

U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Strengthening the Electoral System One Grant at a Time:
A Retrospective of Grants Awarded by EAC
April 2003 – December 2010



CUMULATIVE EXPENDITURES

Coverage Dates:

Help America Vote Act
Section 101 and 102 Funds
April 2003 – September
2010

Help America Vote Act
Section 251 Funds
June 2004 – September
2010

ELECTION DATA COLLECTION GRANTS

COLLEGE POLL WORKER GRANTS

MOCK ELECTION GRANTS



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report Overview.....	3
Section 101 Funds.....	8
Section 102 Funds.....	11
Section 251 Funds.....	14
Election Data Collection Grants.....	17
Help America Vote College Program - College Poll Worker Grants	19
Mock Election Grants	23
EAC Administration of HAVA Funds.....	26

Report Overview

Since the passage of the Help America Vote Act in 2002 (HAVA), Congress has appropriated almost \$3.3 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) facilitate the training and education of 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.

This report presents financial and programmatic information on the six grant programs currently administered by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC):

- Section 101 Payments to States for Activities to Improve Administration of Elections
- Section 102 Payments to States for Election Administration Improvements and Replacement of Punch Card and Lever Voting Machines
- Section 251 Requirements Payments
- Election Data Collection Grants
- College Poll Worker Grants
- Mock Election Grants

Section 101, 102, and 251 funds are non-discretionary and awarded to States based on a predetermined formula. The three discretionary grant programs - Election Data Collection, College Poll Workers, and Mock Elections are awarded through a competitive process.

Through September 30, 2010, EAC and the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA), acting on EAC's behalf, have awarded \$3,253,860,616 to the 50 States, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands (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 \$308.1 million as of September 30, 2010, making the aggregate available to States for allowable activities \$3.6 billion.

For the periods covered by this report, States have reported aggregate total expenditures of \$2.6 billion, or approximately 83 percent of total Federal funds disbursed (76 percent including accrued interest). EAC obligates the funds in the year appropriated. States spend the funds and report on all distribution of funds using the SF 425 Federal Financial Report (FFR). States annually report Federal cash receipts and disbursements, the Federal share of expenditures, the Federal share of unliquidated obligations, the total Federal share and the unobligated balance of Federal funds and interest.

TERM	DEFINITION
Cash Receipts	Cumulative amount of actual cash received from EAC not including interest income earned on the Federal share of funds
Cash Disbursements	Cumulative amount of Federal fund disbursements, such as cash or checks, not including any expenditure of interest earned on the Federal share
Expenditures	Federal funds expended to date not including the expenditure of interest income
Unliquidated Obligations	Direct and indirect expenses incurred but not yet paid or charged to the grant including amounts due to subrecipients or contractors
Federal Share	The sum of the Federal share of expenditures and the Federal share of unliquidated obligations
Unobligated Balance	The difference between total Federal funds authorized to the grant recipient and the total Federal share

A State-by-State breakdown of funds reported as 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.

- 1. Section 101 Funds.** Section 101 funds were provided to States for activities to improve the administration of Federal elections. A total of \$349.2 million has been disbursed or distributed to States for their use under Section 101. States report having spent approximately 78 percent of Section 101 funds, with 18 States having spent 100 percent, and 33 States reporting having spent over 80 percent of the Federal funds available. Section 101 funds improve administration of Federal elections and have fewer restrictions on their use as compared to Section 102 and Section 251 funds. For instance, Section 101 funds can be used for the administration of Federal elections without meeting the requirements of Title III or filing a State Plan. Section 101 funds have been used for voter education, developing the State Plan and training.
- 2. Section 102 Funds.** Section 102 funds were authorized for the replacement of punch card or lever voting machines. A total of \$300.3 million has been distributed and deposited in State accounts under Section 102. Of the 30 States that received Section 102 funding, 28 States have reported using 92 percent or more of the funds allocated to their State. Section 102 funds were authorized and used solely for the purpose of replacing punch card and lever voting systems.
- 3. Section 251 Funds.** Section 251 funds, also known as requirements payments, are distributed to the States by formula based on a percentage equal to the quotient of the voting age population of the State and the total voting age population of all States¹. Generally, the funds are to be used to procure voting systems that comply with the requirements of Title III, Section 301 Voting System Standards of HAVA; implement provisional voting (i.e., allowing a voter whose registration status cannot be confirmed to cast a provisional ballot); provide information to voters in the polling place such as general information on voting rights; develop and implement a computerized statewide voter registration list; and implement identification requirements for first-time voters who register to vote by mail. Section 251 funds may also be used for the improvement of the administration of elections for Federal office if a State certifies to EAC that they have either (1) met the requirements of Title III or (2) will not spend more than the amount of the minimum payment applicable to the State. A total of \$2.5 billion has been disbursed to States under Section 251, with all but nine percent of these funds being distributed to States in Fiscal Years (FYs) 2004 and 2005. As of the 2010 reporting period, eight States have reported using 100 percent of the Federal amount disbursed and 22 States had reported using 85 percent or more. Almost 70 percent of the 55 States receiving Section 251 requirements payments reported using 75 percent 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, 2009 and 2010 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 date of the 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 for use of the funds, 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. HAVA requires each state to develop a State Plan to receive Section 251 funds. The State Plan details how

¹ According to a GAO decision issued to the EAC (File No. B-316915, September 25, 2008), *Requirements Payments* authorized by HAVA Sec. 251, and established by statutory formula for the various states, are obligated by operation of law and "required to be paid" within the meaning of 31 U.S.C. Sec. 1501(a)(5)(A), regardless of whether statutory preconditions on the states have been met.

payments will be used in accordance with HAVA and must be developed through a committee that includes the chief election officer of the two most populous jurisdictions, local election officials and other stakeholders. State Plans include activities that span multiple years and are updated if funds will be used for material changes within the plan. Table 4 illustrates that States have robust HAVA State plans and have spent over 74 percent of the Federal funds made available under this section of HAVA.

