Election Data Services

Chapter 12
Poll Workers

Table 12 presents data from the Election Day Survey about poll workers. The survey asked about the number of poll workers statewide and in each local election jurisdiction, the required number of poll workers per precinct or polling place by law or regulation, the number of precincts or polling places in jurisdictions that did not have the required number of poll workers, and the number of additional poll workers that would have been needed to meet the staffing requirement in each precinct that had a deficit of poll workers. Poll workers were defined as persons who (a) verified the identity of a voter; (b) assisted the voter with signing the register, affidavits or other documents required to cast a ballot; (c) assisted the voter by providing the voter with a ballot or setting up the voting machine for the voter; or (d) served other functions dictated by state law on November 2, 2004. The definition excludes observers stationed at polling places.

Applicability and Coverage

All states have polling places and thus need poll workers. However, Oregon conducts all elections by mail, and locates one polling place in each county's administrative offices, and therefore does not have the same staffing requirements as other states that must staff polling places on Election Day.

Historical Context

The type of person who was considered to be a "poll worker" has changed over time. In the era of machine politics in the United States, poll workers were people selected and paid for by the political parties to attend to the passing out of party-printed ballots at the polling place (Sorauf 1954; Woodruff 1908).

Little is mentioned about the poll workers who were responsible for collecting the ballots, though that, too, may have been the responsibility of the partisan-organized poll workers. A sort of checks and balances evolved, where both parties were responsible for stationing poll workers at every polling place to make sure the other side did not steal the election (Oestreicher 1988). During the turn of the last century, the Progressive movement initiated reforms designed to clean up the United States electoral system. The regulation of poll workers may have been one aspect of this reform effort; this was at least true in New Jersey (Lapomarda 1970). It was during this time that the modern image of the nonpartisan poll worker evolved. However, as a holdover from the machine era, many jurisdictions still require that the political parties nominate or provide lists of poll workers.

Poll workers must be able to work on Election Day. Most jurisdictions require poll workers to work the entire day, while some arrange shifts. Duties range from managing the polling place, recording who votes on the registration list, registering voters to vote in states with Election Day registration, assisting voters in casting their vote, ensuring the voting equipment works properly, tallying the ballots (depending on the voting equipment in use), and transmitting information to the central-count location at the end of the day.

Most poll workers receive training in the elections process from local election administrators. Training for poll workers is documented as early as 1964 in Hamilton County, Ohio, where training was deemed necessary to learn how to use new voting machines (Willis 1966). In most cases, poll workers are compensated for their training time, but these rates vary greatly across the nation.

While poll workers are often compensated for their time, being a poll worker is not a career. It is largely a voluntary activity. Near the close of the 1800s, one study documented that women served as poll workers prior to women's suffrage (Formisano 1999). Beginning in the late 1960s, as the female population went back into the workforce in greater numbers, the reservoir of available poll workers begin to dry up. Compensation pay was increased to reflect the scarcer commodity. Allowable precinct sizes were increased so that the total number of precincts could decrease to correspond with the smaller labor pool. Changing the type of voting equipment used in precincts was also an alternative used by election administrators to deal with the difficulty in finding poll workers. In modern times, the pool of potential volunteers consists of retired persons and college students. In addition, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has a special mandate under the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to encourage to college students to volunteer.

Survey Results

Table 12 presents data on poll workers from questions 15–17 on the Election Day Survey. In the table, the average number of poll workers is calculated for precincts and polling places. The number of precincts with fewer than the required number of poll workers is calculated as a percentage of the total number of precincts. The column headings in Table 12 are as follows:

Column Headings for Table 12. Poll Workers

Col.	Heading	Description
1	Code	State census code
2	Name	Respondent to Election Day Survey
3	Jurisdiction	Number of local election jurisdictions from survey question 22
4	Total Number of Precincts	Number of precincts from survey question 19
5	Cases	Number of jurisdictions that responded to question 19
6	Total Number of Polling Places	Number of polling places from survey question 20
7	Cases	Number of jurisdictions that responded to question 20
8	Total Number of Poll Workers	Number of poll workers from survey question 15
9	Cases	Number of jurisdictions that responded to question 15
10	Average # of Poll Workers per Precinct	Number of poll workers (col. 8) divided by the number of precincts (col. 4)
11	Cases	Number of jurisdictions that responded to question 15b on poll workers and question 19 on precincts

Column Headings for Table 12 (cont.)

Col.	Heading	Description
12	Average # of Poll Workers Polling Place	Number of poll workers (col. 8) divided by the number of polling places (col. 6)
13	Cases	Number of jurisdictions that responded to questions 15 and 20
14	Number of Precincts or Polling Places < Req. Poll Workers	Number of precincts or polling places with fewer than the required number of poll workers from question 17a
15	Cases	Number of jurisdictions that responded to question 17a
16	Percent Precincts < Req. Poll Workers	Number of precincts with fewer than the required number of poll workers (col. 14) divided by total number of precincts (col. 4)
17	Cases	Number of jurisdictions that responded to questions 4 and 17a
18	Cases > 100%	Number of cases where the reported number of precincts and polling places with fewer than the required number of poll workers (col. 16) is greater than the reported number of precincts (col. 4)
19	Percent Polling Places < Req. Poll Workers	Number of polling places with fewer than the required number of poll workers (col. 14) divided by total number of polling places (col. 6)
20	Cases	Number of jurisdictions that responded to questions 17a and 20
21	Cases > 100%	Number of cases where the reported number of polling places with fewer than the required number of poll workers (col. 14) is greater than the number of polling places (col. 6)

Analysis of Survey Results

The following is our analysis of the data in Table 12 for each of the 18 cross-tabulation factors described earlier in this report. A description of each factor follows a general summary and a state-level summary of the survey data.

