting elections officials. It recommends the recruitment of student poll workers as an effective means of meeting this demand.146 Several jurisdictions have implemented programs for recruiting student poll workers, with notable successes in Chicago and Rhode Island, and with ongoing efforts in California.

• In Chicago, the Chicago Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law (CLC), inspired by the PCEA report, approached the Chicago Board of Elections (BOE) about a new partnership.147 Together, they recruited and managed a corps of community and four-year college students from Cook County schools to work the polls on Election Day. The BOE trained and placed the students at poll sites. Through this partnership, the BOE was able to tap into a large new source of poll workers, particularly for hard-to-staff locations and those needing bilingual individuals. By expanding its civic engagement program, the CLC provides youth with hands-on exposure to democracy at its most fundamental level. The CLC’s emphasis on community colleges reaches traditionally underrepresented and less engaged youth — lower-income African Americans and Latinos.148

The results of the Chicago program from 2014 and 2015 are impressive.

• More than 1,500 students served as poll workers.
• The program increased the BOE’s pool of bilingual poll workers.
• College students improved efficiency at polling places. Precincts with one student transmitted elections results 4–5 minutes faster than precincts without one. Sites where two students served transmitted results 9–12 minutes faster.
• Student participants reported greater levels of civic engagement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td>learned more about the democratic and voting process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td>were more motivated to reform the electoral process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82%</td>
<td>said they would serve as a poll worker again; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>were more likely to vote in future elections.149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The Rhode Island Civic Fellowship program, launched by Rhode Island Secretary of State Nellie Gorbea in November 2015, was inspired by the PCEA report. Collaborating with a group of high school students, academic advisors, and local canvassing officials from six communities, the program aims to increase voter turnout among Rhode Islanders between the ages of 18 and 29. Only 17 percent of Rhode Island millennials cast a ballot in the 2014 general election—nearly three points lower than the already abysmal national millennial turnout rate of 19.9 percent.

Participating students design and implement nonpartisan outreach and engagement plans that leverage social media to target millennial voters in their communities. The students will also participate in workshops led by the secretary of state’s office, have opportunities for internships at their local boards of canvassers, attend poll worker trainings, and serve as poll workers during elections.

• In Georgia, Republican Secretary of State Brian Kemp has continued poll worker recruitment efforts, including the introduction of a program to recruit and train military veterans to serve as poll workers.

In related efforts, organizations like the Bipartisan Policy Center and Democracy Works have developed corporate civic responsibility programs to recruited companies like Marriott, Spotify, Starbucks, Target Corporation, and Westfield Corporation to encourage greater participation in the nation’s election process among their employees, especially millennials. Working in a partnership, Fair Elections Legal Network, Election Academy, and Development Seed have also introduced a web resource at workelections.com, which provides poll worker requirements and links to applications for prospective poll workers in a handful of jurisdictions.

CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY — CORPORATE PARTNERS

Modernizing Voting Technology

Of all the issues it raised, the PCEA found “the impending crisis in voting technology” to be the most urgent. Forty-three states have voting machines that are at least 10 years old; 14 states have machines that are at least 15 years old. The report points to legal and market constraints preventing the development of new voting technology and to a lack of funding for elections administrators to develop their own. The PCEA recommended reforms to the certification process for new technology, post-election audits of voting equipment each year, and the publication of voting machine performance.

Although reforms in this area continue to be slow, some of the legal and market constraints for the production of new technology have been alleviated, and progress is starting to be made.

A. FEDERAL VOTING MACHINE STANDARDS

Many voting machines were purchased with federal dollars appropriated in 2003 (before the now ubiquitous smartphone market entry), were designed and engineered in the 1990s, and are now reaching the end of a normal lifespan. The PCEA learned that Congress was unlikely to make a large new appropriation for new machines and that the states had no provision for replacing existing voting equipment.
Resolving the voting machine crisis requires urgent action by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) because states look to it for guidance on purchases of new voting equipment. Gridlock on Capitol Hill, however, precluded the EAC from seating a quorum of commissioners to advise the states between 2010 and 2014. During this period, elections administrators lacked the federal guidance and capital to replace old voting machines. Administrators continued running elections with increasingly obsolete voting equipment for which parts and software were scarce or no longer available.

The three new EAC members appointed at the end of 2014 were able to move quickly to approve an existing draft of voting machine standards, the Draft Voluntary Voting System Guidelines (VVSG), Version 1.1, because of the PCEA. At the urging of PCEA co-chairs Bauer and Ginsberg, the VVSG rose to the top of the EAC’s list of priorities. Within three months, the EAC approved new guidelines for voting system certification, a new program manual for certification and testing, and established a new web-based clearinghouse of sample requests for proposals for voting equipment.

Additionally, the Technical Guidelines Development Committee, which assists the EAC in maintaining and updating the VVSG, was reconstituted in July 2015. With these developments, voting machine vendors have started to bring new voting systems to market and states have received a green light on planning for new equipment purchases.

The PCEA also charted a course toward long-term solutions. It recommended reform of the voting system testing and certification process, as well as a commitment to a comprehensive system of auditing and disclosure of voting technology performance.

B. STATES REPLACING VOTING MACHINES

The PCEA’s “impending crisis in voting technology” frame not only amplified concerns about voting machine replacement at the federal level, but in some instances helped kick-start state and local action. First, the report provided an opening for (and third-party validation of) the urgent funding requests of local elections administrators. As with other elements of election administration, the cost of new voting machines is typically borne by county or municipal governments. Regrettably, local elections administrators have historically wielded little political influence. Although the administration of elections plays a very critical role in our democracy, elections administrators tend to be the “least powerful lobby.” As one representative of local election offices observed, “[county commissioners] are sick of hearing us whine.”