Some States consider the requirements payment funds to be available in perpetuity so they can continue to meet the HAVA mandates (see chart below). These States view the funds as available for long-term voting system maintenance, enhancement and replacement. Section 251 funds have been used to improve Statewide Voter Registration Systems (SVRS), purchase voting systems, and facilitate military and overseas balloting.

Finally, some States have processes that delay the expenditure of funds after they are received from EAC. States often have lengthy procurement processes that require them to request proposals for equipment purchases and to select vendors. States also have to enter into subgrant agreements with other agencies or entities for the completion of certain activities under 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 \$93.0 million of the \$215.0 million of Section 251 funds appropriated in FYs 2008 and 2009. EAC disbursed \$28.4 million during the last three quarters of FY 2010 plus an additional \$29.7 million of funds appropriated in FY 2010.

Process to Receive 251 Payments

States file a certification with EAC declaring that the State:

- ❖ Has filed and implemented a plan for uniform, nondiscriminatory administrative complaint procedures required by HAVA Section 402.
- ❖ Has 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)...”
- ❖ Has, to the extent that any portion of the requirements payment be used for activities to meet the requirements of Title III, or for uses consistent with the requirements of HAVA Title III and the usage restrictions set forth in Section 251(b) on use of funds.
- ❖ Is in compliance with six Federal laws:
 1. The Voting Rights Act of 1965.
 2. The Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act.
 3. The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act.
 4. The National Voter Registration Act of 1993.
 5. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.
 6. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973.
- ❖ Filed a State Plan that complies with the HAVA plan requirements listed in Sections 254, 255, and 256 of HAVA.

The following table shows the combined funding, interest earned, expenditures, and balance for Sections 101, 102, and 251 funds for each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories, as of September 30, 2010.

Table 1 *Combined HAVA Funds Reported by the States as of September 30, 2010*

State	Total Section 101/102/251 Funds Received	Interest Earned	Total Expenditures ^a	Balance of Funds and Interest	Percent of Funds and Interest Expended
Alabama	\$40,907,194	\$2,691,826	\$29,844,858	\$13,754,162	68.45%
Alaska	18,021,803	2,943,357	11,199,657	9,765,503	53.42%
American Samoa	3,319,361	274,148	3,319,361	274,148	92.37%
Arizona	52,532,245	6,066,089	41,687,961	16,910,373	71.14%
Arkansas	30,396,569	2,404,875	27,253,261	5,548,183	83.09%
California	348,900,661	42,924,421	287,119,823	104,705,259	73.28%
Colorado	44,752,318	5,626,694	44,636,893	5,742,119	88.60%
Connecticut	34,081,608	4,268,612	34,197,820	4,152,399	89.17%
Delaware	16,596,803	1,415,100	12,093,194	5,918,709	67.14%
District of Columbia	16,596,803	1,971,099	9,185,765	9,382,137	49.47%
Florida	165,008,621	19,475,602	133,457,596	51,026,628	72.34%
Georgia	83,231,168	1,414,325	77,514,641	7,130,852	91.58%
Guam	3,319,361	-	2,479,333	840,028	74.69%
Hawaii	17,671,803	2,049,138	11,346,769	8,374,171	57.54%
Idaho	18,021,803	2,446,598	17,067,087	3,401,314	83.38%
Illinois	155,480,687	10,005,763	143,537,289	21,949,161	86.74%
Indiana	70,193,157	3,322,746	64,489,838	9,026,065	87.72%
Iowa	31,633,492	2,124,859	30,338,448	3,419,902	89.87%
Kansas	29,022,045	3,467,490	23,503,977	8,985,557	72.34%
Kentucky	42,070,093	4,786,075	29,333,396	17,522,772	62.60%
Louisiana	49,051,620	4,638,396	48,732,546	4,957,470	90.77%
Maine	16,596,803	2,055,424	13,890,951	4,761,276	74.47%
Maryland	53,646,392	4,737,860	54,323,251	4,061,001	93.04%
Massachusetts	65,115,059	7,394,264	21,781,092	50,728,230	30.04%
Michigan	94,699,081	8,619,678	72,702,015	30,616,744	70.37%
Minnesota	49,254,669	3,587,120	43,615,166	9,226,623	82.54%
Mississippi	30,603,916	1,685,631	27,933,272	4,356,275	86.51%
Missouri	62,262,661	5,568,509	62,762,098	5,069,072	92.53%
Montana	18,021,803	991,634	16,398,732	2,614,705	86.25%
Nebraska	20,021,034	1,807,525	20,021,034	1,807,525	91.72%
Nevada	23,144,727	1,657,512	18,505,918	6,296,321	74.61%
New Hampshire	16,596,803	2,761,229	6,238,606	13,119,427	32.23%
New Jersey	84,904,403	6,585,380	77,604,939	13,884,844	84.82%
New Mexico	20,599,671	1,194,999	20,447,957	1,346,714	93.82%
New York	238,095,934	35,610,686	158,210,222	115,496,398	57.80%
North Carolina	82,203,337	7,721,857	75,841,773	14,083,421	84.34%
North Dakota	18,021,803	1,336,032	12,578,415	6,779,420	64.98%
Ohio	136,496,196	7,859,392	140,940,438	3,415,150	97.63%
Oklahoma	35,200,722	2,394,000	8,387,429	29,207,293	22.31%
Oregon	36,421,250	3,609,941	25,628,529	14,402,662	64.02%
Pennsylvania	147,009,727	21,942,547	150,839,146	18,113,128	89.28%
Puerto Rico	5,470,505	506,172	2,419,500	3,557,177	40.48%
Rhode Island	18,021,803	625,270	18,647,073	-	100.00%