1) Regions
2) Urban to Rural
3) Size of Jurisdiction
4) Race and Ethnicity
5) Median Income
6) High School Education
7) Section 203 Language Minority Requirements
8) Section 5 Preclearance of Voting Procedures
9) Type of Voting Equipment
10) Changed Voting Equipment since 2000
11) Statewide Voter Registration Database
12) Election Day Registration
13) Provisional Ballot Acceptance
14) No Excuse Absentee Balloting
15) Early Voting
16) Battleground States
17) Presidential Margin of Victory
18) Red versus Blue Jurisdictions

This analysis is based only on data that was *reported* to the EAC on the Election Day Survey. Many state responses to a survey question or part of a question did not cover all local election jurisdictions. In Table 12 as well as other tables in this report, a jurisdiction was excluded from a statistical calculation if its response was missing for one or more of the data items (i.e., columns) used in the calculation. A column labeled "Cases" next to each statistical calculation shows the number of jurisdictions covered by that calculation.

Summary

In the analysis, we construct four measures from the responses to the Election Day Survey: the average number of poll workers per precinct, the average number of poll workers per polling place, the percentage of precincts reporting an insufficient number of poll workers, and the percentage of polling places reporting an insufficient number of poll workers.

Nationally, jurisdictions reported an average of 7.9 poll workers per polling place and 5.7 poll workers per precinct. Jurisdictions reported that 5.8 percent of polling places and 4.0 percent of precincts did not have the minimum number of required poll workers. In all, 5,252 precincts or polling places of the 113,749 reported polling places or 174,252 reported precincts were said to have inadequate staffing.

Generally, precincts and polling places are the same. An important qualification is that more than one precinct may be consolidated into one polling place, and consolidation occurs more often in urban jurisdictions, among others. (See polling place analysis in chapter 13 for further description and analysis.)

States have different methods of defining polling places, and how they staff those locations affects the measurement of workers per polling place. Oregon, Wisconsin, and Puerto Rico report the number of poll workers per polling place in unique ways that confound the analysis:

- Oregon conducts elections by mail, and locates only one polling place in each county's administrative offices. In many instances, therefore, the count of poll workers represented the number of election staff workers within a county office.

- Wisconsin administers elections within what they call "wards," which may have created confusion with regard to how to report precincts and polling places on the Election Day Survey among jurisdictions within the state. For most jurisdictions, the reported number of polling places is much too low, e.g., six in the city of Milwaukee. In some cases, adding precincts and polling places appears to provide a reasonable number of polling places, e.g., Milwaukee reported 314 precincts. However, this decision rule is not consistent; Burlington City reported 34 polling places, 16 precincts, and 47 poll workers, which, if we sum precincts and polling places as the correct number of polling locations, would mean there was less than one poll worker per polling place.

- Puerto Rico included party observers in their count of poll workers, contrary to the Election Day Survey instructions.

We report state-level responses for these jurisdictions, but exclude all highly questionable jurisdictions within these states or territories in the following tabulations.

In addition to these administrative practices, we note that jurisdictions vary on how they staff polling places on Election Day. Some require that poll workers be present the entire day while other states schedule poll workers by shifts. These latter jurisdictions tend to report higher numbers of poll workers per polling place than other jurisdictions. In jurisdictions that consolidate precincts into a single polling place, some managerial positions may be shared among the consolidated precincts. These jurisdictions tend to report fewer poll workers per precinct than other jurisdictions. We do not exclude jurisdictions that report using poll workers in shifts or consolidate precincts because the information necessary to identify and control for these jurisdictions was not systematically collected on the Election Day Survey.

In all, much care should be taken in interpreting the responses to the Election Day Survey regarding poll workers. Definitions of what constitutes a poll worker and a polling place or precinct are not consistent across jurisdictions and a few outlier jurisdictions, such as those in Louisiana and Illinois, figure prominently in the observed relationships. With this in mind, we present our primary findings.

Jurisdictions with higher levels of income and education reported higher average numbers of poll workers per polling place or precinct and reported lower rates of staffing problems per precinct. Staffing problems appeared to be particularly acute for jurisdictions in the lowest income and education categories. Small, rural jurisdictions and large, urban jurisdictions tended to report higher rates of inadequate poll workers within polling places or precincts.

Predominantly non-Hispanic Black jurisdictions reported a greater percentage of polling places or precincts with inadequate number of poll workers. Predominantly non-Hispanic Native American jurisdictions reported the second highest percentage of staffing problems. This appears to be related to similar reports on inadequate numbers of poll workers for Section 5 covered jurisdictions, though at least some of the observed relationships are attributable to the high percentage of understaffed polling places in Louisiana.

Jurisdictions that anticipated Election Day needs reported higher average numbers of staffing of polling places or precincts and fewer instances of not being able to adequately staff polling places or

precincts. For example, jurisdictions in battleground states reported fewer polling places and precincts with inadequate staffing, as did jurisdictions that allow Election Day registration. Jurisdictions with "no excuse" absentee balloting and those with early voting reported lower rates of problems staffing polling places or precincts, perhaps because these alternative modes of voting reduced the Election Day burden for these jurisdictions.

States

Excluding Oregon, Washington reported the lowest number of poll workers per precinct, 1.5. However, Washington also consolidates many precincts and the high rate of absentee voting in the state reduces demands on polling places within the state. Washington also reported a middle-range average number—6.3—of poll workers per polling place. Washington reported that 7.3 percent of its polling places were inadequately staffed.

The Virgin Islands and Oklahoma reported the lowest average number of poll workers per polling place, at 2.6 and 3.0, respectively. The Virgin Islands reported that 41.2 percent of its polling places were inadequately staffed, while Oklahoma reported no staffing problems.

With 64.7 and 44.3 percent, respectively, of their polling places reported to have inadequate staffing, Louisiana and Hawaii reported the highest rates of staffing problems. Delaware and Illinois also reported a sizable percentage of polling places with inadequate staffing, 28.3 and 18.4 percent, respectively. In terms of absolute numbers, Illinois and Louisiana reported that over one thousand polling places or precincts had inadequate staffing: 1,693 and 1,550, respectively. Similar patterns among states exist when precincts are the unit of analysis.

