

U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Annual Report on Grant Programs



FY2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Report Overview	5
Section 101 Funds	7
Section 102 Funds	9
Section 251 Funds	11
Election Data Collection Grants	14
College Poll Worker Grants.....	15
Mock Election Grants	17
EAC Administration of HAVA Funds	19

Report Overview

Since the passage of the Help America Vote Act in 2002 (HAVA), Congress has appropriated almost \$3.2 billion to support States in improving the administration of Federal elections, primarily by upgrading systems for casting votes and for registering voters in statewide voter registration systems. States have also used HAVA funds to: (1) implement provisional voting; (2) train election officials, poll workers, and voters; (3) improve polling place accessibility; (4) provide voter information at the polling places; (5) provide language assistance; (6) use toll free telephone lines; and (7) establish identification requirements for first-time voters who register to vote by mail. Table 1 provides a general overview of activities supported through HAVA funding.

Description	Amount	Percent
Voting Systems	\$1,604,367,413	71.01
Voter Registration Systems	354,992,541	15.72
Improving the Administration of Federal Elections*	155,299,936	6.87
Educating Voters, Training Officials and Poll Workers, and Recruiting Poll Workers	77,140,039	3.41
Improving Polling Places	29,765,726	1.32
Provisional Voting	3,664,550	0.16
Uncategorized	34,206,688	1.51
Total	\$2,259,436,893	

*Includes costs associated with preparing State plans, administering the HAVA program, identification for first-time voters, posting voting information at polls, and language assistance. Also, includes additional costs of training, voting equipment, and voter registration systems that were reported collectively. Total does not include 2008 and 2009 appropriations.

This report presents financial and programmatic information on the programs currently administered by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC), including non-discretionary payments to States authorized under Sections 101, 102, and 251 of HAVA and competitive, discretionary grants to support College Poll Workers (\$750,000), Mock Elections in High Schools (\$300,000), and Election Data Collection (\$10 million).

The reporting periods covered in this report differ by grant program, as follows:

<i>Grant Program</i>	<i>Reporting Through</i>
Section 101 and 102	December 31, 2008
Section 251	September 30, 2008
Election Data Collection	December 31, 2008
Poll Worker	May 31, 2008
Mock Election	May 31, 2008

Overall, EAC and GSA (acting on EAC's behalf) have awarded \$3,183,860 to 55 States, U.S. Territories, and the District of Columbia (hereinafter referred to as States). HAVA stipulated that EAC disburse these grant funds to States in advance and that States use the interest earned on the advanced funds for HAVA-authorized purposes. Since the initial disbursement of funds in 2003, States have reported interest in the amount of \$279 million, making the aggregate available to States for allowable activities \$3.46 billion.

For the periods covered by this report, States are reporting aggregate total expenditures of \$2.27 billion, or approximately 76% of total Federal funds disbursed (71% including accrued interest).

A State-by-State breakdown of funds expended for HAVA Sections 101, 102 and 251 funding as well as EAC's discretionary grants is described in the succeeding chapters of this report. Briefly:

Section 101 Funds. A total of \$349 million has been disbursed to States under Section 101. States report having spent approximately 70% of Section 101 funds with 13 States having spent 100% and 27 States reporting having spent over 80% of the Federal funds

available. Section 101 funds are intended to improve administration of Federal elections and have fewer restrictions on their use as compared to Section 102 and Section 251 funds.

Section 102 Funds. A total of \$300 million has been disbursed to States under Section 102. These are dedicated to replacing punch card and lever voting systems. Of the 30 States that received Section 102 funding, 27 States have used 95% or more of the funds allocated to their State. All but 3% of the remaining funds (\$49.6 million) belong to the State of New York, which is planning to purchase new voting systems in FY 2010.

Section 251 Funds. A total of \$ 2.32 billion has been disbursed to States under Section 251, with all but 1% of these funds being disbursed in FYs 2004 and 2005. As of the 2008 reporting period, 11 States have reported using 100% of the Federal amount disbursed and 15 States had reported using 85% or more. Almost 60% of the 55 States receiving Section 251 requirements payments reported using 75% or more of the Federal amount available under this Section.

