THE UNIVERSITY *of*
NEW MEXICO

ASSESSING ELECTORAL PERFORMANCE IN THE NEW MEXICO 2010 GENERAL ELECTION

PRINCIPAL AUTHORS:
LONNA RAE ATKESON
PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE & DIRECTOR CENTER FOR DEMOCRACY, UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

R. MICHAEL ALVAREZ
PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

ALEX N. ADAMS
GRADUATE STUDENT, UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

LISA A. BRYANT
PHD CANDIDATE, UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

PROJECT PARTNERS:
MAGGIE TOULOUSE OLIVER, BERNALILLO COUNTY CLERK
ROBERT ADAMS, BERNALILLO DEPUTY COUNTY CLERK
VALERIE ESPINOZA, SANTA FE COUNTY CLERK
DENISE LAMB, SANTA FE DEPUTY COUNTY CLERK
LYNN ELLINS, DOÑA ANA COUNTY CLERK
DEBBIE HOLMES, SAN JUAN COUNTY CLERK
TANYA SHELBY DEPUTY SAN JUAN COUNTY CLERK
RHONDA B. BURROWS, LINCOLN COUNTY CLERK
CONI JO LYMAN, CURRY COUNTY CLERK

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT SUPPORT
CHRISTOPHER SHANNON, SYDNEY RUIZ, DANIEL APODACA

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:
BERNALILLO COUNTY CLERK, UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO RESEARCH ALLOCATION COMMITTEE
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE AND DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

FEBRUARY 2011

Table of Contents

Study Executive Summary

The 2010 New Mexico Election Administration Report represents a systematic examination of New Mexico's November 2010 General election. It is the third election report in a series that we began unintentionally in 2006 with our academic partners R. Michael Alvarez, professor at the California Institute of Technology, and Thad E. Hall, associate professor at the University of Utah. To our knowledge no other state has had the kind of sustained and independent analysis over multiple elections. But New Mexico is a unique environment culturally, politically, and electorally and project partners, the Secretary of State's office, and the broader electoral community, made up of a variety of activist organizations, have supported and encouraged our efforts. Moreover feedback on our work from regular voters, poll workers as well as responsiveness by local election administrators has made our efforts productive and helpful as New Mexico continues to reform its electoral processes.

In this report, we combine qualitative and quantitative methods to analyze the New Mexico election landscape.[1] We think the key to improving elections is to collect and analyze the experiences of voters, poll workers, and administrators systematically.[2] Together these data provide a portrait of the election experience from which problems and successes can be identified and confirmed from multiple players.   Our research design is a multi-pronged evaluation strategy. Combining data from different electoral actors provides multiple perspectives from key players and groups to assess how well the election was run and how the management of the election can be improved in future elections.

In 2007, we released our research on the 2006 New Mexico Election Administration Report.[3] At the beginning of 2010, we released our 2008 Ecosystem report.[4] The 2006 and 2008 reports provide points of comparison for how the system is evolving since the implementation of a statewide optical scan paper ballot system in 2006. We use these data wherever possible to assist us in determining where improvement or deteriorations have occurred.

---

[1] For another example of an ecosystem approach see: Steven F. Huefner, Daniel P. Tokaji, & Edward B. Foley with Nathan

[2] Evaluating the fairness and accuracy of democracies is an important international and national question, see, for example, Heather K. Gerken (2009), *The Democracy Index.* Princeton: Princeton University Press and Jorgen Elkitt and Andrew Reynolds, 2005, "A Framework for the Systematic Study of Election Quality," *Democratization*12(2):147-62.

[3] R. Michael Alvarez, Lonna Rae Atkeson and Thad E. Hall, 2007, *The New Mexico Election Administration Report: The 2006 November General Election*, (University of New Mexico), available at: http://www.unm.edu/~atkeson/newmexico.html.

[4] Lonna Rae Atkeson, R. Michael Alvarez and Thad E. Hall, 2010, *Assessing Electoral Performance in New Mexico Using an Ecosystem Approach*, (University of New Mexico), available at: http://www.unm.edu/~atkeson/newmexico.html.

Part 1 of this report examines Election Day and Early Voting observations in Bernalillo County and poll worker training. Though in 2008, we participated and observed poll worker training, this is the first time we included a critique of training as part of our overall focus. Unfortunately, we did not have resources to include any other counties in our Election Day observations, but we were able to expand our reach with more observers on the ground and covered more precincts in Bernalillo County than ever before. We found that voting largely went smoothly and without complications and that election officials overall did a good job in preparing for an implementing the 2010 general election. Nevertheless better training of poll workers and judges, as well as better education of poll workers, poll judges and voters, should enhance the accountability and quality of the election experience in future elections. Our observations produce a number of recommendations to improve poll worker training as well as the the uniformity of voter identification across precincts, ballot security, voter privacy, the underuse of the AutoMARK, general polling place policies, and procedures in early voting elections.

Part 2 of this report examines the attitudes and experiences of a sample of poll workers in the 6 New Mexico counties: Bernalillo, Doña Ana, San Juan, Santa Fe, Lincoln and Curry.[5] The goal of the survey was two-fold: first, to determine how poll workers generally view the election process in New Mexico, and second, to examine specific electoral issues and questions (how poll workers are implementing specific laws, how they view recent changes to state election laws, and their attitudes about various electoral reforms and the incidence of election fraud). In Part 2, we analyze the characteristics of poll workers, their recruitment and training, an assessment by poll workers of their polling locations, the use of voter identification, problems that occurred at the polls, their training experience and suggestions for improvement, their attitude toward the possible establishing of vote centers and replacement of traditional precincts, an evaluation of election procedures, the use of provisional balloting, voter privacy, contact with the county clerk, job confidence and satisfaction as well as attitudes toward election reform and fraud.

Part 3 of this report turns to the attitudes and experiences of a random sample of voters in New Mexico. The report examines factors associated with the voting experience, experience with the ballot, the polling site, voter interaction with poll workers, voter confidence, voter identification, attitudes toward the possible establishment of vote centers, and voter satisfaction. The report also provides data on attitudes toward election reforms, voter identification, and the perceived incidence of voter fraud. This survey gives corroborating evidence supporting the findings from our Election Day observations and poll worker reports as well as providing additional information about how the public reacts to and feels toward their election process.

The combined report provides a multifaceted profile of the election landscape in New Mexico. Most importantly, our analysis shows a system that is fundamentally working, where voter problems are infrequent, and where voter and poll worker confidence is

---

[5] Curry County only participated in the first round of contact with poll workers and were not included in our mailings to poll workers. Therefore, the number of poll workers participating from this county was quite small.

generally high. For example, voters indicate that their confidence in their vote being counted is quite high with over half of voters (54%) very confident and another two in four voters (39%) somewhat confident. Poll worker confidence is slightly higher with nearly nine in ten poll workers (87%) very confident and another 12% somewhat confident. Only about 1% of poll workers indicated that they were not very confident (0.9%) and no poll worker indicated that they were not at all confident. Thus, poll workers strongly believed that the vote tabulating machine, the ES&S M100, produced accurate results in the election. Both poll workers and voters rated the overall performance of their poll workers high with almost all voters (98%) indicating their poll workers were very helpful (77%) or somewhat helpful (20%) and almost 9 in 10 (85%) poll workers rating the overall performance of their peers as an 8 (18%), 9 (29%) or 10 (38%) on a 10 point scale.

Equally important, the early and Election Day observations revealed a variety of strengths and weaknesses in the election system leading to a series of policy recommendations. For example, Election Day observations showed consistent problems in the administration of voter identification, though we did see an improvement over both 2006 and 2008. We also saw a number of situations where schools were being used for precincts and there was not coordination between election and school officials creating rather chaotic precincts at some point. For the first issue their needs to be better presiding judge training and attention needs to be placed on emphasizing the importance of consistency both within and across precincts for professional and legal reasons. For the second issue, better communication with school officials regarding the needs of a precinct for privacy and quiet before the election need to be negotiated.

Based on our findings, we also highlight several areas where improvements could be made in voter education as well as poll worker and poll judge training, and precinct preparations. Although most polling locations had the supplies and workers they needed, a small minority of poll workers reported that they did not have the supplies (10%) or workers (8%) needed to do the job. We noted in our observations that some precincts had few workers all day, while others were very, very busy. We suggest that the number of poll workers in any particular precinct may not need to be constant and that election administrators may want to consider varying the number of poll workers based upon the history of Election Day turnout. In the case of supplies, we recommend that checklists be developed to ensure each precinct has all the necessary supplies to perform its Election Day operations and that poll judges review their supplies before election morning to ensure that they are prepared. The poll worker survey noted differences in how New Mexico's voter identification laws were applied. New Mexico's laws appeared to have been confusing to voters and poll workers alike. This has been true across all three elections we have observed. There has been improvement, but in some precincts poll workers are still deciding the type of identification required. The law allows voters the choice of several types of identification they could provide including a verbal statement of their name, address, and birth year.[6] Although many poll workers asked for voter identification, many

---

[6] In 2006 the verbal identification also included the last four numbers of the voter's social security number.

of them did not. And, although many voters did not have to show identification, many of them just automatically handed an ID to the poll worker. The poll worker and voter surveys confirmed that there were serious problems of uniformity across and within precincts on this issue. The voter survey indicated that just under half (45%) of voters were identified correctly and this includes voters who provided an ID without being asked. The poll worker survey indicated that poll workers ask for identification for reasons outside of the law and often used authentication methods that were incorrect (e.g. had voters look up their number in the rolls). Voters should be treated equally by poll workers, and given the politics around this issue and the clear confusion by poll workers, more effort should be made to train poll workers to accurately follow voter identification requirements.

 In addition to these issues, each part of our report identifies key areas where voters could be better served including consideration of placement of voting equipment in polling places, issues related to voter privacy, and, procedures in early voting. We also often provide specific recommendations to enhance the efficiency and general quality of the voting experience.

Although we identify issues in the implementation of the 2010 election, relative to previous elections, this election was relatively problem-free. However, as the larger problems in the election are addressed, it is important that election officials address the other problems that arise that can become larger problems if left unattended.   This report should, therefore, not be read as an indictment of how the 2010 elections were run in New Mexico, but as a series of observations and recommendations for how to improve an already improving process.

The recommendations contained in the report are primarily administrative in nature and in many cases the Secretary of State may want to issue administrative rules to obtain uniformity across counties and precinct administration. However, there are three recommendations that could require legislative action in order to be effectively addressed.

First, the multi-layered voter identification law in New Mexico created an uneven implementation environment. Specifically, we find that Hispanics and men are more likely to be asked to show identification before being given the option to engage in verbal identification, as allowed under law. Given the continuous problems with the law as it now stands, there may be a need to clarify the statute. Although the lawmakers were attempting to promote easy access to the polls, the flexibility in the identification process creates a chaotic environment where poll workers can easily go outside of the law. This creates uneven implementation across and within precincts. Although poll worker training and voter education may help to solve the problem, more serious measures may be necessary.

Second, there was confusion among poll workers, third-party observers, and partisans, about where the boundaries are for their activities outside the polls. The key question here was where the boundaries start—for example, is it the door of the school building or the door of the room where the polling place is located in the school—and then how to

measure off that boundary. Clarifying this issue is important for uniformity in implementation and the lessening of problems at the polls.

Third, in 2010 due to changes in the law county clerks across New Mexico were not allowed to use retired public employees as poll workers. This created a huge loss of many experienced, hard working and reliable poll workers. This unintended consequence of the law should be remedied so that these individuals can continue to play a valuable role in their community.

Finally, we wish to make clear that our work would not have been possible without the assistance of many individuals throughout New Mexico who we thank throughout this report. We also relied upon the direct research support of many students and colleagues, and in each part of the report below we indicate those individuals who assisted with the research and analysis. This is especially true for the Election Day observations where graduate and undergraduate students observed voting as part of their class assignment. Funding for these projects came from a contract with the Bernalillo County Clerk for the poll worker survey and pieces of the voter survey. The Resource Allocation Committee at the University of New Mexico assisted with the statewide voter survey, and the College of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Political Science supported the voter and poll worker surveys as well.. The Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project also helped to facilitate this research effort especially the early voting observations. Of course, all of the conclusions and recommendations made within this report are ours and do not reflect the views of any of these entities.

Summary of Key Recommendations:

Recommendations Regarding Poll Worker Training

- New Mexico election officials might consider using scenario-based training, where election workers are presented with various problems that may occur on Election Day and then discuss how to address them. This could include more experiential techniques such as situational analysis, role-playing, and using probing techniques to elicit responses and discussion among the participants.

- Given the length of time training already takes, it may be beneficial to consider breaking training down into two sessions. An interactive, lecture, video, and Power Point session and a hands on training that deals with specific tasks such as closing procedures, which are very complicated and challenging for poll workers to complete, including the hand counting of machine unreadable ballots and the votes for write-in candidates, and other more complicated tasks such as provisional balloting.

- The trainers should go through a "training the trainer" process to assist them in learning how to handle conflicts in the training session and how most effectively to create a positive learning environment.

- Procedures should be developed to handle unexpected problems during training. Trainers should communicate with other staff if and when they are having problems, missing training items, etc. so that problems can be solved during training.

Recommendations Regarding Procedural Considerations in Elections

- There should be posted information at all precincts about provisional voting and what a voter should do before casting a provisional ballot in order to increase the chances of the provisional vote being counted.

- Counties should ensure they have adequate personnel and phone lines to deal with calls from presiding judges throughout the day so that voters can be helped as quickly as possible. Larger counties may want to consider a rapid response system designed specifically for Election Day.

- A greater emphasis should be placed on poll workers logging instances of "assisted voting," including the name of the person giving assistance.

- Incidents or unusual activities that occur during Election Day, early voting or in the counting of absentee ballots should be recorded by poll workers in an incident log and returned to the county clerk's office for review.

- Election officials should discuss with school officials before Election Day how to handle normal student activity so that it does not interfere or hinder the voting process.

- Election officials should identify polling places that may have difficult issues for signage, set up, or traffic flow on Election Day and work through those issues with presiding judges before Election Day.

- If a polling place is under renovation or construction on Election Day, the precinct should be re-located within the same general location (ex. from a school library to the cafeteria) for voting. An internal backup location should be arranged at the time of contract to account for such an instance.

- Cell phones and computers should not be available for personal use by voters or poll workers. These items should only be used for contacting a local election official or for assisting voters.

Recommendations Regarding Early Voting

- Develop procedures for how to handle technical problems related to the ballot-on-demand system.

- Orient the ballot-on-demand system so that the voter picks up the ballot from the machine.

- Early voting opening procedures should be consistent with Election Day policies.

- The poll workers who monitor the use of the M100 devices by voters should attempt to more evenly distribute voters across the scanners to avoid wear and tear.

- Identification badges should be used by all precinct workers to help identify them to voters, but that the name of the poll worker should be included as part of the badge.

Recommendations Regarding Voter Identification

- Poll worker training should continue to emphasize the importance of uniformity in election rules and administration across precincts. This is especially true for voter identification procedures, which should be followed even in small communities where poll workers may be familiar with many voters.

- Prior to the opening of the poll, the presiding judge should review the voter identification law with all poll workers, especially the poll worker designated to check-in voters. This will help ensure that all workers understand the law and to ensure consistency among poll workers.

- There should be a sign placed at the first station on the check-in table. This sign could be a two-sided placard placed on the registration desk so that both the worker and voter may read the sign at check-in. The sign would reflect a uniform standard procedure for beginning the check-in process: "voter should state their name, address, and year of birth." If a voter cannot meet the standard procedure, then a back-up form of identification may be requested.

Recommendations Regarding Security

- A greater emphasis should be placed on logging instances of "assisted voting," including the name of the person giving assistance in compliance with New Mexico law. This log should include any voting assistance by poll workers.

- During training poll workers should learn that they are allowed to assist voters who request help. However, an important caveat within this instruction is for poll workers to refrain from discussing candidates with voters when they are assisting voters with ballots.

- When a voter spoils his ballot, the spoiled ballot should be retained by the precinct judge in a sealed envelope or voter privacy sleeve to assure voter privacy *before* the voter is able to get a new unmarked ballot.

Recommendations Regarding Watchers and Challengers

- The precinct boards should be better informed and trained about the proper role of challengers and watchers, in the polling place. Precinct boards, and in particular precinct judges, should be well trained in what challengers and watchers are permitted to do and what they are not permitted to do.

- Election officials should develop informational materials that are given to challengers and watchers in voting locations that present in detail what they can and cannot do in the voting location.

- Election officials—either at the state or the local level—should develop training sessions and detailed training materials for county chairs of political parties, as well as the appointed challengers and watchers themselves, to ensure that all concerned are aware of activities that are permitted and prohibited on the part of these challengers and watchers.