State	Total Section 101/102/251 Funds Received	Interest Earned	Total Expenditures ^a	Balance of Funds and Interest	Percent of Funds and Interest Expended
South Carolina	43,185,727	1,658,502	39,657,777	5,186,452	88.43%
South Dakota	18,021,803	3,014,695	8,049,016	12,987,482	38.26%
Tennessee	54,714,608	7,214,734	26,549,303	35,380,039	42.87%
Texas	203,631,822	14,671,727	172,131,087	46,172,463	78.85%
Utah	26,804,496	1,723,926	26,497,451	2,030,971	92.88%
Vermont	16,596,803	2,909,822	5,920,919	13,585,706	30.35%
Virginia	69,121,820	7,374,132	49,511,845	26,984,107	64.72%
Virgin Islands	3,319,361	143,382	1,706,915	1,755,828	49.29%
Washington	65,825,930	6,130,114	56,894,775	15,061,269	79.07%
West Virginia	22,043,424	1,351,567	20,602,433	2,792,558	88.06%
Wisconsin	54,013,843	5,189,935	48,956,954	10,246,824	82.69%
Wyoming	17,671,803	2,135,293	17,785,995	2,021,101	89.80%
Total	<u>\$3,138,168,954</u>	<u>\$308,087,705</u>	<u>\$2,606,321,542</u>	<u>\$839,935,117</u>	75.63%

^a Includes cash disbursements and unliquidated obligations. Also States earned interest on Section 101 funds deposited in their State Election Fund, which is why some States spent more than they received.

4. **Election Data Collection Grants.** Election Data Collection Grants were competitively awarded to five eligible states to improve the collection of precinct-level data relating to the November 2008 Federal elections. These grants were \$2 million each.
5. **Help America Vote College Program – College Poll Worker Grants.** Funds for the College Poll Worker Grant Program are awarded to encourage students enrolled in institutions of higher education to assist in the administration of elections. To date, \$3,177,000 has been appropriated for this program.
6. **Mock Election Grants.** HAVA authorized EAC to award a non-competitive grant to the National Study and Parent Mock Election in FYs 2004 and 2006 to conduct simulated nation elections. Beginning in FY 2008, Congress has appropriated funds for a competitive grant program to promote voter participation in national elections. To date, \$800,000 has been appropriated for this program.

The financial data in this report is based on financial status and narrative reports received and reviewed by EAC from the States and other grantees.² For grant expenditures, EAC used the net cash disbursements and unliquidated obligations³ listed in Federal Financial Reports (Standard Form 425 or SF-425) submitted by States and other grantees to EAC.

EAC changed the State reporting requirements on HAVA funds for cycles beginning in FY 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 the Financial Status Report form) with one form. The new form is called the SF-425 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. The FFRs for College Poll Worker and Mock Grant programs are due July 31 and January 31 for the periods ending June 30 and December 31. EAC is currently reviewing the reporting cycle for these latter grants.

² 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.

³ Unliquidated obligations represent the amount of grants or contracts awarded or orders placed for which payments have not been requested or made.

SECTION 101 Funds

Background

To qualify for Title I – Payments to States for Election Administration Improvements and Replacement of Punch Card and Lever Voting Machines, Section 101 Payments to States for Activities to Improve Administration of Elections, States certified to General Services Administration (GSA)⁴ that the funds would not be used inconsistently with the provisions of HAVA Title III – Uniform and Nondiscriminatory Election Technology and Administration Requirements and the laws listed in Section 906⁵ of HAVA. Section 101 funds have similarities to Section 251 Requirements Payments, but the Section 101 funds are less restrictive. Section 101 funds may be used for more purposes without the eligibility requirements contained in Section 251. Section 101 funds do not require the development of a State Plan, a plan for the implementation of the uniform nondiscriminatory administrative complaint procedures, or the five percent State matching funds. Section 101 funds were included in the Election Reform Programs no-year appropriation. 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 \$324,750,000.

HAVA required States to deposit Section 101 funds in interest-bearing State Election Funds. Section 101 funds are available with no restriction on when they can be used by the States once obligated at the Federal level.

Expenditures

States reported expenditures of \$273,706,057, or approximately 78 percent, of the \$349,182,262 awarded for Section 101. These funds have generated a reported additional \$43,826,663 in interest, which is available for States to use on activities authorized under Section 101. As of December 31, 2010, nine States had spent all of their funds and interest, 22 other States had expended more than 75 percent, while 12 States had spent less than 50 percent of their funds and interest.

Table 2 *HAVA Title I, Section 101 Funds Reported by the States as of September 30, 2010*

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	\$352,352	\$2,951,845	\$2,390,112	59.16%
Alaska	5,000,000	675,831	4,676,604	999,227	82.40%
American Samoa	1,000,000	66,224	1,000,000	66,224	93.79%
Arizona	5,451,369	749,256	2,095,600	4,105,025	33.80%
Arkansas	3,593,165	226,287	3,819,452	-	100.00%

⁴ GSA awarded the funds on behalf of EAC as EAC was under development.

