UOCAVA
Voting Trend Analysis & Risk Assessment
Maricopa County, Arizona

Tammy Patrick
Federal Compliance Officer
Maricopa County Recorder/Election Department
UOCAVA Working Group

- Overall assessment of current Vote By Mail (VBM) UOCAVA system was circulated in February of this year identifying areas of potential vulnerability.
- Maricopa County collects data which speak to two of the categories:
  - Denial of Service/Misdirected or Diversion
  - Authentication
- As a background, Arizona has allowed for the delivery and return of ballots electronically since the 2008 election cycle and is an important element of this presentation.
Denial of Service/
Misdirected or Diversion

• Discussed as:
  – Accidental or malicious failure of the voter receiving their ballot either due to inherent qualities of the delivery system of the ballot or the voter not providing accurate/sufficient/timely information.
  – Competing resources for the delivery of necessities (FVAP’s 4B’s: “Beans, Bullets, Bandages, and Ballots”)
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Authentication

- For existing VBM systems this is usually in reference to the signature verification of the returned balloting materials.
- This is a two-fold issue:
  - Lack of signature
  - Signature which does not match
MOVE Act

• It is important to note in this discussion that this analysis is not a comprehensive review of the impact of the MOVE Act because the State of Arizona did not reduce the coverage period MOVE allows until this legislative session.

• Therefore, there were still many voters who had requested to be a covered UOCAVA voter up to 4 years prior to the 2010 General Election, consequently impacting the efficacy of MCED’s ability to successfully transmit a ballot to the voter.
With that said.

- UOCAVA voting behaviors in Maricopa County 2004-2010
- Review of ballots returned, & their dispositions
- Review of who did not return ballots
UOCAVA Voter At Risk

Voter Type
Ballot Type
Disposition Failure
Location
Age
Party Affiliation
FPCA
2004-2010

UOCAVA BY
TOTAL NUMBER OF BALLOTS
2004-2010 UOCAVA Comparison

Ballots

- **Sent 2004**: 65%
- **Return 2004**: 22%
- **Sent 2006**: 66%
- **Return 2006**: 28%
- **Sent 2008**: 66%
- **Returned 2008**: 28%
- **Sent 2010**: 66%
- **Returned 2010**: 28%
2004-2010 UOCAVA Comparison

Domestic Military
Overseas Military
Overseas Citizens
Overseas Employee
Electronic

Sent 2004
Return 2004
Sent 2006
Return 2006
Sent 2008
Returned 2008
Sent 2010
Returned 2010

2006 OSC & OSE were grouped together
Some of the Domestic Military in ‘04 could possibly be a portion of the Overseas Military voters 4 years later.
2004-2010 Mid-term Cycle
UOCAVA Comparison

Domestic Military
Overseas Military
Overseas Citizens
Overseas Employee
Electronic

Sent 2006
Return 2006
Sent 2010
Returned 2010

2006 OSC & OSE were grouped together
2004-2010 Overall Return Rate:

- Domestic Military 53%
- Overseas Military 43%
- Overseas Citizen 47%
- Overseas Employee 56%
- Electronic 68%

- Total Military 49%
- Total Civilian 51%
UOCAVA Voter At Risk

- Military
- Ballot Type
- Disposition Failure
- Location
- Age
- Party Affiliation
- FPCA
UOCAVA BY PERCENTAGE OF BALLOTS
2004-2010 UOCAVA Comparison
% of Ballots Returned by Voter Type

- Domestic Military
- Overseas Military
- Overseas Citizens
- Overseas Employee
- Electronic
2010 UOCAVA Rate of Return

• The average return rate for UOCAVA voters was 28%, well below the average return rate of 77%.

• Although faxing was the smallest category, it had the highest rate of return of 80%.

• Notice that providing an electronic mechanism for UOCAVA voters to access and return their ballot greatly improved their participation/return rate to 68% over the other UOCAVA Categories:
  – Overseas Citizen 26%
  – Overseas Employee 12%
  – Overseas Military 18%
  – Domestic Military 23%
Rate of Return

• General Election 2008 UOCAVA voters returned their ballots 64% of the time, total ballot return for all early voters was 92%.

• General Election 2010 UOCAVA voters returned their ballots 28% of the time, total ballot return for all early voters was 77%. (But electronic return was much closer at 68%.)
2010 UOCAVA Requests & Returns

- Overseas Civil: 26%
- Overseas Employment: 12%
- Overseas Military: 18%
- Domestic Military: 23%
- Electronic: 68%
- Fax: 80%
RETURNED
BALLOT & VOTER TYPE ANALYSIS

General 2008 & 2010
2008 UOCAVA Returned Ballot Types

- Military Standard: 53%
- Military FWAB: 45%

Legend:
- Green: Military Standard
- Light Green: Military FWAB
- Gray: Civilian Standard
- Light Gray: Civilian FWAB
2010 UOCAVA Returned Ballot Types

We had 0% voters use the FWAB in the 2010 General Election—there were a handful returned but the voters also submitted full ballots so those were the ones tabulated.