- Appointed challengers and watchers should be **required** to attend to be certified for this job.

- The County should continue to emphasize in their training where the 100 foot and 50 foot boundaries begin. We saw large improvement in the implementation of this law in the 2010 general election.

- The County should include a 50 foot or 100 foot piece of twine or low-cost string in the Election Day materials so that poll officials can measure the boundary if necessary.

Recommendation Regarding Recruitment

- A legislative remedy should be considered for amending the Public Employees Retirement Act (§ 10.11.8 NMSA) to allow retired state employees to be hired as poll workers.[7] The loss of these reliable, hard-working and professionally oriented poll workers is unfortunate to the election administrative process and action should be taken to allow them to participate as temporary employees in the elections.

---

[7] HB57 and HB142 have been introduced to solve this problem.

Recommendations Regarding AutoMARK Voting Devices

- Incorporate more poll worker training on the AutoMARK. This training should focus on stressing that the AutoMARK should be offered explicitly to voters who are most likely to benefit from its use (elderly, disabled, voters who spoil ballots, etc.).

- Additionally, training should emphasize the optimal placement of the AutoMARK; somewhere that is accessible and visible, but also protects the privacy of voters using the AutoMARK.

- Training should include opportunities for poll workers to vote using an AutoMARK so they are comfortable working with the machine.

- To reduce the instances of poll worker's looking over spoiled ballots, all voters that spoil a ballot should be instructed to use the AutoMARK when filling out their second ballot.

- Finally, a public relation campaign should be used to educate the voters about the opportunity to vote on the AutoMARK.

Recommendations Regarding Spoiled Ballots

- When a voter's ballot is rejected, the poll worker should try to read off the machine's electronic display which office is over voted.

- When a voter's ballot is rejected, the voter should be allowed to look for herself as to why the ballot was rejected and determine if she wants to vote the ballot anyway.

- The voter should also have their ballot covered when it is being handled. This can be accomplished by having the voter put the ballot in a sleeve (e.g., a legal size file folder) and handing that folder to the poll worker. Poll workers should be instructed to not use white out or write the word spoiled on the ballot, if someone has to touch a voted ballot the voter's privacy is violated. Perhaps the best message to poll workers is to never touch a voted ballot whenever the identity of the voter is known.

- Whenever a voter spoils a ballot, the poll worker should consider offering the AutoMARK as an alternative option for completing the balloting processing. Given that the AutoMARK does not allow over-voting, it can provide the voter with a mistake-free means of casting their ballot.

Recommendations Regarding Voter Privacy

- Continue training on the importance of voter privacy. One possible technological solution is to provide privacy sleeves to all voters to cover the ballot as they walk from the privacy booth to the M100 (10 to 12 legal sized file folders per precinct should be adequate to accomplish this).

- Training should cover specific procedures for inserting ballots into the machines that were put into the M100 unread ballot slot due to machine failures. Voter privacy should be maintained and poll workers should not examine or discuss the ballots or the votes on the ballots while they are engaged in this activity.

Recommendations Regarding Provisional Voting

- Presiding judges and poll workers need better training on the provisional ballot process and need clearer instructions on what should be done before allowing a voter to vote provisionally.

- Because provisional voting is a potentially common occurrence, it would be helpful to voters if there was some posted information at a precinct about provisional voting and what a voter should do before casting a provisional ballot in order to increase the chances of their vote being counted.

- If presiding judges confirm that a voter is not on the voter registration list through the county election officials, we recommend allowing the voter to vote provisionally so that they have a second opportunity for their voter qualification to be examined and the potential to appeal any decision.

- Provisional voters should be provided with an explanation sheet that defines their status, the criteria used to qualify the ballot, how the provisional voter will be contacted regarding the final disposition of the ballot, and the fact that a provisional voter may appeal the disqualification of their ballot.

Recommendations Regarding Closing Procedures

- Poll workers and election judges should be clearly trained that the closing procedures in polling places not be initiated until after the polling place has closed operations.

- Election officials should use the step-by-step checklists provided for closing operations. In training, the poll workers should be walked through how to complete this checklist, preferably in a simulation exercise.

- Poll worker training should emphasize to poll workers that they are not allowed to dismantle the polling location early, or even at 7:00 pm if voters are still voting.

Summary of Key Findings from Voter and Poll Worker Surveys:

Voter Survey Findings

- New Mexican voters, on average, reported waiting 6 minutes in line to vote during the 2010 gubernatorial election.

- Very few (2%) voters reported problems filling out their paper ballot.

- Sixty-seven percent of absentee voters indicated it was very easy to follow the instructions and an additional 29% indicated that it was somewhat easy to follow the instructions. Only about 4% of voters indicated they felt the instructions were "somewhat hard" and no one felt they were very hard.

- Just over one-third (34%) of absentee voters indicated they were somewhat or very concerned that their ballot would not arrive in time to be counted.

- Sixty-four percent of voters who vote absentee do so for reasons of convenience.

- Over three quarters (77%) of voters found their poll workers to be very helpful and another one in five (20%) found them to be somewhat helpful. Only 3% of voters found their poll workers to be not too helpful or not at all helpful.

- Only 2% of voters found it very or somewhat hard to find their voting location.

- A little more than half (54%) of voters were very confident and almost four in ten voters (39%) were somewhat confident that their vote was counted correctly. Less than one in ten voters (7%).

- Over half of voters (52%) rated their voting experience as excellent and another 43% of voters rated their voting experience as good.

- Just under half of all in-person voters (45%) were identified correctly and just over half 55% were not identified correctly.

- Just over four in ten voters (44%) of voters thought that protecting voter access was most important and just over one-half (53%) also thought that preventing voter fraud was more important.

- We asked, "Do you think the minimum identification is: too strict, just right, or not strict enough." We find that about two in five voters (39%) think that the law is just right, and three in five voters (61%) think that the law is not strict enough. But it is important to note that the findings are highly influenced by partisan identification. Republicans (83%) and Independents (72%) are more likely than Democrats (39%)

to state that the law is not strict enough.

- Few (between 3% and 8%) voters think fraud occurs all or most of the time. Roughly one-in-five think that it occurs "some of the time."

- Voters support proof of citizenship to register to vote. They do not support all mail elections or Election Day Registration. Just under half, however, support automatic registration.

- Voters are somewhat ambivalent about the introduction of vote centers. When voters were provided arguments both for and against voter centers, on average voters increased their support for this policy change.

Poll Worker Survey Findings

- When we asked poll workers why they were poll workers, the three statements most poll workers strongly agreed with were (1) "it is my duty as a citizen," (2) "I am the kind of person who does my share," and (3) "I wanted to learn about the election process."

- Ninety-five percent of poll workers said they are either very likely (81%) or somewhat likely (14%) to be a poll worker again

- Two-thirds of poll workers rated the overall performance of their colleagues very high, giving them either a 9 (28%) or a 10 (37%) on a 1 to 10 scale (where 10 is excellent); only about 16% were rated a seven (7) or lower.

- Just under half (48%) of poll clerks rated their presiding judge excellent (a 10 on a 1 to 10 scale); only 10% rated their judge a five (5) or lower and less than a quarter (19%) rated the presiding judge 7 or lower.

- On average, about 8% of poll workers felt intimidated by poll watchers or challengers at one point or another, but in Santa Fe County 17% of poll workers indicated they felt intimidated by poll watchers or challengers.

- Importantly, all of the presiding judges, who are responsible for the management of the precinct, attended at least one training session and were more likely to have worked more than five elections then precinct clerks.

- Nearly three in ten (28%) of poll workers attended two or more training sessions.

- Between 92% and 97% of poll workers received a manual, booklet, or DVD at their training and about seven in ten (70%) of the poll workers said that they actually read all of the materials before Election Day.

- Poll workers in all counties reported that they would be less likely (36%) to use training resources available online.

- Just over half (51%) of poll workers left feeling confident in their ability to do their job on Election Day.

- Seven in ten (71%) of poll workers thought that the instructions for opening the polls were very clear, while only 60% poll workers thought that the procedures for closing the polls were clear.

- Three-fourths of poll workers thought that the instructions for securing the ballots during and after the election were clear.

- One of the weakest areas, where the instructions were thought to be least clear, was the procedures for reconciling the number of ballots cast and the number of voters who voted. A majority of poll workers—54%—said that those instructions were clear but this item was rated lowest of all of the areas examined.

- Just over 17% of poll workers said that they had a problem with their AutoMARK or optical scan voting device over the course of the day.

- Almost nine out of ten (88%) poll workers said that they called the county election office during the day. However, there is great variation across counties in how easy it was to get through to their county office and how responsive they viewed the county office to their concerns. For example, only 46% of Bernalillo poll workers thought their county election office was easy to contact, however 83% report that they were very responsive once they got through.

- Overall, less than 10% of poll workers find the equipment somewhat or very problematic to set up

- We also see that most poll workers either strongly (22%) or somewhat (53%) agreed that the AutoMARK worked well, but fewer than 3 in 10 (29%) encouraged voters who made mistakes and spoiled their ballot to use the machine to cast their second ballot.

- Almost all poll workers were very satisfied (80%) or somewhat satisfied (18%) with their performance as a poll worker.

- Approximately 87% of the poll workers were very confident that the votes were counted accurately in their polling place.

- The minimal voter identification requirement under law is for the voter to state his/her name, address, and birth year. However, it was more prevalent for voters to be asked for their name or their name and address. Poll workers report using the minimum requirement 42% of the time, but not as often as just having the voter state their name (68%).

- Many different forms of identification were requested by the poll workers—some of which were inappropriate as a first-level means of identifying voters—including

photo identification, which was requested over one-quarter of the time either very (11%) or somewhat (14%) often.

- Asking for a voter registration card was used another 22% of the time when considering very or somewhat often. Even identification methods such as "had the voters look up their number in the rolls," were used by poll workers either "somewhat often" or "very often" nearly 15% of the time.

- Almost half (44%) of poll workers indicated that they helped a voter find a problem with their ballot.

- Almost 20% of poll workers stated that they looked at a voter's completed, spoiled, or provisional ballot.

- The survey found that 15% of poll workers helped a voter complete a ballot.

- Seven out of ten poll workers said that providing convenient options was more important than cost effectiveness.

- Poll workers like voters were fairly ambivalent about the move to vote centers. Over the course of several questions regarding the pros and cons of vote centers, poll workers increased their support for this policy change.

Part I. Election Observations

Principal Authors:

Lonna Rae Atkeson
R. Micheal Alvarez

With University of New Mexico Graduate Students:

Alex Adams, Lisa A. Bryant, Theodore Bolstead, Jacob Claussen, Brittany Esswein, Angelina Gonzalez-Aller, Julia Hellwege, Willard Hunter, Jessica Jones, Kimberly Proctor, Mark Pustay, Lisa Sanchez, Terry Shannon, Benjamin Waddell

1.1 Introduction and Study Background

Since 2006, we have participated in Election Day observations in Bernalillo County. Our repeated experiences and exposure to the election process provides us with a long-term and linear perspective on changes in the training of poll workers as well as their administration of the election process in early voting and on Election Day. Thus, we want to begin by expressing that over time we have seen tremendous progress and improvement in both the training and the administration of elections in Bernalillo County. There is greater consistency and overall better performance both within and across precincts. Therefore, overall we believe that the election was successfully administered and that Bernalillo County did an excellent job running the 2010 general election.

We make this important comment because this type of report naturally focuses on problems that we found and areas where future progress and improvement can be made.

Election monitoring has a long tradition and, when done systematically, can provide important insights into how elections are implemented on the ground. In 2010 we only had resources to observe Election Day precincts and early voting locations in Bernalillo County. However, we expanded the number of teams on the ground, covering a larger number of precincts within the county over the course of Election Day. Our observers were trained and each completed poll clerk or presiding judge training prior to the election. Thus team members learned about the process and what to expect from county officials, read previous reports on our experiences in the polls, and were trained on how to monitor elections. In addition, several team members, both undergraduate and graduate students, worked as presiding judges and election clerks, thus giving us another perspective on the experiences of poll workers.

This part of our report should be read as one component of this systematic analysis of the election process. The Election Observation Report has 6 sections.

- This part, part 1, describes the background to the study.

- Part 2 discusses the methodology that briefly explains the election observation process in general.

- Part 3 is an examination of pre-election preparations (e.g., training) and polling place setup.

- Part 4 discusses the observations related to early voting operations.

- Part 5 reviews observations related to actual election operations on Election Day.

- Part 6 is the conclusion

- Finally, there are a set of appendices detailing the voting locations the observation teams visited, the names of observation team members, copies of the forms we filled out in each precinct, and the frequency report from those forms based upon our Election Day observations.

1.2. Election Observation Methodology

In the 2006 New Mexico general election, teams of observers examined Election Day voting operations in three New Mexico counties (Bernalillo, Doña Ana, and Santa Fe Counties).[8] In the 2008 New Mexico general election, teams of observers examined Election Day voting operations in four New Mexico counties (Bernalillo, Doña Ana, San Juan and Santa Fe Counties).[9] For both projects, the County Clerks provided the research teams with full and independent access to every precinct in the county. In addition, the research teams were allowed to monitor and observe polling place operations for as long as team members deemed necessary and were allowed to return to polling places multiple times over the course of the day. Thus, the research teams had freedom of mobility and no restrictions on their activities, other than following good rules of behavior.

---

[8] The 2006 election observation study was conducted in Bernalillo, Doña Ana, and Santa Fe Counties. See "The New Mexico Election Administration Report: The 2006 November General Election", http://www.vote.caltech.edu/drupal/files/report/NM_election_admin_report.pdf.

[9] The 2008 election observation study was conducted in Bernalillo, Doña Ana, San Juan and Santa Fe Counties. See Atkeson, Lonna Rae. R. Michael Alvarez, Thad E. Hall. 2010. "Assessing Electoral Performance in New Mexico using an Eco-system Approach: The 2008 New Mexico General Election," University of New Mexico, available at http://www.unm.edu/~atkeson/center/csved_papers.html.

Because the 2006 and 2008 observation methodology worked well—and in order to have as much comparability as possible with this project—the research team adopted a very similar methodology for monitoring the 2010 midterm general election. This comparability lets the researchers assess both the current election administration performance, and how procedural, administrative, and legal changes implemented since 2006 may have affected the performance of the electoral ecosystem in 2010.[10] In addition, it allows us to examine how increased familiarity with the paper ballot system, both among voters and poll workers, has changed and improved over time.

The important policy change made prior to the 2006 election was that the state adopted the use of optical scan voting for use in all counties. This voting technology requires a voter to fill in a bubble next to the name of a candidate on a paper ballot as a means of marking their vote choice. If a voter votes through the absentee voting process, these ballots are tabulated centrally, using the Election Systems & Software (ES&S) Model 650 (M650) ballot tabulator in larger counties and the ES&S Model 100 (M100) in smaller counties. Bernalillo County is the most populous county in the state and therefore uses the M650 to count absentee ballots. For voters casting ballots in a precinct either during Early Voting or on Election Day, ballots are tabulated using the ES&S M100 tabulator. In addition, voters with special needs can use the ES&S AutoMARK, which allows the voter to make vote choices using an electronic touch-screen interface. These choices are then printed onto a paper ballot that can be scanned into either the M100 or M650 tabulators.

The research team made a number of improvements in preparation for the 2010 study and expanded its scope of reach relative to the 2006 and 2008 study in Bernalillo County. Due to fewer resources we had to focus our election monitoring efforts on one county. On the positive side, we had many more teams available to us and had much greater coverage in the Albuquerque metropolitan area. We had a total of 16 teams working 2 separate shifts and they observed the voting operations of 269 precincts in 102 locations. The first shift observed from 6:00 AM (poll opening) until 1:30 PM and the second observed from 1:30 PM through closing. We also visited 5 early voting locations during the early voting period. In addition, we had 6 team members working as poll workers who reported their Election Day experiences. Information on team members and locations where voting was observed can be found in the appendices at the end of this section.