⁵ 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 *HAVA Title I, Section 101 Funds Reported by the States as of September 30, 2010*

State	Total Section 101 Funds Received	Interest Earned	Total Expenditures ^a	Balance of Funds and Interest	Percent of Funds and Interest Expended
California	27,340,830	2,535,851	23,727,535	6,149,146	79.42%
Colorado	4,860,301	815,576	2,947,337	2,728,540	51.93%
Connecticut	5,000,000	683,555	5,382,213	301,342	94.70%
Delaware	5,000,000	433,080	5,211,828	221,252	95.93%
District of Columbia	5,000,000	596,250	3,940,274	1,655,975	70.41%
Florida	14,447,580	1,520,936	12,835,020	3,133,496	80.38%
Georgia	7,816,328	687,964	7,430,258	1,074,034	87.37%
Guam	1,000,000	-	827,234	172,766	82.72%
Hawaii	5,000,000	1,149,789	1,549,001	4,600,789	25.19%
Idaho	5,000,000	1,510,650	4,334,895	2,175,755	66.58%
Illinois	11,129,030	1,135,417	10,858,990	1,405,457	88.54%
Indiana	6,230,481	925,381	5,049,384	2,106,478	70.56%
Iowa	5,000,000	678,929	5,092,743	586,186	89.68%
Kansas	5,000,000	1,277,076	1,647,896	4,629,180	26.25%
Kentucky	4,699,196	929,783	844,058	4,784,921	14.99%
Louisiana	4,911,421	913,342	1,956,244	3,868,519	33.58%
Maine	5,000,000	586,804	3,540,705	2,046,098	63.38%
Maryland	5,636,731	812,027	3,327,797	3,120,961	51.60%
Massachusetts ^b	6,590,381	767,003	3,284,488	4,072,897	44.64%
Michigan	9,207,323	1,473,433	2,194,720	8,486,036	20.55%
Minnesota	5,313,786	62,945	5,376,731	-	100.00%
Mississippi	3,673,384	397,990	3,529,042	542,332	86.68%
Missouri	5,875,170	893,379	6,665,255	103,294	98.47%
Montana	5,000,000	374,411	3,769,747	1,604,664	70.14%
Nebraska	5,000,000	1,085,758	5,000,000	1,085,758	82.16%
Nevada	5,000,000	432,451	4,267,615	1,164,836	78.56%
New Hampshire	5,000,000	931,628	1,441,170	4,490,457	24.30%
New Jersey	8,141,208	719,244	8,167,547	692,905	92.18%
New Mexico	5,000,000	292,244	5,292,244	-	100.00%
New York	16,494,325	3,031,806	12,039,621	7,486,510	61.66%
North Carolina	7,887,740	709,626	6,855,870	1,741,495	79.74%
North Dakota	5,000,000	63,997	5,063,997	-	100.00%
Ohio	10,384,931	426,837	10,811,768	-	100.00%

Table 2 *HAVA Title I, Section 101 Funds Reported by the States as of September 30, 2010*

State	Total Section 101 Funds Received	Interest Earned	Total Expenditures ^a	Balance of Funds and Interest	Percent of Funds and Interest Expended
Oklahoma	5,000,000	265,158	2,860,529	2,404,629	54.33%
Oregon	4,203,776	59,199	4,262,975	-	100.00%
Pennsylvania	11,323,168	1,298,271	12,358,852	262,587	97.92%
Puerto Rico	3,151,144	320,843	1,902,985	1,569,002	54.81%
Rhode Island	5,000,000	140,275	5,140,275	-	100.00%
South Carolina	4,652,412	683,822	4,316,813	1,019,421	80.90%
South Dakota	5,000,000	1,326,429	1,410,529	4,915,900	22.30%
Tennessee	6,004,507	977,155	1,914,846	5,066,816	27.43%
Texas	17,206,595	2,899,238	11,343,436	8,762,397	56.42%
Utah	3,090,943	554,503	2,910,649	734,797	79.84%
Vermont	5,000,000	579,926	5,255,978	323,948	94.19%
Virginia	7,105,890	1,192,593	3,244,458	5,054,025	39.10%
Virgin Islands	1,000,000	21,682	999,018	22,664	97.78%
Washington	6,098,449	259,047	6,357,496	-	100.00%
West Virginia	2,977,057	104,747	3,081,804	-	100.00%
Wisconsin ^c	5,694,036	1,065,877	2,238,737	4,521,176	33.12%
Wyoming	5,000,000	1,284,707	4,753,551	1,531,156	75.64%
Total	\$349,182,262	\$43,826,663	\$273,706,057	\$119,302,868	69.64%

^a Includes cash disbursements and unliquidated obligations. Also States earned interest on Section 101 funds deposited in their State Election Fund, which is why some States spent more than they received.
^bThe FFR report is currently under review by EAC.
^cThe FFR report is currently under review by EAC.

Results

Section 101 funds have been used in a variety of ways by States. Funds have been used to conduct preliminary planning for Statewide Voter Registration Systems and to upgrade and replace county voter registration election management systems for compatibility with new voter registration systems. States have implemented voter education programs and conducted training for election officials and poll workers. Section 101 funds have also been used for the preparation and administration of State Plans. Another key result has been making polling places accessible and providing voter materials at polling places in multiple languages.

SECTION 102 Funds

Background

GSA distributed \$300,317,737⁶ in Title I – Payments to States for Election Administration Improvements and Replacement of Punch Card and Lever Voting Machines, Section 102 Replacement of Punch Card or Lever Voting Machines, funds to 30 States in FY 2003 using a HAVA formula based on the number of precincts 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 Voting System Standards.
- Comply with applicable Federal laws such as the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

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, for redistribution 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 remaining precincts using punch card or lever voting machines 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, 2008.⁷ 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, 2010.⁸

Table 3.1 shows the status of Section 102 funds reported by the States as of September 30, 2010.

Expenditures

States have reported spending \$309,841,802 (Table 3.2) of the \$300,317,737 of Section 102 funds received including interest reported as earned on the deposited funds. As of September 30, 2010, 25 of the 30 eligible States expended more than 90 percent of the funds including interest earned and 17 States expended the full amount. To date, four states have returned funds totaling \$226,333.74.

⁶ Note that HAVA authorized and Congress appropriated \$324,750,000.

⁷ 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.

