



*Uniformed and Overseas
Citizens Absentee Voting Act*

UOCAVA

Survey Report Findings
September 2007



*Uniformed and Overseas
Citizens Absentee Voting Act*

UOCAVA

Survey Report Findings
September 2007

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Background	4
Survey Methodology	4
Survey Questions	6
Possible Interpretations of Survey Questions	7
Response Rates	7
Survey Results	8
UOCAVA Turnout: Ballots Requested, Returned, and Counted	9
The UOCAVA Environment Faced by the States	13
Federal Write in Absentee Ballots	13
Advanced Ballots	18
Reasons for Not Counting UOCAVA Ballots	19
Conclusions	21
Recommendations	21
Moving Ahead and Next Steps for 2008	22

Figures and Tables

Table A: Selected Response Rates on UOCAVA Survey Questions	8
Figure 1 Relationship of UOCAVA Voters to Their Ballots	10
Figure 2 Relationship Between Requested Ballots and Counted Ballots	11
Figure 3 Source of UOCAVA Ballots	12
Figure 4 Share of UOCAVA Ballots by Source	14
Figure 5 Predominant Reason for Military and Overseas Absentee Ballots to Not be Counted	20
Footnotes to Tables	23
Table 19 UOCAVA Ballots Cast by Category	24
Table 20 UOCAVA Ballots Counted by Category	28
Table 21a Ballots Counted as Percent Cast, by Category	32
Table 21b Ballots Counted as Percent of All UOCAVA Ballots, by Category	33
Table 21c UOCAVA Ballots: Maximum Cast or Counted by Category	34
Table 22 UOCAVA Ballots Requested	36
Table 23 Advanced Ballots Transmitted	38
Table 24 Federal Write-in Absentee Ballots (FWAB) Received	40
Table 25a Military and Overseas Absentee Ballots Rejected by Reason	42
Table 25b Military and Overseas Absentee Ballots Rejected by Reason - Percentages	43
Cross Reference of Survey Questions to Tables	45
Survey Instrument Extract	46

Executive Summary

The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Voting Act (UOCAVA) of 1986 (42 USC 1973ff) protects the voting rights of members of the uniformed services (on active duty), members of the Merchant Marine and their eligible dependents, Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service, Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and U.S. citizens residing outside the U.S. UOCAVA requires States and territories¹ to allow these citizens to register and to vote in elections for Federal office using absentee procedures.

The Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002 (42 USC 15301) mandates that for each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) shall collect comprehensive data from the States on all of the ballots sent and received by UOCAVA voters. This is the second report from the EAC to Congress regarding UOCAVA voting. It is based on information gathered from a survey administered to States and local jurisdictions after the November 7, 2006 election.²

Response rates from many States and local jurisdictions were low, making the monitoring of compliance with the mandated requirements of UOCAVA difficult. A concern voiced during the congressional debate about HAVA was that citizens covered by UOCAVA faced an unusual burden in finding out how to register to vote and how to cast their ballot. The Election Administration and Voting Survey remains the primary tool by which the Congress and the public can monitor compliance with those portions of HAVA that apply to UOCAVA voters.

Unfortunately, numerous States and local jurisdictions are still not collecting information on UOCAVA ballots requested, ballots returned, and, although not mandated by law, the reasons for ballot rejection in a manner appropriate to provide a full and fair accounting of the UOCAVA voting experience.

While this report reflects far more, and in fact better, data than what was able to be collected two years ago for the 2004 election, it is still built upon a dataset that is both incomplete and replete with improbable information. Readers must be cognizant of this fact as they review this report.

Highlights from the 2006 UOCAVA survey include:

1. UOCAVA turnout remains low. At least 992,034 UOCAVA-related absentee ballots were requested for the 2006 general election. There is no way of knowing how many of these were actually requests for ballots for the 2006 election or were the automatic generation of ballots through the use of the “Federal Post Card Application” form. Less than 16.5 percent of the estimated 6 million potentially eligible UOCAVA voters sought to participate in the 2006 election.
2. States report slightly more than 330,000 UOCAVA ballots were cast or counted, for an estimated eligible turnout rate of approximately 5.5 percent. The ballots returned account for just under one-third of the ballots requested.
3. Over 70 percent of all UOCAVA ballots reported not counted by States and localities were because they were returned to the local elections office as undeliverable.³ This is the largest category for rejection and may be one that can be substantially reduced with partnerships among States, localities, and the armed services. The establishment of a program whereby the military notifies local election offices when a military transfer takes place would go a long way toward solving the problem with undeliverable ballots. The second largest categorized reason for rejecting ballots was “other reason,” while the third was that the ballot was returned after the deadline for receipt.

¹“United States,” where used in the territorial sense, means all States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

²In 2004, the EAC administered a separate UOCAVA survey. In 2006, in order to reduce the data collection burden on States and to improve the quality of data, the EAC combined the UOCAVA survey with surveys that collected information for the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) and the Election Day Survey.

³Technically, these ballots were never rejected because they were never submitted by the voter. However, for the sake of consistency and clarity, they are treated here as if they were all submitted in order to review reasons for not being counted.

4. In many cases, States were unable to provide sufficiently detailed information on UOCAVA balloting. For over one-third of the UOCAVA ballots that were cast, as well as counted, it was not possible to determine whether they came from domestic military, overseas military or overseas citizens. In 14 States, less than 2/3 of the jurisdictions collected the information mandated by UOCAVA. (In a number of these cases, “uncategorized” became a “catch-all” category to describe UOCAVA ballots.)
5. Domestic military voters who requested ballots had 56.3 percent of their ballots cast or counted. Overseas citizens that requested ballots had 52.6 percent of their ballots cast or counted. On the other hand, overseas military voters had only 47.6 percent of their requested ballots cast or counted. What significantly drove down the overall rate of counted ballots was the large number of ballots that were uncategorized as to their origin, which represented nearly one-third of all ballots requested. Just 21.8 percent of these uncategorized requested ballots were cast or counted.
6. On average, 26.5 percent of the UOCAVA ballots came from domestic military voters, 19.7 percent from overseas citizens, and 16.9 percent from overseas military. Federal Write-in Absentee Ballots (FWABs) contributed 4.9 percent. The remaining one-third of UOCAVA ballots were uncategorized as to their source.
7. The EAC survey found that the FWAB program is not being used by many voters. Only 1,451 clearly identifiable FWAB ballots were cast in the 2006 election, while only 698 were counted. Therefore, FWAB ballots amounted for only 2.5 percent of all UOCAVA ballots.
8. Low responses to the survey may also have been hindered by actions of the EAC. Some states didn’t realize the survey sought numbers at County and lower geographic areas, and had failed to program their voter registration systems to provide finite data. Some of the wording and layout of the survey instrument caused many jurisdictions to place wrong data into fields that were reserved for UOCAVA-only answers, necessitating further follow-up to obtain correct information. Finally, the web-based survey answer mechanism was set up for individual jurisdictions to answer all questions, but many states collected the data from the local governments first and then found it extremely difficult and time-consuming to enter data into the EAC system.

Conclusions

Too many local election authorities continue to fail to track the precise number of ballots they mailed or transmitted to their domestic military, overseas military, and overseas citizens, as required by HAVA. The quality of information regarding UOCAVA ballots is low, making it impossible to sufficiently monitor compliance with HAVA mandates.

The tracking of these transmitted absentee ballots is complicated by the following factors that may artificially inflate or deflate the numbers reported in this survey:

- The Federal Write-in Absentee Ballots are not classified as “sent” from the State, and they may or

may not be counted as UOCAVA ballots received in the data reported.

- State record-keeping protocols might inflate the number of ballots received when voters send in both the Federal Write-in Absentee ballot and the full absentee ballot.
- Persons eligible for UOCAVA ballots move a great deal, yet ballots are automatically sent for two federal elections after they have registered. This is likely the cause of large numbers of ballots returned as undeliverable.

Recommendations

1. States must redouble their efforts to make sure that local jurisdictions collect the mandated information for UOCAVA voters, including:
 - Appropriately separating domestic civilian and domestic military absentee ballots;
 - Correctly categorizing UOCAVA ballots and not employing the “uncategorized” category as a catch-all;
 - Tracking the reasons for ballot rejection;
 - Reporting data at the appropriate jurisdictional level (county, township, and city) and not just statewide.
2. More effort needs to be made to ensure that members of the armed services and citizens living overseas are made fully aware of their voting rights and that any obstacles to voter registration, ballot receipt, and ballot return should be reduced, minimized, or eliminated. However, all legislators should be aware of the unique electoral environments experienced in different states, given the wide variation in the number of domestic and overseas armed services personnel and overseas citizens.
3. States should work in partnership with federal agencies to develop best practices and ongoing programs for encouraging voting participation among the UOCAVA population.
4. States should be open to legal changes and to new technologies that may overcome some of the barriers currently faced by UOCAVA voters. States may wish to explore new technologies to deliver and receive ballots, such as voting by fax, by telephone, or by using the Internet as ways to encourage UOCAVA voting, while attending to vital issues of ballot integrity and voter privacy.
5. It is unrealistic to keep sending ballots to voters who have moved: more than 35,000 ballots were returned as undeliverable. There are a wide number of mechanisms that should be established to solve this problem.
6. Continuing efforts by the EAC should be aimed at States and their local election authorities to educate them about HAVA requirements regarding UOCAVA. While it is important to recognize the tremendous variation in how States and their local election authorities handle the mailing and processing of their ballots, it is equally important that EAC assist States and local election authorities to develop policies and procedures that will make them HAVA-compliant.
7. The EAC needs to provide the survey instrument to States well in advance of upcoming Federal elections and then assist States with their collection and reporting of UOCAVA survey data.
8. The EAC needs to continue to work to develop uniform measures for the collection and reporting of UOCAVA data. It is anticipated that this type of information will assist States with their implementation of effective and efficient methods for sending and receiving ballots to UOCAVA voters.

Background

The 1988 Executive Order 12642 names the Secretary of Defense as the Presidential designee for administering UOCAVA. Executive Branch departments and agencies with employees overseas provide voting assistance under guidance from the Secretary of Defense.⁴ The U.S. Postal Service and the Department of Defense Military Postal Service Agency physically transmit election materials between the voter and local election officials. The Department of Justice enforces UOCAVA protections through litigation.

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA), Section 703 (a), amended Section 102 of UOCAVA by adding the following requirement:

“Not later than 90 days after the date of each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, each State and unit of local government which administered the election shall (through the State, in the case of a unit of local government) submit a report to the Election Assistance Commission (established under the Help America Vote Act of 2002) on the combined number of absentee ballots transmitted to absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters for the election

and the combined number of such ballots which were returned by such voters and cast in the election, and shall make such a report available to the general public.”

HAVA Section 703 (b) requires EAC to work with the EAC Board of Advisors and EAC Standards Board to develop a standardized format for the reports submitted by States and units of local government under UOCAVA Section 102, as revised. HAVA also requires EAC to make the format available to the States and local units of government submitting such reports.

Section 702 of HAVA also requires each State to establish a single State office that is “responsible for providing information regarding voter registration procedures and absentee ballot procedures to be used by absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters with respect to elections for Federal office (including procedures relating to the use of the Federal Write-in Absentee Ballot) to all absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters who wish to register to vote or vote in any jurisdiction in the State.” It further recommends that this State office be the entity responsible for carrying out the entire State’s responsibilities under UOCAVA.

Survey Methodology

The EAC is assigned the task, through HAVA, of collecting comprehensive data on all of the ballots sent and received by uniformed and overseas citizen absentee voters. In 2004, EAC developed a survey instrument to collect information and data on UOCAVA voters from the November 2, 2004 Presidential Election. During the process of collecting the data, it was determined that many States and local jurisdictions did not track the specific data required by HAVA, and/or stored the requested statistics in various formats, which resulted in gaps in the UOCAVA data collected by EAC.