Voters demonstrated their support of the electronic return by using it for the return of their ballots.
UOCAVA Voter At Risk

- Military
- Standard
- Disposition Failure
- FPCA
- Location
- Age
- Party Affiliation
2008 UOCAVA vs. Total EV Return & Disposition of the Ballot

- Total EV: 99.3% (1485)
- UOCAVA: 98%

- Counted: 99.3%
- Late: 0.2% (1485)
- No Sig: 0.2%
- Bad Sig: 0.4%
- UOCAVA: 0.3%
2010 UOCAVA vs. Total EV Return & Disposition of the Ballot

- **Total EV**
  - Counted: 99% (2680)
  - Late: 0.1% (2680)
  - No Sig: 0.4%
  - Bad Sig: 0.5%

- **UOCAVA**
  - Counted: 97%
  - Late: 2% (29)
  - No Sig: 1% (17)
  - Bad Sig: 0%
2010 had a higher percentage of voters returning their ballots late; however, none of them had received their ballot electronically—all of those voters returned their ballot on time.
2010 had a higher percentage of voters returning their ballots without a signature; 1 voter returned theirs electronically without the necessary signature.
UOCAVA Voter At Risk

- Military
- Standard
- Returned Late
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- Party Affiliation
- FPCA
GENERAL 2008 & 2010

UNRETURNED BALLOT VOTER TYPE ANALYSIS
2008 UOCAVA Not Returned by Voter Type

- Domestic Military: 33%
- Overseas Military: 22%
- Overseas Citizen: 18%
- Overseas Employee: 27%

Legend:
- Domestic Military
- Overseas Military
- Overseas Citizen
- Overseas Employee
2010 saw a very different picture of the ballots not returned than 2008. A large shift occurred to Overseas Citizen not returning –28% compared to only 18% in 2008.
Dom. Mil was only slightly higher than ‘08
‘08 vs. ‘10 UOCAVA Not Returned by Voter Type
As % of All UOCAVA Not Returned
2010 General Election

FPCA ANALYSIS
Quick Methodology Narrative

• This query looked at those voters on the voter file as of the date of the analysis.

• The data includes:
  – Date of the voter’s FPCA request
  – History of any election post request
  – Status of ballot for each election in voter’s history

• Graphs reflect the percentages of ballots for all elections the voter was eligible for by year with raw numbers listed.

• Anomalies may be attributed to those voters who are no longer on the voter file.
’08 vs ’10 Effective Ballots Returned in Years After FPCA Request

% of UOCAVA Ballots

First Year  Second Year  Third Year  Fourth Year
’08 vs ’10 Ballots Returned as Undeliverable in Years After FPCA Request

Odd that the % is so consistent within an election year—3% in 2008 & 1% in 2010 returned as undeliverable.

Due to more emphasis by USPS in a Presidential year??
’08 vs ’10 Ballots Sent But Never Returned in Years After FPCA Request
'08 vs '10 Ballots Cast by UOCAVA Voters at the Polls in Years After FPCA Request

% of UOCAVA Ballots

- First Year
- Second Year
- Third Year
- Fourth Year

- 2008
- 2010
UOCAVA Voter At Risk

- Military
- Standard
- Returned Late
- After 1 year of FPCA
- Location
- Age
- Party Affiliation
UNRETURNED BALLOT
VOTER PARTY AFFILIATION ANALYSIS

General 2008 & 2010
2008 UOCAVA Not Returned by Party

- Democrat: 26%
- Republican: 37%
- Other: 36%
- Libertarian: 1%
The shift occurred with 4% more Dem voters not returning & more Rep did return.
Gen 2008 vs. Gen 2010
UOCAVA Not Returned by Party

# of Ballots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UOCAVA Voter At Risk

- Military
- Standard
- Returned Late
- Location
- Age
- Unaffiliated
- After 1 year of FPCA
UNRETURNED BALLOT
AGE OF VOTER ANALYSIS

Ballot Sent, Not Returned
2010 General Election
2010 Ballot Sent, Not Returned
By Decade & Voter Type

![Graph showing 2010 ballot sent, not returned by decade and voter type. The x-axis represents decades from 1900s to 1990s, and the y-axis represents the number of ballots. The graph uses different colors to represent MIL, OSM, OSC, and OSE voter types.](image)
UOCAVA Voter At Risk