While most of the requirements payment funds disbursed by EAC have been spent, several factors led to States delaying their 2008 and 2009 requirements payments requests. One challenge was the timing of the FY 2008 Federal appropriation. Before a State can request a disbursement from EAC, the State must request matching funds from its State legislature for deposit in its election fund. The late enactment of the FY 2008 appropriation meant that many States missed the deadline for requesting State appropriated funds. A second factor was that many States were updating their HAVA State plans, which includes a public input process that can take many months to complete, and were not able to request funds until that process was concluded. Despite a relatively slow start to the disbursement of FY 2008 funds, Table 4 illustrates that States have robust HAVA State plans and have spent over 70% of the Federal funds made available under this section of HAVA.

By the end of fiscal year 2009, most of the initial hurdles with requesting FYs 2008 and 2009 requirements payments had been overcome. In the last two quarters of FY 2009 and the first quarter of FY 2010, EAC disbursed over \$70 million of the \$215 million of Section 251 funds appropriated in FYs 2008 and 2009.

Report Methodology

The financial data in this report is based on financial status and narrative reports self-reported by States and other grantees.¹ For grant expenditures, EAC used the net cash disbursements and unliquidated obligations² listed in financial status reports (Standard Form 269) submitted by States to EAC. To estimate how States used funds under the Section 101, 102, and 251 programs, EAC extracted information from narrative reports to group expenditures by types of activity authorized by HAVA.

¹ EAC made adjustments to reconcile total expenditures to total amounts used to offset the impact of including unliquidated obligations in total expenditures and to adjust for States that made changes in current reports to expenditures that were reported in prior periods.

² Unliquidated obligations represent the amount of grants or contracts awarded or orders placed for which payments have not been made.

SECTION 101 Funds

Background

To qualify for Section 101 funds, States certified to the U.S. General Services Administration³ (GSA) that the funds would be used consistent with the provisions of HAVA Title III and the laws listed in Section 906⁴ of HAVA, which relate to the provisions of HAVA. GSA distributed \$349.2 million in Section 101 funds to States between April 2003 and August 2003.

The total amount of Section 101 funds appropriated for all States was \$349,182,262. HAVA required States to deposit Section 101 funds in interest bearing State Election Funds. Interest earned on Section 101 funds is approximately \$39.8 million. Section 101 funds are available with no restriction on when they can be used.

Expenditures

States spent \$246,602,226, or approximately 70%, of the \$349,182,262 appropriated for Section 101. These funds have generated an additional \$39,835,643 in interest, which is available for States to use on activities authorized under Section 101. As of December 31, 2008, eight States had spent all of their funds and interest, 25 other States had expended more than 75%, while 22 States had spent less than 50% of their funds and interest.

Table 2.1 HAVA Title I, Section 101 Funds as of December 31, 2008

State	Total Section 101 Funds Received	Interest Earned	Total Expenditures ^a	Balance of Funds and Interest	Percent of Funds and Interest Expended
Alabama	\$4,989,605	\$349,969	\$1,890,501	\$3,449,073	35.41
Alaska	5,000,000	625,012	4,268,913	1,356,099	75.89
American Samoa	1,000,000	63,650	905,742	157,908	85.15
Arizona	5,451,369	645,414	2,095,600	4,001,183	34.37
Arkansas	3,593,165	226,287	3,819,452	0	100
California	27,340,830	2,373,123	22,517,647	7,196,306	75.78
Colorado	4,860,301	708,922	2,511,791	3,057,432	45.1
Connecticut	5,000,000	510,276	5,382,213	128,063	97.68
Delaware	5,000,000	426,971	4,500,404	926,567	82.93
District of Columbia	5,000,000	592,331	3,531,113	2,061,218	63.14
Florida	14,447,580	1,380,422	12,981,812	2,846,190	82.02
Georgia	7,816,328	685,077	7,378,212	1,123,193	86.79
Guam ^b	1,000,000	0	827,234	172,766	82.72
Hawaii	5,000,000	1,201,229	1,815,417	4,385,812	29.28

³ GSA awarded the funds on behalf of EAC as EAC was under development.

⁴ HAVA Section 906 lists the following laws: The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973 et seq.), The Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ee et seq.), The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff et seq.), The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg et seq.), The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.).