Observation forms used for the 2010 study were updated based upon our previous experiences. Observation forms allow us a more systematic look at precinct activity across all the locations we visited. These forms, along with a frequency of answers to each question, are also located in the appendix and we refer to them throughout this section of the report. There are four operational components of our research design that allow us to

---

[10] Voter identification laws were relaxed after 2006. Voters in both 2008 and 2010 did not have to provide the last 4 digits of their social security number, while in 2006 they theoretically did. The election audit and recount laws also led some counties to sort ballots by precinct in absentee voting and to a variety of new guidelines for audit implementation. In response to our suggestions, the Secretary of State included signage related to voter identification, which were to be posted in all precincts. In addition, numerous changes in the training of poll workers and procedural changes to better enhance the election experience for poll workers and voters were completed by Bernalillo County in 2010.

create more comparability across our observation teams and systematically study early and Election Day operations:

- First, nearly all of the observation team members attended poll worker training so that they would be knowledgeable about the rules and procedures for precinct opening, closing, and general operations. This proved to be very helpful in recognizing common procedural problems and areas where improvement could be made. In addition, this allows us to extend our remarks and recommendations on training as people attended different training sessions, as well as different types of training (e.g. presiding judge or poll clerk), providing us with a good overview of the training process.

- Second, each team completed an observation form for each precinct visited and special observation forms were developed specifically for observing polling place opening and closing operations (the forms are reproduced in Appendix 1.3). This allowed for systematic comparability of specific precinct or early voting locations across teams. For example, every observation team had to report for each polling place whether certain procedures were being followed, such as the correct application of voter identification laws and report on several aspects of the polling place's physical quality (e.g. adequate parking, lighting, space for voting booths, etc.) The frequency reports produced from these forms are in Appendix 1.4.

- Third, each team member wrote a 1-3 page Election Day report describing his or her experiences. These reports provided us with a detailed account and record of each observer's experience and helps us determine consistent problems or particular successes. We draw from these anecdotes to highlight key problems or experiences of importance.

- Fourth, most of the observation teams attended a post-election debriefing so that the researchers could compare experiences across the observation teams on areas of strengths and weaknesses while everyone had these thoughts fresh in their minds.

Many of those involved in the election observation study had considerable previous experience studying and observing elections in several states including New Mexico. All of the observers were academics or students, both undergraduate and graduate students, making them independent of the political parties and candidates. Team members were recruited from two research design courses at the University of New Mexico, one at the graduate (Political Science 580, Introduction to *Methods of Political Science Research*) and one at the undergraduate (Political Science 280, *Research Methods*) level. Additionally advanced graduate students interested in the process were allowed to participate and one law student, who had previously worked with us, assisted us again. Graduate students and faculty were paired with undergraduate students to create 16 election-monitoring teams. Several observers study elections and campaigns and many of them were very knowledgeable about New Mexico elections and politics. A number of graduate students had worked with us previously and thus had intimate knowledge of the paper ballot system

in New Mexico and had direct experience with the vote tabulators and other aspects of New Mexico's election administration from previous elections and other projects.[11]

Prior to the election, observers were given briefing materials on the purpose of the study, some details on New Mexico election law, including voter identification rules, and state rules on election observation and monitoring. Teams also had Election Day forms, maps of the area, precinct lists, and contact phone lists for the team leader (Professor Lonna Atkeson) and her graduate assistant (Alex Adams). Observers also participated in election monitoring training on Thursday, October 28th, before the election. Training included information about forms to fill in, location of precincts, voter identification rules, details about rules and laws to voting in New Mexico (e.g. campaigning rules, required precinct signage, opening and closing procedures, etc), expectations for handling provisional ballots, expectations for handing spoiled ballots, rules of contact, contact information for observers, etc.

Working in close consultation with the team leader and her assistant, each team of observers was assigned a specific set of precincts to observe on Election Day. Each team was given between 19 and 33 precincts to examine. Numbers varied depending on the distance between precincts and the number of precincts in each location. Often, more than one precinct is housed at a particular location. Teams were not necessarily expected to complete their list, as they were given full freedom of movement, allowing them to visit any location for as long as they wanted and to return to locations observed earlier in their shift if they so chose. Observer independence is an important aspect of election observation. As with other auditing methods the auditor, or in this case the observer, must be free from interference or influence that could improperly limit or modify the scope of the observation process. Therefore, we arranged for complete autonomy in the observation process with no criteria for where we could go and when or how long we could stay. Observers attempted to see a variety of precincts within each county including largely Hispanic areas, poorer areas, high turnover precincts (e.g. around the universities), and largely immigrant areas. Thus, observers saw a wide range of precincts with differing voter characteristics and within different types of facilities. Observation teams usually consisted of pairs of project members, except during early voting observation where it was done by a single individual).

On Election Day, the observation process consisted of the following three stages:

- First, observation teams began their work at selected polling places, arriving at 6:00 AM, the same time as the poll workers and well before the opening of polls, to study the precinct setup process and complete a special opening form that asked questions specific to the opening process.

---

[11] See, for example, Atkeson, Lonna Rae, R. Michael Alvarez, Thad E. Hall, Lisa A. Bryant, Yann Kereval, Morgan Llewyllen, David Odegaard. 2008. "The 2008 New Mexico Post Election Audit Report," available at: http://www.unm.edu/~atkeson/newmexico.html.

- Second, observation teams went to other precincts throughout the day and for each precinct they studied they completed an observation form that asked about the condition of polling location and activities in the precinct.

- Third, the observation teams stayed in their final precinct at the end of voting, observing and studying the polling place closing procedures and completing an observation form about that process.

Observation team members participated in a debriefing session the day after the election and returned all of their completed observation forms to the project leader. All data collected were analyzed and the results of these analyses are reported below.

1.3. Pre-Election Preparation: Poll Worker Training and Polling Place Setup

Pre-election training of election workers and the initial set up of polling places are important for setting the stage for an effective Election Day experience for voters. Academic research has shown that the quality of the voter-poll worker experience plays an important role in shaping voter confidence.[12] This confidence comes from the interaction between voters and poll workers. When voters have a good experience, they are more confident, when their experiences are poor they are less confident. Therefore, election training is critical because it leads to a better functioning polling location, which results in a better experience for voters, boosting their confidence that their vote was counted correctly.

1.3.1 Poll Worker and Precinct Judge Training

Nearly all the members of the observation teams attended presiding judge and/or poll clerk training in Bernalillo County. The training sessions involved video materials, lectures, and review of a notebook containing Election Day procedures. The training session for presiding judges took about 3 hours and poll workers were paid a small fee for their time. The training covered the legal and policy issues associated with voting as well as important administrative components of the poll worker's day including how to set up the machine, the handling of spoiled and provisional ballots, opening and closing procedures, etc. Compared to 2008 there were fewer materials provided to the poll workers. Each poll worker received only one booklet. This was used in conjunction with a lecture, as well as Power Point and video demonstrations of Election Day activities.

---

[12] [12] See Lonna Rae Atkeson and Kyle L. Saunders. 2007, "Voter Confidence: A Local Matter?" *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40(October):655-660. Also see: www.vote2006.unm.edu and Thad E. Hall, J. Quin Monson, and Kelly D. Patterson. 2007. "Poll Workers and the Vitality of Democracy: An Early Assessment." *PS: Political Science and Society*, 647-654.

Overall, the training has improved immensely based upon our previous observations and studies. The County Clerk and her staff are making huge strides in the presentation and overall effectiveness of poll worker training. They are responding to poll worker needs and research team feedback by fine tuning their training materials and enhancing and streamlining their training sessions and presentations. The voter identification training video was especially strong and overall we saw more precincts correctly identifying voters than ever before.

In particular, the training facilitators were better organized and the training materials were more concise and focused. The use of PowerPoint presentations, along with video examples and a printed poll worker guide were particularly effective at illustrating the election procedures with clear language and concrete examples. Some instructors were also effective at demonstrating how to set up voting machines if poll workers requested additional assistance. Finally, trainers provided clear messages about the importance of impartiality among poll workers. Thus, overall, poll worker training ran smoothly and efficiently and we saw improvements in training that are creating better-trained poll workers.

There are still, however, some challenges. First, some trainers used a confrontational tone to communicate the issue of accountability to trainees. In one instance, the trainer repeatedly said that the County was closely monitoring poll workers and the consequences for mistakes were twofold: incompetent poll workers would be not compensated or they would be barred from working at future elections. The trainer's tone was harsh and, at times, shaming.

The harsh and demeaning nature of this form of messaging could potentially result in oppositional responses from the trainees. For instance, evidence from psychological theories of behavioral change and adult learning suggest that confrontation and shaming strategies are often counterproductive and can reinforce negative behaviors. From a behavioral change perspective, if the intent is to change the behaviors of poll workers, the training may benefit from *training the trainers* to utilize adult learning strategies that incorporate these perspectives into their training.

Second, from a content perspective, at times, the trainer's responses to participant questions were unclear, which could potentially lead to inconsistent practices among the poll workers. For instance, in one judge training session, when a trainee asked about the procedure for instances in which voters could not remember their voter registration address, the trainer first suggested that the worker could assist the voter and verify the address with a roster. But when another participant challenged this response stating that this violated the voter identification rules, the trainer agreed. The trainer essentially offered two different answers that could potentially lead to the inconsistent application of voter identification rules. In the future, the County could alleviate these inconsistencies by continuing to provide opportunities for staff members to participate in professional development training that specifically trains trainers in responding to difficult questions or questions that lead to a range of responses.

Third, in at least one training session, the oath of office materials were not available and thus could not be given to the presiding judges. The judges were told these would be available in their packets on Election Day and that they would have to sign and administer them. This situation creates multiple problems. Most importantly it created a group of presiding judges who did not complete their training before Election Day and their training did not begin with the oath about the position they are holding on Election Day, which sets an important tone about their responsibility and duties in that office. In addition, administratively, more materials had to be included with a subset of presiding judges and special instructions had to be created to ensure that these judges took the required oath. Having different subsets of judges creates additional administrative burden. Given that training was a 3-hour long process and we were in the city-county building, it should have been fairly easy to obtain these forms during the training and administer the oath of office at this time.

Fourth, in one training session the trainer began nearly all answers with the word, "unfortunately." For example, she said, "Unfortunately, we cannot request photo voter identification of regular voters." There is no need for a trainer to apologize for laws and procedures. Trainers should be encouraged to not evaluate policies and procedures as they are being discussed.

Fifth, what was covered was very good, but there were some items missing, for example, inactive voters were not discussed at all and given the complexities of closing procedures, we think this and perhaps other areas should be a second session for hands on training.

Training Recommendations

Recommendation 1: New Mexico election officials might consider using scenario-based training, where election workers are presented with various problems that may occur on Election Day and then discuss how to address them. This could include more experiential techniques such as situational analysis, role-playing, and using probing techniques to elicit responses and discussion among the participants. This kind of discussion is important because the recognition of accountability comes from the participants themselves rather than from authority figures. While training efficiency is clearly important and didactic techniques such as Power Point are simple to implement, if the intent is to create more consistency among workers, interactive approaches and situational based learning techniques have been documented to effect behavioral changes--even in short term settings.

- For example, the actual process of handling a provisional ballot or an absentee ballot brought into the polling place for drop-off could have been more effectively covered this way. Both topics were covered, but only in a cursory way in the trainings attended. In addition, issues of privacy, precinct set-up and handling spoiled ballots were covered with less precision in the format observed. Such issues are likely better covered in smaller group training, which can be done in the context of breakout sessions within a larger training.

Recommendation 2: Given the length of time training already takes, it may be beneficial to consider breaking training down into two sessions. An interactive, lecture, video, and Power Point session and a hands on training that deals with specific tasks such as closing procedures, which are very complicated and challenging for poll workers to complete, including the hand counting of machine unreadable ballots and the votes for write-in candidates, and other more complicated tasks such as provisional balloting.

Recommendation 3: The trainers should go through a "training the trainer" process to assist them in learning how to handle conflicts in the training session and how most effectively to create a positive learning environment.

Recommendation 4: Procedures should be developed to handle unexpected problems during training. Trainers should communicate with other staff if and when they are having problems, missing training items, etc. so that problems can be solved during training.

- For example, there were several others trainers in the room at various times. These individuals could have been utilized to find and obtain the presiding judge oaths. Alternatively, trainers should have access to phones so that they can communicate problems to other personnel and resolve them during the training session.

1.3.2 General Polling Place Issues

The setup of polling places varies by its location. The voting locations observed included fire stations, churches, schools, community centers, city council chambers, and libraries. Each of these facilities has their own issues when considering the set-up of a polling place. We saw a number of problems particularly in school libraries, gyms and cafeterias and how different schools handled the flow of voters. Some schools allowed the voting process to be mixed with school activities. So, for example, we saw several precincts set up in school libraries where the libraries remained open to students during voting hours. This was problematic because students would wonder around the voting machines, the voting booths and voters looking for book materials. Students would also sit down at computers and use other electronic media in the library. Overall, this created a somewhat chaotic environment, in which voters and students were mixed together. This created less privacy for voters and made it difficult to maximize the flow of voters. We also saw cafeterias that allowed students to eat during their normal time slots in a portion of the cafeteria not being used for voting. This created very loud and generally more chaotic voting environments.

Another area where we saw potential problems is in the various signage required in each precinct. There are numerous pieces of important information that were put up in the polling places regarding voter rights, identification, and how to mark ballots. The election officials in some locations were able to put these in conspicuous places but at many polls the signage was not something that was readily noticeable when the voter entered the

polling place. Again, this is often a function of the types of places and rooms where the polls were set up; in some cases there were not good wall spaces for signage.

Most of the polling locations had been set up in a way that maximized the flow of voters throughout the voting space. However, some polling places were very cramped, which minimizes voter privacy.

In addition, we noted that some polling places were very busy and some polling places were hardly busy at all over the course of Election Day. But, regardless of voting expectations, the number of poll workers assigned at each precinct is identical. This leads some poll workers to spend most of their day with little to do, while other poll workers are very, very busy. Because we suspect that there is a lot of similarity across elections, we suggest that the county model and estimate the expected number of voters at each precinct and use this information to help determine the number of poll workers needed for an effective and efficient Election Day operation.

Polling Place Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Election officials should discuss with school officials before Election Day how to handle normal student activity so that it does not interfere or hinder the voting process. For example, schools that contain precincts in libraries should consider closing them to student activity during Election Day operations. In addition, students could have lunches delivered to their classroom and be allowed to eat in their classrooms during Election Day operations, so that they are not filing through the cafeterias while voting is in process. Additionally, physical education activity should be done outside of areas designated for voting on Election Day.

Recommendation 2: Election officials should identify polling places that may have difficult issues for signage, set up, or traffic flow on Election Day. With these types of precincts identified we recommend that:

- Polling places that are located in non-obvious or difficult-to-find locations (especially those that are not near major roads or intersections) should have the appropriate signage. Poll workers should have clear and appropriate instruction about where to put signs outside of the polling place. Poll workers should be instructed to periodically check the signs to make sure that they are still present throughout Election Day, and that they are accurately located in a visible location.

- Poll workers should be educated regarding where to put the signs inside polling places to maximize the ability of voters to see them.

- Polling places that are going to be in crowded spaces should be provided with a plan for setting up the polling place to maximize voter flow.

- If a polling place is under renovation or construction on Election Day, the precinct should be re-located within the same general location (ex. from a school library to

the cafeteria) for voting. An internal backup location should be arranged at the time of contract to account for such an instance.

1.4. Early Voting

1.4.1 Ballots On-Demand

In 2008, we observed early voting in Bernalillo County, and replicated that observation effort in 2010. In both 2008 and 2010 observation teams visited the Siesta Hills Shopping Center early voting location, repeating the study there. The most significant difference in the early voting procedures between 2008 and 2010 that we observed was the use of ballot on-demand systems. It should also be noted that ballot on-demand is an amazing improvement over ballot provisioning in the 2008 early voting process. In 2008 each early voting location had to have printed versions of all ballot styles on hand ---this was insecure, procedurally complex, and difficult to handle logistically. Ballot on-demand for early voting is more secure, less complex, easier procedurally, more environmentally friendly, more cost-effective, and can be helpful when last-minute changes to ballot are necessary.

In each of the three locations, the voter application and balloting processes were independent. They were staffed by different types of employees (the authentication process was staffed by individuals with county badges, while the balloting process was staffed by the precinct board (precinct judges and poll clerks) and they used different procedures. These differences are due to the different roles played by the county officials and the precinct board. The county officials are there to process the application for the in-person absentee voter. The precinct board is there to handle the voting process once the application process has been completed.

A voter who entered the early voting location was typically greeted by a poll worker who ushered the voter to the authentication station. The application station, staffed by individuals with county clerk badges, was equipped with computers and printers, and there a voter's eligibility was verified and their request for an in-person absentee ballot was processed. Upon approval, a ballot application was printed (and handed to the voter) followed by a ballot (which the individuals with the county badges were careful to not handle). The voter signed and dated the application. Typically the staff would ask the voter to compare the precinct number printed on the application with the precinct number on the ballot. If the numbers matched, the voter returned the application to the county employee and these were retained by the application station staff. Once this process was done, the voter took the ballot and was ushered to a voting booth, at which time the process was handed off to the poll workers and precinct judges. The voter would mark the ballot and then insert it into the M100 device when done (following what is a standard procedure).