To study the 2004 election, the EAC administered two separate surveys to collect and report the information required under the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) and Section 102(c) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voter Act. In addition, it conducted a third survey to collect information regarding the November 2004 Federal general elections. To reduce the burden of responding to multiple collections of information, facilitate data collection and reporting, and encourage participation in the 2006 survey, the EAC incorporated the three previous collections into a single survey instrument (2006

⁴The Secretary of Defense has been designated by the President to have primary responsibility for Federal functions under UOCAVA, through the Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP). The U.S. Department of State assists the Secretary of Defense in carrying out these functions with respect to U.S. civilians overseas.

Election Administration and Voting Survey). The latter was designed with feedback received from State and local election officials, political scientists, researchers, members of election and voter registration groups, and the general public.

In May 2005, the EAC met with a small group of election officials to solicit their feedback regarding the 2004 Election Day Survey. The group discussed the challenges faced by election officials when collecting the survey's data, including the interpretation of the survey questions and terms and the methods for assembling the data. In April 2006, the EAC convened a second group, consisting of election officials, social scientists, and voter interest groups, to discuss recommendations to improve the EAC's data collection efforts, including the design of one survey instrument to collect all of the required data.

One month later, the EAC completed the first draft of the 2006 Election Administration and Voting Survey and presented it to the EAC's Advisory and Standards Boards. The boards are comprised of 110 State and local election officials, and another 37 are drawn from various national associations and government agencies that play a role in the implementation of HAVA, as well as science and technology-related professionals appointed by Congressional members. In addition, a presentation of the survey was made to the annual meeting of the National Association of State Election Directors (NASSED) in the summer of 2006. Finally, a copy of the survey draft was forwarded to the Department of Defense's Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) office for their input. The survey was revised based on the input from all of these groups, and a second draft was produced.

The second draft of the survey was posted in the Federal Register on August 1, 2006 (71 FR 43477), for a period of 60 days to solicit public comment, as required for approval of information collection under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The survey was revised again based on the 14 comments received during the 60-day public comment period and was published for an additional 30 days in the Federal Register on October 31, 2006 (71 FR 63755). States were notified of both comment periods, and the draft survey was made available on the EAC Web site. The 2006 Election Administration and Voting Survey was approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on November 30, 2006 (OMB Control No. 3265-0006, exp. 11/30/2009). The final, approved version of the survey contained 58 questions;

28 questions required information only at the State level, and 30 required information at both State and county levels. The actual UOCAVA questions from the survey instrument are contained as an Appendix to this report.

In addition to revising the survey to improve the clarity of the questions and terminology, EAC designed a web-based application for States and for local jurisdictions to submit their data. In early December 2006, EAC provided States with an identification and password to log in to the online survey to begin entering data. Although the deadline for States to submit data was March 7, 2007, data were collected and tabulated for this report up to August 24, 2007. Unlike previous surveys conducted by EAC and the FEC to collect the required data, the 2006 survey asked for information for both the State and the county/local election jurisdictions, rather than a single State-wide number as in previous surveys. State totals were, in most cases, merely the sum of the information from the local jurisdictions that responded.

The 2006 Election Administration and Voting Survey was sent to 55 State-level election jurisdictions, including the District of Columbia and the four territories—Guam, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. The survey sought information for the States' local jurisdictions, and some States allowed their jurisdictions to fill in the Web-based survey instrument. Other State offices collected the information from local governmental bodies, created a State-wide compilation, and entered the data into the Web-based survey instrument. Finally, almost half of the States sought to submit the State-wide compilation of data to the EAC via spreadsheets and avoid the online data entry process. EAC staff, temporary employees, and the contractor performed the data entry.

During the process of performing an analysis of the EAC survey, all States were sent the information extracted from the survey at two different times, and were allowed to review the compiled information and submit amendments or corrections. Unfortunately, some States and local jurisdictions neither track the specific data required by HAVA, nor do they store the required statistics in various formats. Both problems resulted in gaps in the UOCAVA data in this report. To reflect the irregularities in States' collections of data by local jurisdictions, the tables at the end of this report show the overall number of jurisdictions in a State and the number responding for a particular question in the column labeled "Jur."

Furthermore, this report to Congress does not cover all jurisdictions (i.e., county and township level) in each State. States were able to submit county and local-level data, although in a number of instances, the States' data were incomplete. Some States only submitted statewide figures and did not report data from local jurisdictions. As a result, this report is based on survey results from 50 States, the District of Columbia, and two territories, and, depending upon the specific question, at most 2,029 jurisdictions out of 3,123 total jurisdictions possible. Puerto Rico had no Federal election in 2006, so it did not submit any information.

Survey Questions

The UOCAVA portion of the 2006 Election Administration and Election Day Survey is contained in six questions in the survey. They are:

- Ballots Cast (question 33)
- Ballots Counted (question 34)
- Absentee Ballots Requested (question 38)
- Advanced Ballots Transmitted to Overseas Voters (question 39)
- FWAB Ballots Received (question 40)
- Military and Overseas Absentee Ballots Rejected (question 42)

For the questions dealing with ballots cast (question 33), ballots counted (question 34), and absentee ballots requested (question 38), each had subcategories that dealt specifically with UOCAVA voters, and this extracted information is summarized in the tables of the appendix to this report. The subcategories were domestic military, overseas military, and overseas citizens. The rest of the information from these questions, including the domestic citizens subcategory, will appear in the Election Day Survey report, which is scheduled to be released shortly after this report.

Over one third of all UOCAVA ballots tallied in the survey could not be attributable to an appropriate category, that is, whether they came from domestic military, overseas military, or overseas citizens. For the purposes of determining an overall UOCAVA number for any question, the subcategories of domestic military, overseas military, and overseas citizens were combined together with the

Federal Write-in Absentee Ballot (FWAB) information and the “uncategorized” data to create a “Sum of UOCAVA” field. While the subcategories of voters provide the most detailed information, some jurisdictions did not break down voters in this manner. As a result, the survey also allowed for a total UOCAVA field to be entered. In the attached tables to this report, the “Uncategorized” column reflects this data.

For the purposes of the survey, the EAC provided the following definitions within the questionnaire:

- **Ballots cast:** refers to ballots that have been submitted manually or electronically by a voter regardless of whether they are ultimately counted. *Note:* Jurisdictions that provide voters with more than one ballot card to vote for different contests or measures should have only reported one ballot cast per voter.
- **Ballots counted:** refers to all ballots that have been cast, processed, and counted.
- **Domestic military citizen** is statutorily defined as:
 - A. A member of a uniformed service on active duty who, by reason of such active duty, is stationed or positioned within the United States or its territories, and who is absent from the place of residence where the member is otherwise qualified to vote;
 - B. A member of the merchant marine who, by reason of service in the merchant marine, is serving within the United States and its territories, and who is absent from the place of residence where the member is otherwise qualified to vote; and
 - C. A spouse or dependent of a member referred to in subparagraph (A) or (B) who, by reason of the active duty or service of the member, is absent from the place of residence where the spouse or dependent is otherwise qualified to vote.
- **Federal Write-in Absentee Ballot (FWAB)** is an emergency ballot available to military and overseas citizens (including APO and FPO addresses) when they have properly requested but have not received a regular absentee ballot from their local jurisdiction in time to return it before the deadline.

- **Overseas military citizen** is statutorily defined as:
 - A. A member of a uniformed service on active duty who, by reason of such active duty, is stationed or positioned outside of the United States and its territories, and who is thus absent from the place of residence where the member is otherwise qualified to vote;
 - B. A member of the merchant marine who, by reason of service in the merchant marine, is serving outside of the United States and its territories, and who is thus absent from the place of residence where the member is otherwise qualified to vote; and
 - C. A spouse or dependent of a member referred to in subparagraph (A) or (B) who, by reason of the active duty or service of the member, is absent from the place of residence where the spouse or dependent is otherwise qualified to vote.
- **Overseas citizens** refers to persons who are citizens of the United States who are living, working, or stationed outside of the United States and its territories and who are not members of a uniformed service.

Possible Interpretations of Survey Questions

While the survey instrument provided definitions of various terms, some state and local jurisdictions appear to have interpreted some questions differently than intended. One of the major problems that occurred dealt with various questions that asked for the subcategories of UOCAVA voters (domestic military, overseas military, and overseas civilians) and then allowed the responder to provide an overall total of the UOCAVA voters. Because of the placement of the overall total UOCAVA field at the bottom of a column of numbers, and the fact that

the field was just labeled with the word “Total,” many jurisdictions summed the overall column of numbers (which included non-UOCAVA fields) and placed the resulting number in the total UOCAVA field. Numerous contacts with states and local jurisdictions were made to correct this problem.

Response Rates

States and jurisdictions were asked to provide numeric responses to nearly all the survey questions. In the Web-based survey response instrument, it was noted that if a jurisdiction intended to record a zero in answer to a question, then a “0” should have been entered as the response rather than leaving it blank. In determining the number of jurisdictions that responded to a particular question, a “zero” was considered a valid response from a jurisdiction, while a “blank” was an indication the jurisdiction did not respond to the question. Jurisdictions were also allowed to respond with “Don’t know” or “Check if your office does not collect this data,” either of which was also considered a valid response to a question.

Response rates varied across the UOCAVA-related questions, but in general, they are at a level that makes it difficult to monitor compliance with the basic requirements of UOCAVA. For example, as shown in Table A, of 3,123 possible jurisdictions, 54 percent (1,685) provided information on the number of domestic military absentee ballots cast, while a somewhat higher 62 percent (1,933) provided information on the number of overseas military absentee ballots. Interestingly, there is a consistent pattern in the relative response rates. Generally, more jurisdictions kept track of information on overseas voters as opposed to domestic military voters.⁵ The lowest responses dealt with the Federal Write-in Absentee Ballots (FWAB), in all instances, less than 50 percent of the jurisdiction responded.

The table on the opposite page reports the response rates across a selected set of the UOCAVA items.

⁵ One possible explanation for this is that some jurisdictions may be lumping domestic military ballots with absentee ballots and they did not report any information for this category. According to the survey protocol, however, the jurisdiction still should have reported, even if the answer provided was “none” or “zero.”

Table A: Selected Response Rates on UOCAVA Survey Questions

UOCAVA Question	Response Rate	
	Number of Jurisdictions	Per-cent
Domestic Military Ballots Cast	1685 of 3123	54%
Domestic Military Ballots Counted	1692	54%
Domestic Military Ballots Requested	1761	56%
Overseas Military Ballots Cast	1933	62%
Overseas Military Ballots Counted	1940	62%
Overseas Military Ballots Requested	2024	65%
Overseas Citizen Ballots Cast	1947	62%
Overseas Citizen Ballots Counted	1948	62%
Overseas Citizen Ballots Requested	2014	64%
Domestic Military FWAB	1276	41%
Overseas Military FWAB	1529	49%
Overseas Citizens FWAB	1462	47%

Notes: Figures calculated from Tables 19, 20, 22, and 24.

Survey Results

The accompanying charts and tables illustrate the results of the *2006 Election Administration and Election Day Survey*, including data that the EAC is required by HAVA to report, and additional information regarding UOCAVA voters and the UOCAVA voting process. As already noted, the statistics in this report may be artificially inflated or deflated by a number of factors. Most important, many States reported incomplete information or told the EAC that they do not collect the information necessary that would have allowed the EAC to respond to the mandated requirements of UOCAVA. Thus, many of the results are based on incomplete information. The number of reporting jurisdictions is always noted in the data tables.⁶

A review of the data collected and submitted by the States for the UOCAVA portion of the *2006 Election Administration and Voting Survey* indicates large variations

in the manner in which UOCAVA information is collected, tracked, and reported.

In many cases, States were unable to provide sufficiently detailed information on UOCAVA balloting. In 13 States, only one-third of the jurisdictions collected the information mandated by UOCAVA. (In a number of these cases, “uncategorized” became a “catch-all” category to describe UOCAVA ballots.)