Table 2.1 cont. HAVA Title I, Section 101 Funds as of December 31, 2008

State	Total Section 101 Funds Received	Interest Earned	Total Expenditures ^a	Balance of Funds and Interest	Percent of Funds and Interest Expended
Idaho	5,000,000	1,265,725	2,014,294	4,251,431	32.15
Illinois	11,129,030	1,084,308	10,410,863	1,802,475	85.24
Indiana	6,230,481	918,236	3,734,865	3,413,852	52.25
Iowa	5,000,000	661,085	5,342,310	318,775	94.37
Kansas	5,000,000	1,164,164	1,607,417	4,556,747	26.08
Kentucky	4,699,196	885,887	376,210	5,208,873	6.74
Louisiana	4,911,421	817,093	1,762,796	3,965,718	30.77
Maine	5,000,000	547,366	3,237,251	2,310,115	58.36
Maryland	5,636,731	693,263	2,646,214	3,683,780	41.8
Massachusetts	6,590,381	557,441	3,283,792	3,864,030	45.94
Michigan	9,207,323	1,364,287	2,194,720	8,376,890	20.76
Minnesota	5,313,786	62,945	5,376,731	0	100
Mississippi	3,673,384	393,427	3,136,267	930,544	77.12
Missouri	5,875,170	790,597	3,083,880	3,581,887	46.26
Montana	5,000,000	446,054	3,459,181	1,986,873	63.52
Nebraska	5,000,000	911,464	2,895,876	3,015,588	48.99
Nevada	5,000,000	405,163	3,786,630	1,618,533	70.06
New Hampshire	5,000,000	899,686	1,387,707	4,511,979	23.52
New Jersey	8,141,208	698,815	8,153,900	686,123	92.24
New Mexico	5,000,000	292,244	5,292,244	0	100
New York	16,494,325	2,787,762	9,076,159	10,205,928	47.07
North Carolina	7,887,740	623,777	6,847,059	1,664,458	80.44
North Dakota	5,000,000	63,997	5,063,997	0	100
Ohio	10,384,931	426,837	10,811,768	0	100
Oklahoma	5,000,000	86,853	1,501,407	3,585,446	29.52
Oregon	4,203,776	59,199	4,262,975	0	100
Pennsylvania	11,323,168	1,309,181	11,795,199	837,150	93.37
Puerto Rico	3,151,144	317,093	1,562,478	1,905,759	45.05
Rhode Island	5,000,000	140,275	5,140,275	0	100
South Carolina	4,652,412	619,122	3,769,519	1,502,015	71.50%
South Dakota	5,000,000	868,676	1,154,330	4,714,346	19.67
Tennessee	6,004,507	882,871	1,609,343	5,278,035	23.37
Texas	17,206,595	2,708,352	10,519,647	9,395,300	52.82
Utah	3,090,943	540,816	2,522,461	1,109,298	69.46
Vermont	5,000,000	569,433	4,565,803	1,003,630	81.98
Virginia	7,105,890	1,084,655	2,721,451	5,469,094	33.23
Virgin Islands	1,000,000	21,535	1,004,018	17,517	98.29
Washington	6,098,449	259,047	6,357,496	0	100
West Virginia	2,977,057	102,558	2,731,457	348,158	88.69
Wisconsin	5,694,036	633,888	2,003,588	4,324,336	31.66
Wyoming	5,000,000	1,081,783	2,972,597	3,109,186	48.88
Total	<u>\$349,182,262</u>	<u>\$39,835,643</u>	<u>\$245,602,226</u>	<u>\$143,415,679</u>	63.13

^a Includes cash disbursements and unliquidated obligations.

^b Guam did not file a report for Section 101 for 2008; data is from FY 2006.

SECTION 102 Funds

Background

GSA distributed \$300,317,737 in Section 102 funds to 30 States in FY 2003 using a HAVA formula based on the number of precincts within an eligible State that used punch card or lever voting systems during the November 2000 Federal general election. To qualify for a Section 102 payment, States certified that they would:

- Use the payment either directly or as a reimbursement for the costs of replacing punch card or lever voting systems by the required deadline.
- Obtain replacement voting systems that would meet the requirements of HAVA Section 301.
- Comply with applicable Federal laws.

The deadline for States to have replaced their punch card and lever voting systems was originally November 2, 2004, unless a State filed for a waiver under HAVA Section 102(a)(3)(B). States with unobligated funds after the deadline are required by HAVA to return the balance of funds to the EAC, which will redistribute the funds to all States in the form of Section 251 requirements payments. The amount of the funds to be returned is the greater of either:

- The amount of unobligated funds, or
- The amount percentage of noncompliant precincts multiplied by the total amount of Section 102 payments provided to the State.