The process that was described verbally by two county officials was that the applications were placed, face down, in a bin. At the end of each day of early voting, those applications were to be reconciled against both the electronic information in the voter registration

database as well as against the record of ballots used and cast in the polling place. Since we were unable to observe this process, it would be important to observe it and to obtain the documentation, as this process might need improvement.

A potential problem that might arise is conflict in the resolution process. Given the procedural differences (for example, the people staffing the application and authentication station were loath to handle a ballot because they were not supposed to be involved with the balloting process once the voter's application had been approved, but most poll workers do not show that same concern because processing voters and ballots is their job1) as well as staff differences, if there is a reconciliation problem a significant conflict could arise in the accounting of the election, as well as among the personnel who will continue to work in that location. It is unclear how these conflicts or differences would be resolved and who is ultimately responsible for conflict resolution. It is also unclear what sort of audit trail is produced for the voter applications, and as a single individual is involved in the production and authentication of a voter, questions could be raised about the propriety of voter authentication. A thorough review of the process and the procedures involved in the reconciliation process is warranted.

There were two specific aspects of the ballot on-demand procedure that might be further studied. One is a simple physical issue of the orientation of the printers. The printers in each location were oriented so that the paper materials, which were actually intended for the voter, were printed towards the local election official. This made for some awkward situations, but it also created the ambiguity about who handles the ballot. It might be better to orient the paper output towards the voter, to make it clear to all concerned that those materials are to be handle by the voter. The second regarded the handling of the ballot by the individuals with the county badges. They clearly were reluctant in virtually all cases (except for one or two busy moments, or when a voter could not easily handle the ballot themselves) to handle the ballot; if physical reorientation of the printers is not possible, it might be a good idea to develop an alternative procedure to eliminate this awkward step.

Also, in one location (Montgomery Crossing) the ballot on-demand system was not functioning correctly; apparently it was printing problematic ballot applications. The site coordinator and precinct judge had no idea what to do procedurally, apparently a procedure was invented by telephone and implemented as necessary. Clearly, procedures are needed for situations where the ballot on-demand process has technical difficulties Future study iteration should review any such procedures and review any relevant documentation.

Recommendation 1: Develop procedures for how to handle technical problems related to the ballot-on-demand system.

Recommendation 2: Orient the ballot-on-demand system so that the voter picks up the ballot from the machine.

1.4.2 Opening

Despite the fact that the early voting location we visited was well staffed, the precinct judge had enormous difficulty opening the polling place on time. He could not keep all of the keys straight, did not know how to start the M100 devices, did not properly deal with the zero tapes, did not open the M100 to ensure that both sides were empty, and without a reminder from our observer would not have set up the AutoMARK.

There continue to be issues with the use of the AutoMARK. The attitude of the typical poll worker towards the AutoMARK was expressed by a frequently heard comment --- "no one ever uses it." While that *might* be true, it is self-fulfilling if AutoMARKs are not available at the start of poll operations, if precinct workers and poll judges do not let voters know about the utility of an AutoMARK, or if they are put in a completely non-obvious and out-of-the-way location.

At the Daskalos location, two voters were seen using the AutoMARK. And one was overheard telling a poll worker, "That machine was wonderful." In this location, the AutoMARK was located in an ideal location; it was placed immediately adjacent to the voter authentication station, in a very visible and accessible location, and was not hidden from sight by the usual cardboard privacy hood. A conjecture is that were AutoMARKs' located in such highly accessible and visible positions, and were available for use, they would be used more (for example it would not be surprising to learn that there were more ballots marked using the AutoMARK at the Daskalos location than Montgomery Crossing or Siesta Hills). There has to be a way to better instruct precinct judges and poll workers about locating and use of AutoMARKs.

Some recommendations regarding the opening of early voting polls:

Recommendation 1: Early voting opening procedures should be consistent with Election Day policies including:

- If they do not already, the precinct judges should have an opening checklist, perhaps a single sheet, that walks them precisely through the process and allows them to check off the steps completed (this could become part of the early voting audit trail).

- Early poll workers should check to insure the M100 is empty, and then lock and reseal the ballot box.

- All poll workers and the precinct judge should carefully examine the zero tape and sign (this was neglected, and it was not clear to me whether the precinct judge signed all of the zero tapes).

- All of the voting machine and ballot box keys should be kept in secure and carefully marked containers. Santa Fe County, for example, uses a zipper pouch that is worn around the presiding Judge's neck to secure keys. Other counties should consider this option.

- The AutoMARK device should be powered up and ready for use before the polling place opens for voting.

- The AutoMARK should be placed in an obvious place so that voters are more likely to request it and poll workers are more likely to encourage its use.

1.4.3 Over voted Ballots and Privacy

Privacy continues to be a concern for voters who over vote. This is true in both early and Election Day voting. A number of times the following typical procedure was observed: a voter's ballot is returned by the M100 once, the poll worker inserted it again to have it returned again, the poll worker looks it over, and then the precinct judge looks it over. The entire time the voter stands there with the entire polling location aware that they have done something wrong, and with at least two people who now know how they voted.

A procedure should be implemented to preserve the voter's privacy. The poll worker stationed at the M100 machine should not handle the voted ballot without using some sort of privacy sleeve (even just a file folder). If the ballot needs to be inspected at all, it should be done only by the precinct judge and in a place and way that does not violate the voter's privacy and make them feel foolish. It would be possible to simply instruct the poll workers and precinct judges to not view the voted ballot at all – to just trust the M100 that it has detected a voter error. That would preserve voter privacy to the maximum level possible.

1.4.4 Distributing Voters to M100s

As there are multiple M100 machines at early voting sites, we speculate that M100 devices located closer to the ballot booths will have more recorded votes than devices located further from ballot booths. The poll workers who monitor the use of the M100 devices by voters should attempt to more evenly distribute voters across the scanners to avoid wear and tear.

1.5. Election Procedures

Procedural uniformity is a key component to making elections functional and fair and to ensure that all of the activities in the election are completed correctly across the entire election jurisdiction. Where there is a lack of uniformity, problems can arise in the election process. In the 2010 general election, observer teams generally saw effective procedures in place. However, there were areas where the observers did see a lack of uniformity, which are identified below.

1.5.1 Opening Procedures

Observation team members found that, although most precinct judges in Bernalillo County swore in the other members of the precinct board, there were several instances where this procedure was forgotten. This may have been especially likely in areas where presiding judges did not take the oath of office during training.

We had several presiding judges discuss a problem with us about contacting the County Clerk's office prior to 8:00 AM during the critical set-up time. Apparently, in their documentation, they were provided a single number to contact the county with any problems. However, this number does not connect to a human being until after 8:00 AM. Poll workers, of course, arrive at their polling locations at 6:00 AM. If they are having problems and need to contact county officials they need to have phone numbers that will get them through to a county election official before 8:00 AM. In addition, the number apparently is attached to an automated system and presiding judges who spoke with us about this issue suggested that a streamlined automated system be developed for Election Day operations for easy access to county officials.

We saw one instance of a special kind of problem on Election Day when the presiding judge was unable to get to the precinct on time due to car trouble and communication problems led to a very disorganized opening. Because the presiding judge had all of the election materials, the two workers were only able to set up the voting booths. These workers also did not have contact with any election officials, the problem was handled by a county official who was observing opening operations in the precinct and fortunately had direct contact with county operations. However, the county official only indicated to poll workers that the presiding judge was on his way and did not immediately provide advice to the poll workers on how to handle voters entering the precinct without a working voting machine or ballots. This created a confusing opening for both the poll workers and voters, and likely one that could have been dealt with more effectively with better communication from the central organization with workers on the ground. Voters for the precinct did not know whether to wait around or decide to come back later and precinct workers were unsure what to tell them other than that the presiding judge was on his way. Eventually poll workers determined that voters could vote provisionally at other precincts in the same location, although several voters had already left by the time this was decided. Although anticipating events like this are difficult, it does suggest that improving communication could be valuable to better deal issues of this nature. Also, ensuring that judges are aware in the future that provisional ballots can be used in similar situations can ensure that as problems come up they are dealt with in an expedited manner.

1.5.2 Uniform Procedures

Computers and Cell Phones

Observers noted that in one precinct where two young poll workers were managing the check-in process, they had brought along a laptop and were on Facebook and other web sites. We also noted numerous places where voters and poll workers were talking on their cell phones during polling place operations. For example, we saw voters and poll workers talking on their phones during check-in and voters talking on their cell phones while voting. We also saw a number of especially younger poll workers text messaging on their cell phones extensively.

Such outside communications are problematic. First, poll workers should be focused on their jobs when communicating and processing voters and talking on their cell phone, working on their computer, or texting creates unnecessary distractions and is rude to voters. Second, outside communications, especially from poll workers, raise the suspicion of impropriety and the potential for voter fraud. Third, voter communications on their cell phones creates unnecessary noise and distraction in the precinct as voters are not focused on the primary voting task. In addition, voters likewise could be receiving instructions on how to vote, again creating the suspicion of impropriety. Therefore, it is critical that both poll workers and voters not engage in outside communications over the course of Election Day.

It should be noted that several precinct judges reported that having their laptops helped throughout the day, especially when voters showed up at the wrong polling location. Precinct judges could look the voter up on the county web site and redirect them to the correct location. If this process is going to be allowed, it should be clear to all poll workers that only a precinct judge should be allowed to have a laptop and a cell phone. Poll workers should be instructed not to bring laptops and to take all cell phone calls outside of the precinct unless it is regarding official election business with the county and only for emergency situations.

Food/Drinks

In many of the polling places, poll workers placed food and/or drinks onto the main poll worker tables. Food and drinks should be placed away from voting materials and places where voters and poll workers interact.

In addition, we observed elected officials and candidates bringing food and goodies into the precinct for the poll workers. In one case, a judicial candidate brought pizza to the poll workers and stayed and chatted and ate with precinct officials during the lunch hour. Although there are no rules that specifically bar candidates and election officials from bringing food to poll workers, we think it could be construed as a form of electioneering and should be discouraged.

Forms for Recording Problem Incidents

Over the course of the election, it became clear (in both the early and Election Day operations) that when small or large incidents happened there were often no forms provided for poll workers to record the events. Thus, when there were disagreements between a poll worker and a voter, between poll workers themselves, or when voters came by and left without voting, these events were not recorded. Activities that happen over the course of the day may be indicative of procedural problems, staff problems or areas where better training is needed and as such need to be recorded for post election review.

Identification Badges

We noted an increase of use of identification badges provided by the county during this election. These badges identify poll workers by their party (e.g. Democratic poll worker, Republican poll worker or Independent) and not by their name. Many poll workers found this system of identification odd and wrote their name on the badge in addition to their party or instead of the party. In many precincts, we noticed that badges were not in use. We liked the use of identification badges to help voters identify precinct workers, but like many poll workers, we found it odd that their personal identity was denied in favor of their partisanship. Therefore, we recommend that badges be used by all precinct workers to help identify them to voters, but that the name of the poll worker be included as part of the badge.

Protecting the M100 Tape

While taping a piece of paper or cardboard to cover the tape scrolling out of the top of the M100 is a clever short-term innovation, in the long run there must be a better, low-cost solution. Some voters seem puzzled by why something is taped to the top of the M100, and it is of course possible that poll workers will forget to cover the tape or that in a busy location it might be removed or become dislodged. Perhaps something that appears more like an official seal could be developed and used.

Uniformity Procedures Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Poll worker training should emphasize that procedures across precincts need to be as uniform as possible. Thus, clear policies need to be established on food and drink consumption and computer and cell phone usage.

Recommendation 2: All poll workers, including poll clerks, should have a telephone number they can call at any time to report problems. The county telephone should operate during polling operation hours.

Recommendation 3: The County should streamline their phone system for Election Day operations to enable easier, quicker and more direct response to Election Day precinct problems.

Recommendation 4: Any unusual activities over the course of the day should be recorded by poll workers in an incident log. Each log entry should be signed and dated. These should be returned to the county clerk's office for review.

Recommendation 5: Cell phones and computers should not be allowed to be used in precincts except by the presiding judge or other designated poll workers and then only to talk to county election officials about voting problems or to identify correct voting locations for voters. Training should emphasize that the no cell phone rule applies to both poll workers and voters and that includes the use of a smart phone for purposes of texting.

Recommendation 6: Poll workers should wear name badges that make it easy for voters to identify poll workers form watchers, observers, and other voters.

1.5.3 Voter Identification

Getting poll workers to correctly follow voter identification rules has been an on-going challenge for election officials. The overall training for voter identification was the best we have seen so far and anecdotally, we had the highest compliance we have seen on this issue. Our observational evidence suggested that about 25% of precincts we visited in 2008 were asking for photo identification, but only about 15% of precincts we visited in 2010 were asking for photo identification. In addition, our observers estimated that 69% of precincts we examined were administering voter identification requirements correctly compared to only 61% in 2008. Thus, there was clear improvement and we believe that this is directly related to the better training for the 2010 election. That being said, we still saw a variety of identification procedures being applied in the 31% of precincts where we observed incorrect procedures:

1. Voters volunteered identification (picture or other type of identification card, especially voter registration cards) without being asked by the poll workers.

2. Voters were told to look up their name in the voter identification roll and provide that number to the poll workers without showing any additional identification.

3. Voters were asked for their name only.

4. Voters were asked for their name and address.

5. Voters were asked for their name and birth year.

6. Voters were immediately asked for identification, sometimes picture identification, upon arrival.

7. Voters were recognized upon entering the polling site and were simply asked to sign the voter rolls.

8. Voters who could not be found in the precinct roll were then asked for identification so that the poll workers could call the county clerk and request registration status and the correct voter precinct.

9. Poll workers simply held out their hand with the expectation that an individual's identification would be placed in it.

10. Poll workers simply looked at the voter waiting for the voter to volunteer information of their choice.

The variation in the check-in procedures and requests for identification are indicative of two issues related to New Mexico voter identification laws.

First, the New Mexico voter identification law requires poll workers to accept multiple forms of identification. For instance, picture identification, such as a valid driver's license, is a valid form of identification. In addition, an individual can also state their name, address, and birth year as a valid form of identification. This encourages an environment where poll workers select their favorite form of identification and request that upon check-in.[13] Indeed, in some cases observers noted that poll workers altered their procedure depending on the voter asking for identification sometimes and not asking for identification other times.

Second, the issue that leads to greater variability in the form of identification requested is a lack of clear signage at the check in table, as well as the possible weakness in poll worker training and a subsequent lack of understanding of the voter identification laws on the part of poll workers. Although in many precincts there were often "voter rights signs" and voter identification rules, these were not posted in places where voters might notice them. In addition, due to many precincts being located in schools, the posters simply blended in with many other colorful posters around them.

Voter Identification Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Poll worker training should continue to emphasize the importance of uniformity in election rules and administration across precincts. This is especially true for

---

[13] See Lonna Atkeson, Yann Kerevel, Michael Alvarez and Thad Hall. 2010. "Who Asks for Voter ID?" Presented at the Midwest Political Science Association, April 22-25, Chicago, Illinois.

voter identification procedures, which should be followed even in small communities where poll workers may be familiar with many voters. Training in this area has made a difference and we see improvement, but continuing efforts will have to made.

Recommendation 2: Prior to the opening of the poll, the presiding judge should review the voter identification law with all poll workers, especially the poll worker designated to check-in voters. This will help ensure that all workers understand the law and to ensure consistency among poll workers.

Recommendation 3: There should be a sign placed at the first station on the check-in table. This sign could be a two-sided placard placed on the registration desk so that both the worker and voter may read the sign at check-in. The sign would reflect a uniform standard procedure for beginning the check-in process: "voter should state their name, address, and year of birth." If a voter cannot meet the standard procedure, then a back-up form of identification may be requested.

1.5.4 Security Procedures

The physical security of election materials—especially ballots, voting machines, and ballot boxes on Election Day—is perhaps the most central concern in any election. In the 2006 and 2008 studies, observation team members noted some areas in which the physical security of election materials could be improved in New Mexico. Generally, observers noted that, compared to the 2006 election, both in 2008 and in 2010 the ballots, voting machines, and ballot boxes were physically secure, except in early voting, and there seemed to be fewer problems.