- Military
- Standard
- Returned Late
- After 1 year of FPCA
- Born in 1980’s
- Unaffiliated
- Location
2010 General Election

RETURNED UNDELIVERABLE ANALYSIS
Domestic Military ballot which were returned undeliverable had equal numbers of voters cast an effective ballot in 2008 and most were not UOCAVA voters in 2006 election.
Overseas Military ballots returned saw 92% cast an effective ballot in 2008 (8% were not UOCAVA voters) while 100% of them were not UOCAVA voters in 2006.
All of the ballots returned as undeliverable for Overseas Citizens were for voters who returned ballots in 2008 but none had requested for the 2006 General election.
All of the ballots returned as undeliverable for Overseas Employees were for voters who returned ballots in both the 2008 and the 2006 General elections.
UOCAVA Voter At Risk

- Military
- Standard
- Returned Late
- After 1 year of FPCA
- Domestic Mailing Address
- Born in 1980’s
- Unaffiliated
GLOBAL DISTRIBUTION
OF NON-MILITARY UOCAVA VOTERS

Spring 2011
ALL NON-MILITARY UOCAVA VOTERS

[Graph showing the number of non-military UOCAVA voters by country.]
51-100 VOTERS BY COUNTRY

- MEXICO
- FRANCE
- JAPAN
- ISRAEL
- SPAIN
5-10 Voters by Country

- Egypt
- Indonesia
- Poland
- Jordan
- Kuwait
- Lebanon
- Austria
- Kenya
- Malaysia
- Albania
- Columbia
- Paraguay
- Romania
CITIZENS & EMPLOYEES

I am a citizen living outside the U.S.
COUNTRIES WITH MORE THAN 100 VOTERS
CANADA: 229 VOTERS

81% OVERSEAS CITIZENS

19% OVERSEAS EMPLOYEES
UNITED KINGDOM: 214 VOTERS

- OVERSEAS CITIZENS: 65%
- OVERSEAS EMPLOYEES: 35%
GERMANY: 144 VOTERS

73% OVERSEAS CITIZENS
27% OVERSEAS EMPLOYEES
China has more temporary UOCAVA voters than any other country.

China: 136 Voters

58% OVERSEAS CITIZENS
42% OVERSEAS EMPLOYEES
AUSTRALIA: 118 VOTERS

- OVERSEAS CITIZENS: 74%
- OVERSEAS EMPLOYEES: 26%
MEXICO: 81 VOTERS

- Overseas Citizens: 67%
- Overseas Employees: 33%
DOES THE UOCAVA VOTER AT RISK PROFILES ACCESS ONLINE SERVICES?

Presidential Election 2008
Data Source: MCED MILOS

(MILitary and Over Seas)

• All UOCAVA emails go to a single email address—this includes directly from the voter, as well as inquiries made via the SOS or MCED website.

• The email information was then exported from Outlook into Excel for sorting, categorizing, and recording.

• Some emails were difficult to allocate as the voter failed to select or mention what their inquiry was for, they simply provided their information.

• This summary is presented as a general snapshot of online traffic from UOCAVA voters.
% of UOCAVA Online Voters

- **APO**: 13%
- **FPO**: 3%
- **DPO**: 1%

Map showing distribution of UOCAVA online voters worldwide: 48% in North America, 13% in Europe, 4% in Asia, 4% in Africa, 2% in South America, 1% in Australia, and 2% in Antarctica.
UOCAVA Voter At Risk

- Born in 1980’s
- Unaffiliated
- Returned Late
- After 1 year of FPCA
- Standard
Decade of Birth of UOCAVA Online voters

(From the SOS data)
UOCAVA Voter At Risk

- Standard
- Returned Late
- After 1 year of FPCA
- Unaffiliated
Many people are requesting to register to vote. The survey results show that 64% of the respondents said "Yes," while 36% said "No."
Timeline for using SOS site in month leading up to the election for VR

29 voters used the service to register after standard deadline on October 6th.
UOCAVA Voter At Risk

- Standard
- Returned Late
- Unaffiliated
Requesting an Early Ballot?

- Yes: 87%
- No: 13%
Timeline for using SOS site in month leading up to the election for EV

66 voters used the service to request a ballot after standard deadline on October 24th.
UOCAVA Voter At Risk

Born in 1980s
Domestic Mailing Address
After 1 year of FPCA Standard
Unaffiliated Military
Conclusion

• The existing VBM system has inherent risks which impact all UOCAVA voters, but in Maricopa County we have isolated particular voter characteristics which are more vulnerable.

• Providing online access to information and services aid in mitigating the impact of those risks.

• We are undergoing enhancements to our online system and data collection and have set our expectations high for 2012 voter participation.