States that applied for a waiver had until the first Federal election in the State in 2006 to replace the voting systems. On May 25, 2007, Congress extended this deadline to the first Federal election held in the State after March 1, 2008.⁵ The extension applied only to those States that received the initial 2004 waiver. Congress again extended the deadline in 2009 to the first Federal election held after November 1, 2010.⁶

Table 3.1 shows the status of Section 102 funds as of December 31, 2008.

Expenditures

States have spent \$254,088,558 (Table 3.2) of the \$300,317,737 of Section 102 funds received including interest earned on the deposited funds. As of December 31, 2008, 24 of the 30 States expended more than 90% of funds including interest earned and 15 States expended the full amount.

⁵ The extension is contained in the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act of 2007, Public Law 110-28.

⁶ The extension is contained in the Omnibus Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2009, Public Law 111-8.

Table 3.1 Section 102 Funds Status as of December 31, 2008

State	Date of Waiver	102 Deadline	Unexpended Funds
Alabama	None Filed	November 2, 2004	\$50,157
Illinois	July 8, 2003	November 4, 2010	136,049
Kentucky	December 5, 2003	November 4, 2010	27
Massachusetts	December 23, 2003	November 4, 2010	73,421
Michigan	December 30, 2003	November 4, 2010	188,343
New York	December 23, 2003	November 4, 2010	49,603,917
Oregon	None Filed	November 2, 2004	111,352
South Carolina	None Filed	November 2, 2004	169,188
Texas	December 23, 2003	November 4, 2010	2,836
Washington	December 12, 2003	November 4, 2010	485,549
Wisconsin	December 23, 2003	November 4, 2010	302,096
Total			\$51,122,935

Table 3.2 Section 102 Funds as of December 31, 2008

State	Total Section 102 Funds Received	Interest Earned	Total Expenditures ^a	Balance of Funds and Interest	Percent of Funds and Interest Expended
Alabama	\$51,076	\$3,582	\$919	\$53,739	1.68
Arizona	1,564,188	0	1,564,188	0	100
Arkansas	2,569,738	184,915	2,754,653	0	100.
California	57,322,707	1,133,995	57,322,707	1,133,995	98.06
Colorado	2,177,095	146,757	2,323,852	0	100
Florida	11,581,377	39,385	11,581,377	39,385	99.66
Georgia	4,740,448	0	4,740,448	0	100
Illinois	33,805,617	1,230,026	33,669,568	1,366,075	96.10
Indiana	9,522,394	142,040	9,664,434	0	100
Kentucky	469,256	19,028	469,229	19,055	96.10
Louisiana	7,351,684	193,790	7,545,474	0	100
Maryland	1,637,609	51,353	1,637,609	51,353	96.96
Massachusetts	1,519,497	11,803	1,446,076	85,224	94.43
Michigan	6,531,284	405,703	6,432,323	594,046	91.44
Mississippi	1,778,067	105,925	1,883,992	0	100
Missouri	11,472,841	646,780	12,119,621	0	100
New Jersey	8,695,609	283,762	8,979,371	0	100
New York	49,603,917	9,067,860	0	58,671,777	0
North Carolina	893,822	0	893,822	0	100
Ohio	30,667,664	1,186,901	31,854,565	0	100
Oregon	1,822,758	43,763	1,711,406	155,115	91.69
Pennsylvania	22,916,952	4,901,423	23,926,816	3,891,559	86.01
South Carolina	2,167,518	108,060	1,998,330	277,248	87.82
Tennessee	2,473,971	134,659	2,608,630	0	100
Texas	6,269,521	295,410	6,266,685	298,246	95.46
Utah	5,726,844	536,464	6,263,308	0	100
Virginia	4,526,569	210,768	4,737,337	0	100
Washington	6,799,430	511,810	6,313,881	997,359	86.36
West Virginia	2,349,474	111,131	2,460,605	0	100
Wisconsin	<u>1,308,810</u>	<u>144,024</u>	<u>1,006,714</u>	<u>446,120</u>	<u>69.29</u>
Total	<u>\$300,317,737</u>	<u>\$21,851,117</u>	<u>\$254,088,558</u>	<u>\$68,080,296</u>	<u>78.87</u>

^aIncludes cash disbursements and unliquidated obligations.