One problem that was noted by observers involved "assisted voting", which is both a security and a privacy issue. New Mexico election law (S 1-12-15) allows certain types of voters to request that certain individuals provide them with assistance while they vote and we saw several instances where poll workers were assisting voters with the ballot. In one case, the voter could not read English and so requested a poll worker assist her by reading the names. The poll worker was helpful and responsive, but perhaps too much so. The poll worker not only read the ballot names for each office, but also had a running commentary on their ideology. When poll workers assist voters they should refrain from commenting on the candidates. This could be interpreted as a form of electioneering. In addition, the law also requires that "The name of the person providing assistance to a voter pursuant to this section shall be recorded on the signature roster." Although observers did note instances of "assisted voting", they also noted that the name of the person providing assistance was rarely, if ever, recorded in the signature roster. Both poll workers and individual voters' designate as assistants should be placed in the signature file.

Another potential ballot security issue noted by observers occurred in situations where a voter spoiled their ballot. In some situations, precinct judges would allow the voter to take the ballot they wished to spoil along with a new unmarked ballot back to the voting booth; these voters were then in possession of two ballots. Such voters could attempt to vote both

ballots (either accidentally or deliberately), or could attempt to leave the polling place with the unvoted ballot. In either of these scenarios, this could lead to some form of nefarious activity (double voting, chain voting and problems with balancing when the precinct closes) or be perceived that way by other voters at the precinct.

Security Recommendations

Recommendation 1: A greater emphasis should be placed on logging instances of "assisted voting," including the name of the person giving assistance in compliance with New Mexico law. This log should include any voting assistance by poll workers.

Recommendation 2: During training poll workers should learn that they are allowed to assist voters who request help. However, an important caveat within this instruction is for poll workers to refrain from discussing candidates with voters when they are assisting voters with ballots.

Recommendation 3: When a voter spoils his ballot, the spoiled ballot should be retained by the precinct judge in a sealed envelope or voter privacy sleeve to assure voter privacy *before* the voter is able to get a new unmarked ballot.

1.5.5 Watchers, Challengers, Observers and Voter Assistance

The observer teams noted that in many voting locations there were appointed challengers and watchers inside polling places who were attempting to ensure that the elections were run appropriately.

In New Mexico, the activities of challengers and watchers are governed by statute. There are certain permitted and prohibited activities that are delineated in Sections 1-2-21 through 1-2-30 of the New Mexico election code.

However, in some polling places, it was unclear to some of the observation teams whether precinct judges and poll workers were well instructed as to the permitted and prohibited activities of both challengers and watchers. For example, under New Mexico law, challengers are allowed to inspect registration books, signature rosters, voting machines before the opening of the polls, and to make written records of the actions or omissions of members of the precinct boards. Likewise, under law, challengers and watchers are prohibited from performing any duty of a precinct board member, and in particular "shall not handle the ballots, poll books, signature rosters or voting machine or take part in the tallying or counting of the ballots" (§ 1-2-25). There were occasions, in some precincts, where challengers engaged in such prohibited activities but were prevented from engaging in appropriate ones.

Transparency and openness are critical for ensuring the integrity of any election and it is critical that representatives of political parties have the ability to observe the process in all

voting locations. However, the observation teams saw instances where challengers and watchers might have engaged in some of the prohibited activities listed in § 1-2-25, even if well intentioned. In some locations, challengers and watchers were involved in precinct voting activities more directly that § 1-2-23 (which discusses permitted activities) implies. In some instances, it looked as though challengers and watchers were engaged in some of the activities of precinct board members (for example, handling registration books and signature rosters). Two students attempted to observe the watcher/challenger training to learn more about the training of watcher/challengers. However, no one attended, perhaps explaining these problematic behaviors. However, a conversation with county officials revealed that the planned training included no formal materials.

Some of the observation teams noted similar issues when it came to party observers and other interested individuals outside of polling places. In the 2006 and 2008 study, observation team members noted that election officials needed to work to better enforce § 1-20-16 of the New Mexico election code, which prohibits "campaigning on Election Day within one hundred feet of the building in which the polling place is located." During training Bernalillo County emphasized this aspect of the law and discussed that the 100' rules started from the entry door to the building in which the polling place was in, regardless of where in the building the polling place was located. This definition was very helpful and overall we saw poll workers being responsive to campaign material that was located too close. Thus, previous recommendations and responses to those recommendations in training have considerably improved polling place activities in this area.

Watcher and Challenger Recommendations

Recommendation 1: The precinct boards should be better informed and trained about the proper role of challengers and watchers, in the polling place. Precinct boards, and in particular precinct judges, should be well trained in what challengers and watchers are permitted to do and what they are not permitted to do.

Recommendation 2: Election officials should develop informational materials that are given to challengers and watchers in voting locations that present in detail what they can and cannot do in the voting location.

Recommendation 3: Election officials—either at the state or the local level—should develop training sessions and detailed training materials for county chairs of political parties, as well as the appointed challengers and watchers themselves, to ensure that all concerned are aware of activities that are permitted and prohibited on the part of these challengers and watchers. Furthermore, the appointed challengers and watchers should be **required** to attend to be certified for this job.

Recommendation 4: Election officials—either at the state or the local level—should develop training sessions and detailed training materials for all political and partisan campaigns, as well as for non-partisan groups operating at polling places, to ensure that all concerned are aware of activities that are permitted and prohibited at the polls.

Recommendation 5: The County should continue to emphasize in their training where the 100 foot and 50 foot boundaries begin. We saw large improvement in the implementation of this law in the 2010 general election.

Recommendation 6: The County should include a 50 foot or 100 foot piece of twine or low-cost string in the Election Day materials so that poll officials can measure the boundary if necessary.   We heard several requests for such an item during training sessions from experienced presiding judges.

1.5.6 AutoMARK Machines

The AutoMARK is a special voting machine that assists voters in filling out their ballots. Over the past several years we have noted an underutilization of AutoMARK machines. This year, we saw a large increase in its use in some precincts, in other precincts found it underutilized and in at several precincts the poll workers decided not to even set it up. When our team asked about the AutoMARK at one location, the presiding judge pointed to the box on the floor behind the poll worker table and told us, "if anyone wants to use the AutoMARK, they can use theirs," (pointing to the precinct nearby). We commend the overall increase in the use of the AutoMARK, but believe more could be done to increase its use by voters.

Voters that do use the AutoMARK are usually very satisfied.[14] We observed one voter who was very excited after using the AutoMARK on Election Day exclaiming, "that machine was wonderful." And, where we saw the AutoMARK in use, we saw it consistently in operation. However, some poll workers still subscribe to the general feeling that it is useless because "no one ever uses it." Nevertheless, we saw multiple instances where if the presiding judges or poll workers were more attentive, they could have offered it to voters. For example, an elderly gentleman was observed asking for help filling out his ballot because he could not see very well, even with the help of a magnifying glass. Instead of directing him to the AutoMARK, the poll workers pointed at his ballot to help him out, which raises unnecessary privacy concerns. While this behavior seems too common, at least some judges were observed directing voters to the AutoMARK for a more pleasant voting experience. This variation leads us to believe that better training of the judges on what the AutoMARK can do and who it can help would lead to greater use of the machine. Furthermore, we recommend a public relation campaign about the uses of the AutoMARK. This recommendation is based on an experience of a young voter who saw someone using the AutoMARK who got very excited to use it in the next election so that she would not have to deal with filling in the bubble ballot. Thus, a public relations campaign that introduces voters to their options in the polling place might help to increase the use of the AutoMARK in the election.

---

[14] See Lisa A. Bryant, 2010. "Voter Confidence and the Use of Absentee Ballots and Voter Assist Terminals: An Experimental Study, Typescript, University of New Mexico."

Observers noted that the AutoMARK was often placed away from the standard privacy booths and located in places that were especially open to observation from poll workers. Perhaps this is because the AutoMARK is a special electronic machine and needs electricity to operate. The machines were frequently set up without the privacy screen and facing into the center of the voting area or in many places facing toward the entry to the polling place. In at least one location it was set up directly behind the voter check in table, making it appear almost "off-limits" to voters. One observer anecdotally noted that the AutoMARK was utilized more often when it was located in more highly accessible and visible positions. Though that may be the case, there are also privacy concerns here. Since the AutoMARK displays the ballot choices on a vertical screen instead of laying flat on the table, it is much easier to see what choices the voter is making and in several cases where we observed AutoMARK voting we could easily discern the voter's choices. Therefore, the placement of AutoMARKs needs to be more carefully considered by presiding judges so that they are placed in a location that both offers access to the equipment and protects the privacy of the voter.

Throughout our observations, we noted that in most instances of spoiled ballots, the poll workers looked at the filled out ballot to show the voter where they had over voted so as to avoid it when filling out the ballot a second time. A solution to this violation of the voter's privacy is to train the workers to direct any voters that spoil their ballot to the AutoMARK to fill out the ballot a second time. In this way, there would be no reason for any poll worker to look at a filled out ballot as the AutoMARK will not allow a ballot to be over voted.

The observer teams found several instances where the AutoMARK was not working or was broken. In many of these cases, multiple precincts existed in one location and, therefore, poll workers could use the AutoMARK from other precincts. In some locations with multiple precincts, only one AutoMARK machine was set up. In such cases, the location of the AutoMARK machine meant that it was sometimes located in one precinct area, so that it was not clear by observation that the machine was available for use by voters in all of the precincts. Although the poll workers may have known that the AutoMARK was available and could direct voters to the machines if they asked, the voters might not know that this machine was available for their use and the poll workers may also be more reluctant to encourage a voter to use an AutoMARK that is part of another precincts equipment. Working AutoMARKs should be available in all precincts.

There were also incidents where we observed or where poll workers told us that particular voters would likely have been good candidates for using the AutoMARK machine but they did not mention the machine as an option to these voters. These poll workers said that they would have directed these voters to the AutoMARK machine if they requested it, but did not seem to think it was their job to suggest that particular voters might find the machine useful. If poll workers do not think that anyone will use the AutoMARK or it will be difficult to use, they may be less likely to consider issues of privacy for AutoMARK users, or making it clear that the machine is available for use. Also, because the machine is used so infrequently, the poll workers may be less comfortable working with it and may be hesitant to encourage voters to use the machines. In one case, observers saw a voter repeatedly

spoil his ballot only to have to start over; he was never advised of the possibility of using the electronic voting equipment to overcome the difficulties he was having.

AutoMARK Machine Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Incorporate more training on the AutoMARK:

    a. This training should focus on stressing that the AutoMARK should be offered explicitly to voters who are most likely to benefit from its use (elderly, disabled, voters who spoil ballots, etc.).

    b. Additionally, training should emphasize the optimal placement of the AutoMARK; somewhere that is accessible and visible, but also protects the privacy of voters using the AutoMARK.

Recommendation 2: Training should include opportunities for poll workers to vote using an AutoMARK so they are comfortable working with the machine. If more poll workers were familiar and comfortable with using the machine, they might be more willing to suggest its use to voters.

Recommendation 3: To reduce the instances of poll worker's looking over spoiled ballots, all voters that spoil a ballot should be instructed to use the AutoMARK when filling out their second ballot.

Recommendation 4: Finally, a public relation campaign should be used to educate the voters about the uses of the AutoMARK, so as to increase its use.

1.5.7 Spoiled Ballots

All election precincts and election jurisdictions in New Mexico use optical scan ballots for voting. Voters use a black pen to fill in a bubble for their choice in each race on the ballot. The ballot is then scanned using the ES&S Model 100, which is a precinct-based, voter-activated paper ballot counter and vote tabulator. The M100 has a feature that alerts voters to over-voted races, which is designed to avoid problems with voters making too many marks for a given race on the ballot and to ensure that a voter's intent is captured most accurately. In New Mexico, if a voter casts a ballot with an over-vote, when that ballot is put into the M100, three actions occur.

- First, the machine reads the over-vote and the ballot is rejected and ejected by the tabulator.

- Second, when this occurs, the machine emits a beeping sound to inform the voter and the election officials that the ballot has a problem.

- Third, the machine reports on a small screen the race or races that contain an over-vote.

At this point, the voter has two choices. The voter can ask the election official to place the ballot into the hand counting bin, in which case the over-voted office will not be counted, or the voter can "spoil" their ballot. When a voter "spoils" their ballot, the ballot containing the mistake is voided and the voter is issued a new ballot.

During the election observations, there were problems in many precincts related to the way in which these spoiled ballots were handled. The primary problem was that, when ballots were rejected, the privacy of the voter's ballot was not respected. In one precinct, we saw liquid paper being used to fix the "mistake." This involved extensive and inappropriate activity between the voter and the presiding judge.

Based on these observations, the spoiled ballot problem has multiple aspects. First, voters were rarely offered the chance to override the spoiling of their ballot and allow the ballot to be cast as it was filled out and hand counted at the end of the day.

Second, when the M100 indicated that there was a problem with a ballot, the voter was generally not told to read the error report herself. Instead, the voter's ballot was inevitably taken by the poll worker and visually inspected for the error. This is almost always because the ballot was removed too quickly and, once the ballot is removed, the machine error can no longer be read.

Third, the voter's ballot often became a subject of public interest to all precinct workers because the poll worker working the M100 would look at the ballot, as would the other precinct workers involved in issuing a new ballot. Every observation team saw a case where a spoiled ballot was handled or viewed by multiple poll workers and done in a way that spotlighted to the entire precinct the voter's mistake, which may make the voter uncomfortable. Because the spoiled ballot was almost always taken to the check-in table when a new ballot was issued, the ballot was also occasionally in view of any voters who were checking in.

Fourth, different poll worker procedures were used in handling a spoiled ballot, with some judges writing the word spoiled on the ballot before inserting it into the spoiled ballot envelope and other judges just inserting the ballot into the envelope.

Despite these problems, we want to note that we saw increased appropriate procedures in the polling location with regard to this issue. In 2008, we saw the spoiled ballot mishandled 59% of the time. In 2010, it was mishandled only 39% of the time. Thus, we have seen improvement in this area and continued quality training regarding privacy and ballot handling issues will lead to continued improvement of this part of the election process.

Spoiled Ballot Recommendations

Recommendation 1: When a voter's ballot is rejected, the poll worker should try to read off the machine's electronic display which office is over voted. The voter can always reinsert their ballot if it was removed too quickly to make that determination.

Recommendation 2: When a voter's ballot is rejected, the voter should be allowed to look for herself as to why the ballot was rejected and determine if she wants to vote the ballot anyway. (For example, a voter might not be overly concerned that she made an error in a judicial retention race).

Recommendation 3: The voter should also have their ballot covered when it is being handled. This can be accomplished by having the voter put the ballot in a sleeve (e.g., a legal size file folder) and handing that folder to the poll worker. Poll workers should be instructed to note use white out or write the word spoiled on the ballot, if someone has to touch a voted ballot the voter's privacy is violated. Perhaps the best message to poll workers is to never touch a voted ballot whenever the identity of the voter is known.

Recommendation 4: Whenever a voter spoils a ballot, the poll worker should consider offering the AutoMARK as an alternative option for completing the balloting processing. Given that the AutoMARK does not allow over-voting, it can provide the voter with a mistake-free means of casting their ballot.

1.5.8 General Voter Privacy Issues

Given that the secret ballot is the hallmark of the voting process, a voter should be able to cast her ballot without concern about her vote choices becoming public. In the area of privacy, observers saw several issues of concern. First, as was noted above, voters who spoil their ballot should have the privacy of their vote choices better protected. We noted in many cases that when we discussed spoiled ballots with poll workers many of them seemed to know exactly which race the voter had over voted using the spoiled ballot. According to the procedures for spoiled ballots the voter was to fold the ballot and place it into the spoiled envelope. However in most cases the presiding judge would take the ballot write spoiled across it while examining where the spoil took place and place the ballot in the envelope themselves. This could cause a voter to feel unsure about his or her vote choice and make them unnecessarily uncomfortable.

Second, voters need to be able to cast their ballots without people being able to see how they vote. The physical layout of some polling places and the small size of others created actual or perceived privacy problems. Even in fairly well designed polling locations, a voter might feel as if someone could see for whom they voted merely by peering over the top of the voting booth. This could happen because lines had formed inside the polling station or because voting booths were crowded too closely together. In more poorly designed polling places, this could occur because some of the voting booths were on the path between other parts of the polling location and the M100. In one precinct there was a worker who would walk very close to the backs of the voters while they were voting. She would pace back an forth, peering over the voters shoulders and although no voters openly complained about the poll worker's awkward behavior many voters kept looking over their shoulder to determine what she was doing.

A problem we noted in a few precincts involved workers feeding ballots into the M100. In some cases this would be the worker taking the ballot from the voter and placing it through the M100. Though it is important to note we saw this less in 2010 than in previous election cycles. Indeed, in many precincts we observed poll workers showing considerable restraint and respect for voters' privacy.