Compilation of accurate data for the 2006 UOCAVA report has been challenging. A major difficulty was due to confusion over the appropriate response to several questions relating to the categorization of ballots. This resulted from both the lack of definition as to what constitutes a UOCAVA ballot and a lack of clarity in the question. For example, numerous checks were made on the data, and repeated contacts with the State

⁶Of course, jurisdictions vary greatly in population and the impact of non-response on the overall numbers will vary accordingly.

and local election authorities were made, to the extent possible, during processing of the data for this report. States were given the opportunity to correct all data prior to the release of the report. Nevertheless, while many discrepancies were resolved,⁷ the end result is still a dataset that is both incomplete and replete with improbable information. In many categories (e.g. turnout) the estimates provided, to the degree they are incorrect, are underestimates.

UOCAVA Turnout: Ballots Requested, Returned, and Counted

At least 992,034 UOCAVA-related absentee ballots were requested for the 2006 general election (see Table 22). Question 38 does not specifically ask how many absentee ballots were “transmitted” (“transmitted” as defined by UOCAVA), but there is no indication in the data that absentee ballot requests were not acted upon by local jurisdictions. There are indications in the footnotes and comments from jurisdictions that UOCAVA-related ballots were not tracked separately and may have been merged into overall absentee ballot counts or even into the civilian absentee numbers. In addition, about one third of the nation’s jurisdictions did not report any answer to the question of how many absentee ballots were transmitted.

While there were nearly one million UOCAVA ballots requested, as reported in the survey, this number is still dwarfed by the absolute number of eligible voters. A recent Government Accounting Office (GAO) report estimates that “6 million citizens...are covered under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act and have the opportunity to exercise their right to vote.”⁸ As such, less than 16.5 percent of potentially eligible UOCAVA voters sought to participate in the 2006 election. While low, these EAC survey figures are not as low as the numbers reflected in the GAO report, which reported that only 80 voters received ballots—and eight returned—through one of the two “tools” developed by the Department of Defense to encourage UOCAVA registration and turnout.⁹

While the EAC survey sought information on number of ballots requested, there was no separation of the data between actual inquiries made by voters for ballots for the 2006 election versus information that was already on hand in the elections office. When a voter uses the Federal Post Card Application to register with an overseas address, jurisdictions are required under law to automatically mail an absentee ballot for the next two federal elections. As a result, many local jurisdictions flag their voter registration files with this information and a ballot is then automatically generated for the voter. The EAC survey did not seek information about these two possible ways that a ballot could be requested. As such, the nearly one million figure cited above could be artificially high.

The EAC survey showed that only a quarter of UOCAVA ballots that were requested were eventually cast. In response to question 33 in the survey (Total number of ballots cast), nearly 264,000 UOCAVA ballots were cast in 2006 (see Table 19). This accounts for only 26.5 percent of the requested ballots. For the component pieces of UOCAVA voters, of the 141,317 domestic military ballots requested, only 45.6 percent (or 64,540) were cast. Only 39 percent of overseas military ballots requested were cast, and 42.8 percent of overseas citizen ballots requested were cast.¹⁰

The survey also reported, in response to question 34 (Total number of ballots counted), that there were 244,027 UOCAVA ballots counted. This would seem to indicate that 92.5 percent of all UOCAVA ballots cast were counted. However, there are a number of instances where States reported more UOCAVA ballots counted than were cast. This is because not all jurisdictions keep both sets of data. Some jurisdictions in a State reported only ballots counted and nothing for ballots cast. This affected data reporting from California, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming, as noted in Table 21a.

Because of this finding, Table 21c was created, and it reports the maximum number of UOCAVA ballots either cast or

⁷In some cases, offsetting discrepancies at the local level mask the impact of the problem at the State level.

⁸GAO 07-774, ELECTIONS: Action Plans Needed to Fully Address Challenges in Electronic Absentee Voting Initiatives for Military and Overseas Citizens, June 2007, p. 30.

⁹The discrepancies between the GAO report and this report may be explained by the different methodology used by the two studies. The GAO report was based on a sampled survey of UOCAVA voters conducted by the Department of Defense, whereas this study attempts to collect information from all jurisdictions in the United States. While the EAC survey did not get a high response rate on the UOCAVA questions, the EAC collected information from a great deal more jurisdictions than did the DOD.

¹⁰The reader should note that these figures are artificially low due to previously noted non-response problems in the survey.

counted in each local jurisdiction that responded, and then sums to the statewide level. Using these data, the EAC survey found that slightly more than 333,000 UOCAVA ballots were either cast or counted in the 2006 general election. This accounts for only one-third of the requested ballots.

Figure 1 shows the relationship between the total estimated eligible UOCAVA voters (according to the GAO report), the number of requested UOCAVA ballots as reported in the EAC survey, and the maximum number of UOCAVA ballots cast or counted.

Using the maximum cast or counted data slightly raises the percentage of requested ballots that were tallied in the 2006 election. Overall, 33.6 percent of the requested UOCAVA ballots were cast or counted in 2006.

There are significant differences between the different types of voters, as well as the large portion of the ballots that were uncategorized. At the highest level, domestic military voters that requested ballots had 56.3 percent of their ballots cast or counted. Overseas citizens that requested ballots had 52.6 percent of their ballots cast or counted. On the other hand, overseas military voters had only 47.6 percent of their requested ballots cast or counted. What significantly drove down the overall rate of the survey responses were the ballots that were uncategorized as to their origin, which represented nearly one-third of all ballots requested. Just 21.8 percent of these uncategorized requested ballots were cast or counted. Figure 2 shows both the number of ballots requested and the number that were cast or counted, as well as the percentages between those two calculations.

Figure 1
Relationship of UOCAVA Voters to Their Ballots





Figure 2

Relationship Between Requested Ballots and Counted Ballots



Approximately one-third of the cast or counted ballots were uncategorized by the States. On average, 26.5 percent of the UOCAVA ballots came from domestic military voters, 19.7 percent from overseas citizens, and 16.9 percent from overseas military. FWAB ballots contributed the final 4.9 percent. Figure 3 shows the overall source of UOCAVA ballots, as reported in the EAC survey—with a reminder that the “uncategorized” category became a “catch-all.” There was great variation between the States as to the source of the UOCAVA ballots. Table 21c shows the share that each subcategory contributes to the overall count of UOCAVA ballots for each State.

Note: Federal Write-in Absentee Ballots (FWABs) are not shown in Figure 2 because no data was available for requested ballots.





Figure 3
Source of UOCAVA Ballots



Excluding the States mentioned earlier that reported more ballots counted than cast, on average, 77.6 percent of all UOCAVA ballots that were cast were counted. Overseas citizens' ballots fared better, with on average 78.3 percent of their ballots being eventually counted. On the other hand, domestic military UOCAVA ballots were counted, on average, 75.5 percent of the time, overseas military 71.6 percent of the time, and FWAB ballots 63.7 percent of the time. However, differences between the States are great (see table 21a). Some

States reported that 100 percent of the UOCAVA ballots were counted, even for the subcategory groups. On the other hand, the percentage of ballots counted was very low for some States. This varied by the various subcategories of UOCAVA voters.

It is impossible to calculate accurate turnout figures based on these survey results because of incomplete information provided by the States. By any measure, however, the number of ballots requested and returned is remarkably low.

The UOCAVA Environment Faced by the States

In summary, for those jurisdictions that were able to report the source of the UOCAVA ballots, most States reported that domestic military voters were their predominant source of UOCAVA ballots. These included the States of Alaska, Arizona, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, South Carolina, Texas, and Wyoming. On the other hand, overseas citizens were the predominant source of UOCAVA ballots in the States of Colorado, Delaware, Hawaii, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, and New York. Overseas military voters were the main component of UOCAVA votes in Arkansas, North Carolina, Utah, Virginia, and the American Samoa. States not listed above were either unable to report the source of UOCAVA ballots, or the predominant component was uncharacterized.

Thus, some States report relatively small numbers of overseas absentee ballots, whether from members of the armed services or from citizens residing overseas, while other States deal with thousands or tens of thousands of such ballots. Any guidelines to improve UOCAVA balloting need to incorporate the wide ranges of approaches that States will need to take in order to comply, given their varied environments.

While nearly one-third of all UOCAVA ballots nationwide could not be categorized as coming from domestic military, overseas military, or overseas citizens, regions of the country or states that were able to provide this information present some important clues as to the demands on election administration in those jurisdictions. There is great variability in the UOCAVA voting environment. States wrestle with dramatically different numbers of UOCAVA voters and the types of UOCAVA voters. Figure 4 illustrates the source of the UOCAVA votes for each State with colored bars for the States that provided some categorized data.

For example, States with major military bases process significant numbers of domestic armed services ballots. The EAC survey showed that more than one-half of all UOCAVA ballots cast in the States of Alaska, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa,

Louisiana, Missouri, Montana, South Carolina, Texas, and Wyoming were from domestic military voters. For these jurisdictions, UOCAVA balloting may be managed by working constructively with base personnel.

Other States that serve significant numbers of UOCAVA voters face a more challenging electoral environment because they have to register UOCAVA citizens, deliver ballots to these voters, and make sure ballots are returned by these same voters, some of whom may live thousands of miles away. In many instances, these voters reside in localities where telephone, mail, Internet, and/or other methods of communication between elections officials and citizens are complicated. As shown in Table 20, the States of Arkansas, American Samoa, and Virginia report that more than 40 percent of UOCAVA ballots that were counted came from overseas armed services personnel.¹¹ For these States, working with UOCAVA voters means dealing with issues of overseas mail delivery and the attendant delays in the delivery and receipt of registration information and ballots. This may require new and creative solutions for election administrators.


A third group of States must focus their registration and turnout efforts on all three types of UOCAVA voters (domestic military, overseas military, and overseas civilians). Seven States— Georgia, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, and Ohio—had greater than 20 percent of UOCAVA ballots cast or counted in each of the three major subcategories (domestic military, overseas military, and overseas citizens). Ohio faces perhaps the most complex environment with almost one-third of its UOCAVA voters in each subcategory. California would be added to this list if their numbers of uncategorized UOCAVA ballots were not so high.

Federal Write-in Absentee Ballots

Under Section 103 of UOCAVA, overseas military and civilians are eligible to cast a “back-up” ballot called


¹¹North Carolina is excluded from this discussion because only one jurisdiction provided information on domestic military ballots, thus inflating the relative proportion of overseas ballots. The State’s responses to the survey showed that most domestic military ballots are counted as domestic absentee. This may be a more widespread phenomenon. The States of California, Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Washington all process substantial numbers of overseas military ballots but report such high numbers of “uncategorized” UOCAVA ballots that it is impossible to make any conclusive statements.

Figure 4
Share of UOCAVA Ballots by Source




Note: Some states failed to report any categorized data.

Figure 4
Share of UOCAVA Ballots by Source
South




Note: Some states failed to report any categorized data.

Figure 4
Share of UOCAVA Ballots by Source
Midwest



Note: Some states failed to report any categorized data.

Figure 4
Share of UOCAVA Ballots by Source



the Federal Write-In Absentee Ballot, or FWAB. These are available if an absent uniformed services member or citizen outside the United States (including APO and FPO addresses) requested but did not receive the regular absentee ballot from his or her State after having made a timely application for the ballot. The FWAB is used to vote for Federal offices (President/Vice President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, Delegate or Resident Commissioner) in general elections. Some States now allow military and overseas citizens to use the FWAB in elections other than general elections or for offices other than Federal offices.

Generally, an absent uniformed services member or citizen outside the United States can only use the FWAB under very specific conditions. UOCAVA voters may be able to use a FWAB available through Voting Assistance Officers (VAOs) at military installations or at U.S. embassies/consulates.

The absent uniformed services voter must:

- Be absent from his/her voting residence;
- Have applied for a regular ballot early enough so the request is received by the appropriate local election official not later than the State deadline; or the date that is 30 days before the general election; **AND**
- Have not received the requested regular absentee ballot from the State.

The citizen outside the United States must:

- Be located outside the United States (including APO/FPO addresses);
- Have applied for a regular ballot early enough so the request is received by the appropriate local election official not later than the State deadline; or the date that is 30 days before the general election; **AND**
- Have not received the requested regular absentee ballot from the State.