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

State	Date of Waiver	102 Deadline	Unexpended Funds
Alabama	N/A	November 2, 2004	\$50,156.70 Returned
Illinois	July 8, 2003	November 4, 2010	\$136,049
Kentucky	December 5, 2003	November 4, 2010	\$26.70 Returned
Massachusetts	December 23, 2003	November 4, 2010	0
Michigan	December 30, 2003	November 4, 2010	98,961
New York	December 23, 2003	November 4, 2010	0
Oregon	N/A	November 2, 2004	\$6,961.98 Returned
South Carolina	N/A	November 2, 2004	\$169,188.36 Returned
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			\$1,025,491

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	3,607	919	53,764	1.68%
Arizona	1,564,188	-	1,564,188	-	100.00%
Arkansas	2,569,738	184,915	2,754,653	-	100.00%
California	57,322,707	1,158,245	58,480,952	-	100.00%
Colorado	2,177,095	146,757	2,323,852	-	100.00%
Florida	11,581,377	40,506	11,621,883	-	100.00%
Georgia	4,740,448		4,740,448	-	100.00%
Illinois	33,805,617	1,232,424	34,901,992	136,049	99.61%
Indiana	9,522,394	142,040	9,664,434	-	100.00%
Kentucky	469,256	19,182	469,256	19,182	96.07%
Louisiana	7,351,684	193,790	7,545,474	-	100.00%
Maryland	1,637,609	51,353	1,637,609	51,353	96.96%
Massachusetts ^b	1,519,497	11,491	1,446,076	84,912	94.45%
Michigan	6,531,284	413,329	6,432,323	512,290	92.62%
Mississippi	1,778,067	105,925	1,883,992	-	100.00%
Missouri	11,472,841	646,780	12,119,621	-	100.00%
New Jersey	8,695,609	283,762	8,979,371	-	100.00%
New York	49,603,917	9,095,143	16,010,629	42,688,432	27.28%
North Carolina	893,822		893,822	-	100.00%
Ohio	30,667,664	1,186,901	31,854,565	-	100.00%
Oregon	1,822,758	44,783	1,815,796	51,745	97.23%
Pennsylvania	22,916,952	4,867,463	27,451,171	333,244	98.80%
South Carolina	2,167,518	126,584	1,998,330	295,772	87.11%
Tennessee	2,473,971	134,659	2,608,630	-	100.00%
Texas	6,269,521	300,522	6,266,685	303,358	95.38%
Utah	5,726,844	536,464	6,263,308	-	100.00%
Virginia	4,526,569	210,768	4,737,337	-	100.00%

Table 3.2 Section 102 Funds Reported by States as of September 30, 2010

State	Total Section 102 Funds Received	Interest Earned	Total Expenditures ^a	Balance of Funds and Interest	Percent of Funds and Interest Expended
Washington	6,799,430	534,391	6,313,881	1,019,940	86.09%
West Virginia	2,349,474	111,131	2,460,605	-	100.00%
Wisconsin	<u>1,308,810</u>	<u>178,418</u>	<u>1,006,714</u>	<u>480,514</u>	<u>67.69%</u>
Total	<u>\$300,317,737</u>	<u>\$21,961,333</u>	<u>\$309,841,802</u>	<u>\$12,437,267</u>	<u>96.14%</u>

^aIncludes cash disbursements and unliquidated obligations. Also States earned interest on Section 102 funds deposited in their State Election Fund, which is why some States spent more than they received.

^bThe FFR report is currently under review by EAC.

Results

Section 102 funds have been used to replace punch card and lever voting systems that were in use during the November 2000 general Federal election. The 30 States eligible to receive these funds were able to purchase new voting systems or be reimbursed for costs incurred on or after January 1, 2001 under multiyear contracts. States have been able to replace punch card voting systems or lever voting systems by purchase or lease. States that received waivers through November 2010 will submit their final FFR in 2011.

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 Establishment of State-Based Administrative Complaint Procedures to Remedy Grievances;
- Appropriated matching funds equal to “five percent of the total amount to be spent for such activities (taking into account the requirements payment and the amount spent by the State)...”;
- Uses the requirements payment for activities to meet the requirements of Title III, or for proposed uses consistent with the requirements of HAVA Title III and are consistent with the usage restrictions set forth in HAVA Section 251(b) Use of Funds;
- Is in compliance with the laws listed in Section 906 of HAVA (see footnote 4); and
- Filed a State Plan that complies with the plan requirements listed in Title II – Commissions, Subtitle D – Election Assistance, Part 1 – Requirements Payments, Sections 254, 255, and 256 of HAVA.

EAC disbursed a total of \$2.3 billion in requirements payments appropriated in FYs 2003 (\$830 million) and 2004 (\$1,491,150). Congress appropriated \$115 million in FY 2008, \$100 million in FY 2009 and \$70 million in FY 2010. Section 251 funds were included in the Election Reform Programs no-year appropriation. As of September 30, 2010, EAC distributed approximately \$169.3 million of the FYs 2008, 2009 and 2010 requirements payments.

HAVA requires States to deposit Section 251 funds in the States’ election funds and earn interest consistent with the State Plan provisions of HAVA Section 254(b). Section 251 funds and interest earned on deposits of Section 251 funds have no fiscal year limitation at the State level once obligated at the Federal level in the year appropriated.