Another problem we observed was that in some cases where the M100 broke down and the ballots had to be fed through at a later time some issues arose. Sometimes only one worker would feed the ballot through. Some times they were fed through slowly and a lot of discussion took place around each ballot. Depending on the number of ballots awaiting to be fed through the machine, some voters' ballots may be able to be identified.

Third, voting sometimes occurs in places where there can be less than obvious privacy issues. For example, schools and other locations that have video cameras inside the room where voting occurs may cause concerns for some voters.

Voter Privacy Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Voter privacy was increased during the 2010 election. Continued training on the importance of voter privacy will likely yield additional compliance. One possible technological solution is to provide privacy sleeves to all voters to cover the ballot as they walk from the privacy booth to the M100 (10 to 12 legal sized file folders per precinct should be adequate to accomplish this).

Recommendation 2: Training should cover specific procedures for inserting ballots into the machines that were put into the M100 unread ballot slot due to machine failures. Voter privacy should be maintained and poll workers should not examine or discuss the ballots or the votes on the ballots while they are engaged in this activity.

1.5.9 Provisional Ballots

In this election, observers saw fewer instances of provisional balloting than in previous election. This could indicate voters were not provided the option of voting provisionally as often as in previous elections and were turned away. We suggest this later possibility because observation reports noted several instances where voters would arrive at the incorrect precinct according to voter registration lists and be turned away. In general there seemed to be confusion regarding the appropriate procedures for handling voters who did not appear on the voter list. As several observers noted there were some occasions where provisional voting was offered without first attempting to locate the voter's appropriate precinct; whereas in other instances provisional voting was not offered and voters were turned away. In addition in those instances where provisional voting was offered, it sometimes appeared that the presiding judge was not always aware of how the process of provisional voting worked, and was not always able to explain the process to the voter, leaving the voter unclear on if or how her vote would be counted and the possibilities for appeal. In one instance, we saw a voter turned away because county officials could not find the voter's registration. In a second instance, we were contacted by a potential

voter after the election who told us that she was told by a presiding judge that she was not on the voter list and therefore could not vote, but we did find her on our voter survey list, therefore there was some problem in finding voters in the system on Election Day. Given the large number of voters in any particular jurisdiction, we recommend that voters not be turned away and allowed to vote provisionally even if there appears no record of them at the central election office. Given time pressures and the stress of the day, it may be easy to accidentally overlook a voter who is on the list. In addition, as one observer noted in her report, provisional voting was one of the topics that was covered fairly quickly during poll worker training and thus better training may be necessary.

Provisional Voting Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Presiding judges and poll workers need better training on the provisional ballot process and need clearer instructions on what should be done before allowing a voter to vote provisionally.

Recommendation 2: Because provisional voting is a potentially common occurrence, it would be helpful to voters if there was some posted information at a precinct about provisional voting and what a voter should do before casting a provisional ballot in order to increase the chances of their vote being counted.

Recommendation 3: If presiding judges confirm that a voter is not on the voter registration list through the county election officials, we recommend allowing the voter to vote provisionally so that they have a second opportunity for their voter qualification to be examined and the potential to appeal any decision. Once the judge turns away the voter, there is no appeal process or opportunity for the voter to engage in his or her civic duty.

Recommendation 4: Additionally, provisional voters may be provided with an explanation sheet that defines their status, how their ballot will be judged, and how they will be contacted regarding their final disposition, and the fact that they will have the right to appeal any negative decision regarding the counting of their ballot. Perhaps an explanation of provisional voting on the clerk and secretary of state's web site would be helpful to these voters.

1.5.10 Post-election Procedures

The closing of a polling place is a complex, but vital, final step in the election process. Poll workers and precinct judges have all had a long day, they are tired and hungry, and know that they face a variety of important tasks before they can leave for the day. Oftentimes they also close the polls under the scrutiny of challengers and watchers, as they try to follow the procedures learned in their training or provided in their manuals. This can be more stressful when, as sometimes occurs, they find themselves in situations that were not covered in their training, or that are not discussed in their manuals, and they will then improvise.

Breakdown Procedures

The early breakdown of privacy booths and other equipment can be very disruptive for voters. At more than one precinct, poll workers began disassembling equipment while voters were still inside the precinct completing their ballots. At one location in particular, equipment was taken down as early as 6:15 pm. In this instance poll workers expressed their desire to leave promptly after the polls closed and explained that the privacy booths would most likely not get used. Although the precinct was kept open and a few privacy booths were still available, the early breakdown created a noisy and distracting environment. At another location, where the precinct was located in a gym, there were two voters voting at 6:50 pm and poll workers began disassembling voting booths creating quite a bit of noise. They removed all the booths around the voters as they were voting, leaving only these two booths standing.

Early breakdowns are especially problematic when there is more that one precinct in the polling location. For instance, one precinct had begun breaking down their equipment while voters across the same gym were checking in to receive their ballots. The disassembly of privacy booths creates loud clanging noises and a stressful environment for voters where it is difficult to concentrate and they feel rushed to complete their ballot. During training it should be emphasized to poll workers that they cannot prematurely disassemble the equipment for any reason.

In the debriefing meeting on Nov 3rd, the observers reported quite different procedures when the total number of ballots cast and the total number of voters who signed the poll book did not balance. This is perhaps one of the most difficult aspects of Election Day procedures and therefore good training and instructions need to be provided.

Closing Procedures

It is important to recognize that poll workers and precinct judges provide an invaluable service on Election Day, and that it is a long and hard day. But although the research team is aware of the important service that poll workers and precinct judges provide, a voter who arrives at a polling place late on Election Day still deserves the same degree of customer service that a voter who had a chance to participate earlier on Election Day.

We observed quite a few instances where poll workers and precinct judges began closing polling place operations—including removing informational and educational signs, initiation of post-election tallying procedures, and especially the breaking down of polling booths—before the close of polls (see closing polls in the uniformity section). This creates a poor environment for those who are voting at the end of Election Day, and is not an environment in which poll workers and precinct judges can provide a proper level of support to voters and ensure a high degree of administrative integrity.

Closing procedures are complex, and although it might not be easy to reduce the complexity of the procedures, it might be easier to better train poll workers and precinct judges about closing procedures and to provide them with easier-to-use guides that can walk them step-by-step through the closing procedures at the end of a long day.

Closing Procedure Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Poll workers and election judges should be clearly trained that the closing procedures in polling places not be initiated until after the polling place has closed operations.

Recommendation 2: Election officials should use the step-by-step checklists provided for closing operations. In training, the poll workers should be walked through how to complete this checklist, preferably in a simulation exercise.

Recommendation 5: During training, presiding judges should be trained in the closing procedures through a skit, video, or simulation exercise so that they are familiar with the process. Alternatively, it would likely be even better to have poll workers engage in mock election work and actually perform the tasks they are expected to complete on Election Day.

Recommendation 6: Poll worker training should emphasize to poll workers that they are not allowed to dismantle the polling location early, or even at 7:00 pm if voters are still voting.

1.6. Conclusions

In our Election Day observations, we generally saw smoothly operating polling places and overall a good Election Day experience in New Mexico. We did observe a number of places where we believe the process can be improved and have offered a number of situations along those lines in this report. We also suggest that it might be helpful for the county to I develop a better outreach campaign to stakeholder groups. Although the county has done several open forums, it might be helpful for the county to have a more formal process as well, for example a community outreach committee. This committee would meet periodically and provide a forum for election officials to communicate with the stakeholder groups and vice versa. We hope these recommendations help to improve the electoral process in New Mexico.

Appendix 1.1 Polling places and precincts studied

Bernalillo County: Polling Places and Precincts

Early Voting Locations:
> Union Building, University of New Mexico
> Siesta Hills Shopping Center, 5407 Gibson SE.
> Daskalos Shopping Center, 5339 Menaul NE
> Montgomery Crossing, 8510 Montgomery Blvd NE

Election Day Locations:

Team 1:
> Albuquerque High School (precincts 211, 212)
> Barelas Community Center (precincts 133, 135)
> Dolores Gonzales Elementary School (precincts 122, 124, 131, 132)
> Encino Terrace (precincts 216, 217)
> Herman Sanchez Community Center (precincts 103, 104, 226)
> Jack Candelaria Community Center (precincts 94, 106, 109)
> Washington Middle School (precincts 121, 123, 125, 166)

Team 2:
> CNM (precincts 215, 223, 241)
> Jefferson Middle School (precincts 354, 355, 356, 357)
> Loma Linda Community Center (precincts 107, 246)
> Monte Vista Elementary School (precincts 243, 244, 351, 352)
> UNM Continuing Education Center (precincts 341, 345)

Team 3:
> Alvarado Elementary School (precincts 12, 13)
> Griegos Elementary School (precincts 180, 181, 182)
> La Luz Elementary School (precincts 192, 193, 194, 196)
> Los Ranchos Elementary School (precincts 18, 455)
> MacArthur Elementary School (precincts 11, 191)
> Mission Avenue Elementary (precincts 14, 15)
> Taft Middle School (precincts 4, 16, 17, 108)
> Valley High School (precincts 183, 184)

Team 4:
> Alice Hoppes African American Pavilion (precincts 311, 312)
> Encino Garden (precinct 282)
> Highland High School (precincts 253, 271, 272, 281)
> La Mesa Elementary School (precincts 318, 321, 322, 323)
> Van Buren Middle School (precincts 286, 287, 326)

Zia Elementary School (precinct 383, 385, 386, 387)

Team 5:
      Alameda Elementary School (precincts 6, 86)
      Cibola High School (precincts 3, 78, 89)
      James Monroe Middle School (precinct 80)
      Paradise Hills Community Center (precinct 19, 68)
      Petroglyph Elementary School (precinct 79, 84, 85, 114)
      Raymond G. Sanchez Community Center (precincts 8, 9)
      Seven Bar Elementary School (precincts 2, 116)
      Sierra Vista Elementary School (precincts 1, 87)
      Taylor Middle School (precincts 5, 7)
      Ventana Ranch West Elementary School (precincts 115, 117)

Team 6:
      Chamiza Elementary School (precincts 82, 112, 113)
      Chaparral Elementary School (precincts 24, 25, 26, 30)
      Lyndon B. Johnson Middle School (precinct 83, 110)
      Marie M. Hughes Elementary School (precincts 20, 22, 81, 111)
      Our Savior Lutheran Church (precincts 27, 39)

Team 7:
      Apache Elementary (precincts 295, 297, 299, 301)
      Four Hills Country Club (precincts 289, 290, 294, 333)
      Four Hills Mobile Home Park (precincts 296, 330)
      Las Colinas Village (precinct 293)
      Lomas Tramway Library (precinct 302)
      Manzano Mesa Multicultural Center (precincts 328, 329)
      Singing Arrow Community Center (precincts 331, 332)

Team 8:
      Duranes Elementary School (precincts 150, 151, 152, 153)
      Lavaland Elementary School (precincts 34, 35, 36)
      Reginald Chavez Elementary School (precincts 154, 162)
      Westside Community Center (precinct 63, 67)

Team 9:
      Alamosa Elementary (precincts 32, 33, 51)
      John Adams Middle School (precinct 37)
      Los Padillas Elementary School (precinct 92)
      Pajarito Elementary School (precincts 90, 91)
      Polk Middle School (precincts 88, 97)
      West Mesa Community Center (precinct 40)

Team 10:
      Heights Cumberland Presbyterian Church (precinct 482, 490, 529)

Madison Middle School (precincts 495, 509, 513, 523)
New Life Presbyterian Church (precincts 450, 484, 512, 563)
S Y Jackson Elementary School (precincts 454, 522, 527, 566)
St. Stephens United Methodist Church (precincts 428, 429, 430, 520)

Team 11:
APS Aztec Complex (precincts 502, 504)
Bellehaven Elementary School (precincts 471, 472)
Collet Park Elementary School (precincts 531, 532)
Eisenhower Midle School (precincts 449, 451, 452, 483)
Eldorado High School (precincts 480, 521, 564, 565)
Faith in Christ Luthern Church (precincts 308, 549)
Grant Middle School (precincts 473, 475, 476)

Team 12:
Acoma Elementary School (precincts 536, 545, 546, 547)
Chelwood Elementary School (precincts 304, 307)
Covenant Presbyterian Church (precincts 507, 508)
Eubank Elementary School (precincts 46, 464, 465, 474)
Jackson Middle School (precincts 533, 534, 535)
Manzano High School (precincts 298, 300, 306, 550)

Team 13:
Albuquerque Meadows Mobile Home Park (precincts 410, 418)
Arroyo Del Oso Elementary School (precincts 407, 419, 420, 421)
Dennis Chavez Elementary School (precincts 426, 485, 486, 487)
Holy Cross Lutheran Church (precincts 488, 489)
New Mexico Activities Association (precinct 422)
North Hills Mobile Home Park (precincts 448, 510)
Sombra Del Monte Christian Church (precincts 411, 414, 466)

Team 14:
Bel Air Elementary (precincts 442, 443, 444)
Comanche Elementary School (precincts 496, 497)
Fellowship Christian Reformed Church (precincts 371, 372, 374, 375)
Hodgin Elementary School (precincts 346, 436, 437, 440)
McKinely Middle School (precincts 408, 431, 432, 435)
Zuni Elementary (precincts 401, 402, 491)

Team 15:
Carlos Rey Elementary School (precincts 41, 42)
Edward Gonzales Elementary School (precincts 50, 59)
La Cueva High School (precincts 423, 424, 601)
Mary Ann Binford (precincts 49, 60)
Tierra West Mobile Home Community (precinct 58)

Truman Middle School (precincts 52, 53, 56)
West Mesa High School (precinct 38)

Team 16:
Church of the Good Shepherd (precincts 537, 602, 603)
Coronado Village Mobile Home Park (precinct 10)
Double Eagle Elementary School (precincts 539, 541, 567, 569)
Mark Twain Elementary School (precincts 313, 314, 315, 412)
North Star Elementary School (precincts 425, 447)
Sandia High School (precincts 492, 493, 494)

Appendix 1.2. Election Day Observation Team Members

Alex Adams
Rebecca Aldridge
R. Michael Alvarez
Arturo Anaya
Daniel Apodaca
Lonna Atkeson
Glennas'ba Augborne
Lisa Bryant
Theodore Bolstad
Jacob Claussen
Brett Crader
Sarah Ebbers
Brittany Esswein
Kyle Ferris
Jorge Osvaldo Gonzales
Angelina Gonzales-Aller
Yvonne Grimes
Gavin Gutierrez
Julia Hellwege
Willard Hunger

Jessica Jones
Alyssa Kearney
William Kelipuleole
Rebecca McCain
Antonio Noriega
David Odegaard
Michael Perino
Kimberly Proctor
Mark Pustay
Sydney Ruiz
Lisa Sanchez
Shannon Sanchez-Youngman
Christopher Shannon
Brian Spencer
Michael Thorning
Adriana Toomey-Hernandez
Benjamin Waddell
Sato Wakabayashi
Johnna Walker
Brook Ward
Keenan Wilder

Appendix 1.3. Frequency Reports, Election Day Observations

Frequency Report for Opening Procedures

1a.   Did the presiding judge show up at the precinct on time? (n = 18)
      Yes   100.0%
      No   0.0%

1b.   Did all the poll workers show up on time? (n = 18)
      Yes   88.9%
      No   11.1%

2.   Did poll workers check to make sure the yellow warehouse slip numbers match the M100? (n = 13)
      Yes   76.9%
      No   23.1%

3.   Did they verify the ballot bins in the M100 are empty? (n = 15)
      Yes   80.0%
      No   20.0%

4.   Was the zero-tape generated? (n = 17)
      Yes   88.2%
      No   11.8%

5.   Was the zero-tape signed by all the poll workers? (n = 15)
      Yes   86.7%
      No   13.3%

6.   Was the zero-tape left on the machine? (n = 15)
      Yes   80.0.%
      No   20.0%

7.   Was the signature voter roster signed by all the poll workers? (n = 15)
      Yes   73.3%
      No   26.7%

8.   Was the checklist voter roster signed by all the poll workers? (n = 14)
      Yes   78.6%
      No   21.4%

9.   Was the registered voter list posted at the precinct and easily visible? (n = 18)
      Yes   100.0%

10. Was the voter bill of rights posted at the precinct and easily visible? (n = 18)
    Yes   72.2%
    No   27.8%

11. Were sample ballots posted at the precinct and easily visible? (n = 17)
    Yes   64.7%
    No   35.3%

12. Was the ballot marking example sign posted at the precinct and easily visible?
    (n = 17)
    Yes   95.1%
    No   4.9%

13. Was the voter identification poster posted at the precinct and easily visible?
    (n = 18)
    Yes   72.2%
    No   27.8%