An online version of the FWAB is available through the Department of Defense's Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) website. The online version must be completed, printed, signed, dated, and mailed to the Local Election Official. The online form must be mailed in an envelope with proper postage, or using the DOD's prepaid return envelope. The voted FWAB must be returned to the local

election official to meet the State or territorial deadline for counting. However, these ballots would not be classified as "sent" from the State, and they may or may not be counted as UOCAVA ballots received in the data reported.

Additionally, twelve States have expanded the use of the FWAB to go beyond what is required in UOCAVA. These States are Colorado, Connecticut, Iowa, Maryland, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

The EAC survey found that the Federal Write-in Absentee Ballot program is not being used by many voters. Only 1,451 clearly identifiable FWAB ballots were cast in the 2006 election (see Table 19), while only 698 were counted (Table 20). As noted in Table 21b, FWAB ballots amounted for only 2.5 percent of all UOCAVA ballots.

The low rate at which the FWAB ballots were both cast and counted was also revealed in the EAC survey. Only 48.1 percent of FWAB ballots were counted—the lowest rate of counted ballots of any UOCAVA subcategory of data. However, this counting rate varies greatly for different States (see Table 21a). The State of Arkansas reported that only 25 percent of their FWAB ballots were counted, while eight States reported that all of their FWAB ballots that were cast were counted. In addition to Arkansas, the States of Arizona, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, and North Carolina all reported less than 50 percent of their FWAB ballots were counted.

Advanced Ballots

The EAC survey also asked for the total number of "advanced ballots" transmitted to military and overseas citizens for the 2006 general election (question 39, with results reported in Table 23). For the purposes of the survey, advanced ballots were defined as "any special Write-In Absentee Ballot, State Write-In Absentee Ballot, Special Write-In Early Ballot, or Blank Absentee Ballot that is distributed by a State in advance of the publication of an official ballot for a Federal election on which military and overseas citizens are allowed to write in the name of the candidate in each contest for whom they choose to vote." In some ways this would appear to describe a FWAB ballot, but the numbers reported by some States and jurisdictions are much higher than the information provided on Tables 19 and 20. It appears that some States and

jurisdictions reported overall absentee ballots in response to this question.

Question 40 in the EAC survey specifically asked about the number of FWAB ballots received from domestic and overseas military, as well as overseas citizens. Yet, the 86,000 ballots reported in this question were heavily dominated by data from Illinois and California that appear to have overall absentee ballots reported in their so-called UOCAVA totals.

Reasons for Not Counting UOCAVA Ballots

Given the unique situation faced by many UOCAVA voters, many of whom have to request and return their ballots from a great distance, there is special interest in the reasons for ballot rejection. Of the nearly 1 million UOCAVA ballots that were requested, the EAC survey found about 48,600 were rejected for a variety of reasons (see Table 25a). This amounts to an average of 4.9 percent nationwide, although there were wide variations between the States. For example, the States of Indiana and North Carolina reported


that more than 40 percent of the requested ballots were subsequently rejected, while a number of States reported less than 3 percent were rejected.

As shown in Table 25a (question 42) and Figure 5, from one-third to two-thirds of jurisdictions provided a count of the number and reasons for not counting the UOCAVA ballots. The biggest reason (over 70 percent) reported by States and local jurisdictions for not counting the ballots was that they were returned as undeliverable. As a result, the ballots were not even eligible to be cast. A number of States reported much higher percentages—six States said that more than 90 percent of their rejected ballots¹² were because they were undeliverable. Therefore, for more than 34,000 UOCAVA voters, the ballots never arrived in the hands of the voter and could never be cast.

The third largest reason for rejected ballots (after “other reason”) was that they were received by the election offices after the deadline stipulated by State law. This accounted for nearly 10 percent of all rejected ballots nationwide. But the variation of reasons among the States was large, and resulted in an average 23.1 percent across the country.

¹²Of course, technically, these ballots were never rejected because they were never submitted. However, for the sake of consistency and clarity, they are treated here as if they were all submitted in order to review reasons for not being counted.

Figure 5
Predominant Reason for Military and Overseas Absentee Ballots to Not be Counted



The map in Figure 5 illustrates the predominant reason cited by each State for UOCAVA ballots failing to be counted. The dominance of red in the map shows the great number of States that reported a large number of UOCAVA ballots that were returned as non-deliverable. The percentages within each State outline shows what percent of the overall rejected ballots were due to the reason cited by

color. Although not a predominant response in any State, other reasons cited were (in descending order of frequency):

- No voter signature
- Voter signature was not verifiable or unmatched
- No date of notary on the witness signature
- Had no date of voter signature
- Lacked a postmark

Conclusions

Too many local election authorities continue to fail to track the precise number of ballots they mailed or transmitted to their domestic military, overseas military, and overseas citizens, as required by HAVA. Provisions in State laws may contribute to the difficulty in the tracking of ballots. The tracking of these transmitted absentee ballots is complicated by the following factors that may artificially inflate or deflate the numbers reported in this survey:

- If UOCAVA voters do not receive their State ballots close to the date of the elections, they can download, via the Web, and then send, a Federal Write-In Absentee Ballot that indicates his or her preferences for known races. These ballots are not classified as “sent” from the State, and they may or may not be counted as UOCAVA ballots received in the data reported.
- Additionally, if the UOCAVA voter submits his or her Federal Write-In Absentee Ballot, and subsequently receives his or her full UOCAVA ballot from the State, the voter is allowed to vote the full ballot, and the State should count those full ballots. That is the fact that several ballots might legitimately be received from one voter further complicates the accuracy of the data collected and, as a consequence, State record-keeping protocols might inflate the number of ballots received.
- Finally, when a voter registers to vote using the Federal Post Card Application,¹³ an absentee ballot is automatically sent to that voter for the next two Federal elections. However, voters may move or change addresses and ballots may be sent to addressees for voters who are no longer residing at that address. This may be one of the sources of the problem for the large number of ballots that were returned to local election offices because they were undeliverable.

¹³The Federal Post Card Application (FPCA), also known as Standard Form 76 (SF 76), is a postage-free postcard, printed and distributed by the FVAP for use by absentee voters covered by UOCAVA. Every election year, the FVAP has a minimum of eight million FPCAs in worldwide distribution, serving more than six million U.S. citizens covered by UOCAVA.

Recommendations

1. The quality of information regarding UOCAVA ballots is low, making it impossible to sufficiently monitor compliance with HAVA mandates. States must redouble their efforts to make sure that local jurisdictions collect the mandated information for UOCAVA voters, including:
 - Appropriately separating domestic civilian and domestic military absentee ballots;
 - Correctly categorizing UOCAVA ballots and not employing the “uncategorized” category as a catch-all;
 - Tracking the reasons for ballot rejection;
 - Reporting data at the appropriate jurisdictional level (county, township, and city) and not just State-wide.
2. More effort needs to be made to ensure that members of the armed services and citizens living overseas are made fully aware of their voting rights and that any obstacles to voter registration, ballot receipt, and ballot return should be reduced, minimized, or eliminated. When crafting solutions, however, States should attend to their unique electoral environments, given the wide variation in the number of domestic and overseas armed services personnel and overseas citizens.
3. States should work in partnership with the Department of Defense’s Federal Voting Assistance Program, and the Election Assistance Commission, to develop best practices and ongoing programs for encouraging voting participation among the UOCAVA population.
4. States should be open to legal changes and to new technologies that may overcome some of the barriers currently faced by UOCAVA voters. For example, States may consider whether it is necessary to have ballots received by Election Day or whether a postmark by

Election Day is sufficient. States may wish to explore new technologies to deliver and receive ballots, such as voting by fax, by telephone, or by using the Internet as ways to encourage UOCAVA voting, while attending to vital issues of ballot integrity and voter privacy.

5. It is unrealistic to keep sending ballots to voters who have moved: more than 35,000 ballots were returned as undeliverable. Mechanisms need to be set up by the military whereby a military transfer generates a move notice to the local registrar. Additionally, military bases need to set up programs with State and local elections offices whereby an undeliverable registration or ballot generates a rapid notification—perhaps by email—to the individual voter so that they may respond in a timely fashion. Another possibility would be to provide forwarding exemptions for overseas military ballots.

Moving Ahead to 2008

The various processes required of States by UOCAVA procedures vary substantially and will be considered when promoting further surveys and collecting data. The following State processes should be considered as EAC assesses future data collection efforts:

- How States and local election authorities handle the sending and the return of ballots. This includes variations among States in scheduling elections (late or early primaries), policies and procedures regarding the use of faxes, rules regarding the time allowed to return ballots, and early voting policies and procedures.
- How States and their local election authorities handle ballots received from overseas military, domestic military on active or inactive duty, overseas citizens, and Federal Write-in Absentee Ballots.

- How States count domestic and overseas military ballots, overseas citizen ballots, ballots cast early, and all absentee and FWAB ballots cast and counted.
- How States define and assess UOCAVA ballot responses through the single State UOCAVA offices, and how those offices communicate the recordkeeping protocols with local election officials.

Continuing efforts by the EAC should be aimed at States and their local election authorities to educate them about HAVA requirements regarding UOCAVA. The EAC will continue to coordinate its efforts with the staff of the Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) at the Department of Defense to ensure that both agencies work together in providing a service that is effective to States and to UOCAVA voters. While it is important to recognize the tremendous variation in how States and their local election authorities handle the mailing and processing of their ballots, it is equally important that EAC assist States and local election authorities to develop policies and procedures that will make them HAVA-compliant.

Providing the survey instrument to States well in advance of upcoming Federal elections will assist States with their collection and reporting of UOCAVA survey data. This could include sending the survey at least 9-12 months in advance of an election.

EAC will continue to work to develop uniform measures for the collection and reporting of UOCAVA data. These steps and measures will be shared with each State's UOCAVA office and will be recommended for use when completing future Election Administration and Election Day surveys. It is anticipated that this type of information will assist States with their implementation of effective and efficient methods for sending and receiving ballots to UOCAVA voters.

Footnotes to Tables

General Notes

State: In the interest of consistency in these tables, the term State includes the District of Columbia and the four territories of American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Jurisdictions in the Survey: For the 2006 survey, information was requested for each county-level election administration jurisdiction. The following exceptions apply: a) in some States, the information was initially compiled by town or township; b) in some States, independent cities were treated as counties; and c) in some States, the only response was one record for the State. States in which the town/city or township is the initial unit of collection include the six States in New England and a handful of States in the Midwest. Independent cities were treated as county-level reporting units for the States of Maryland, Virginia, Missouri, and Nevada. Selected Election Boards in Illinois and Missouri were also treated as county jurisdictions. State-level information was provided for Alaska, which does not have counties. Coverage for the territories varied.

Missing Data: Information for several items remains unavailable for several reasons; in general, this is reflected by a blank cell in the table. If a calculation is impossible because of missing information, a separate symbol may be indicated, e.g., a series of periods (.....). If a calculated percentage is greater than 100%, it is labeled with a different symbol (###). Highlighted information, when

included, will indicate inconsistent values, e.g., the sum of several columns is greater than 100%. In a few instances, information was edited to remove obvious inconsistencies or to facilitate edits that States were unable to undertake due to technical difficulties. States for which these edits were made are: The “Uncategorized Total” was forced to zero in several tables for Alaska, California, Indiana, New Jersey, and West Virginia.

Sum of Above: The information listed in the tables below the State detail is generally the addition of the information listed in the table. If the national summary is labeled as “Sum of Above,” any percentages are calculated from the numbers on the summary line. If the national summary is labeled as “Sum or Average,” any percentages are calculated from the State detail; and averages will be underlined. Due to inconsistencies in the data for this report, the Average is simply the Sum of Above (sum) divided by the States with non-zero responses. In some cases, the term “calc” indicates a calculation was made to derive the data in the column; this may also refer to information from another table (see notes below).

Footnotes: In the proofing phase of data for this report, data for the full question were provided to the States even though only part of the question related to the UOCAVA report is included in the tables. Therefore, some footnotes may include references to information not specifically related to the UOCAVA data and/or for information not printed in this report.