Expenditure of Section 251 Funds

States reported expenditures of \$2,022,773,684 or about 71 percent of Section 251 funds appropriated by Congress (\$2,604,360,617) and interest earned (\$242,299,709) through September 30, 2010. Thirteen States have spent 90 percent or more, while 31 States spent more than 75 percent of their funds and interest. On the other hand, 11 States have spent less than 50 percent 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	\$2,335,867	\$26,892,094	\$11,310,286	70.39%
Alaska	13,021,803	2,267,526	6,523,053	8,766,276	42.66%
American Samoa	2,319,361	207,924	2,319,361	207,924	91.77%
Arizona	45,516,688	5,316,833	38,028,173	12,805,349	74.81%
Arkansas	23,586,449	1,993,673	20,679,156	4,900,966	87.67%

Table 4 HAVA Title II, Section 251 Funds Reported by States as of September 30, 2010

State	Total Section 251 Funds Received(\$) ^a	Interest Earned	Total Expenditures ^a	Balance Of Funds and Interest	Percent of Funds and Interest Expended
California ^b	264,237,124	39,230,326	204,911,336	95,556,114	67.52%
Connecticut	29,081,608	3,585,057	28,815,607	3,851,058	99.09%
Delaware	11,596,803	982,020	6,881,366	5,697,457	54.71%
District of Columbia	11,596,803	1,374,849	5,245,491	7,726,161	40.44%
Florida	138,979,664	17,914,160	109,000,693	47,893,132	69.47%
Georgia	70,674,392	726,361	65,343,935	6,056,818	91.52%
Guam	2,319,361	0	1,652,099	667,262	71.23%
Hawaii	12,671,803	899,348	9,797,769	3,773,383	72.20%
Idaho	13,021,803	935,948	12,732,192	1,225,559	91.22%
Illinois	110,546,040	7,637,923	97,776,307	20,407,656	82.73%
Indiana	54,440,282	2,255,325	49,776,020	6,919,587	87.80%
Iowa	26,633,492	1,445,930	25,245,706	2,833,716	89.91%
Kansas	24,022,045	2,190,414	21,856,082	4,356,377	83.38%
Kentucky	36,901,641	3,837,110	28,020,082	12,718,669	68.78%
Louisiana	36,788,515	3,531,265	39,230,828	1,088,951	97.30%
Maine	11,596,803	1,468,620	10,350,245	2,715,178	79.22%
Maryland	46,372,052	3,874,480	49,357,845	888,687	98.23%
Massachusetts ^c	57,005,181	6,615,769	17,050,529	46,570,421	26.80
Michigan	78,960,474	6,732,916	64,074,972	21,618,418	74.77%
Minnesota	43,940,883	3,524,175	38,238,435	9,226,623	80.56%
Mississippi	25,152,465	1,181,716	22,520,238	3,813,943	85.52%
Missouri	44,914,650	4,028,350	43,977,222	4,965,778	89.85%
Montana	13,021,803	617,223	12,628,986	1,010,041	92.59%
Nebraska	15,021,034	721,767	15,021,034	721,767	95.42%
Nevada	18,144,727	1,225,061	14,238,303	5,131,485	73.51%
New Hampshire	11,596,803	1,829,601	4,797,435	8,628,969	35.73
New Jersey	68,067,586	5,582,374	60,458,021	13,191,939	82.09%
New Mexico	15,599,671	902,755	15,155,713	1,346,714	91.84%
New York	171,997,692	23,483,737	96,566,685	98,914,744	49.40%
North Carolina	73,421,775	7,012,231	68,092,080	12,341,926	84.66%
North Dakota	13,021,803	1,272,035	7,514,418	6,779,420	52.57%
Ohio ^d	95,443,601	6,245,654	98,274,105	3,415,150	96.64%
Oklahoma	30,200,722	2,128,842	5,526,900	26,802,664	17.10%
Oregon	30,394,716	3,505,959	19,549,758	14,350,917	57.67%
Pennsylvania	112,769,607	15,776,813	111,029,124	17,517,296	86.37%
Puerto Rico	2,319,361	185,329	516,515	1,988,175	20.62%
Rhode Island	13,021,803	484,995	13,506,798	-	100.00%
South Carolina	36,365,797	848,096	33,342,634	3,871,259	89.60%
South Dakota	13,021,803	1,688,266	6,638,487	8,071,582	45.13%
Tennessee	46,236,130	6,102,920	22,025,827	30,313,224	42.08%
Texas	180,155,706	11,471,967	154,520,966	37,106,707	80.64%
Utah	17,986,710	632,959	17,323,494	1,296,174	93.04%
Vermont	11,596,803	2,329,896	664,941	13,261,758	4.77%
Virginia	57,489,361	5,970,771	41,530,050	21,930,082	65.44%

Table 4 HAVA Title II, Section 251 Funds Reported by States as of September 30, 2010

State	Total Section 251 Funds Received(\$) ^a	Interest Earned	Total Expenditures ^a	Balance Of Funds and Interest	Percent of Funds and Interest Expended
Virgin Islands	2,319,361	121,700	707,897	1,733,164	29.00%
Washington	52,928,051	5,336,676	44,223,398	14,041,329	75.90%
West Virginia	16,716,893	1,135,689	15,060,024	2,792,558	84.36%
Wisconsin ^e	47,010,997	4,077,559	45,165,107	5,923,450	88.41%
Wyoming	12,671,803	850,586	13,032,444	489,945	96.38%
Total	\$2,488,668,955	\$242,299,709	\$2,022,773,684	\$708,194,981	74.07%

^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.

^bThe FFR report is currently under review by EAC.

^cThe FFR report is currently under review by EAC.

^dThe FFR report is currently under review by EAC.

^eThe FFR report is currently under review by EAC.

Results

Section 251 funds have been used to meet the requirements of Title III. In addition to procuring voting systems, States have used these funds to modernize voting equipment and make it accessible for disabled and language minorities. States have developed and updated voter registration databases. More voters have materials available at polling places and have the option of casting a provisional ballot on Election Day. States have also reported the implementation of requirements for voters who register by mail.

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 election 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 included 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

In 2008, EAC administered a \$10 million data collection grant program in which five States were provided \$2 million each to improve their data collection processes and procedures for the 2008 election.