SECTION 251 Funds

Background

To qualify for a HAVA Title II, Section 251 requirements payment, States filed a certification with the EAC affirming that the State:

- Filed and implemented a plan for uniform, nondiscriminatory administrative complaint procedures required by HAVA Section 402;
- Appropriated matching funds equal to “5 percent of the total amount to be spent for such activities (taking into account the requirements payment and the amount spent by the State)...”;
- To the extent that any portion of the requirements payment is used for activities other than meeting the requirements of Title II, provided that the proposed uses are not inconsistent with the requirements of HAVA Title III and are consistent with the usage restrictions set forth in HAVA Section 251(b);
- Is in compliance with the laws listed in Section 906 of HAVA, as related to HAVA; and
- Filed a State plan that complies with the requirements listed in Sections 254, 255, and 256 of HAVA.

EAC disbursed a total \$2.3 billion in requirements payments in FYs 2003 (\$830 million), and 2004 (\$1,489 million). Congress appropriated \$115 million in FYs 2008 and \$100 million in 2009. As of October 1, 2009, EAC distributed approximately \$78 million of the FYs 2008 and 2009 requirements payments.

HAVA requires States to deposit Section 251 funds in the States’ election fund and earn interest consistent with the provisions of HAVA Section 254(b). Section 251 funds and interest earned on deposits of Section 251 funds have no fiscal year limitation.

Expenditure of Section 251 Funds

States spent \$1,770,722,528 or about 76% of Section 251 funds appropriated by Congress (\$2,319,360,617) and interest earned (\$217,467,497). Twelve States have spent 90% or more, while 25 States spent more than 75% of their funds and interest. On the other hand, 13 States have spent less than 50% of their funds and interest.

State	Total Section 251 Funds Received(\$) ^a	Interest Earned	Total Expenditures ^a	Balance Of Funds and Interest	Percent of Funds and Interest Expended
Alabama	\$35,866,513	\$2,260,382	\$26,785,313	\$11,341,582	70.25
Alaska	11,596,803	1,581,881	6,829,221	6,349,463	51.82
American Samoa	2,319,361	133,973	1,643,416	809,918	66.99
Arizona	40,584,515	4,857,270	24,392,214	21,049,571	53.68
Arkansas	21,598,570	1,888,869	18,968,929	4,518,510	80.76
California	264,237,124	33,002,325	197,446,357	99,793,092	66.43
Colorado	34,545,365	4,337,216	33,724,080	5,158,501	86.73
Connecticut	27,719,501	3,351,016	19,097,193	11,973,324	61.46

Table 4.1 Cont.

HAVA Title II, Section 251 Funds

State	Total Section 251 Funds Received(\$) ^a	Interest Earned	Total Expenditures ^a	Balance Of Funds and Interest	Percent of Funds and Interest Expended
Delaware	11,596,803	817,986	5,603,999	6,810,790	45.14
District of Columbia	11,596,803	1,356,564	4,979,978	7,973,389	38.45
Florida	132,502,091	15,230,008	93,291,172	54,440,927	63.15
Georgia	64,748,170	696,778	64,961,519	483,429	99.26
Guam ^b	2,319,361	0	1,652,099	667,262	71.23
Hawaii	11,596,803	820,675	8,753,279	3,664,199	70.49
Idaho	11,596,803	899,265	12,484,297	11,771	99.91
Illinois	98,595,252	7,271,927	89,451,036	16,416,143	84.49
Indiana	48,544,987	2,127,175	50,318,460	353,702	99.30
Iowa	23,739,383	1,339,361	25,033,616	45,128	99.82
Kansas	21,409,789	1,976,843	19,369,228	4,017,404	82.82
Kentucky	32,899,292	3,083,286	22,182,252	13,800,326	61.65
Louisiana	35,067,672	3,399,269	34,498,557	3,968,384	89.68
Maine	11,596,803	1,437,130	7,766,150	5,267,783	59.58
Maryland	42,478,430	3,362,223	32,960,662	12,879,991	71.90
Massachusetts	52,222,225	3,707,231	10,257,040	45,672,416	18.34
Michigan	78,960,474	6,371,291	59,637,152	25,694,613	69.89
Minnesota	39,178,788	4,642,050	36,301,371	7,519,467	82.84
Mississippi	22,418,203	1,071,010	20,163,416	3,325,797	85.84
Missouri	44,914,650	3,698,128	41,613,242	6,999,536	85.60
Montana	11,596,803	602,461	11,295,094	904,170	92.59
Nebraska	13,749,549	629,726	14,155,595	223,680	98.44
Nevada	16,166,810	1,054,922	12,644,293	4,577,439	73.42
New Hampshire	11,596,803	1,714,936	4,075,465	9,236,274	30.62
New Jersey	68,067,586	5,501,660	53,522,329	20,046,917	72.75
New Mexico ^c	14,279,790	902,473	15,123,547	58,716	99.61
New York	153,414,430	22,744,148	60,713,108	115,445,470	34.47
North Carolina	65,477,808	6,099,413	58,616,996	12,960,225	81.89
North Dakota	11,596,803	1,152,269	5,215,421	7,533,651	40.91
Ohio	90,992,517	6,174,851	93,743,145	3,424,223	96.48
Oklahoma	27,659,637	348,163	3,446,283	24,561,517	12.30
Oregon	27,837,407	3,041,940	13,863,641	17,015,706	44.90
Pennsylvania	100,578,829	15,278,254	96,921,297	18,935,786	83.66
Puerto Rico	2,319,361	176,159	527,369	1,968,151	21.13
Rhode Island	11,596,803	483,942	12,080,745	0	100.00
South Carolina	32,421,280	623,579	32,421,280	623,579	98.11
South Dakota	11,596,803	985,430	5,574,409	7,007,824	44.30
Tennessee	46,236,130	5,572,841	21,769,684	30,039,287	42.02
Texas	160,691,949	10,779,735	135,236,716	36,234,968	78.87
Utah	16,467,182	623,198	17,090,380	0	100.00
Vermont	11,596,803	2,011,107	0.00	13,607,910	0.00
Virginia	57,489,361	5,199,726	35,047,607	27,641,480	55.91
Virgin Islands	2,319,361	103,737	707,897	1,715,201	29.21
Washington	47,195,971	4,805,038	33,337,308	18,663,701	64.11
West Virginia	15,303,569	1,121,238	14,474,244	1,950,563	88.12
Wisconsin	43,063,935	4,191,432	36,532,637	10,722,730	77.31