Table 19. UOCAVA Ballots Cast by Category.

Question 33. Total number Statewide and by county/local jurisdiction, for the November 7, 2006, Federal general elections of ballots cast.

The column labeled 'Sum of UOCAVA' is calculated from the count of the categorized breakouts and the uncategorized total. States differed as to how to respond to this 'uncategorized' item and also as to what should be included in the item. A review was undertaken to check for possible erroneous or double reporting. See the notes at the beginning of this section.

Alabama – Montgomery reported: Provisional Ballots included in 'At Polls' number.

Arizona – One jurisdiction reported: Domestic civilian absentee ballot, domestic military, overseas military, overseas citizens, and FWAB data are not accessible because it was purged. Several jurisdictions reported: Did not separate domestic civilian absentee ballots from other UOCAVA voters. Another jurisdiction reported: Included UOCAVA voters in Domestic civilian absentee voters.

Arkansas – One jurisdiction reported: 197 total Absentees were cast and counted. Another jurisdiction reported: Provisional Ballots included in 'At Polls' number.

California – One jurisdiction reported: Q33: Domestic Military and Overseas Military are added together, 102; they do not track the separation. Another reported: FWAB - Box checked with an X only, but no number given. Los Angeles County reported: Military are both domestic and overseas, no way of separating them.

Colorado – One jurisdiction reported: Military vs. Civilian status not flagged in our system. Jefferson County reported: Overseas military and Overseas Civilian counted same as Domestic Military.

Connecticut – There is only data for total ballots cast.

Florida – Miami-Dade reported: A total of 65,955 - Absentee Ballots were cast during the 2006 General Election. The UOCAVA Votes are included with the Domestic Civilian Absentee Ballots. Another jurisdiction reported: Domestic civilian absentee ballots and UOCAVA ballots have been combined. Another reported: The totals above include absentee ballots returned with errors (rejected) and all provisional ballots received in the Clay County Supervisor of Elections' office whether they were counted or not. Volusia County reported: Under Provisional Ballots, total of 662 included 526 accepted and 136 rejected. The State reported that the following counties did not break out domestic civilian absentee ballots from the total UOCAVA amount; the domestic civilian ballot amounts are included in the combined UOCAVA amount: Miami-Dade; Walton. Also: In totaling the number of absentee ballots cast and counted, several Florida counties did not make a distinction between domestic civilian absentee ballots and UOCAVA ballots (domestic military, overseas military, overseas citizens and Federal Write-in Ballots). As a result, it is not possible to accurately calculate the percentage of UOCAVA ballots cast and counted compared to the total number of ballots cast and counted.

Idaho – A number of jurisdictions reported: Ballots cast for domestic military, overseas military and overseas citizens are the number of absentee ballots cast by each group.

Indiana – Nearly all jurisdictions reported: The number provided in the 'At the Polls' box indicates the voter turnout tracked in Indiana.

Illinois – One jurisdiction reported: 328 total absentees were requested – this number was not broken down by category. Another jurisdiction reported: The County did not break down this data into categories – total ballots cast on Election Day.

New Jersey – One jurisdiction reported: Combined with Absentee total. Several jurisdictions reported: Domestic Civilian absentee ballot, Domestic Military, Overseas Military, Overseas citizens totals are combined. Another reported: Domestic Civilian Absentee Ballots, Domestic Military, Overseas Military totals are combined. A number of jurisdictions reported: Domestic Military and Overseas Military are combined totals.

Kansas – One jurisdiction reported: Did not breakout Federal Services Absentee Voting. Several jurisdictions reported: Federal Services Absentee Voting not broken out. Another reported: Only designation was Federal Services Absentee Voting; could not match a category.

Kentucky – The number of ballots cast is not available for any jurisdiction.

Maine – One jurisdiction reported: All absentee ballots are cast at the polls (or at a central polling place). Therefore, the number of absentee ballots included in the above number of absentee ballots cast are also included in the total number of ballots cast at the polls. Municipalities report the total number of absentee ballots cast and how many of those ballots were cast by UOCAVA voters. We do not require the towns to report how many FWAB are cast, but those ballots would be included in total number of military/overseas absentee ballots cast.

Massachusetts – Massachusetts does not have early voting. All ballots are totaled together. No separate count is made for absentee ballots of any kind or provisional ballots.

Minnesota – Minnesota is exempt from provisional balloting requirements under HAVA 302 (a)

Missouri – Grundy County says regarding 33d and e, 'some were sent out but were not received prior to election day closing deadline.' Jackson County reports that 33d and 33e are a combined total.

Montana – Montana does not have early voting.

Nebraska – One jurisdiction reported: 15 precincts vote by mail - so 941 'at polls' voters actually voted by mail.

New Hampshire – One jurisdiction reported: Information not submitted by categories; only provided the overall total ballots cast. Another jurisdiction reported: The above information was not broken down in categories. Another reported: The county included in its total the number of regular and absentee ballots cast in the November 7, 2006, federal general election. Another reported: The total for ballot cast was not broken down in categories. Another reported: This total is for all ballots cast, this information is not separate, i.e., total FWAB, Provisional ballots, etc.

New Mexico – Once the ballots were canvassed, provisional and different types of fed absentee ballots were no longer separated. One jurisdiction reported: Reporting Total combines ALL Absentee Voters.

New York – The number provided for domestic military voters above is for both domestic and overseas military voters

Nevada – One jurisdiction reported: Domestic and overseas military have been combined under domestic military. Another reported: Domestic citizen absentee ballots also includes 386 ballots from mail-in precincts. Another reported: for 'At Polls' 258 ballots were cast in mail-in precincts.

Ohio – Ohio does not offer early voting. One jurisdiction reported: Domestic military, overseas military and overseas citizens included in the 15,716 total.

Oklahoma – One Jurisdiction reported: County provided no separation for domestic military, overseas military and overseas citizens. Another reported: Includes data for domestic military, overseas military and overseas citizens. Another reported: Overall total given for UOCAVA voters.

Oregon – We are currently unable to separate out domestic civilian absentee, domestic military, overseas military citizen, and overseas citizens. All categories are included in UOCAVA.

South Dakota – One jurisdiction reported: 1 military overseas, 10 civilian overseas

Tennessee – Most jurisdictions reported: Do not collect.

Virginia – Military voters are only tracked by the reason they requested to vote by absentee ballot which is active duty military or a spouse or dependent thereof. As there is no place to provide a general comment, this comment covers all 134 entries. As neither the FPCA nor the VA absentee application requires an applicant to State if they are domestic or overseas, VA does not classify military into these two categories. All questions pertaining to the military and answers for all 134 localities are answered in the overseas military response.

Washington – One jurisdiction reported: 23 votes cast on Disability Access Units (DREs), another reported: 8 votes 'at the polls' were cast on disability access units. Another reported: early votes are cast on disability access units

West Virginia – One jurisdiction reported: Provisional ballots are included in the at the polls total.

Wisconsin – All voters given a number at the polling place who cast Ballots; Provisional ballots and absentee ballots, absentee military etc., are considered counted at the Polling Place and are contained in the Total number of Ballots cast. Wisconsin does not have early voting. Wisconsin does have no excuse absentee voting.

American Samoa – Early voting is also identified as absentee voting.

Table 20. UOCAVA Ballots Counted by Category

Total number of UOCAVA ballots counted by category.

State	Categorized UOCAVA Ballots												Uncategorized		Percentages of Sum of UOCAVA						
	Domestic				Overseas				Sum of				Total	Jur.	Total	Jur.	Dom. Military	Overseas Military	Citizens	FWAB	Uncat. Total
	Military	Jur.	Military	Jur.	Citizens	Jur.	FWAB	Jur.	Cat.	Military	Citizens	FWAB									
	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.
Alabama	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alaska	1	1,473	1	412	1	155	1	4	1	2,044	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	15	624	11	209	11	594	11	14	10	1,441	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	75	194	46	204	47	66	43	1	37	465	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
California	58	1,591	21	1,591	28	2,446	25	34	10	5,662	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colorado	64	738	59	352	56	1,117	57	39	59	2,246	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Connecticut	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	3	122	3	49	3	242	3	0	3	413	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dist. of Columbia	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	67	13,591	59	3,238	59	4,260	59	59	67	21,148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Georgia	159	1,293	159	581	159	859	159	3	159	2,736	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	4	121	1	0	0	422	1	2	3	545	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	44	429	44	115	44	124	44	0	44	668	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	110	163	8	286	28	8	1	0	0	457	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indiana	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iowa	99	1,679	99	263	99	768	99	0	0	2,710	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kansas	105	431	104	233	104	477	104	0	0	1,141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	1,285	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	64	393	64	88	64	197	64	0	4	678	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maine	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maryland	24	444	24	304	24	2,015	24	27	24	2,790	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	83	1,414	83	826	83	962	83	129	83	3,331	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minnesota	87	0	0	1,072	87	1,623	87	14	86	2,709	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	82	75	46	142	46	5	45	6	42	228	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missouri	116	1,347	116	543	116	653	116	32	116	2,575	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montana	56	629	56	142	56	204	56	26	56	1,001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	93	180	50	130	37	118	36	0	2	428	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nevada	17	756	14	449	13	215	14	6	14	1,426	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	21	15,821	18	15,801	18	11,174	18	0	19	42,796	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	33	153	11	112	12	6	10	0	7	271	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New York	58	2,420	58	0	0	12,525	58	0	0	14,945	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Carolina	100	357	1	1,278	99	498	100	10	100	2,143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Dakota	53	68	53	53	53	28	53	3	53	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	88	1,341	86	1,301	86	1,168	86	32	88	3,842	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oklahoma	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	60	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,331	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rhode Island	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	46	33	2	1	2	14	2	0	0	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	66	268	38	102	36	46	33	1	28	417	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	95	622	2	28	3	255	4	0	1	345	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Texas	254	14,420	254	4,528	254	2,692	254	32	254	21,672	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Utah	29	77	23	297	22	83	21	0	14	457	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vermont	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	134	0	0	3,769	127	3,621	125	122	77	7,512	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	39	838	19	939	19	678	19	74	39	2,529	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	55	522	39	97	25	65	13	3	3	687	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,303	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	23	401	18	109	17	96	18	2	19	608	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
American Samoa	1	15	1	112	1	103	1	0	1	230	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	1	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sum or Average	3,123	64,502	1,692	39,760	1,940	50,583	1,948	698	1,705	155,543	sum	938	88,484	q34total	244,027	calc	27.6	16.5	21.3	2.6	32.1

Table 20. UOCAVA Ballots Counted by Category

Question 34. Total number Statewide and by county/local jurisdiction, for the November 7, 2006, Federal general elections of ballots counted.

The column labeled 'Sum of UOCAVA' is calculated from the count of the categorized breakdowns and the uncategorized total. States differed as to how to respond to this 'uncategorized' item and also as to what should be included in the item. A review was undertaken to check for possible erroneous or double reporting. See the notes at the beginning of this section.

Arizona – One jurisdiction reported: Domestic civilian absentee ballot, domestic military, overseas military, overseas citizens, and FWAB data are not accessible because it was purged. Several jurisdictions reported: Did not separate domestic civilian absentee ballots from other UOCAVA voters.

Connecticut – There is only data for total ballots counted.

Florida – Miami-Dade reported: A total of 64,774 Absentee Ballots were cast during the 2006 General Election. The UOCAVA Votes are included with the Domestic Civilian Absentee Ballots. Another jurisdiction reported: Absentee Ballots are counted as a single category. Another jurisdiction reported: All absentee ballots were counted per SOE. Another jurisdiction reported: Domestic Civilian absentee ballots, Domestic Military, Overseas Military, and Overseas Citizens are added together. Another jurisdiction reported: FWAB'S were counted with overseas military/civilian absentees. Provisional ballots were counted with 'at the polls.' Another jurisdiction reported: The totals above do not include ballots returned with errors (rejected). Several jurisdictions reported: This county did not report an amount for domestic civilian absentee ballots because they are included in the combined UOCAVA amount. Also: In totaling the number of absentee ballots cast and counted, several Florida counties did not make a distinction between domestic civilian absentee ballots and UOCAVA ballots (domestic military, overseas military, overseas citizens and Federal Write-in Ballots). As a result, it is not possible to accurately calculate the percentage of UOCAVA ballots cast and counted compared to the total number of ballots cast and counted.