Even though Maryland reported 13.4 poll workers per polling place, the state also reported that 7.9 percent of polling places were inadequately staffed. We note that Maryland operates shifts of poll workers, so we do not know if the reported problems are for the entire day or specific shifts.

Regions

The U.S. Territories reported the lowest number of poll workers per polling place, 2.6. Within the United States, the West reported the lowest average number of poll workers per polling place, 6.6, with the Midwest, 6.7, and South, 7.8, reporting slightly higher numbers. The Northeast reported the highest average number of poll workers per polling place, 14.0. In terms of average number of poll workers per precinct, the U.S. Territories reported the highest average, 14.5; followed by the Northeast, 9.1; the South, 6.6; the Midwest, 4.7; and the West, 4.1.

The South reported the highest rate of inadequate staffing of polling places, at 8.1 percent, followed by the Midwest at 6.8 percent and the Northeast at 5.3 percent. The West reported the lowest rate of inadequately staffed polling places, at 2.3 percent. When examined from the perspective of precincts, the percentages are smaller and the regions retain their relative order.

Urban to Rural

The average number of poll workers per polling place was reported as 9.3 for urban and 7.4 for suburban jurisdictions, while small towns and rural areas reported lower averages, 6.7 and 5.3, respectively. The pattern is similar when precincts are the unit of analysis.

Urban jurisdictions also report the highest percentage of inadequate numbers of poll workers, 7.3 percent, followed by rural jurisdictions at 6.3 percent, small towns at 5.5 percent, and suburban jurisdictions at 3.6 percent. When then unit of analysis is precincts, the relative order is essentially the same.

Size of Jurisdiction

The reported average number of poll workers per polling place generally increases with jurisdiction size, from 4.8 for the smallest to 9.1 for the second largest, and dropping slightly to 7.7 for the largest jurisdictions. When the unit of analysis is the precinct, the same general pattern is evident.

The percentage of jurisdictions reporting polling places with inadequate numbers of poll workers does not follow a clear pattern. Those jurisdictions with the smallest and largest populations report the largest percentages of polling places with inadequate numbers of poll workers, 9.2 and 7.4, respectively. Jurisdictions with voting age population (VAP) between 10,000 and 50,000 reported the next highest percentage, 6.8. Those in the 1,000-to-3,500 range reported the lowest percentage, 3.0 percent. The pattern is similar when precincts are the unit of analysis.

Race and Ethnicity

Predominantly non-Hispanic Native American jurisdictions reported the lowest average number of poll workers per polling place, 5.7, and precinct, 5.5. Predominantly non-Hispanic Black jurisdictions reported the highest average of poll workers per polling place, 9.6, and per precinct, 7.6.

The high average number of poll workers per precinct for predominantly non-Hispanic Black jurisdictions did not translate into better coverage of the polling places. Predominantly non-Hispanic Black jurisdictions reported the highest percentage of inadequate numbers of staff, at 16.9 percent per polling place, and 12.8 percent per precinct. Predominantly non-Hispanic Native American jurisdictions reported the second highest rate of inadequate staffing as a percentage of polling places, at 6.3 percent, and 6.2 percent per precinct. White jurisdictions reported percentage of inadequate staffing at 6.0 percent per polling place and 4.1 percent per precinct. Predominantly Hispanic jurisdictions reported the lowest rate of inadequate staffing, at 1.5 percent for polling places and 1.0 percent for precincts.

Median Income

The reported average number of poll workers per polling place tends to increase with median income of the jurisdiction, with 4.9 reported for the lowest category and 9.1 reported for the highest. There is a less apparent trend when the unit of analysis is the precinct, with 4.4 reported for the lowest category and 6.1 reported for the highest. In both cases, jurisdictions in the $35,000—$40,000 median income category report high averages, 8.2 and 5.7 percent respectively, for polling places and precincts, confounding the direct linear trend.

The reported percentage of polling places with an inadequate number of poll workers generally follows a trend of decreasing percentages as median income within the jurisdictions rises. For the lowest income category, the very high rates of 23.5 percent of polling places and 16.1 percent of precincts reported inadequate numbers of poll workers. The numbers drop steeply as income rises, leveling off near 4 percent among polling places and 2.5 percent for precincts in jurisdictions with median income greater than $40,000.

High School Education

The categories of reported average number of poll workers per polling place and precinct rise with education, from the lowest category reporting 4.8 and 4.1, respectively, steadily climbing to 7.8 and 5.6, respectively, for the second highest category, before falling slightly at the highest level of education, 7.6 or 4.7, respectively.

Jurisdictions reporting inadequate numbers of poll workers are highest for the lowest education category, 20.8 percent among polling places and 14.2 percent among precincts. They generally follow a decreasing trend found across all jurisdictions as education rises, to 2.5 percent for polling places and 1.5 percent for precincts among jurisdictions in the highest education category.

Section 203 Language Minority Requirements

Jurisdictions covered by Section 203 reported a similar average number of poll workers per polling place as other jurisdictions, 7.9 and 7.2 respectively; for precincts, 5.4 and 5.3. Jurisdictions covered by Section 203 reported a similar percentage of polling places and precincts with an inadequate number of poll workers, 5.7 and 5.9 percent, respectively.

Section 5 Preclearance of Voting Procedures

Jurisdictions covered by Section 5 reported the same average number of poll workers per polling place, 7.4, as jurisdictions not covered by Section 5, and a slightly higher average number of poll workers per precinct than noncovered jurisdictions, 6.1 versus 5.2, respectively. Jurisdictions covered by Section 5 reported more than twice as high a percentage of polling places and precincts with an inadequate number of poll workers than jurisdictions not covered by Section 5: polling places scored 10.4 versus 4.5 percent, and precincts, 8.3 versus 3.1 percent. The relationship is primarily due to Louisiana's high percentage of inadequate poll workers per polling place or precinct.