Closing Frequency Report

1. Were there any voters still in line waiting to vote when the polls closed? (n= 9)
   Yes   11.1%
   No   88.9%

2. Did the poll workers balance the number of voters, the public count, with the M100
   tape? (n= 7)
   Yes   71.4%
   No   28.6%

3. Was there a problem balancing the # of voters with the # of ballots cast at closing?
   (n= 7)
   Yes   71.4%
   No   28.6%

4. Did the poll workers post a copy of the election results at the location for the public
   to view? (n= 5)
   Yes   100.0%

5. Did poll workers place the ballots in the ballot box? (n= 7)
   Yes   100.0%

6. Were spoiled ballots also included in the ballot box? (n= 10)
   Yes   90.0%
   No   10.0%

7. Was the ballot box padlocked? (n= 5)
   Yes   100.0%

8. Were the 2 sets of keys for the locked ballot box placed in different envelopes?
   (n= 6)
   Yes   100.0%

9. Did the poll workers destroy all the unused ballots? (n= 9)
   Yes   100.0%

10. Were the stubs of unused ballots removed prior to destroying them? (n= 9)
   Yes   100.0%

11. Was anything other than ballots placed in the ballot box? (n= 6)
   Yes   16.7%
   No   83.3%

12. Did you see poll workers attempt to feed any uncounted ballots (placed in the
   emergency slot in the M100) into the M100 after polls closed? (n= 10)
   No   100.0%

12. Did they have to hand tally any ballots? (n= 9)
   Yes   66.7%
   No   33.3%

14. Did the poll workers use any chain of custody forms? (n= 6)
   Yes   83.3%
   No   16.7%

15. Was the PCMCIA card removed from the M100? (n= 7)
   Yes   100.0%

Election Day Frequency Report

1. Was the voting location easy to find and clearly marked? (n = 216)
   Yes   81.9%
   No   18.1%

2. Was the accessibility to the voting location easy for voters (esp. handicapped)?
   (n = 203)
   Yes   88.2%
   No   13.8%

3. Was there only one entrance into the voting location? (n = 217)
   Yes   76.5%

No   23.5%

4.   Was there adequate parking at the polling location? (n = 207)
        Yes   82.6%
        No   17.4%

5.   Were all campaign materials located at least 100 feet from the polling location? (n = 198)
        Yes   92.4%
        No   7.6%

6.   Were there people holding political signs outside the polling location? (n = 204)
        Yes   25.5%
        No   74.5%

7.   How many poll workers were working at the time you were present? (n = 208)
        Mean   4.67
        Median   5
        Range   3– 8

8a.   Was there a line of voters? (n = 212)
        Yes   17.0%
        No   83.0%

8b.   If there was a line, were voters waiting to check-in or waiting to vote? (n = 42)
        Check-in   78.6%
        Vote   21.4%

8c.   Estimate the amount of time a voter waited to vote – in minutes (n = 48):
        Mean   4.15
        Median   2.0
        Range   1-20

9.   Was it noisy inside the polling location? (n = 211)
        Yes   18.0%
        No   82.0%

10.   Was it crowded inside the polling location? (n = 213)
        Yes   15.0%
        No   85.0%

11.   Were poll workers asking voters for voter identification (such as a photo ID)?
        (n = 194)
        Yes   14.4%
        No   85.6%

11a.   Based on your observations, were they asking for identification appropriately?
        (n = 200)
        Yes   68.5%
        No   31.5%

12.   Was at least one of the poll workers bi-lingual? (n = 202)
        Yes   79.7%
        No   20.3%

12b.   Did you see the poll workers help someone in a language other than English?
        (n = 199)
        Yes   7.5%
        No   92.5%

13.   Did you see anyone using a cell phone in the voting booth or at the voting location?
        (n = 188)
        Yes   23.4%
        No   76.6%

14.   Did voters have adequate privacy while filling out their ballots? (n = 207)
        Yes   87.0%
        No   13.0%

15.   Was the AutoMARK set up, operational and available for use? (n = 208)
        Yes   93.7%
        No   6.3%

16.   Were there any reported problems with the M100 voting tabulators? (n = 206)
        Yes   19.4%
        No   80.6%

17.   Did anyone try to drop off an absentee ballots at the polling location? (n = 197)
        Yes   34.0%
        No   66.0%

18.   Did anyone but the voter handles a spoiled ballot? (n = 148)
        Yes   38.5%
        No   61.5%

19.   Were ballots being fed into the M100s by voters or poll workers? (n = 191)
        Voters   78.5%
        Poll Workers   6.3%
        Both   15.2%

20.   Did the poll worker examine the ballots as they were fed through the machine in
        such a way that it could have been a privacy issue for the voter? (n=148)
        Yes   27.7%

No   72.3%

21.   Was the address of the polling place in clear sight on the outside of the precinct?
       (n = 151)
       Yes   75.5%
       No   24.5%

22.   Was the correct address given for the polling place?   (n = 157)
       Yes   97.5%
       No   2.5%

23.   Was the polling place adjacent to a major street (4 lanes/divided traffic)?   (n = 151)
       Yes   48.3%
       No   51.7%

24.   Was the polling place readily visible from the street?   (n = 154)
       Yes   31.2%
       Somewhat   50.0%
       No   18.8%

25.   Were any signs, flags or banners visible from outside, such as "Vote Here"?
       (n = 154)
       Yes   92.9%
       No   7.1%

25a.   If yes, did the sign(s) make it obvious that this was a polling place?   (n = 152)
       Yes   88.2%
       No   11.8%

26.   Was the entrance handicapped (wheelchair) accessible?   (n = 149)
       Yes   91.9%
       No   8.1%

27.   Generally speaking, how small or large was the polling place?   (n = 159)
       Very small   6.9%
       Somewhat small   22.0%
       Medium   29.6%
       Somewhat large   20.8%
       Very large   20.8%

28.   Was the interior of the polling place well lit for reading?   (n = 154)
       Yes   93.5%
       No   6.5%

29.   Were there any additional amenities to voters (such as coffee, snacks, etc.)?
       (n = 155)

Yes   19.4%
No   80.6%

30.   When you visited the precinct, how safe did you feel?   (n = 157)
Very   88.5%
Somewhat   11.5%
Not safe   0.0%

31.   How many polling booths/voting machines were available to voters?   (n = 158)
Mean   10.5%
Median   9.0%
Range   1 -32

Appendix 1.4. Election Day Observation Forms

Election Day Open Polls Observation Worksheet

2008 Presidential Election, November 4, 2008 - New Mexico

(THIS FORM IS FOR OPENING POLLS ONLY!)

In addition to this form, please fill out a general observation form for this precinct.

Please fill out a form for each individual precinct, even if there are multiple precincts at a single location. When appropriate, ask poll workers, poll judges or observers for their observations for answers to questions that took place during periods when you were not present or events that are taking place currently. When a situation is different then it should be, please elaborate as much as possible. Always feel free to add notes and other observations. Please write as much as you like about each precinct.

Polling Location Information:

Polling Location Name and
Number:_____

Type of Polling Location (church, school,
etc.)_____

Other Precinct Number(s) at Location:

_____

City:_____ County:

_____

Names of Observers:

_____

Time of Arrival: _____ AM/PM   Time of Departure: _____
AM/PM

- -

- - - -

1a. Did the presiding judge show up at the precinct on time?   Yes   No

1b. Did all the poll workers show up on time? (Please explain any tardiness issues in the comments section of this form)
     Yes   No

2. Did poll workers check to make sure the yellow warehouse slip numbers match the m-100?

        Yes   No

3. Did they verify the ballot bins in the M-100 are empty?   Yes   No

4. Was the zero-tape generated?   Yes   No

5. Was the zero-tape signed by all the poll workers?   Yes   No

6. Was the zero-tape left on the machine or was it detached?   Yes   No

7. Was the signature voter roster signed by all the poll workers?   Yes
    No

8. Was the checklist voter roster signed by all the poll workers?   Yes
    No

9. Was the registered voter list posted at the precinct and easily visible?   Yes
    No

10. Was the voter bill of rights posted at the precinct and easily visible?   Yes
    No

11. Were sample ballots posted at the precinct and easily visible?   Yes
    No

12. Was the ballot marking example sign posted at the precinct and easily visible?   Yes
No

13. Was the voter ID poster posted at the precinct and easily visible?   Yes
    No

14. Additional Comments:

Election Day Close Polls Observation Worksheet
2010 Gubernatorial Election, November 2, 2010 - New Mexico

(THIS FORM IS FOR CLOSING POLLS ONLY!)

In addition to this form, please fill out a general observation form for this precinct.

Please fill out a form for each individual precinct, even if there are multiple precincts at a single location. When appropriate, ask poll workers, poll judges or observers for their observations for answers to questions that took place during periods when you were not present or events that are taking place currently. When a situation is different then it should be, please elaborate as much as possible. Always feel free to add notes and other observations. Please write as much as you like about each precinct.

Polling Location Information:

Polling Location Name and Number:
_____

Type of Polling Location (church, school, etc.)_____

Other Precinct Number(s) at Location:
_____

City:_____

County: _____

Names of Observers:
_____

Time of Arrival: _____ AM/PM   Time of Departure: _____ AM/PM

- -

1. Were there any voters still in line waiting to vote when the polls closed? Yes   No

2. Did the poll workers balance the number of voters, the public count, with the M-100 tape?   Yes   No

3a. Was there a problem balancing the # of voters with the # of ballots cast at closing?
     Yes   No

3b. If yes, how was the problem resolved?

4. Did the poll workers post a copy of the election results at the location for the public to view?   Yes   No

5. Did poll workers place the ballots in the ballot box?   Yes   No

6. Were spoiled ballots also included in the ballot box?   Yes   No

7. Was the ballot box padlocked?   Yes   No

8. Were the 2 sets of keys for the locked ballot box placed in different envelopes? Yes No

9. Did the poll workers destroy all the unused ballots?   Yes   No

10. Were the stubs of unused ballots removed prior to destroying them? Yes   No

11. What did the poll workers do with the stubs of unused ballots?

12a. Was anything other than ballots placed in the ballot box?   Yes   No

12b. If yes, please describe what those items were:

13. Did you see poll workers attempt to feed any uncounted ballots (placed in the emergency

slot in the M-100) into the M-100 after polls closed?   Yes   No

14a. Did they have to hand tally any ballots?   Yes   No

14b. If yes, about how long did this take?

14c. How many poll workers were involved in hand tallying?

15. How were provisional and in lieu of ballots separated and organized?

16a. Did the poll workers use any chain of custody forms?   Yes   No

16b. If yes, for what purposes? 17. Was the PCMCIA card removed from the M-100?
        Yes   No

18. Additional Comments (please also describe the drop off process):

Election Day Polling General Observation Worksheet

2010 New Mexico General Election, November 2, 2010

Please fill out a form for each individual precinct, even if there are multiple precincts at a single location. When appropriate, ask poll workers, poll judges or observers for their observations for answers to questions that took place during periods when you were not present or events that are taking place currently. When a situation is different then it should be, please elaborate as much as possible. Always feel free to add notes and other observations. Please write as much as you like about each precinct.

Polling Location Information:

Polling Location Name and Number:

_____

Type of Polling Location (church, school, etc.)_____

Other Precinct Number(s) at Location:

_____

Names of Observers:

_____

Time of Arrival: _____ AM/PM   Time of Departure: _____ AM/PM

‑ ‑

1. Was the voting location easy to find and clearly marked?   Yes   No

2. Was the accessibility to the voting location easy for voters (esp. handicapped)?   Yes   No

3. Was there only one entrance into the voting location?   Yes   No

4.   Was there adequate parking at the polling location?   Yes   No

5. Were all campaign materials located at least 100 feet from the polling location?   Yes   No

6. Were there people holding political signs outside the polling location?   Yes   No

7. How many poll workers were working at the time you were present? _____

8a. Was there a line of voters?   Yes   No

8b. If there was a line, were voters waiting to check-in or waiting to vote?   Check-in
      Vote

8c. Estimate the amount of time a voter waited to vote:_____

9.   Was it noisy inside the polling location?   Yes   No

10.   Was it crowded inside the polling location?   Yes   No

11. Were poll workers asking voters for photo ID?   Yes   No

12. Were voters offering identification without being asked?   Yes   No

13a. Based on your observations, were they asking for ID appropriately?   Yes   No

13b. If no, please explain:

14a. Was at least one of the poll workers bi-lingual?   Yes   No

14b. Did you see the poll workers help someone in a language other than English?   Yes No

15. Did you see anyone using a cell phone in the voting booth or at the voting location?
        Yes   No

16. Did voters have adequate privacy while filling out their ballots?   Yes   No

17. Was the AutoMARK set up, operational and available for use?   Yes   No

18a. Were there any reported problems with the M-100 voting tabulators?   Yes   No

18b. If yes, please explain:

19. Did anyone try to drop off an absentee ballot at the polling location?

        Yes   No

20a. Did anyone but the voter handle a spoiled ballot?   Yes   No

20b. What was the process for handling spoiled ballots?

21. Were ballots being fed into the M-100s by voters or poll workers?

        Voters   Poll Workers   Both

22. Did the poll worker examine the ballots as they were fed through the machine in such a way that if could have been a privacy issues for the voter? Yes No

23. Additional Comments:

Supplemental General Election Observation Form

Team Name _____

Time of Day _____

Precinct No. _____

1) Was the address of the polling place in clear sight on the outside of the precinct?
_Yes _ No

2) Was the correct address given for the polling place? _Yes _ No

4) Was the polling place adjacent to a major street (4 lanes/divided traffic)?
    _Yes _ No

5) Was the polling place readily visible from the street? ?
    Yes _ Somewhat _ No

6) Were any signs, flags, or banners visible from outside, such as "vote here"?
    _Yes _ No
7) If yes, did the sign make it obvious that this was a polling place?
    _Yes _ No
8) Was the entrance to the polling place handicap (wheelchair) accessible?
    _Yes _ No

9) Generally speaking, how small or large was the inside of the polling place?
   _Very Small _ Somewhat Small _ Medium _ Somewhat Large _Very Large

10) Generally speaking, was the interior of the polling place well lit for reading?
    _Yes _ No
11) Were there any additional amenities available to voters (such as coffee, donuts, snacks)?
    _Yes _ No

12) Generally speaking, when you visited the precinct, how safe did you feel?
    _Very _ Somewhat _ Not Safe _ DK

13) How many polling booths/voting machines were available to voters? _____

14) Did all voting machines seem to be working properly? _Yes _ No

Part 2: Poll Worker Experiences

Principal Authors:

Lonna Rae Atkeson
Lisa A. Bryant

After the 2010 general election, we conducted a survey of poll workers in Bernalillo, Doña Ana, San Juan, Santa Fe, Lincoln and Curry counties. The survey had a number of goals: (1) to study how poll workers generally view the election and election process, (2) to examine specific electoral administration issues and questions, (3) to gauge how poll workers implement specific laws, (4) to determine how they view recent changes to state election laws and (5) to see if poll worker attitudes have changed over time.[15]

The survey was conducted over the Internet between November 5, 2010 and January 26, 2011.[16] The population of poll workers who participated in the 2010 general election were contacted first by their county clerk in Bernalillo, Doña Ana, San Juan, Santa Fe, Curry and Lincoln counties requesting their participation in the 2010 New Mexico Poll Worker Survey and then reminder postcards were sent to poll workers on December 16 and January 5 by the University of New Mexico in Bernalillo, Doña Ana, San Juan, Santa Fe, and Lincoln counties. A statement of our methodology can be found in Appendix 2.1 and a full frequency report and copy of our survey instrument can be found in Appendix 2.2.

This report has 15 parts:

Part 1 provides background on the study.

Part 2 describes the demographic characteristics of poll workers who responded.

Part 3 provides information on how poll workers reported being recruited and their views about their fellow poll workers.

Part 4 provides reported information on their training.

Part 5 reviews their perceptions of election procedures.

Part 6 covers polling place supplies and county responsiveness to poll workers.

---

[15] We did similar reports in 2006 and 2008, which we mention frequently for purposes of comparison. The reports can be downloaded at: http://www.unm.edu/~atkeson/2008election.html.

[16] Due to cost constraints we were not able to offer a mail survey option.

Part 7 covers problems and successes during the election.

Part 8 examines the condition of polling place facilities.

Part 9 describes the overall level of satisfaction poll workers had with their job and their confidence that the ballots were counted correctly.

Part 10 examines poll worker attitudes toward voter identification.

Part 11 assesses implementation of New Mexico's voter identification law.

Part 12 takes a look at voter privacy issues.

Part 13 looks at poll worker attitudes toward election reform.