Hawaii – One jurisdiction reported: Domestic military and overseas military counts are combined.

Idaho – Ballots counted for domestic military, overseas military and overseas citizens are the number of absentee ballots counted by each group.

Indiana – The State of Indiana has provided UOCAVA information, but due to technical difficulties with the survey response collection process, these totals were not captured accurately.

Maine – All absentee ballots are counted at the polls (or at a central polling place). Therefore, the number of absentee ballots included in the number of absentee ballots counted are also included in the total number of ballots counted at the polls. Municipalities report the total number of absentee ballots counted and how many of those ballots were cast by UOCAVA voters. We do not require the towns to report how many FWAB are counted, but those ballots would be included in total number of military/overseas absentee ballots counted.

Massachusetts – Massachusetts does not have early voting. All ballots are totaled together. No separate count is made for absentee ballots of any kind or provisional ballots.

Minnesota – Minnesota does not have early voting. Minnesota is exempt from provisional balloting.

Missouri – One jurisdiction reported: Comment on FWAB number – Boone County says, 'Regular ballot received.' Osage County reports, 'Much of the information requested by your agency and others is either non-existent or has been impossible to find. We have gone through many files here in the office and have not been able to find information to aid us in completing questions 26, 27, and 34h.'

Montana – Montana does not have early voting.

Nevada – Domestic and overseas military have been combined under domestic military.

New Hampshire – Information not submitted by categories; only submitted by total votes counted. One jurisdiction reported: The county included in its total the number of regular and absentee ballots counted for the November 7, 2006, federal general election.

New Jersey – One jurisdiction reported: Combined Overseas Military, Overseas Civilian, Domestic Military and Domestic Civilian. Several jurisdictions reported: Domestic Civilian Absentee Ballots, Domestic Military, Overseas Military totals are combined. One jurisdiction reported: Problems with Sequoia reporting software - delays encountered

New Mexico – Totals were retrieved from the FINAL Reporting Tool, which combines ALL Absentee Voters.

New York – the number provided for domestic military voters above is for both domestic and overseas military voters

Ohio – One jurisdiction reported: Domestic military, overseas military and overseas citizens included in total.

Oklahoma – One jurisdiction reported: No breakdown provided for UOCAVA voters.

Oregon – We are currently unable to separate out domestic civilian absentee, domestic military, overseas military citizen, and overseas citizens. All categories are included in UOCAVA.

Texas – Several jurisdictions reported: domestic civilian absentee ballots = regular applications for ballot by mail. One jurisdiction reported: Information has already been packed and stored for retention period.

Wisconsin – All voters given a number at the polling place who cast Ballots, Provisional ballots and absentee ballots, absentee military etc., are considered counted at the Polling Place and are contained in the Total number of Ballots cast. Wisconsin does not have early voting. Wisconsin does have no excuse absentee voting. Ballots casts contains all the ballots acceptable for counting.

American Samoa – Ballots cast was 11,182, and ballots counted 11,032.

This page intentionally blank.

**2006 Election Administration and Voting Survey
Table 21a. Ballots Counted as % Cast, By Category**

State	Jur.	Percentage of Ballots Cast										Cast compared to Counted			
		Domestic		Overseas			Uncat.		UOCAVA		Counted		Not Counted		
		Military	Military	Citizens	FWAB	Total	UOCAVA	Counted	% Cast	Counted	Not Counted				
Alabama	67	46.3	97.2	56.8	50.0	81.0	0	2,615	67.3	1,272	0	0			
Alaska	1	98.0	94.1	73.2	25.9	100.0	0	1,669	85.5	283	0	0			
Arizona	15	81.9	##	83.5	25.0	##	0	465	97.1	14	0	0			
Arkansas	75	81.8	37.6	25.0	97.1	##	0	35,209	##	##	0	0			
California	58	93.5	78.9	92.6	79.6	##	0	2,246	90.2	244	0	0			
Colorado	64	73.5	89.1	90.3	0.0	##	0	413	84.1	78	0	0			
Connecticut	8	80.5	81.4	78.7	89.4	83.8	0	148	83.8	24	0	0			
Delaware	3	22.9	19.4	30.5	0.0	##	0	26,440	82.5	4,633	0	0			
Dst. of Columbia	1	49.4	0.0	84.4	100.0	##	0	11,452	23.9	8,716	0	0			
Florida	67	71.1	63.2	78.0	0.0	##	0	772	70.6	227	0	0			
Georgia	159	38.7	72.0	20.0	0.0	##	0	957	69.8	289	0	0			
Hawaii	4	96.5	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0	3,335	##	##	0	0			
Hawai	4	96.5	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0	2,770	97.8	60	0	0			
Idaho	44	##	##	##	##	##	0	1,244	91.7	103	0	0			
Illinois	110	##	##	##	##	##	0	1,285	##	##	0	0			
Indiana	92	##	##	##	##	##	0	785	86.4	107	0	0			
Iowa	99	89.9	76.5	84.5	##	##	0	678	##	##	0	0			
Kansas	105	##	##	##	##	##	0	500	100.0	##	0	0			
Kentucky	120	##	##	##	##	##	0	3,114	89.6	324	0	0			
Louisiana	64	88.8	87.6	91.5	41.5	97.4	0	38	97.4	1	0	0			
Maine	16	81.4	72.5	84.1	60.3	##	0	4,236	78.6	905	0	0			
Maryland	24	84.0	84.0	86.1	100.0	##	0	3,176	85.3	467	0	0			
Massachusetts	14	76.5	86.6	62.5	35.3	##	0	290	##	##	0	0			
Michigan	83	80.0	71.2	85.2	45.1	##	0	3,326	77.4	751	0	0			
Minnesota	87	78.0	81.6	92.7	92.9	##	0	1,121	89.3	120	0	0			
Mississippi	82	90.0	70.7	95.9	##	##	0	651	83.6	107	0	0			
Missouri	116	84.1	70.7	95.9	##	##	0	3,211	86.0	451	0	0			
Montana	56	87.3	78.9	88.8	31.6	##	0	2,760	##	##	0	0			
Nebraska	93	##	##	##	##	##	0	42,930	##	##	0	0			
Nevada	17	68.6	64.4	66.7	##	##	0	1,483	90.7	138	0	0			
New Hampshire	10	92.3	##	##	##	##	0	17,376	86.0	2,431	0	0			
New Jersey	21	86.1	51.7	86.6	35.7	##	0	3,073	69.7	930	0	0			
New Mexico	33	86.1	89.8	93.3	100.0	##	0	171	88.9	19	0	0			
New York	58	62.1	68.4	62.9	76.2	##	0	5,958	64.5	2,116	0	0			
North Carolina	100	##	##	##	##	##	0	9,285	92.8	85	0	0			
North Dakota	53	##	##	##	##	##	0	9,099	98.0	186	0	0			
Ohio	88	73.3	50.0	100.0	100.0	##	0	21,970	42.5	12,639	0	0			
Oklahoma	77	32.7	92.7	85.2	100.0	##	0	9,331	##	##	0	0			
Oregon	36	##	##	##	##	##	0	61	78.7	13	0	0			
Pennsylvania	67	##	##	##	##	##	0	9,280	##	##	0	0			
Rhode Island	5	##	##	##	##	##	0	2,577	##	##	0	0			
South Carolina	46	96.3	71.6	89.2	80.0	##	0	15,666	##	##	0	0			
South Dakota	66	##	##	##	##	##	0	837	97.1	24	0	0			
Tennessee	95	##	##	##	##	##	0	4	0.0	4	0	0			
Texas	254	##	##	##	##	##	0	7,761	96.8	249	0	0			
Utah	29	##	##	##	##	##	0	15,705	97.9	328	0	0			
Vermont	14	##	##	##	##	##	0	24,367	5.0	23,145	0	0			
Virginia	134	##	##	##	##	##	0	1,303	100.0	##	0	0			
Washington	39	##	##	##	##	##	0	660	##	##	0	0			
West Virginia	55	##	##	##	##	##	0	233	98.7	3	0	0			
Wisconsin	72	##	##	##	##	##	0	0	##	##	0	0			
Wyoming	23	##	##	##	##	##	0	0	##	##	0	0			
American Samoa	1	100.0	97.4	100.0	##	##	0	0	##	##	0	0			
Guam	1	##	##	##	##	##	0	0	##	##	0	0			
Puerto Rico	1	##	##	##	##	##	0	0	##	##	0	0			
Virgin Islands	1	86.4	21.1	100.0	##	##	0	42	57.1	18	0	0			
Sum or Average	3,123	75.5	71.6	78.3	63.7	70.7	70.7	263,793	77.6	19,766	77.6	19,766			

**2006 Election Administration and Voting Survey
Table 21b. Ballots Counted as % All UOCAVA Ballots, By Category**

State	Jur.	Percentage of Ballots Counted									
		Domestic		Overseas			Uncat.		UOCAVA		
		Military	Military	Citizens	FWAB	Total	Total	Counted	Counted		
Alabama	67	0
Alaska	1	56.3	15.8	5.9	0.2	21.8	21.8	2,615
Arizona	15	37.4	12.5	35.6	0.8	13.7	13.7	1,669
Arkansas	75	41.7	43.9	14.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	465
California	58	4.5	4.5	6.9	0.1	83.9	83.9	35,209
Colorado	64	32.9	15.7	49.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	2,246
Connecticut	8	0
Delaware	3	29.5	11.9	58.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	413
Dist. of Columbia	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	124
Florida	67	62.3	14.8	19.5	0.3	3.0	3.0	21,807
Georgia	159	47.3	21.2	31.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	2,736
Hawaii	4	22.2	0.0	77.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	545
Idaho	44	64.2	17.2	18.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	668
Illinois	110	11.2	19.6	0.5	0.0	68.6	68.6	1,456
Indiana	92	0
Iowa	99	62.0	9.7	28.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2,710
Kansas	105	37.8	20.4	41.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,141
Kentucky	120	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	1,285
Louisiana	64	58.0	13.0	29.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	678
Maine	16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	500
Maryland	24	15.9	10.9	72.2	1.0	0.0	0.0	2,790
Massachusetts	14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	37
Michigan	83	42.4	24.8	28.9	3.9	0.0	0.0	3,331
Minnesota	87	0.0	39.6	59.9	0.5	0.0	0.0	2,709
Mississippi	82	20.1	38.1	1.3	1.6	38.9	38.9	373
Missouri	116	52.3	21.1	25.4	1.2	0.0	0.0	2,575
Montana	56	62.8	14.2	20.4	2.6	0.0	0.0	1,001
Nebraska	93	33.1	23.9	21.7	0.0	21.3	21.3	544
Nevada	17	27.4	16.3	7.8	0.2	48.3	48.3	2,760
New Hampshire	10	0
New Jersey	21	36.9	36.8	26.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	42,930
New Mexico	33	11.4	8.3	0.4	0.0	79.9	79.9	1,345
New York	58	16.2	0.0	83.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	14,945
North Carolina	100	16.7	59.6	23.2	0.5	0.0	0.0	2,143
North Dakota	53	44.7	34.9	18.4	2.0	0.0	0.0	152
Ohio	88	34.9	33.9	30.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	3,842
Oklahoma	77	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	98.3	98.3	1,088
Oregon	36	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	9,099
Pennsylvania	67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	9,331
Rhode Island	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	2
South Carolina	46	68.8	2.1	29.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	48
South Dakota	66	1.7	0.7	0.3	0.0	97.3	97.3	15,318
Tennessee	95	2.4	1.1	9.9	0.0	86.6	86.6	2,577
Texas	254	66.5	20.9	12.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	21,672
Utah	29	9.5	36.5	10.2	0.0	43.8	43.8	813
Vermont	14	0
Virginia	134	0.0	50.2	48.2	1.6	0.0	0.0	7,512
Washington	39	5.4	6.1	4.4	0.5	83.6	83.6	15,377
West Virginia	55	42.7	7.9	5.3	0.2	43.8	43.8	1,222
Wisconsin	72	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	1,303
Wyoming	23	60.1	16.3	14.4	0.3	8.8	8.8	667
American Samoa	1	6.5	48.7	44.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	230
Guam	1	0
Puerto Rico	1	0
Virgin Islands	1	79.2	16.7	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	24
Sum or Average	3,123	27.6	16.5	21.3	2.6	32.1	32.1	244,027
Question		q34dm	q34om	q34oc	q34f		q34tot		q34calc		

Tables 21a, b, and c. Ballots Counted as % of Cast; Ballots Counted as % of all UOCAVA Ballots; and Maximum Ballots Cast or Counted

The 'UOCAVA Cast' is from Table 19; the 'UOCAVA Counted' is from Table 20. Table 21c calculates the maximum value for Cast and Counted in an attempt to address the inconsistency evident in some jurisdictions which may have reported one but not the other.