Type of Voting Equipment

The reported average number of poll workers per polling place does not vary greatly by type of voting equipment, ranging from an average of 6.3 among optical scan jurisdictions to 9.8 among electronic jurisdictions. The range and order is similar when the unit of analysis is precincts: an average of 4.6 poll workers per precinct is reported for lever jurisdictions and a 7.2 average is reported for electronic jurisdictions.

Among polling places, lever jurisdictions reported the highest percentage of polling places without an adequate number of poll workers, 36.0 percent. We note that the outlier state of Louisiana primarily uses lever machines. Punch card jurisdictions reported 10.6 percent of polling places with an inadequate number of poll workers, followed by 6.8 percent for electronic jurisdictions. Paper jurisdictions reported the lowest percentage, 1.8. The order is generally the same when precincts are the unit of analysis.

Changed Voting Equipment since 2000

Jurisdictions that changed voting equipment reported a higher average number of poll workers per polling place, 8.1 versus 7.1 percent, and precinct, 6.1 versus 5.1 percent, than jurisdictions that did not change voting systems. Jurisdictions that changed voting equipment reported a slightly lower

percentage of polling places, 4.0 versus 6.5, or precincts, 2.9 versus 4.5, without an adequate number of poll workers.

Statewide Voter Registration Database

Jurisdictions with a statewide voter registration database reported a lower average number of poll workers per polling place than other jurisdictions, 6.8 versus 7.6, and a slightly higher average number of poll workers per precinct than other jurisdictions, 5.6 and 5.3, respectively. Jurisdictions with a statewide voter registration database reported a much higher percentage of polling places or precincts without an adequate number of poll workers than other jurisdictions, 15.1 and 4.2 percent, respectively. We note that Louisiana has a statewide voter registration database.

Election Day Registration

Jurisdictions with Election Day registration reported a slightly lower average number of poll workers per polling place than other jurisdictions, 7.9 versus 7.4, and a higher average number of poll workers per precinct than other jurisdictions, 6.0 versus 5.3. Jurisdictions with Election Day registration reported a lower percentage than other jurisdictions of polling places, 2.1 versus 5.9 percent, and precincts, 1.6 versus 4.1 percent, without an adequate number of poll workers. However, caution should be taken in making any inferences because as we note, only 67 jurisdictions with Election Day registration reported the numbers required to calculate adequate number of poll workers and number of polling places or precincts.

Provisional Ballot Acceptance

Jurisdictions with precinct-only acceptance reported a higher average number of poll workers per polling place than other jurisdictions, 7.8 versus 7.0, and a higher average number of poll workers per precinct to within-jurisdiction acceptance, 5.7 versus 4.9 (those without provisional ballots reported the lowest numbers per polling place, 6.3, and the highest average numbers per precinct, 7.5). Jurisdictions that accept provisional ballots jurisdictionwide reported a higher percentage of polling places and precincts without an adequate number of poll workers, 9.9 and 6.6 percent, respectively, than jurisdictions that accept ballots cast only within polling places and precincts, 2.4 and 1.7 percent, respectively.

No Excuse Absentee Balloting

Jurisdictions with “no excuse” absentee balloting reported a slightly lower average number of poll workers per polling place and precinct than other jurisdictions, 7.0 versus 7.8 in polling places, and 4.8 versus 5.9 in precincts. Jurisdictions with “no excuse” absentee balloting reported a slightly lower percentage than other jurisdictions of inadequate numbers of staff in polling places, 5.2 versus 6.4 percent, and precincts, 3.5 versus 4.6 percent.

Early Voting

Jurisdictions with early voting reported a slightly lower average of poll workers per polling place than other jurisdictions, 7.1 versus 7.8, and a slightly higher per precinct, 5.4 versus 5.3. Compared with other jurisdictions, jurisdictions with early voting reported a markedly lower percentage of polling places—2.0 versus 10.4 percent—and precincts—1.5 versus 6.7 percent—without an adequate number of poll workers.

Battleground States

Jurisdictions within battleground states reported a slightly higher average number of poll workers per polling place, 7.6 versus 7.3, than other jurisdictions and a slightly lower average of poll workers per precinct than other jurisdictions, 4.9 versus 5.7. Compared with other jurisdictions, jurisdictions within battleground states reported a lower percentage of polling places, 2.6 versus 7.4 percent, and precincts, 1.6 versus 5.5 percent, without an adequate number of poll workers.

Presidential Margin of Victory

According to presidential margin of victory, those jurisdictions in the second closest margin-of-victory category reported the highest average number of poll workers per polling place and precinct, 13.3 and 8.7, respectively. All other jurisdictions reported averages around 7 percent per polling place and 5 percent per precinct.

Jurisdictions in the second closest margin-of-victory category also reported the highest percentage of polling places without an adequate number of poll workers, 7.4 percent, followed by the jurisdictions with the closest margin of victory, at 7.0 percent. When measured in terms of precinct, the order is reversed, with the closest margin-of-victory jurisdictions reporting 4.9 percent of polling places with inadequate numbers of poll workers, and the second closest margin-of-victory category reporting 4.7 percent per precinct. All other jurisdictions reported a similar per-precinct average, except for jurisdictions in the third closest margin of victory category, which reported the lowest rates of inadequate numbers of poll workers, 1.9 and 1.4 percent for polling places and precincts, respectively.

Red versus Blue Jurisdictions

Jurisdictions won by Kerry by a majority, and those won by Bush by a plurality, reported higher average numbers of poll workers per polling place (10.8 where Kerry won 50 to 55 percent of the vote, and 8.5 where Kerry won 55 percent of the vote and above). For poll workers per precinct, those jurisdictions won by Bush by a plurality reported the highest number of poll workers per precinct: 7.5. Jurisdictions won by Bush by a plurality reported the highest percentage of polling places and precincts without an adequate number of poll workers, at 18.5 and 14.6 percent, respectively. All other jurisdictions reported a similar percentage, slightly below 5.1 percent for polling places and 4.2 for precincts.