Grantee	Amount	
	Awarded	Expended as of*
Illinois	\$2,000,000	\$1,733,180 (September 14, 2010)**
Minnesota	2,000,000	1,996,918 (September 3, 2010)**
Ohio	2,000,000	1,983,429 (February 2, 2010)**
Pennsylvania	2,000,000	716,567 (December 31, 2010)
Wisconsin	2,000,000	1,983,667 (June 30, 2010)
Total	\$10,000,000	\$8,413,629

*Includes unliquidated obligations that represent the amount of grants or contracts awarded or orders placed for which payments have not been requested or made
 **Represents date of final financial report

Results

As a result of the grant, all of the grantee States – Illinois, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin – made improvements to their data collection systems, allowing them to report more data. For example, before the grant program was implemented, the grantees' level of data collection for core questions on the 2006 Election Administration and Voting Survey (EAVS) averaged 45 percent; in 2008 the grantees' level of data collection for core questions averaged

94 percent. According to Nat Robinson, a staff member who worked on the Wisconsin grant program, "With assistance provided by the grant, we are making substantial strides in identifying new and improving existing best practices in...collecting and analyzing election data." EAC expects to see even greater improvement in the grantee States' ability to collect and report election administration data for the 2010 election. Lessons learned from these States will benefit other States as they seek information regarding effective data collection practices. Table 5 lists the grantees, the amounts awarded and the amounts reported as expended as of December 31, 2010.

COLLEGE POLL WORKER GRANTS

Background

Title V – Help America Vote College Program, Section 501 of HAVA created the Help America Vote 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 funds for the program in EAC’s annual Salaries and Expenses account in the amount of \$750,000 each year for this program in FYs 2008, 2009, and 2010; and \$300,000 in FY 2006; and \$627,000 in FY 2004. In FY 2003, Congress appropriated \$1.5 million in Election Reform Program no-year funds.

Awards and Expenditures

In FY 2004, EAC requested proposals for the College Poll Worker Program and received 81 grant applications. EAC awarded 15 grants with an average grant award amount of \$41,800. Table 6.1 lists the grantees, the amounts awarded, and the amounts reported as expended as of December 31, 2004.

Grantees		Amounts	
Name	Location	Awarded	Expended
Asnuntuck Community College	Connecticut	\$30,000	\$28,890
California State University, Long Beach	California	25,000	23,912
Eastern Michigan University	Michigan	25,000	16,127
Florida Memorial College	Florida	50,000	40,716
Golden Key International Honour Society	Georgia	130,000	130,000
Illinois Central College	Illinois	12,000	12,000
Los Angeles Conservation Corps	California	20,000	20,000
North Hampton Community College	Pennsylvania	25,000	25,000
Northern Kentucky University	Kentucky	25,000	25,000
Roxbury Community College	Massachusetts	30,000	26,676
Rural Ethnic Institute	South Dakota	50,000	50,000
University of Baltimore	Maryland	70,000	70,000
University of Maryland, College Park	Maryland	25,000	25,000
University of North Texas	Texas	80,000	80,000
Wiley College	Texas	30,000	28,150
Total		\$627,000	\$601,471

In FY 2006, EAC solicited and received 50 grant applications. EAC awarded 19 grants with an average grant award amount of \$15,789. Table 6.2 lists the grantees, the amounts awarded, and the amounts reported as expended as of December 31, 2006.

Grantees		Amounts	
Name	Location	Awarded	Expended
American University	District of Columbia	\$16,000	\$16,000
California State University, Long Beach	California	16,992	12,676
Citizens Union Foundation	New York	19,000	19,000
Elgin Community College	Illinois	12,000	12,000
Hattiesburg Alumnae Chapter	Mississippi	10,000	10,000
Illinois Central College	Illinois	15,169	14,727
Indiana University	Indiana	19,910	19,910
Lander University	South Carolina	11,000	11,000

Grantees		Amounts	
Name	Location	Awarded	Expended
Maricopa County Community	Arizona	17,486	14,782
Northern Kentucky University	Kentucky	12,000	7,062
Project Vote, New Castle County	Delaware	16,875	16,875
Project Vote, Saginaw City	Michigan	16,875	16,875
Research Foundation of SUNY	New York	13,678	11,411
United Tribes Technical College	North Dakota	18,000	10,848
University of Baltimore, College Park	Maryland	18,996	18,996
University of Central Florida	Florida	15,288	14,244
University of Texas at El Paso	Texas	20,000	20,000
University of Virginia	Virginia	14,699	14,699
Western Connecticut State University	Connecticut	16,032	16,032
Total		\$300,000	\$277,137

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 6.3 lists the grantees, the amounts awarded, and the amounts reported as expended as of December 31, 2008.

Grantees		Amounts	
Name	Location	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	20,901
St. Louis Community College	Missouri	21,035	14,309
Suffolk University	New York	31,849	20,939
Texans Together Education Fund	Texas	32,167	32,166
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

In FY 2009, EAC went to a two-year grant cycle in order to coincide with the Federal election cycle and received 72 grant applications. EAC awarded 13 grants with an average grant award amount of \$57,692. Table 6.4 lists the grantees, the amounts awarded, and the amounts reported as expended as of the June 30, 2010 mid-year reporting date.

Grantees		Amounts	
Name	Location	Awarded	Expended*
Catskill Center for Independence	New York	\$75,000	\$16,304
Hampton University	Virginia	74,055	25,798
LaGuardia Community College	New York	74,041	17,534
Missouri Western State University	Missouri	74,807	688

Table 6.4 *2009 College Poll Worker Grants Reported as of 6/30/2010*

Grantees		Amounts	
Name	Location	Name	Location
Palmetto Project	South Carolina	74,929	31,164
Regis University	Colorado	74,611	-
Salish Kootenai College	Montana	66,008	17,116
University of Baltimore	Maryland	20,000	1,945
University of Central Florida	Florida	75,000	22,855
University of Missouri (Curators)	Missouri	20,000	6,552
University of Southern Mississippi	Mississippi	48,471	12,514
University of Texas-Austin	Texas	53,078	-
Vassar College	New York	20,000	6,098
Total		<u>\$750,000</u>	<u>\$158,568</u>

*Year two FFR reports are due to EAC on January 31, 2011 as of December 31, 2010

In FY 2010, EAC went to a three-year grant cycle in order to coincide with the Federal election cycle and received 61 grant applications. EAC awarded 15 grants with an average grant award amount of \$50,000. Table 6.5 lists the grantees and the amounts awarded.