Elections administrators’ requests for sufficient funding to upgrade old voting equipment might have been discounted, but for the alarm bells sounded by the PCEA and other elections experts. The PCEA’s focus on voting machine technology has advanced dialogue between elections administrators and state and county policy makers and appropriators. Some of these conversations are bearing fruit, as described below.

The PCEA report also spurred new research, helping inform state policy debates on voting machine replacement. Interviewers cite work undertaken by the Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law as particularly influential. The Brennan Center found that the majority of voting systems then in use are either “perilously close to” or past their expected life span. Many of the machines in key swing states such as Florida, North Carolina, Ohio, and Virginia fall into this outdated category. Estimated replacement costs could exceed $1 billion nationally over the next few years.
**FLORIDA**

The continued use of aging voting equipment has been a chief concern of state and local elections officials in Florida. In November 2014, Secretary of State Ken Detzner estimated that 30 of Florida’s 67 counties needed to replace voting equipment before the 2016 election. “Some of the equipment is old, some as old as 10 years old. … We know we need to do something.”168

State supervisors in 12 small, resource-strapped counties leveraged the PCEA’s concerns about the voting technology crisis to secure new voting machines in their localities.169 Terry Vaughan, Bradford County Supervisor of Elections and unofficial spokesperson for the 12-county consortium, credits the PCEA report, statements made by Secretary of State Ken Detzner, and other voting machine studies warning of equipment breakdowns in the 2016 presidential election as drivers for the county-level effort.170 Elections supervisors approached Secretary Detzner in April 2015, asking that he allocate federal dollars for county voting equipment. Two months later, the secretary of state announced the release of $1.48 million in state Help America Vote Act funds over a five-year period for the purchase of new vote tabulators for the 12 counties. More than 223,000 voters in those jurisdictions can now expect to vote on updated voting equipment in 2016.171

**NEW MEXICO**

Bernalillo County Clerk Maggie Toulouse Oliver reported a high failure rate with memory cards in her jurisdiction. One-third of voting machines needed to be replaced in each election.172

Though deliberations with state legislators about the condition of the state’s old machines and the allocation of state funding for new equipment had been ongoing for some time, the PCEA’s recommendation and report nevertheless helped push county funding requests over the top.173 New Mexico appropriated $12 million for the purchase of new voting equipment for each of New Mexico’s 33 counties. Voters began casting ballots on the new equipment in the November 2014 election.174

**RHODE ISLAND**

The PCEA’s warnings about aging voting equipment spurred Secretary of State Nellie Gorbea into action in her first year of office. In August 2015, she secured legislative authorization to replace voting machines in use since 1997. One month earlier, she empaneled a Voting Equipment Task Force to advise her on the new acquisitions. The task force, notable for its diverse membership, includes not only local elections administrators and experts but also representatives of three political parties, good government groups, and organizations representing racial, ethnic, language minority, and disability communities.175 The inclusion of diverse groups reflects the commission’s belief that voters with disabilities and language minority citizens must be considered at all stages of the electoral process.

“As a threshold matter, an election official must work with community groups to understand the needs of voters with disabilities and limited English proficiency, as well as to gain assistance and advice as to how to meet those needs.”176

PCEA Report

On September 30, 2015, Rhode Island issued a request for proposals for equipment, to be in place by the September 2016 primary election.177

An unknown number of jurisdictions likely wanted to replace their equipment before the 2016 election cycle, but resource constraints and other hurdles prevented this from happening in time. As a result, the elections community is waiting nervously to see the consequences for jurisdictions that have to limp through 2016 with less than adequate equipment.
Conclusion

The recommendations and best practices endorsed by the PCEA have provided a readily accessible yardstick against which states and localities can measure their elections performance and develop a clear path toward improvement. We are thrilled to find, as this report shows, that many states are on the path to improvements.

As a result of the work of election officials and the improvements recommended in the PCEA report, the majority of Americans are able to register to vote online before the 2016 election and to cast a ballot early. State elections administrators are improving the quality of voter-roll data through programs like ERIC and IVCR, and they are allocating resources more effectively to polling places with tools like those provided by Voting Technology Project. The list of successes is long and, in a time of frustration with partisan bickering and gridlock, we should pause to celebrate these accomplishments.

Across the nation, elections officials, administrators, experts, and advocates attest to the positive impact the PCEA team, research, and report have had over the past two years. The PCEA’s authoritative, unwaveringly bipartisan recommendations and extensive outreach efforts have informed federal and state policy debates and helped advance statutory and administrative changes that improve the efficiency of elections and increase access to the vote.

But there is still work to be done. With more than 100 million people voting, errors and problems at the polls this fall will be unavoidable. Most voters will be casting ballots on old voting equipment. It will be the first cycle many of the new online registration platforms are operational. New registration opportunities could generate higher turnout among new voters unfamiliar with polling place processes, which could create long lines. Voters could flag issues via social media, which might overinflate a problem or discourage other voters. All of these challenges highlight the need for elections officials, policy makers, advocates, and voters to be vigilant and to reduce the risk of election problems when possible.

When problems arise, the question should be asked: Were the PCEA’s recommendations taken seriously or effectively implemented? Local, state, and federal officials each have a role to play in running free and fair elections. The PCEA’s policy and administrative recommendations require action from all.

We challenge and implore all jurisdictions, regardless of size, to access and act quickly to adopt any PCEA recommendations they can in time for the general election in November — and to continue to work on others for the years to come. We believe that we must have a system of elections where the views and votes of the public come first. We look forward to collaborating with many partners to continue to improve how voting works.
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