REFERENCES

Formisano, Ronald P. 1999. “The ‘Party Period’ Revisited.” *The Journal of American History* 86(1): 93–120.

Lapomarda, Vincent A. 1970. “Maurice Joseph Tobin: The Decline of Bossism in Boston.” *The New England Quarterly* 43(3): 355–81.

Oestreicher, Richard. 1988. “Urban Working-Class Political Behavior and Theories of American Electoral Politics, 1870–1940.” *The Journal of American History* 74(4): 1257–86.

Sorauf, Frank J. 1954. “Extra-Legal Political Parties in Wisconsin.” *The American Political Science Review* 48(3): 692–704.

Willis, George L. 1966. “Electronic Vote Counting in a Metropolitan Area.” *Public Administration Review* 26(1): 25–30.

Woodruff, Clinton Rogers. 1908. “A Review of Municipal Events, 1906–7.” *The American Journal of Sociology* 13(4): 455–88.

EAC Election Day Survey

Poll Workers 2004 General Election

Cases = Number of Jurisdictions Reporting Subject Matter

Code	Name	Election Administration Jurisdictions	Total Number of Precincts	Cases	Total Number of Polling Places	Cases	Total Number of Poll Workers	Cases	Average # of Poll Workers Per Precinct	Cases	Average # of Poll Workers Polling Place	Cases	Number of Precincts or Polling Places < Req Poll Workers	Cases	Percent Precincts < Req Poll Workers	Cases	Cases >100%	Percent Polling Places < Req Poll Workers	Cases	Cases >100%
Updated: 09/19/2005 13:07:50																				
01	Alabama	67	2,210	67	2,177	67	14,917	67	6.7	67	6.9	67								
02	Alaska	1	436	1	439	1	2,244	1	5.1	1	5.1	1	0	1		1			1	
04	Arizona	15	2,110	15	2,002	15	10,908	15	5.2	15	5.4	15	143	15	6.8	15		7.1	15	
05	Arkansas	75	2,693	75	1,923	75	10,544	75	3.9	75	5.5	75	54	50	2.9	50		4.3	50	
06	California	58	21,857	55	14,467	52	99,289	55	4.5	54	6.6	52	107	55	0.5	54		0.7	52	
08	Colorado	64	3,370	64	2,318	63	14,681	62	4.4	62	6.4	62	0	63		63			63	
09	Connecticut	169			769	169	5,383	169			7.0	169								
10	Delaware	3	437	3	276	3	3,442	3	7.9	3	12.5	3	78	3	17.8	3		28.3	3	
11	District of Columbia	1	142	1	142	1	1,867	1	13.1	1	13.1	1								
12	Florida	67	6,892	67	5,433	67	61,657	67	8.9	67	11.3	67	141	67	2.0	67		2.6	67	
13	Georgia	159	3,163	159	2,907	158	29,422	159	9.3	159	10.1	158								
15	Hawaii	5	353	4	336	4	3,237	4	9.2	4	9.6	4	149	4	42.2	4		44.3	4	
16	Idaho	44	949	44	763	44	5,562	44	5.9	44	7.3	44	21	44	2.2	44		2.8	44	
17	Illinois	110	11,738	110	9,200	110	58,879	110	5.0	110	6.4	110	1,693	110	14.4	110		18.4	110	
18	Indiana	92	5,571	92	3,454	84	8,572	39	5.4	39	6.4	38								
19	Iowa	99	1,966	97	1,916	98	9,609	98	4.8	97	5.0	98	3	98	0.2	97		0.2	98	
20	Kansas	105	3,882	105	2,019	103	10,421	103	2.7	103	5.1	102	11	103	0.3	103		0.5	102	
21	Kentucky	120	3,482	120	2,830	120	14,565	120	4.2	120	5.1	120	29	9	4.0	9		6.3	9	
22	Louisiana	64	4,124	64	2,394	64	16,905	64	4.1	64	7.1	64	1,550	64	37.6	64		64.7	64	22
23	Maine	517	601	517			7,106	516	11.8	516										
24	Maryland	24	1,779	24	1,551	24	20,773	24	11.7	24	13.4	24	123	24	6.9	24		7.9	24	
25	Massachusetts	351	2,177	351	1,458	351														
26	Michigan	83	5,235	83	3,890	83	31,809	83	6.1	83	8.2	83	0	83		83			83	
27	Minnesota	87	4,108	87																
28	Mississippi	82	1,707	67	1,670	67														
29	Missouri	116	5,462	116	3,595	116	21,940	116	4.0	116	6.1	116	98	116	1.8	116	1	2.7	116	1
30	Montana	56	856	56	649	56	5,244	56	6.1	56	8.1	56	2	56	0.2	56		0.3	56	
31	Nebraska	93	1,668	93	1,420	93	8,197	93	4.9	93	5.8	93	0	93		93			93	
32	Nevada	17	1,585	17	526	17	5,537	17	3.5	17	10.5	17	0	17		17			17	
33	New Hampshire	242																		
34	New Jersey	21	6,283	21	3,486	21	57,498	21	9.2	21	16.5	21	188	21	3.0	21		5.4	21	
35	New Mexico	33	684	21	612	21	3,759	21	5.5	21	6.1	21	24	18	4.1	18	1	4.6	18	1
36	New York	58	15,153	56	6,740	56														
37	North Carolina	100	2,749	100	2,762	100	22,276	100	8.1	100	8.1	100	45	100	1.6	100		1.6	100	
38	North Dakota	53	607	53	542	53	3,227	53	5.3	53	6.0	53	2	53	0.3	53		0.4	53	
39	Ohio	88	11,366	88	6,602	88	49,030	87	4.4	87	7.6	87	192	86	1.7	86		2.9	86	
40	Oklahoma	77	2,152	77	2,130	77	6,346	77	2.9	77	3.0	77	0	77		77			77	
41	Oregon	36	1,448	36	36	36	1,357	36	0.9	36	37.7	36								
42	Pennsylvania	67					24,636	50					145	49						
44	Rhode Island	39	577	39	489	39	3,462	39	6.0	39	7.1	39								
45	South Carolina	46	2,168	46			2,986	5	9.2	5										
46	South Dakota	66	827	66	630	66							0	66		66			66	
47	Tennessee	95	2,287	95	2,211	95	17,907	95	7.8	95	8.1	95	35	94	1.5	94		1.6	94	
48	Texas	254	8,554	254	7,032	250	42,078	253	4.9	253	5.9	250	213	254	2.5	254		3.0	250	
49	Utah	29	1,880	29	1,061	29	6,114	29	3.3	29	5.8	29	6	29	0.3	29		0.6	29	
50	Vermont	246	277	246	277	246							0	15		15			15	
51	Virginia	134	2,294	134	2,367	134	19,180	133	8.6	133	8.3	133	0	134		134			134	
53	Washington	39	6,664	39	1,498	34	9,244	33	1.5	33	6.3	33	109	34	1.7	34		7.3	34	
54	West Virginia	55	1,977	55			10,639	50	5.8	50			19	50	1.0	50				
55	Wisconsin	1,910	3,563	1,253	2,686	1,596	18,669	1,264	5.2	1,252	8.2	1,258								
56	Wyoming	23	483	23	345	23	2,339	23	4.8	23	6.8	23	2	23	0.4	23		0.6	23	
60	American Samoa	1																		
66	Guam	1																		
72	Puerto Rico	110	1,676	110	1,554	110	62,070	110	37.0	110	39.9	110	0	110		110			110	
78	Virgin Islands	1	30	1	170	1	435	1	14.5	1	2.6	1	70	1	233.3	1	1	41.2	1	
	Total	**6,568**	**174,252**	**5,396**	**113,754**	**5,180**	**845,962**	**4,641**	**5.7**	**4,408**	**7.9**	**4,005**	**5,252**	**2,289**	**4.0**	**2,238**	**3**	**5.8**	**2,182**	**24**
	Maximum	**1,910**	**21,857**	**1,253**	**14,467**	**1,596**	**99,289**	**1,264**	**37.0**	**1,252**	**39.9**	**1,258**	**1,693**	**254**	**233.3**	**254**	**1**	**64.7**	**250**	**22**
	Average	**119**	**3,485**	**107**	**2,420**	**110**	**18,390**	**100**	**6.9**	**100**	**9.0**	**95**	**138**	**60**	**14.5**	**60**	**1**	**10.0**	**60**	**8**
	Minimum	**1**	**30**	**1**	**36**	**1**	**435**	**1**	**0.9**	**1**	**2.6**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0.2**	**1**	**1**	**0.2**	**1**	**1**