Table 4.1 Cont.		HAVA Title II, Section 251 Funds			
<u>State</u>	<u>Total Section 251 Funds Received(\$)^a</u>	<u>Interest Earned</u>	<u>Total Expenditures^a</u>	<u>Balance Of Funds and Interest</u>	<u>Percent of Funds and Interest Expended</u>
Wyoming	11,596,803	823,987	12,420,790	0	100
Total	<u>\$2,319,360,617</u>	<u>\$217,467,497</u>	<u>\$1,770,722,528</u>	<u>\$766,105,586</u>	69.80

^aIncludes cash disbursements and unliquidated obligations. Also States earned interest on Section 251 funds deposited in their State Election Fund, which is why some States spent more than they received.

^bGuam did not file a report for Section 251 for FY 2008. Reported data is from the last report filed, which reported Section 101 and Section 251 in a joint report covering FY 2006. Guam has not reported any interest.

^cNew Mexico did not file a report for Section 251 for FY 2008. The data provided is from its FY 2007 report.

ELECTION DATA COLLECTION GRANTS

Background

The Omnibus Appropriations Act for FY 2008 (Public Law 110-161) instructed EAC to make competitive grants of \$2 million to each of five eligible States to improve the collection of precinct-level data relating to the November 2008 Federal elections. Funds were provided to:

1. Develop and document a series of administrative and procedural best practices in election data collection that can be replicated by other States;
2. Improve data collection processes;
3. Enhance the capacity of States and their jurisdictions to collect accurate and complete election data; and
4. Document and describe particular administrative and management data collection practices, as well as particular data collection policies and procedures.

EAC published a [report](#) in June 2009 on the impact of the grant program, which included recommendations on how to improve the collection of data relating to regularly scheduled general elections for Federal offices. The report also include EAC's recommendations for related changes in Federal law or regulations and an estimate of the amount of funding necessary to carry out such changes.

Awards and Expenditures

EAC received proposals from 10 States, and awarded grants to five States. The grants were awarded on May 28, 2008. Table 5.1 lists the grantees, the amounts awarded and the amounts expended as of October 26, 2009.

Grantee	Amount	
	Awarded	Expended*
Illinois	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
Minnesota	2,000,000	1,913,453
Ohio	2,000,000	1,973,308
Pennsylvania	2,000,000	603,740
Wisconsin	2,000,000	1,548,767
Total	\$10,000,000	\$8,039,270

*Includes unliquidated obligations

COLLEGE POLL WORKER GRANTS

Background

Section 501 of HAVA created the College Poll Worker Grant Program to encourage students enrolled at institutions of higher education to assist State and local governments in the administration of elections by serving as nonpartisan poll workers or assistants. Congress appropriated \$750,000 for this program in FY 2008. This amount represents a significant increase over \$300,000 appropriated in FY 2006.