Table 22. UOCAVA Ballots Requested

Question 38. Total number Statewide and by county/local jurisdiction of absentee ballots requested (do not include FWAB) for the November 7, 2006, Federal general elections (includes ballots transmitted by mail, fax, e-mail, or courier).

The column labeled 'Sum of UOCAVA' is calculated from the count of the categorized breakouts and the uncategorized total. States differed as to how to respond to this 'uncategorized' item and also as to what should be included in the item. A review was undertaken to check for possible erroneous or double reporting. See the notes at the beginning of this section.

- California – One jurisdiction reported: Overseas Citizens: No information provided.
- Connecticut – Spreadsheet categories did not fit the categories on this site. Here are spreadsheet numbers. Fairfield County: Total Civilian: 19853; Total Military: 448; Total 90 Day: 64; Total Overseas: 117; Total Absentees: 20482. Hartford County: Total Civilian: 16122; Total Military: 595; Total 90 Day: 233; Total Overseas: 204; Total Absentees: 17154. Litchfield County: Total Civilian: 4685; Total Military: 128; Total 90 Day: 18; Total Overseas: 40; Total Absentees: 4871. Middlesex County: Total Civilian: 4525; Total Military: 172; Total 90 Day: 9; Total Overseas: 9; Total Absentees: 29. New Haven County: Total Civilian: 16918; Total Military: 702; Total 90 Day: 82; Total Overseas: 137; Total Absentees: 17839. New London County: Total Civilian: 5308; Total Military: 434; Total 90 Day: 45; Total Overseas: 21; Total Absentees: 5808. Tolland County: Total Civilian: 2575; Total Military: 133; Total 90 Day: 14; Total Overseas: 23; Total Absentees: 2745. Windham County: Total Civilian: 1742; Total Military: 72; Total 90 Day: 26; Total Overseas: 28; Total Absentees: 1868.
- Florida – One jurisdiction reported: Totals include any replacement ballots issued also.
- Hawaii – Several jurisdictions reported: Domestic military and overseas military totals are combined.
- Illinois – Several jurisdictions reported: Not broken down by categories.
- Kansas – The numbers reported here are for UOCAVA absentee voters only; all other early voting and voting by mail are included in Kansas' advance voting totals.
- Maine – The State asks the municipal clerks to report the number of ballots issued to voters. Jurisdictions are not required to report the number of applications that are rejected.
- Missouri – Boone County reported: Includes ballots sent when no application received but on two year auto cycle.
- New Jersey – Several jurisdictions reported: Combined Domestic Military and Overseas Military. Another jurisdiction reported: Domestic Military, Overseas Military and Overseas Citizens totals have been combined.
- New Mexico – One jurisdiction reported: Sorry, I've hit the fun barrier with this one. We're busy running elections, not collecting information.
- New York – the number provided for domestic military voters above is for both domestic and overseas military voters
- Nevada – One jurisdiction reported: Domestic and overseas military have been combined under domestic military.
- Oklahoma – Several jurisdictions reported: County did not separate the UOCAVA voters into categories.
- Oregon – We are currently unable to separate out domestic military, overseas military citizen, and overseas citizens. All categories are included in UOCAVA.
- Texas – One jurisdiction reported: Civilian Ballots by mail may come in person and by mail. Statistics are not available to separate mail requests. Another jurisdiction reported: I am not certain how many went to Domestic we did not keep a separate list on overseas and domestic military. Another jurisdiction reported: Information has already been packed and stored for retention period. Another jurisdiction reported: These were FPCA applications requested for the last presidential election that were still good. Many of the people were no longer at the original address.
- Washington – One jurisdiction reported: Ballots are mailed automatically in this vote-by-mail county.
- West Virginia – Several jurisdictions noted they were unable to provide breakdowns of the data, only totals.

Table 23. Advanced Ballots Transmitted

Question 39. Total number Statewide and by county/local jurisdiction of advanced ballots transmitted to military and overseas citizens for the November 7, 2006 Federal general elections. (Advanced ballot means any special Write-In Absentee Ballot, State Write-In Absentee Ballot, Special Write-In Early Ballot, or Blank Absentee Ballot that is distributed by a State in advance of the publication of an official ballot for a federal election on which military and overseas citizens are allowed to write in the name of the candidate in each contest for whom they choose to vote.)

The column labeled 'Sum of UOCAVA' is calculated from the count of the categorized breakouts and the uncategorized total. States differed as to how to respond to this 'uncategorized' item and also as to what should be included in the item. A review was undertaken to check for possible erroneous or double reporting. See the notes at the beginning of this section.

California – Los Angeles reported: Our Election Management System does not separate Domestic Military from Overseas Military Voters. Therefore, these two categories totals are combined.

Connecticut – This information was not included in the spreadsheet.

Florida – Clay County is longer required to send advanced ballots anymore since the 2nd Primary Election was done away with. Another jurisdiction reported: Difference between requests and transmitted is due to cancelled or ineligible requests. Another jurisdiction reported: We received our regular absentee ballots and mailed them before the 35-day deadline.

Idaho – Idaho does not have advanced ballots.

Illinois – Several jurisdictions reported: County did not break down in categories.

Maine – The number of advanced ballots issued is included in the number provided in Question 38. We do not require municipalities to report separately the number of advanced ballots issued.

Maryland – Maryland does not send advanced ballots.

Minnesota – Minnesota does not provide advance ballots.

Montana – These are not used in Montana.

New Jersey – One jurisdiction reported: Combined Domestic Military, Overseas Military, and Overseas Citizens.

Ohio – Ohio does not issue 'advanced ballots.'

Oregon – We are currently unable to separate out domestic military, overseas military citizen, and overseas citizens. All categories are included in UOCAVA. American Samoa – Ballots are only advanced when requested.

Table 24. Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWAB) Received

Question 40. Total number Statewide and by county/local jurisdiction of Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWAB) RECEIVED from each of the following categories of voters for the November 7, 2006, Federal general elections.

The column labeled 'Sum of UOCAVA' is calculated from the count of the categorized breakouts and the uncategorized total. States differed as to how to respond to this 'uncategorized' item and also as to what should be included in the item. A review was undertaken to check for possible erroneous or double reporting. See the notes at the beginning of this section.

Arizona – Pima County reported: Many voters also submitted a regular absentee ballot, so most FWABs weren't counted. One jurisdiction reported: Did not track UOCAVA voters. Another jurisdiction reported: Does not separate UOCAVA voters out by category.

Connecticut – Spreadsheet data does not make a distinction between domestic and overseas ballots, for either civilians or military personnel. Here are spreadsheet numbers. Hartford County: Civilian Returned: 12835; Mil/Overseas Returned: 71. Fairfield County: Civilian Returned: 17479; Mil/Overseas Returned: 308. Litchfield County: Civilian Returned: 3887; Mil/Overseas Returned: 62. Middlesex County: Civilian Returned: 4232; Mil/Overseas Returned: 45. New Haven County: Civilian Returned: 15431; Mil/Overseas Returned: 163. New London County: Civilian Returned: 5103; Mil/Overseas Returned: 26. Tolland County: Civilian Returned: 2463; Mil/Overseas Returned: 33. Windham County: Civilian Returned: 1701; Mil/Overseas Returned: 28.

Florida – One jurisdiction reported: Collected as a single category.

Illinois – Several Counties reported: Not broken down by categories.

Maine – The number of FWAB ballots received is included in the number provided in Question 38. We do not require municipalities to report separately the number of FWAB received.

Oregon – Multnomah County reported: According to the Director of Elections, some FWAB were received, but the number received was not tracked. Several jurisdictions reported: We are currently unable to separate out domestic military, overseas military citizen, and overseas citizens. All categories are included in UOCAVA.

American Samoa – We did not receive any FWABs.

Oregon – We are currently unable to separate out domestic civilian absentee, domestic military, overseas military citizen, overseas citizens and federal write-in absentee ballots. All categories are included in the answers to Question 41.

Texas – One jurisdiction reported: Ballots returned were due to military transfers. New addresses provided apparently were not good addresses as these were returned also. Several jurisdictions reported: ballots were never returned. Another jurisdiction reported: Did not have any military rejects.