EAC Election Day Survey

Poll Workers 2004 General Election

Cases = Number of Jurisdictions Reporting Subject Matter

Code	Name	Election Administration Jurisdictions	Total Number of Precincts	Cases	Total Number of Polling Places	Cases	Total Number of Poll Workers	Cases	Average # of Poll Workers Per Precinct	Cases	Average # of Poll Workers Polling Place	Cases	Number of Precincts or Polling Places < Req Poll Workers	Cases	Percent Precincts < Req Poll Workers	Cases	Cases >100%	Percent Polling Places < Req Poll Workers	Cases	Cases >100%
	Election Administration	Poll workers removed from OR and PR because of questionable numbers and from ME, MI, TX, UT, VT, and WA where 0 Poll Workers were reported.																		
	Voting Equipment Used in 2004 General Election																			
	None / Unknown	908	13,552	252	9,699	558	54,335	133	4.7	133	7.2	111	258	215	1.9	215	2	2.8	215	1
	Punch card	260	19,745	248	12,985	231	93,220	234	4.7	225	6.9	212	1,313	226	7.0	217		10.6	204	
	Lever	394	20,301	199	10,789	365	38,222	319	4.6	138	7.0	304	1,163	130	22.5	118		36.0	115	19
	Paper	1,734	5,704	1,573	3,416	1,183	26,116	1,308	5.1	1,299	6.7	912	41	251	1.0	250		1.8	240	
	Optical scan	2,541	69,370	2,405	46,265	2,185	284,965	1,855	4.8	1,829	6.3	1,690	1,178	1,120	2.1	1,099	1	2.9	1,071	1
	Electronic	608	35,273	599	24,219	557	231,296	544	7.2	538	9.8	530	1,136	251	4.6	245		6.8	243	3
	Multiple Systems	123	10,307	120	6,381	101	54,381	102	5.8	100	8.5	100	163	96	1.8	94		2.7	94	
	Changed Voting Equipment Since 2000 General Election																			
	Yes	1,753	46,241	1,296	31,649	1,269	250,173	1,207	6.1	1,163	8.1	1,046	1,041	334	2.9	333		4.0	330	2
	No	4,815	128,011	4,100	82,105	3,911	532,362	3,288	5.1	3,099	7.1	2,813	4,211	1,955	4.5	1,905	3	6.5	1,852	22
	State Wide Voter Registration System in Place																			
	Yes	1,335	33,575	1,153	20,815	1,133	143,512	772	5.6	603	6.9	716	1,992	390	10.6	390	1	15.1	340	23
	No	5,233	140,677	4,243	92,939	4,047	639,023	3,723	5.3	3,659	7.6	3,143	3,260	1,899	2.9	1,848	2	4.2	1,842	1
	Election Day Registration																			
	Yes	2,823	9,704	1,924	3,794	1,663	33,676	1,847	6.0	1,835	7.9	1,325	23	67	1.6	67		2.1	67	
	No	3,745	164,548	3,472	109,960	3,517	748,859	2,648	5.4	2,427	7.4	2,534	5,229	2,222	4.0	2,171	3	5.8	2,115	24
	Provisional Ballot Acceptance																			
	In Overall Jurisdiction	1,162	65,986	1,080	44,212	1,070	336,578	840	4.9	789	7.0	786	4,077	630	6.6	580	1	9.9	578	23
	In Precinct Only	4,350	100,295	3,504	66,513	3,902	429,627	3,041	5.7	2,859	7.8	2,975	1,082	1,451	1.7	1,450	1	2.4	1,396	1
	None	1,056	7,971	812	3,029	208	16,330	614	7.5	614	6.3	98	93	208	2.9	208	1	3.1	208	
	No Excuse Absentee Balloting																			
	Yes	3,781	70,535	3,106	47,225	2,922	332,571	2,795	4.8	2,781	7.0	2,269	2,315	1,095	3.5	1,093	1	5.2	1,091	23
	No	2,787	103,717	2,290	66,529	2,258	449,964	1,700	5.9	1,481	7.8	1,590	2,937	1,194	4.5	1,145	2	6.4	1,091	1
	Early Voting Allowed																			
	Yes	1,701	69,882	1,683	51,609	1,618	376,926	1,428	5.4	1,426	7.1	1,370	971	1,257	1.5	1,255	1	2.0	1,199	1
	No	4,867	104,370	3,713	62,145	3,562	405,609	3,067	5.3	2,836	7.8	2,489	4,281	1,032	6.7	983	2	10.3	983	23
	Covered By Section 203, Language Minority Requirements																			
	Yes	468	54,051	443	36,098	443	269,780	413	5.4	405	7.9	407	1,920	421	3.8	420	1	5.7	414	2
	No	6,100	120,201	4,953	77,656	4,737	512,755	4,082	5.4	3,857	7.2	3,452	3,332	1,868	4.1	1,818	2	5.8	1,768	22
	Covered By Section 5 of Voting Rights Act																			
	Yes	880	32,976	855	25,680	803	180,258	743	6.1	743	7.4	733	1,974	515	8.3	515		10.4	511	22
	No	5,688	141,276	4,541	88,074	4,377	602,277	3,752	5.2	3,519	7.5	3,126	3,278	1,774	3.0	1,723	3	4.5	1,671	2