Awards and Expenditures

In FY 2008, EAC received 36 grant applications requesting \$1,008,154. EAC awarded 27 grants with an average grant award amount of \$27,778. Table 6.1 lists the grantees, the amounts awarded, and the amounts expended as of September 30, 2009.

Name	Location	Amounts	
		Awarded	Expended
American University	Washington, DC	\$32,167	\$29,286
Auburn University	Alabama	25,750	25,239
Citizens Union	New York	29,114	29,114
Golden Key International Honor Society	Georgia	32,167	32,167
Greensboro College	North Carolina	32,167	18,309
Henry Ford Community College	Michigan	32,167	32,167
Loyola University	Illinois	30,322	30,322
McDaniel College	Maryland	32,038	32,038
Middlesex Community College	Connecticut	18,852	18,852
Muhlenberg College	Pennsylvania	10,409	8,695
NY Public Interest Research Group Fund	New York	32,167	32,167
Northampton County Area Community College	Pennsylvania	30,704	23,972
Northern Kentucky University Research Foundation	Kentucky	22,577	5,630
Onondaga Community College	New York	16,785	11,627
Rural Ethnic Institute	South Dakota	32,167	23,764
Southern Connecticut State University	Connecticut	28,160	20,910
St. Louis Community College	Missouri	21,035	14,309
Suffolk University	New York	31,849	20,939
Texans Together Education Fund	Texas	32,167	28,830
The University of Texas at El Paso	Texas	20,000	18,951
University of Baltimore	Maryland	32,103	32,103
University of Missouri	Missouri	25,705	25,651
Vassar College	New York	31,785	31,785
Virginia 21	Virginia	32,103	11,574
Washtenaw Community College	Michigan	30,767	10,396
Winona State University	Minnesota	29,495	29,424
Youngstown State University	Ohio	25,278	22,335
Total		\$750,000	\$620,547

College Poll Worker program Results

The program diversified the poll worker population by producing college students who were better armed with the necessary skills to confront new voting technology and the challenges it presents at the polling place. Colleges reported that the participating students were enthusiastic about the program and their individual contributions. Local election officials also expressed great appreciation for the expansion of their poll worker pool. Most college program directors and many of the election officials with whom they worked indicated a willingness to continue this program into the future.

Grantees reported that approximately 2,800 students served as poll workers. From using the internet, to placing flyers on campus bulletin boards, methods for identifying poll workers were varied. Examples include:

- Websites were created to inform students about the program and allow students to submit their contact information.
- MySpace and Facebook, two of the most popular social-networking websites, were used to create entire pages promoting the program.
- *YouTube*, a video sharing website, was used to post the awarding of certificates to attract future student poll workers.
- Emails about the program were sent to campus student organizations.
- Local television and radio advertisements were used to allow program directors and students to reach a broader audience.

Local election officials ran the majority of the training sessions off campus. The length of training averaged 2-3 hours. Students attended an average of two training sessions each. Student poll workers set up the polling places, greeted voters, checked off names on the registry (the most common activity), checked voters' identification, staffed the information booths, demonstrated how to use the machines, answered voters' questions, served as election observers, assisted with crowd control, helped voters to fill out their ballots, acted as translators, assisted disabled voters with curbside voting, secured the machines at the end of the day, counted the votes, and transmitted the results.

A few challenges with placing the students into the poll worker program were encountered, including:

- Many jurisdictions required all poll workers to be registered to vote in that jurisdiction while students were registered in different jurisdictions.
- The supply of college poll workers exceeded the demand for poll workers. Many students who were already recruited and trained were disappointed to discover that they were not needed on Election Day.
- Lack of transportation coordination on Election Day resulted in difficulties getting students to the polls.

MOCK ELECTION GRANTS

Background

Section 295 of HAVA authorized EAC to award a non-competitive grant to the National Student and Parent Mock Election (NSPME) in FYs 2004 and 2006 to conduct simulated national elections for students and parents from each of the 50 States in the United States, its territories, the District of Columbia, and United States schools overseas.

For FY 2008, Congress appropriated \$200,000 for a competitive grant program to promote voter participation in national elections through voter education activities for students and their parents, building community involvement in and awareness of the elections process, and to encourage continued civic engagement and participation by the youth population.