2006 Election Administration and Voting Survey

Table 25b. Military and Overseas Absentee Ballots Rejected by Reason-Percentages

State	[A]		[B]		[C]		[D]		[E]		[F]		[G]		[H]		[I]				
	No Date	Wit. Sig.	No Date	Vot. Sig.	Lacking	Postmark	No Voter	Undeliv.	Retd.	Unmatch.	Unmatch.	Unmatch.	Unmatch.	Unmatch.	Unmatch.	Unmatch.	Unmatch.	Unmatch.	Total		
Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	Jur.	
Alabama	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	
Alaska	1	71.9	1	0.0	0	2.6	15.8	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	9.6	0.0	0	0	0	114	1	
Arizona	15	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	11	16.3	11	0.0	0	0	5.7	78.1	10	0	0	283	15	
Arkansas	75	0.0	37	0.0	37	0.0	4.0	38	58.1	41	1.5	36	9	18.0	28.7	7	0	0	272	75	
California	58	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2.4	11	76.9	27	0.5	9	0	18.0	2.3	7	0	0	4,165	58	
Colorado	64	0.0	3	0.0	3	0.0	0.4	7	83.4	18	0.2	6	0	9.4	6.7	7	0	0	1,634	64	
Connecticut	8	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	8	
Delaware	3	0.0	3	0.0	3	0.0	0.0	3	29.5	3	0.0	3	0	57.7	12.8	3	0	0	78	3	
Dst. of Columbia	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	8.0	1	52.0	1	0.0	1	0	36.0	4.0	1	0	0	25	1	
Florida	67	0.0	67	0.0	67	0.0	2.2	67	68.3	67	1.8	67	0	16.0	11.7	67	0	0	3,626	67	
Georgia	159	0.0	140	0.2	156	0.0	0.8	140	60.9	156	0.1	156	0	3.4	34.6	153	0	0	1,435	159	
Hawaii	4	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.5	1	91.0	2	0.0	0	0	8.5	0.0	0	0	0	997	4	
Idaho	44	0.0	44	0.0	44	0.0	5.2	44	64.7	44	0.0	44	0	22.8	7.3	44	0	0	289	44	
Illinois	110	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	100.0	28	0	0	327	110	
Indiana	92	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	100.0	90	0	0	1,263	92	
Iowa	99	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	22.9	99	8.3	99	0.0	0	0	41.7	27.1	99	0	0	48	99	
Kansas	105	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1.4	104	90.8	104	0.4	104	0	7.4	0.0	1	0	0	1,158	105	
Kentucky	120	0.0	120	0.0	120	0.0	0.0	120	0.0	120	0.0	120	0	0.0	0.0	82	0	0	0	120	
Louisiana	64	0.3	3	0.0	0	0.0	0.8	10	71.8	36	0.5	4	0	12.7	13.9	36	0	0	1,260	64	
Maine	16	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	16	
Maryland	24	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1.5	24	75.1	24	0.0	0	0	17.8	5.6	24	0	0	1,307	24	
Massachusetts	14	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	100.0	2	0	0	2	14	
Michigan	83	0.0	83	0.0	83	0.0	0.9	83	31.9	83	0.1	83	0	33.5	33.6	83	0	0	1,206	83	
Minnesota	87	1.2	86	0.0	0	0.0	1.2	86	79.9	87	0.8	85	0	9.9	6.9	85	0	0	2,262	87	
Mississippi	82	0.0	35	0.0	35	0.0	0.0	36	25.6	37	0.0	36	0	17.9	56.4	14	0	0	39	82	
Missouri	116	1.0	116	0.0	116	0.0	0.7	116	62.4	116	0.0	116	0	17.1	18.8	62	0	0	1,800	116	
Montana	56	0.0	56	0.0	56	0.0	0.0	56	95.3	56	0.0	56	0	3.7	0.9	3	0	0	1,090	56	
Nebraska	93	0.0	2	0.0	2	0.0	1.3	5	89.7	19	0.0	2	0	8.0	1.0	3	0	0	312	93	
Nevada	17	0.0	12	0.0	12	0.0	1.1	12	75.9	15	0.0	12	0	22.6	0.4	7	0	0	266	17	
New Hampshire	10	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	10	
New Jersey	21	0.0	7	0.0	7	0.0	0.0	7	0.0	7	0.0	7	0	100.0	0.0	7	0	0	34	21	
New Mexico	33	0.0	12	0.0	13	0.0	0.0	12	72.2	11	0.0	12	0	27.8	12	5	0	0	18	33	
New York	58	0.0	0	0.0	0	4.9	58	58	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	81.3	58	0	0	2,431	58	
North Carolina	100	0.0	2	0.0	0	0.0	0.4	99	68.4	98	0.0	0	0	4.7	26.5	98	0	0	4,520	100	
North Dakota	53	0.0	53	0.0	53	22.2	11.1	53	11.1	53	0.0	53	0	55.6	57	14	0	0	9	53	
Ohio	88	0.0	79	0.0	79	0.0	0.3	86	83.8	87	0.1	87	0	9.1	6.6	75	0	0	2,379	88	
Oklahoma	77	0.0	4	0.0	4	0.0	0.0	4	0.0	4	0.0	4	0	84.1	15.9	9	0	0	82	77	
Oregon	36	0.0	15	0.0	15	0.0	0.0	15	0.0	15	0.0	15	0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	36	
Pennsylvania	67	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	67	
Rhode Island	5	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	5	
South Carolina	46	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	100.0	0.0	0	0	0	62	46	
South Dakota	66	0.0	27	0.0	27	0.0	0.5	28	54.4	39	0.3	27	0	9.6	35.2	17	0	0	386	66	
Tennessee	95	0.0	2	0.0	2	0.0	0.5	5	84.8	37	0.1	3	0	14.1	3.3	4	0	0	736	95	
Texas	254	0.0	139	0.0	139	0.0	0.3	254	91.4	254	0.3	254	0	3.0	5.0	254	0	0	10,461	254	
Utah	29	0.0	23	0.0	23	0.0	76.3	24	15.5	23	0.0	23	0	8.2	2.3	15	0	0	97	29	
Vermont	14	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	14	
Virginia	134	0.2	3	0.0	2	0.0	1.2	7	94.6	33	0.0	2	0	0.0	3.9	15	0	0	483	134	
Washington	39	0.0	33	0.0	34	0.1	0.8	34	90.6	32	4.8	33	0	1.7	3.3	32	0	0	887	39	
West Virginia	55	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.0	0.9	1	68.9	12	0.0	0	0	8.5	2.8	1	0	0	106	55	
Wisconsin	72	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	72	
Wyoming	23	0.0	23	0.0	23	0.0	0.2	23	88.4	22	0.0	22	0	11.4	0.0	17	0	0	648	23	
American Samoa	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	1	33.3	1	0.0	1	0	66.7	0.0	0	0	0	3	1	
Guam	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	1	
Puerto Rico	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	1	
Puerto Islands	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	100.0	0.0	0	0	0	28	1	
Sum or Average	3,123	1.7	1,232	0.4	1,169	0.7	1,212	4.1	50.4	1,894	0.3	1,495	0	23.1	1,861	19.3	1,539	48,628	3,123	q42total	
Question																					q42w
																					q42v
																					q42r
																					q42ns
																					q42nv
																					q42w
																					q42o

Tables 25a,b. Military and Overseas Absentee Ballots Rejected, by Reason

Question 42. Total number Statewide and by county/local jurisdiction of military and overseas absentee ballots rejected for each of the following reasons for the November 7, 2006, Federal general elections. *The 'Total Requested' is from Table 22: 'Sum of UOCAVA'. Note that ballots returned as undeliverable [E] are included in the 'Total Rejected' even though they were not submitted by the voter.*

- Arizona – Several jurisdictions reported: Not tracked.
- Connecticut – Spreadsheet data does not make a distinction between civilian and military rejected absentee ballots.
- District of Columbia – 102 of these ballots were not returned.
- Florida – One jurisdiction reported: All these numbers are included with above domestic civilian, as they are not separated for canvassing purposes. Another reported: Clay County does not enter ballots into the system at all that are not received by the State deadline.
- Idaho – There is no requirement within Idaho Code to require a signature of a witness or notary on an absentee ballot that is returned by UOCAVA voters.
- Indiana – Reason codes for rejected ballots are tracked on an individual voter basis, but are not aggregated at the county or State level.
- Iowa – Not sealed: 5, Returned not voted: 4, Voter deceased: 2, Wrong voting address: 1.
- Kansas – The returned as undeliverable contains federal service ballots that were not delivered.
- Kentucky – The State reported: Our number of rejected absentee ballots can not be broken down into subcategories like domestic civilian and military/overseas ballots. Therefore, all rejected absentee were put in the domestic civilian category as the survey design does not provide us with any other option to report our numbers.
- Maine – The State does not require municipalities to report the reason that ballots were rejected. Once the State's CVR is fully implemented, the State will have visibility of the reasons that ballots were rejected as clerks will be required to update their list of absentee voters after the polls are closed on Election Night.
- Maryland – The following rejection reasons are not valid reasons for rejection under Maryland law: [A] and [F]. Neither of the reasons [B] or [C] by itself is a valid rejection reason under Maryland law. If the absentee ballot is not received by 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, the local board uses the postmark on the envelope to determine whether the ballot was mailed before Election Day. If the postmark is not legible, the date the voter signed the affidavit is used to determine if the absentee ballot is timely.
- Massachusetts – This office does not collect the reasons why absentee ballots were rejected.
- New Jersey – One jurisdiction reported: County does not separate reasons.
- North Carolina – "Other" consists of various reasons.
- Oklahoma – Ballot was returned after 7pm.
- Oregon – We are currently unable to separate out domestic civilian absentee, domestic military, overseas military citizen, overseas citizens and federal write-in absentee ballots. All categories are included in the answers to Question 41.
- Texas – One jurisdiction reported: Ballots returned were due to military transfers. New addresses provided apparently were not good addresses as these were returned also. Several jurisdictions reported: ballots were never returned. Another jurisdiction reported: Did not have any military rejects.

CROSS REFERENCE OF SURVEY QUESTIONS TO TABLES

Questions 1-31. See **NVRA Report**

Question 32. See **Election Day Report**

Question 33. Total number of ballots cast
See **Table 19. UOCAVA Ballots Cast by Category**

Question 34. Total number of ballots counted
See **Table 20. UOCAVA Ballots Counted by Category**

Question 35-37. See **Election Day Report**

Question 38. Absentee Ballots Requested
See **Table 22. UOCAVA Ballots Requested**

Question 39. Advanced Ballots Transmitted
See **Table 23. Advanced Ballots Transmitted**

Question 40. Federal Write-in Absentee Ballots Received
See **Table 24. FWAB Ballots Received**

Question 41. See **Election Day Report**

Question 42. Military and Overseas Ballots Rejected
See **Tables 25a,b. Military and Overseas Ballots Rejected by Reason**

Questions 43-58. See **Election Day Report**

Extract of Questions from 2006 Election Administration and Voting Survey

NOVEMBER 7, 2006, ELECTION RESULTS

33. Total number statewide and by county/local jurisdiction, for the November 7, 2006, Federal general elections of **BALLOTS CAST**:

At the polls:	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Early voting:	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Domestic civilian absentee ballot:	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Domestic military:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Overseas military:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Overseas citizens:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
FWAB:	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Provisional ballots:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data

*The number provided in response to this question should include the total number of ballots cast in the State's program for contingent or provisional ballots that comply with Section 302(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA).

***UOCAVA voters:** If you are not able to separate ballots cast for UOCAVA voters into the categories above, please, provide the combined total statewide and by county/local jurisdiction:

Total: _____ Don't know Check if your office does not collect this data

Comments:

34. Total number statewide and by county/local jurisdiction, for the November 7, 2006, Federal general elections of **BALLOTS COUNTED**:

At the polls:	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Early voting:	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Domestic civilian absentee ballot:	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Domestic military:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Overseas military:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Overseas citizens:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
FWAB:	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Provisional ballots:	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data

***UOCAVA voters:** If you are not able to separate ballots counted for UOCAVA voters into the categories above, please, provide the combined total statewide and by county/local jurisdiction:

Total: _____ Don't know Check if your office does not collect this data

Comments:

38. Total number statewide and by county/local jurisdiction of **absentee ballots REQUESTED (do not include FWAB)** for the November 7, 2006, Federal general elections (*includes ballots transmitted by mail, fax, e-mail, or courier*):

Domestic civilian absentee ballot:	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Domestic military:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Overseas military:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Overseas citizens:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data

*UOCAVA voters: If you are not able to separate absentee ballots requested for UOCAVA voters into the categories above, please, provide the combined total statewide and by county/local jurisdiction:

Total: _____ Don't know Check if your office does not collect this data

Comments:

39. Total number statewide and by county/local jurisdiction of **advanced ballots TRANSMITTED** to military and overseas citizens for the November 7, 2006 Federal general elections: (*Advanced ballot means any special Write-In Absentee Ballot, State Write-In Absentee Ballot, Special Write-In Early Ballot, or Blank Absentee Ballot that is distributed by a state in advance of the publication of an official ballot for a federal election on which military and overseas citizens are allowed to write in the name of the candidate in each contest for whom they choose to vote.*)

Domestic military:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Overseas military:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Overseas citizens:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data

*UOCAVA voters: If you are not able to separate advance ballots transmitted for UOCAVA voters into the categories above, please, provide the combined total statewide and by county/local jurisdiction:

Total: _____ Don't know Check if your office does not collect this data

Comments:

40. Total number statewide and by county/local jurisdiction of **Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWAB) RECEIVED** from each of the following categories of voters for the November 7, 2006, Federal general elections:

Domestic military:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Overseas military:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Overseas citizens:*	_____	Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data

*UOCAVA voters: If you are not able to separate the FWAB received for UOCAVA voters into the categories above, please, provide the combined total statewide and by county/local jurisdiction:

Total: _____ Don't know Check if your office does not collect this data

Comments:

42. Total number statewide and by county/local jurisdiction of **military and overseas absentee ballots REJECTED** for each of the following reasons for the November 7, 2006, Federal general elections:

Had no date of notary/ witness signature:	_____ Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Had no date of voter signature:	_____ Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Lacked a postmark:	_____ Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
No voter signature:	_____ Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Returned as undeliverable:	_____ Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Voter signature not verifiable:	_____ Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Was received after the state deadline:	_____ Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data
Other (<i>please, specify</i>):	_____ Don't know	Check if your office does not collect this data

Comments:

U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

EAC Commissioners

Chair Donetta L. Davidson
Vice Chair Rosemary E. Rodriguez
Commissioner Caroline Hunter
Commissioner Gracia M. Hillman

EAC Staff

Thomas Wilkey, Executive Director
Juliet Hodgkins, General Counsel



U.S. Election Assistance Commission

1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 (toll free)
HAVAinfo@eac.gov
www.eac.gov