Table 6.5 *2010 College Poll Worker Grants*

Grantees		Amounts	
Name	Location	Awarded	Expended*
Alverno College	Wisconsin	\$40,800	-
Benedictine University	Illinois	55,385	-
Central Connecticut State University	Connecticut	32,107	-
College of the Canyons	California	59,200	-
Harris-Stowe State University	Missouri	43,433	-
Keystone College	Pennsylvania	39,996	-
Kids Voting of Central Ohio	Ohio	84,000	-
Kutztown University	Pennsylvania	58,868	-
Lourdes College	Ohio	34,783	-
Marshall-Wythe Law School Foundation	Virginia	63,700	-
Morehouse College	Georgia	38,037	-
Southern Utah University	Utah	46,480	-
Suffolk University	Massachusetts	30,211	-
University of Rochester	New York	62,000	-
University of Tennessee	Tennessee	61,000	-
Total		<u>\$750,000</u>	<u> </u>

*Initial reports are due to EAC January 31, 2011 for spending as of December 31, 2010

In sum, as of September 30, 2010, EAC has awarded 89 grants for a total of \$3,177,000 and disbursed \$1,657,723.

Results

From using the Internet, to placing flyers on campus bulletin boards, methods for recruiting 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 of training completion 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 two to three 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 voter 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. Some jurisdictions turned away interested students due to local requirements that poll workers be registered to vote in that jurisdiction. Due to the success of recruiting students, the supply of college poll workers in some cases exceeded the demand for poll workers. Additionally, some students did not have transportation to the polls on Election Day. EAC provides ongoing technical assistance and best practices to grantees to address issues such as these.

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.

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) to conduct simulated national elections for students and parents from each of the 50 States in the United States, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and United States secondary schools overseas.

For FY 2008, Congress appropriated \$200,000 for a competitive grant program using EAC's annual Salaries and Expenses account funds. The program promotes 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 encourages continued civic engagement and participation by the youth population. In both FYs 2009 and 2010, Congress appropriated \$300,000 in Salaries and Expenses funds.

Awards and Expenditures

In FY 2008, the EAC awarded grants to 10 organizations. The average grant award was \$20,000. Table 7.1 lists the grantees, the amounts awarded and the amounts reported as expended as of December 31, 2008.

Grantees		Amounts	
Name	Location	Awarded	Expended
Bernalillo County	New Mexico	\$20,091	\$14,011
League of Women Voters of Illinois Education 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 State Hispanic Leadership Institute	Illinois	20,198	20,198
TOTAL		\$200,000	\$166,913

In FY 2009, the first year of two-year grants, the EAC awarded grants to 12 organizations. The average grant award was \$25,000. Table 7.2 lists the grantees, the amounts awarded and the amounts reported as expended as of the June 30, 2010 mid-year reporting date.

Grantees		Amounts	
Name	Location	Awarded	Expended*
Chiesman Foundation For Democracy	South Dakota	\$48,000	\$14,043
County of Miami Dade	Florida	55,000	16,897
Instituto de Formación Democrática	Puerto Rico	33,000	-
Kids Voting North Carolina	North Carolina	41,000	-

Grantees		Grantees	
Name	Name	Name	Name
League of Women Voters of Greater Pittsburgh, Education Fund	Pennsylvania	40,000	17,433
League of Women Voters of Illinois Education Fund	Illinois	38,000	38,000
State of Nevada, Secretary of State	Nevada	45,000	11,823
TOTAL		\$300,000	\$98,196

*Year two reports are due to EAC January 31 2011 for spending as of December 31, 2010

In FY 2010, the first year of three-year awards which allow grantees to be in synch with the Federal election cycle, the EAC awarded grants to eight organizations. The average grant award was \$37,500. Table 7.3 lists the grantees and the amounts awarded.

Grantees		Amounts	
Name	Location	Awarded	Disbursed*
League of Women Voters of Oregon Education Fund	Oregon	\$41,413	-
Michigan Government Television	Michigan	42,000	-
Montana Secretary of State	Montana	30,000	-
Office of the Secretary of State, Kentucky	Kentucky	44,553	-
Polk County Auditor's Office	Iowa	49,293	-
Seminole County Supervisor of Elections	Florida	15,441	-
The State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations	Rhode Island	37,300	-
TVW	Washington	40,000	-
Total		\$300,000	-

*Initial reports are due to EAC January 31, 2011 for spending as of December 31, 2010

In sum, as of September 30, 2010, EAC has competitively awarded 25 grants for a total of \$800,000 and disbursed \$265,109.

Results

Ensuring high levels of student enrollment in the Mock Election Program was critical to the program's success. Based on feedback and information provided in the narrative program reports, 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.

We have found that characteristics of a successful Mock Election Program include:

- 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 grantee communication with secondary schools 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.

Program directors found it beneficial to involve students and teachers through the use of program websites. The websites 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 close an election.

EAC Administration of HAVA FUNDS

Monitoring

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 requirements payments more timely and efficiently, EAC:

- Allowed States to request 2008, 2009 and 2010 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 which identifies the: (1) grant amount; (2) amount of matching funds required; (3) grant period; (4) administrative and reporting requirements; and (5) information needed by EAC to disburse the grant funds (Federal assurances, certifications, and banking information).