Awards and Expenditures

The EAC awarded grants to 12 organizations. The average grant award was \$16,667. Table 7.1 lists the grantees, the amounts awarded and the amounts expended as of September 30, 2009.

Grantees		Amounts	
Name	Location	Awarded	Spent
Bernalillo County Clerk's Office	New Mexico	\$20,091	\$14,011
League of Women Voters of Illinois Election Fund	Illinois	21,307	21,306
League of Women Voters of Oregon Education Fund	Oregon	16,477	13,260
League of Women Voters of Trumbull County	Ohio	15,835	15,835
Montana Secretary of State	Montana	20,109	4,261
National Student/Parent Mock Election	Arizona	24,366	24,366
Office of the Secretary of State, Kentucky	Kentucky	20,072	15,520
Office of the Secretary of State, Texas	Texas	20,104	18,556
Townsend Harris High School	New York	21,441	19,600
United States Hispanic Leadership Institute	Illinois	20,198	20,198
TOTAL		\$200,000	\$166,913

Results

Ensuring high levels of student enrollment in the Mock Election Program was critical to the program's success. At the start, grantees estimated that over 5 million students would participate in the program. When final numbers came in, the participation level at the schools was higher than expected, with a total of 6,317,988 students taking part. These numbers demonstrate that mock elections are a very effective method of educating and exciting students, along with their friends and family, about the importance of voting.

In each of the programs, the students found the experience to be worthwhile, educational, and fun. What the students valued most was that programs focused on much more than voting for a candidate. Students were provided with a "behind-the-scenes" look at the elections process, as well as a thorough educational lesson into the many different aspects of elections. From setting up a polling place, to registering to vote, to casting an informed ballot, students received an invaluable lesson in elections.

Characteristics of a successful Mock Election Program included:

- Coordinating with local election officials and program staff to set ground rules, assign roles, and lay out the blueprint for program leaders.
- Developing a publicity plan to specify the modes of communication such as: site visits to schools; attendance at public events; and advertising on websites as well as through direct mail and email.
- Preparing informative, educational, and engaging election materials.
- Assisting teachers in conducting mock elections and using voting machines.
- Using school forums, cable call-in shows, speeches, debates, quiz team competitions, mock press conferences, and speech writing to involve and inform students.

The programs found it beneficial to involve students and teachers through the use of program websites. The websites were able to provide: (1) curriculum materials to students; (2) a means for uploading election results; and (3) opportunities for students to post pictures, videos, and blogs.

To ensure that students received realistic voting experiences, many of the programs used actual voting machines acquired through the assistance of the States' chief election official and local election officials. Several of the local election officials who provided the voting machines also trained the students as poll workers, and taught them how to set-up, operate, and end an election.

EAC Administration of HAVA FUNDS

MONITORING OF HAVA FUNDS

To support States in the efficient and correct use of HAVA funds, the EAC:

- Issues guidance and conducts training on the administration and use of HAVA funds;
- Tracks the submission of and reviews the content of financial and performance reports submitted by recipients;
- Provides feedback to recipients on issues identified in report reviews;
- Conducts site visits to follow up on potential problem areas; and
- Reviews audit reports and resolves findings applicable to EAC programs.

Streamlining/Reform Efforts

In 2009, EAC changed several internal processes for administering new Section 251 grants of requirements payments and for reporting the expenditure and use of HAVA funds. To help disburse 2008 and 2009 requirements payments more timely and efficiently, EAC:

- Allowed States to request both 2008 and 2009 requirements payments at the same time;
- Advised States to determine whether their State plans reflected how the new requirements payments will be used and managed, and the amount of requirements payments to be requested based on available matching funds; and
- Instituted a new Notice of Grant Award (Appendix 1) which identifies the: (1) grant amount; (2) matching share; (3) grant period; (4) administrative and reporting requirements; and (5) information needed by EAC before it will disburse the grant funds (Federal assurances, certifications, and banking information).

Reporting

The EAC changed the State reporting requirements on HAVA funds for cycles beginning in fiscal year 2009 to comply with the new Office of Management and Budget (OMB) mandates and to simplify the reporting process. OMB consolidated and replaced the existing financial reporting forms (including SF-269) with one form. The new form is called the SF-425 (Appendix 2), Federal Financial Report (FFR). EAC made the reporting periods consistent for Section 101, 102, and 251 grants. Reports are now due by December 31 for the periods beginning October 1 and ending September 30 of each Federal Fiscal year