

**Supporting Statement B:**  
**OMB Control Number: 3265-0006**  
**U.S. Election Assistance Commission**  
**2014 Election Administration and Voting Survey**

**B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS**

**1. Describe (including a numerical estimate) the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection method to be used. Data on the number of entities (e.g. establishments, State and local governmental units, households, or persons) in the universe and the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form. Indicate expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection had been conducted previously, include the actual response rate achieved during the last collection.**

This information collection does not use sampling. The respondent universe consists of 55 entities for the 2014 Election Administration and Voting Survey: the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the four U.S. territories. The EAC seeks and expects all of the identified respondents to provide responses to the collection as a whole. In 2008, EAC received responses from all 55 State and territory respondents. In 2010, EAC received responses from 53 States and territories (Puerto Rico did not hold federal elections and the U.S. Virgin Islands submitted its data after the deadline). In 2012, EAC received responses from 54 States and territories. It is important to note that some of the respondents are exempt from the NVRA and as such are not required to provide certain data (though most of them did in 2012). In addition, since the manner in which elections are administered vary by jurisdiction, there are some questions that may not apply to all respondents.

**2. Describe the procedures for the collection, including: the statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection; the estimation procedure; the degree of accuracy needed for the purpose described in the justification; any unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures; and any use of periodic (less frequent than annual) data collection cycles to reduce burden.**

Not applicable to this collection.

**3. Describe the methods used to maximize response rates and to deal with non-response. The accuracy and reliability of the information collected must be shown to be adequate for the intended uses.**

The EAC has worked closely with State respondents to clarify survey questions and terms, and encourage full participation. Since 2005, EAC has actively solicited State and local election officials' feedback regarding any challenges they may have faced with the survey, including their experiences with data collection and submission. In addition to election officials, EAC also consults with social science and elections researchers, voter interest groups, and other stakeholders to discuss ways to improve the new information collection based on their expertise. Additionally, EAC presents each new information collection to its Advisory and Standards Boards, which are composed of 110 state and local election officials,

with another 37 drawn from various national associations and government agencies that play a role in the implementation of the Help America Vote Act, and science and technology-related professionals appointed by Congressional members. Since 2006 the information collection has also been presented to members of professional associations such as the National Association of Secretaries of States (NASS) and the National Association of State Election Directors (NASSED) during their annual meetings and their feedback is encouraged.

For both the 2008 and 2010 information collections, these same series of discussions occurred with these stakeholders. In January 2008, the EAC held conference calls with the states to discuss issues related to the 2006 survey to solicit feedback on the format for the 2008 survey. That is how we determined that it would be best to split the information collection into two parts:– the Statutory Overview (qualitative) and the Election Administration and Voting Survey (quantitative). That format worked well in 2008, which is why EAC maintained that same format for 2010 and 2012. EAC also sought public comment on the survey and incorporated many of the more feasible suggestions regarding specific questions. For 2014, EAC seeks approval for a survey with additional questions taken from the FVAP Survey of Local Election Officials and added to Section B of the Election Administration and Voting Survey. In other respects, the 2014 survey will mirror the 2012

During the data collection process, EAC carefully reviews the information submitted by State respondents to ensure completeness and accuracy of their submissions. In 2010, EAC implemented an automated error checking function for the data collection template (along with manual review), which greatly aided in the submission of more quality data. We used same approach for 2012. Additionally, we also developed approximately 140 error checks that were applied to the data after initial submission by the States. We will continue to use and expand this error checking for 2014. Respondents will be contacted by phone and e-mail to request information regarding missing and/or erroneous data during the data review phase of the project. Moreover, in an effort to increase response rates, each State and territory will be assigned to a team leader based on shared characteristics of their election databases, just as they were in 2008, 2010 and 2012. This team leader will be responsible for communicating with the State point of contact, supplying supporting materials, answering questions, and tracking responses. Team leaders will monitor the progress of their assigned States, assisted by the contractor's database management team. Email reminders will be sent and telephone calls placed on an as-needed basis as the data collection progresses. We anticipate all communication will be via email and telephone. We do not plan to use any interviewer scripts.

The combination of improved questionnaires and data collection/submission templates, and additional error checking after initial submission, as well as enhanced technical assistance to the States is what led to better response rates in 2008 and even better response rates in 2010 and 2012. For example, in 2008, 4,527 local jurisdictions were included in the survey; in 2010, that number increased to 4,678 jurisdictions; in 2012, the number increased to over 8,400. We believe the aforementioned enhancements (along with States' increased familiarity with the survey) will lead to similar, if not better, response rates in 2014.

**4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken. Tests are encouraged as effective means to refine collections, but if ten or more test respondents are involved OMB must give prior approval.**

Not applicable to this collection.

**5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on the statistical aspects of the design, and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.**

The EAC staff members responsible for conducting this information collection are:

Karen Lynn-Dyson  
Director, Research, Policy and Programs Division  
1335 East West Highway  
Suite 4300  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
(301) 563-3919

Table 7. Selected Response Rates on UOCAVA Questions, Last Two Elections

UOCAVA Question	2012 Election Including Wisconsin		2012 Election (Excluding WI)	2010 Election (Excluding WI)	Change in Percentage Points (Excluding WI Jurisdictions)
	Jurisdictions Responding (out of 8,154)	Response Rate (%)	Response Rate (% out of 4,613)	Response Rate (% out of 4,606)	
Overseas citizen ballots transmitted	7,810	95.8	92.5	86.4	6.1
Overseas citizen ballots cast	7,747	95.0	91.2	88.3	2.9
Overseas citizen ballots counted	7,701	94.4	90.2	84.1	6.1
Uniformed services ballots transmitted	7,831	96.0	93.0	87.6	5.4
Uniformed services ballots cast	7,780	95.4	91.9	90.6	1.3
Uniformed services ballots counted	7,742	94.9	91.1	89.3	1.8
Overseas citizen FWABs cast	3,350	41.1	72.6	62.2	10.4
Uniformed services FWABs cast	3,432	42.1	74.4	63.7	10.7

Table taken from page 4 of the 2012 UOCAVA report; full document available at [eac.gov](http://eac.gov)

## APPENDIX A Response Rates

Summarized below are the response rates for selected questions in the 2012 Election Administration and Voting Survey, with comparisons to 2008 and 2010 response rates where available.<sup>20</sup> Coverage varies significantly across the questions. Not all questions were applicable to all States.

Comparing Response Rates from 2012, 2010, and 2008 (excluding Wisconsin)				
Survey question	Responding Jurisdictions in 2012	2012	2010	2008
Domestic absentee ballots transmitted	4,520	98.0%	97.2%	95.1%
Domestic absentee ballots cast/counted	4,456	96.6%	91.2%	94.7%
Domestic absentee ballots rejected	4,333	93.9%	94.7%	91.6%
Number of poll workers	4,143	89.8%	75.4%	71.7%
Number of precincts	4,573	99.1%	99.1%	97.9%
Number of polling places	4,301	93.2%	86.5%	95.9%
Provisional ballots submitted	4,111	89.1%	94.6%	82.8%
Provisional ballots rejected	3,471	75.2%	77.6%	70.9%
Number of Jurisdictions Surveyed:		4,613	4,606	4,445

Table from Appendix A of the 2012 EAVS Report; full document available at eac.gov