EAC Election Day Survey

Poll Workers 2004 General Election

Cases = Number of Jurisdictions Reporting Subject Matter

Code	Name	Election Administration Jurisdictions	Total Number of Precincts	Cases	Total Number of Polling Places	Cases	Total Number of Poll Workers	Cases	Average # of Poll Workers Per Precinct	Cases	Average # of Poll Workers Polling Place	Cases	Number of Precincts or Polling Places < Req Poll Workers	Cases	Percent Precincts < Req Poll Workers	Cases	Cases >100%	Percent Polling Places < Req Poll Workers	Cases	Cases >100%
	Updated: 09/19/2005 13:07:50																			
	Demographics																			
	Region																			
	Northeast	**1,710**	25,068	1,230	13,219	882	98,085	795	9.1	576	14.0	229	333	85	3.0	36		5.3	36	
	South	**1,423**	48,810	1,408	37,805	1,302	295,504	1,293	6.6	1,293	7.8	1,234	2,287	926	6.4	926		8.1	872	22
	Midwest	**2,902**	55,993	2,243	35,954	2,490	220,353	2,046	4.7	2,033	6.7	2,038	1,999	808	4.7	807	1	6.7	807	1
	West	**420**	42,675	404	25,052	395	168,158	360	4.1	359	6.6	357	563	359	1.4	358	1	2.3	356	1
	Territories	**113**	1,706	111	1,724	111	435	1	14.5	1	2.6	1	70	111	4.1	111	1	4.1	111	
	Urban to Rural																			
	Urban	**567**	60,394	445	36,556	523	306,044	368	6.4	321	9.4	358	2,112	107	4.8	105		7.3	104	
	Suburban	**871**	37,906	639	25,451	715	179,523	557	5.2	472	7.4	501	768	179	2.4	169		3.6	164	1
	Small Towns	**1,710**	41,994	1,421	28,085	1,283	184,288	1,198	5.0	1,123	6.7	977	1,184	617	3.8	590		5.5	565	5
	Rural	**3,307**	32,252	2,780	21,938	2,548	112,245	2,371	4.2	2,345	5.3	2,022	1,118	1,275	4.8	1,263	2	6.3	1,238	18
	Not Available - Territories	**113**	1,706	111	1,724	111	435	1	14.5	1	2.6	1	70	111	4.1	111	1	4.1	111	
	Size of Jurisdiction (VAP)																			
	< 1,000	**1,761**	2,118	1,229	1,350	1,169	6,579	1,082	3.3	1,068	4.8	812	11	40	8.4	39		9.2	39	
	>=1,000 to <3,500	**1,165**	2,558	893	1,976	850	12,133	735	5.7	700	6.3	565	34	210	2.1	210		3.0	210	
	>=3,500 to <10,000	**1,043**	8,343	902	5,891	873	31,797	737	4.7	685	5.6	665	187	466	3.4	463		4.4	450	5
	>=10,000 to <50,000	**1,704**	35,443	1,554	25,830	1,508	140,541	1,323	4.7	1,226	5.7	1,251	1,243	947	5.4	925	2	6.8	892	17
	>=50,000 to <250,000	**586**	41,344	545	28,105	516	196,277	467	5.7	439	7.6	435	1,262	386	4.0	368		5.7	360	2
	>=250,000 to <1,000,000	**140**	44,037	126	27,595	118	246,146	117	6.1	110	9.1	108	1,028	108	2.8	101		4.3	99	
	>=1,000,000	**25**	38,691	24	21,272	24	148,578	21	4.9	21	7.8	21	1,417	21	4.7	21		7.4	21	
	Not Available	**144**	1,718	123	1,735	122	484	13	11.5	13	2.6	2	70	111	4.1	111	1	4.1	111	
	Race and Ethnicity																			
	Predominently NH White	**6,264**	161,698	5,125	104,108	4,925	718,654	4,368	5.3	4,137	7.4	3,749	4,905	2,094	4.1	2,043	2	6.0	1,989	20
	Predominently NH Black	**85**	2,820	80	2,103	69	15,915	52	7.6	51	9.6	51	182	26	12.6	26		16.9	26	4
	Predominently NH Native American	**24**	313	22	302	19	1,392	16	5.5	16	5.7	13	17	14	6.2	14		6.3	14	
	Predominently Hispanic	**50**	7,664	45	5,465	44	45,946	45	6.0	44	8.3	43	78	43	1.0	43		1.5	41	
	Not Available	**145**	1,757	124	1,776	123	628	14	7.8	14	2.8	3	70	112	4.0	112	1	4.0	112	
	Median Income																			
	< $25,000	**298**	3,893	279	2,875	215	14,717	241	4.4	240	4.9	178	377	123	16.1	123	1	23.5	109	7
	>=$25,000 to <$30,000	**884**	12,731	819	9,302	697	52,958	740	4.7	737	5.6	607	794	459	8.8	458		11.8	438	10
	>=$30,000 to <$35,000	**1,372**	23,424	1,197	16,639	1,076	106,519	1,054	5.0	1,022	6.3	895	660	678	3.1	653		4.2	639	4
	>=$35,000 to <$40,000	**1,215**	40,250	1,056	24,419	937	148,397	873	5.1	860	6.8	740	1,723	444	6.7	434		9.3	432	2
	>=$40,000 to <$45,000	**881**	36,644	675	23,887	680	176,158	553	5.7	531	8.2	481	547	223	1.9	214	1	2.9	210	1
	>=$45,000 to <$50,000	**587**	19,189	434	12,206	458	91,423	343	4.9	325	7.6	311	419	111	2.6	109		4.0	108	
	>=$50,000	**1,180**	36,399	810	22,689	993	191,863	675	6.1	531	9.2	643	662	140	2.4	136		3.8	135	
	Not Available	**151**	1,722	126	1,737	124	500	16	10.9	16	2.6	4	70	111	4.1	111	1	4.1	111	
	High School Education																			
	< 60%	**126**	2,148	121	1,577	113	7,649	103	4.1	103	4.8	96	183	60	14.2	60		20.8	55	3
	>=60% to <70%	**661**	18,185	616	13,467	563	90,909	554	5.5	551	7.0	513	711	326	5.1	326		7.1	315	10
	>=70% to <80%	**1,646**	51,393	1,411	32,782	1,319	218,590	1,263	5.2	1,224	7.0	1,091	2,235	746	6.1	726	1	8.8	696	8
	>=80% to <90%	**3,111**	87,644	2,502	56,581	2,410	411,176	2,107	5.6	1,992	7.9	1,781	1,900	951	2.8	920	1	4.0	910	3
	>=90%	**873**	13,121	619	7,569	650	53,567	451	4.7	375	7.6	373	153	94	1.5	94		2.5	94	
	Not Available	**151**	1,761	127	1,778	125	644	17	7.6	17	2.8	5	70	112	4.0	112	1	4.0	112	

EAC Election Day Survey

Poll Workers 2004 General Election

Cases = Number of Jurisdictions Reporting Subject Matter

Code	Name	Election Administration Jurisdictions	Total Number of Precincts	Cases	Total Number of Polling Places	Cases	Total Number of Poll Workers	Cases	Average # of Poll Workers Per Precinct	Cases	Average # of Poll Workers Polling Place	Cases	Number of Precincts or Polling Places < Req Poll Workers	Cases	Percent Precincts < Req Poll Workers	Cases	Cases >100%	Percent Polling Places < Req Poll Workers	Cases	Cases >100%
	Political																			
	Battleground States in 2004 Presidential Election																			
	Yes	**3,093**	59,123	2,113	33,037	2,309	282,662	2,038	4.9	1,975	7.6	1,932	928	746	1.6	696	2	2.6	647	2
	No	**3,475**	115,129	3,283	80,717	2,871	499,873	2,457	5.7	2,287	7.3	1,927	4,324	1,543	5.5	1,542	1	7.4	1,535	22
	Margin of Victory in 2004 Presidential Election																			
	< 2.5%	**515**	13,708	383	8,230	350	59,491	333	5.8	298	7.7	254	429	97	4.7	92		6.7	90	3
	>=2.5% to < 5.0%	**476**	10,126	359	5,981	335	72,536	307	8.6	279	13.1	231	390	99	5.3	93		8.4	89	
	>=5.0% to < 7.5%	**510**	13,805	416	9,195	388	60,013	354	5.3	332	7.0	287	145	107	1.4	107		1.9	101	1
	>=7.5% to < 10.0 %	**429**	9,114	333	5,538	313	40,024	275	4.8	258	7.5	225	202	102	2.6	99		4.4	95	1
	>=10.0 %	**4,492**	125,787	3,788	83,067	3,664	550,008	3,219	5.1	3,089	7.1	2,855	4,016	1,773	4.3	1,736	2	6.1	1,696	19
	Red vs Blue Jurisdictions Won By in 2004 Presidential Election																			
	Bush > 55%	**3,115**	68,994	2,690	49,173	2,617	315,045	2,486	5.0	2,424	6.5	2,277	1,880	1,553	3.5	1,519	2	4.8	1,484	15
	Bush 50% to 55%	**982**	25,314	760	16,788	700	112,551	669	5.1	630	6.9	546	658	260	3.4	252		4.7	241	4
	Bush < 50%	**136**	1,701	106	1,181	79	8,449	92	7.4	81	8.6	54	140	16	14.1	15		17.9	15	
	Kerry < 50%	**150**	4,276	107	3,030	101	16,330	100	5.5	83	6.4	70	134	20	5.1	19		6.0	20	2
	Kerry 50% to 55%	**872**	22,439	683	12,452	656	117,045	539	6.7	491	10.7	426	457	154	2.9	150		4.9	142	1
	Kerry > 55%	**1,161**	49,810	927	29,387	897	212,602	596	5.5	541	8.2	479	1,913	175	5.3	172		8.3	169	2
	Tied	**25**	12	12	8	8	78	12	6.5	11	4.7	6								