Part 14 looks at poll worker attitudes toward vote centers

Part 15 looks at poll worker attitudes toward election fraud.

2.1. *Poll Worker Demographics*

In Table 2.1, we see that there are differences across counties in the demographics of poll workers who responded to our survey, including between presiding judges (27% of the sample) and poll clerks (73% of the sample), except in regards to age.[17] As in previous years, most poll workers in the state are women (62%). In 2010 there were efforts to reduce the average age of poll workers by recruiting 16 and 17 year olds to work the polls, however the average age of poll workers in this general election remained fairly high, at 62 years old. San Juan County has the highest percentage of Native American poll workers (17%).[18] Doña Ana County had the highest percentage of Hispanic poll workers.[19] In Bernalillo County, 23% of poll workers were Hispanic, in Santa Fe County it was 17%, and in Lincoln/Curry counties 6% of poll workers were Hispanic.[20]

---

[17] The demographic characteristics of the poll clerks and the presiding judges vary across several dimensions. Presiding judges are more likely to me male, white, have higher levels of education, are more likely to take Election Day off of work to perform their duty, and more likely to work a precinct other than the one where they cast a ballot.

[18] According to the Census, Native Americans make up 36% of the county's entire population, not just those of voting age.

[19] Hispanics make up approximately 65% of the county's population.

[20] Hispanics and Whites make up roughly equal proportions of Bernalillo County residents at about 44% each. In Santa Fe, Hispanics represent about 50% of the population and whites represent about 44% of the population and in Lincoln/Curry Counties, whites represent about 69% of the population, with Hispanics making up only about 29% of the total population.

On average, 87% of poll workers had at least some college education and in three counties—Doña Ana, Bernalillo and Santa Fe—over half of the respondents were college graduates. Just over 14% of poll workers are employed full-time; most are retired (60%). The survey also shows that a majority of poll workers have computer experience and are Internet savvy. In all counties, the majority of poll workers said that they are very comfortable with computers and use the Internet one or more times a day. Of course, given the survey was only available over the Internet, these numbers likely overestimate the number of poll workers in the population who are active computer users.

Table 2.1: Demographics of Poll Workers by County (in %)

		Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
Age and Gender	Average Age	61.5	61.5	63.7	63.0	62.9	62.0
	Percentage Male	38.6	44.6	38.8	29.2	20.0	37.9
Race	White	68.7	76.1	73.6	73.9	93.9	72.1
	African American	0.9	0.9	1.8	1.4	0.0	1.0
	Native American	1.6	0.9	0.0	17.4	0.0	2.6
	Hispanic	23.4	21.4	17.3	4.3	6.1	19.7
Education	High school or less	16.4	10.8	5.2	9.6	17.1	13.3
	Some college	31.7	30.0	22.4	56.2	37.1	32.6
	College degree +	51.9	59.2	72.4	34.2	45.7	54.1
Employment Status	Full time	13.5	10.8	20.0	12.3	17.1	14.1
	Part time	9.3	9.2	9.6	13.7	2.9	9.4
	Unemployed	8.8	5.0	7.0	5.5	0.0	7.3
	Student	4.9	9.2	1.7	1.4	0.0	4.5
	Retired	59.6	63.3	59.1	57.5	71.4	60.4
	Homemaker	4.0	2.5	2.6	9.6	8.6	4.3
Time Off	Took day off	35.5	27.7	36.4	25.9	32.0	33.5
	Was normal day off	64.5	72.3	63.6	74.1	68.0	66.5
Comfort With Computers	Very comfortable	59.4	66.4	76.1	58.9	51.4	62.5
	Somewhat comfortable	32.2	27.7	21.4	31.5	40.0	30.2
	Not very comfortable	5.7	5.0	2.6	5.5	5.7	5.1
	Not at all comfortable	2.6	0.8	0.0	4.1	2.9	2.1
Frequency of Internet Use	Once or more a day	73.8	73.1	82.1	71.2	77.1	74.8
	A few times a week	15.8	21.8	10.3	13.7	14.3	15.6
	A few times a month	2.9	3.4	6.0	9.6	5.7	4.1
	Hardly ever	5.5	1.7	1.7	4.1	2.9	4.1
	Never	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	1.3

Table 2.2 shows there are also differences across counties in the party identification of poll workers. Bernalillo and Lincoln/Curry Counties were less likely to have Democratic poll

workers than the other three counties.[21] About half of poll workers in Doña Ana identify as Democrats, while in San Juan and Santa Fe counties Democrats fill the majority of positions, with Santa Fe being the most heavily Democratic. Lincoln/Curry Counties is the only group to have Republicans filling a majority of the positions. To give some context to these findings, Santa Fe County is the most Democratic of the five counties examined in term of registered voters, with 64% of voters self-identifying as Democrats, 17% as Republicans, and 19% as other or decline-to-state. Lincoln County, by contrast, is the most Republican of the five examined, with 56% of voter self-identifying with the GOP and 27% identifying as Democrats. In Doña Ana County nearly half (49%) of voters are registered Democratic, only 28% are Republican, while 22% are other or decline to state. San Juan County is 36% Democratic, 45% Republican and 19% decline to state or other. Bernalillo County is 48% Democratic, 32% are Republican and 20% are other or decline to state.[22]

Thus, the precinct workers tend reflect the underlying demographics of the county in which they live. However, non-major parties are still underrepresented as poll workers. In Bernalillo County, self-identified Independents comprised only 7.4% of poll workers in 2010. The shortages that persist in the representativeness of Independents as poll workers may likely be due to the rules surrounding precinct board appointment, which require nearly equal representation across the major parties (See NMSA § 1-2-12); Independent voters and poll workers are not discussed in the law. Ideologically, most poll workers in our survey are middle-of-the-road, either identifying as moderates, somewhat liberal or somewhat conservative, however 12% identified as very liberal, while 21% identified as very conservative.

Table 2.2. Partisanship and Ideology of Poll Workers by County (in %)

		Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
Party Identification	Democrat	48.2	50.0	61.3	52.2	39.4	50.3
	Independent	7.4	12.9	10.8	5.8	6.1	8.5
	Republican	44.4	37.1	27.9	42.0	54.5	41.1
Ideological Attitudes	Very liberal	14.1	7.0	16.2	7.5	0.0	12.1
	Somewhat liberal	17.5	20.9	26.1	22.4	20.0	19.8
	Moderate	20.9	33.0	30.6	23.9	31.4	24.9
	Somewhat conservative	24.1	21.7	15.3	23.9	20.0	22.3
	Very Conservative	23.4	17.4	11.7	22.4	28.6	21.0

---

[21] This difference is statistically significant at p<.001.

[22] These data come from the voter registration report for the 2010 general election created by the Secretary of State and available at: http://www.sos.state.nm.us/sos-elections.html.

2.2. Poll Worker Recruitment and Views of Colleagues

How do people become poll workers in New Mexico? Table 2.3 shows that, in general, most people seek out the job or are recruited by another poll worker. In Doña Ana County, recruitment advertisements and political party officials also recruit many poll workers. When we asked poll workers why they were poll workers, the three statements most poll workers strongly agreed with were (1) "it is my duty as a citizen," (2) "I am the kind of person who does my share," and (3) "I wanted to learn about the election process." These statements consistently rank as the primary reasons people chose to become poll workers, however the social benefits of meeting and being with other people and excitement of being a poll worker also seem to play a role in why people chose to work on Election Day.

Table 2.3. Poll Worker Recruitment and Reasons for being a Poll Worker

		Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
How Recruited	I wasn't recruited by anyone, I sought the job on my own	44.5	32.8	41.1	29.6	26.3	40.1
	Another poll worker	23.9	18.3	30.2	29.6	36.8	25.1
	Some other way	11.9	6.9	13.2	23.5	26.3	13.0
	An advertisement in the local media	9.5	20.6	5.4	7.4	0.0	10.0
	A political party official	2.6	13.0	3.9	3.7	7.9	4.6
	A teacher or professor	4.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1
	An official job posting by the county	3.2	1.5	5.4	1.2	0.0	2.9
	At a precinct caucus meeting	0.0	0.0	0.8	3.7	2.6	0.6
	I was a poll watcher or challenger and was recruited when a scheduled poll worker didn't arrive	0.4	1.5	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.6
Why they are a poll worker? Percent Saying Very Important	I think it is my duty as a citizen	69.6	73.5	68.5	71.6	76.3	70.5
	I am the kind of person who does my share	57.6	57.3	59.4	65.9	65.8	59.0
	I wanted to learn about the election process	56.3	42.0	55.8	44.4	55.3	53.0
	I found it exciting	34.6	20.5	28.9	25.6	31.6	30.7
	I get to meet new people	35.7	25.4	33.8	34.2	39.5	33.9
	I wanted to make some extra money	31.9	22.1	17.3	34.1	10.5	26.7
	I can be with people I enjoy	24.2	18.5	22.5	22.5	31.6	23.3
	I like to be with people who share my ideals	21.5	13.8	18.0	20.0	23.7	19.8
	I received recognition from people I respect	14.5	9.8	11.7	10.1	16.1	13.1
	I was asked by someone in my political party	7.2	10.2	4.2	3.9	11.1	7.1
	I did not want to say no to someone who asked	6.3	3.9	6.6	6.4	5.4	6.0

In Table 2.4, 95% of poll workers said they are either very likely (81%) or somewhat likely (14%) to be a poll worker again.[23] We also see that two-thirds of poll workers rated the overall performance of their colleagues very high, giving them either a 9 (28%) or a 10 (37%) on a 1 to 10 scale (where 10 is excellent); 16% were rated a seven (7) or lower. This rating is similar to numbers we saw in 2008, but is substantially higher than in 2006, when fully one-quarter of poll workers rated their colleagues seven (7) or lower and just over one-quarter (27%) rated their colleagues a 10. Many of the poll workers had worked in previous elections with the optical scan equipment, and thus the learning curve between 2008 and 2010 was much lower than between 2006 and 2008 when the paper ballot and optical equipment was new, which may have left more room for error and thus lower performance ratings. Forty-eight percent of poll workers rated the presiding judge excellent (a 10 on a 1 to 10 scale); only 10% rated their judge a five (5) or lower and less than a quarter (19%) rated the presiding judge 7 or lower. These generally high numbers speak to the overall positive environment in most precincts during the 2010 general election.

Table 2.4. Evaluation of Fellow Poll Worker and Previous Work Activity

		Total
Likelihood of Being a Poll Worker Again	Very likely	81.2
	Somewhat likely	14.2
How would you rate the overall performance of your fellow poll workers? (1= Very Poor; 10=Excellent)	1 to 7	15.6
	8	18.6
	9	28.4
	10	37.4
How would you rate the overall performance of your presiding judge? (1= Very Poor; 10=Excellent, clerks only)	1 to 7	18.5
	8	10.6
	9	22.6
	10	48.4
Did you ever feel intimidated by the poll watchers and or poll challengers?	Yes	7.6
	No	92.4
First Election Worked	Before 1990	10.5
	1991-2000	17.7
	2001-2010	71.8
Number of Elections Worked	0	7.0
	1	18.4
	2 to 5	39.3
	6 to 10	22.9
	More than 10	12.4

---

[23] We do not divide the data by county unless it is of substantive interest. County frequencies are detailed in the frequency report located in Appendix 2.2.

When we asked poll workers about poll watchers and challengers, we found that overall they do not pose much of a problem for poll workers. On average, about 8% of poll workers felt intimidated by poll watchers or challengers at one point or another. The exception to this was Santa Fe County, where 17% of poll workers report feeling intimidated. This is a large increase in Santa Fe over 2008, when only about 10% of poll workers reported feeling intimidated by a watcher or challenger. In 2008 Doña Ana had higher reported rates of intimidation (21%), but in 2010 they reported numbers much lower (8%) and much more comparable to other counties. In 2008, large numbers of partisans volunteered for these positions due to the excitement surrounding the presidential election. In 2010 there were many fewer volunteers and in many precincts no challengers and watchers were present. Thus, the general decline, at least partially, reflects the differences in election contexts and the lack of a large party presence. Nevertheless, poll workers should not be intimidated by the actions and activities of poll watchers and challengers. Future research should be directed to determine the cause of any conflict or intimidation in the precinct, as such an environment is not positive for voters. Clear instructions should be provided to poll judges regarding how to handle problematic poll watchers or challengers.

We also see that most poll workers have not been working as poll workers for a long time and we saw a substantial decline from 2008 in these numbers. In fact, 72% started after the 2000 election and most (65%) poll workers have worked in fewer than six elections. This is due to a new law (CITE LAW) that prevented retired employees from working the polls, a reliable and professional source of poll workers. This hurt all the counties in terms of their overall numbers of experienced poll workers, especially Santa Fe County, which is the capitol. This likely had ramifications on the election process and we see a number of declines in our results from 2008. These changes likely influenced these outcomes.

2.3. Training

In Table 2.5, we see that almost all poll workers attended at least one training session and most of the poll workers who did not attend a training session were poll workers in previous elections. Importantly, all of the presiding judges, who are responsible for the management of the precinct, attended at least one session and were more likely to have worked more than five elections than precinct clerks.   Not only did most poll workers attend one training session, but nearly three in ten (28%) of poll workers attended two or more training sessions.[24] Between 92% and 97% of poll workers received a manual, booklet, or DVD at their training and about seven in ten (70%) of the poll workers said that they actually read all of the materials before Election Day. This is an improvement over

---

[24] Some research has found little relationship between having poll workers attend more than one training session and their performance on Election Day, assuming the one session is effective. See Thad E. Hall, J. Quin Monson, and Kelly Patterson. "Poll Workers and American Democracy." In *Democracy in the States: Experiments in Election Reform*, by Bruce Cain, Todd Donovan and Caroline Tolbert. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

2008, when only 62% of poll workers reported having read the materials prior to Election Day. There has also been an improvement among the County Clerks in terms of providing take home information for poll workers. In 2006, only 85% of poll workers received materials that they could take home to examine in preparation for working on Election Day In 2008 it was between 89% and 96%, so it is clear that improvements continue to be made over time. A majority of poll workers who received a DVD or video watched it before the election, which is what was reported in both 2006 and 2008. Of all of the materials provided the majority of poll workers report that they found the Training Manual (38%) to be the most useful, although in San Juan County, 35% reported that the Power Point presentation was the most useful.

Poll workers were also asked if the training resources were available online if they would be more or less likely to access them in preparation for the election. Less than half (36%) of the poll workers in all counties reported that they were more willing to use the resources online. These data suggest that, over the three elections, there were some improvement in efforts to reach more poll workers with training materials and that when take home materials are provided, poll workers utilize them.

Table 2.5. Information on Poll Worker Training in Percentages by County

		Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
How many training sessions did you attend?	Zero	3.0	2.3	5.6	2.7	2.8	3.2
	One	69.3	69.7	64.8	69.3	69.4	68.7
	Two or More	27.7	28.0	29.6	28.0	27.8	28.0
Did you receive any manuals, booklets, or video/DVD at your training session	Yes	94.6	97.0	95.2	94.7	91.7	94.9
	No	3.8	0.8	3.2	4.0	5.6	3.4
	No training, no materials received	1.6	2.3	1.6	1.3	2.8	1.7
How much of the materials did you read before to Election Day?	All of them	68.7	71.2	69.9	68.0	72.2	69.3
	Most of them	18.6	21.2	23.6	24.6	11.1	19.9
	Some of them	8.1	6.8	2.4	4.0	8.3	6.4
	None of them	2.0	0.0	2.4	1.3	0.0	2.0
	I didn't receive any written materials	2.6	0.8	1.6	2.7	8.3	2.4
How much of the materials did you watch prior to Election Day?	All of them	40.2	25.8	10.5	25.7	55.6	33.1
	Most of them	4.9	8.3	5.6	5.4	5.6	5.6
	Some of them	3.0	2.3	2.4	4.1	0.0	2.8
	None of them	2.8	0.8	3.2	4.1	0.0	2.6
	I didn't receive any video materials	49.0	62.9	78.2	60.8	38.9	55.9
If you reviewed any of the media on training, which did you find most useful?	Video	26.5	5.6	2.6	8.5	22.2	18.2
	Training manual	36.8	34.9	40.5	19.7	52.8	36.3
	Power Point	14.5	25.4	0.0	38.0	5.6	15.8
	Other	2.5	5.6	6.0	8.5	2.8	4.0
	Didn't use them	19.6	28.6	50.9	25.4	16.7	25.7
If the training resources were available online, would you be more or less willing to utilize these resources?	More willing	36.4	33.3	27.2	30.7	8.3	32.9
	About the same	18.2	18.2	22.4	18.7	27.8	19.2
	Less willing	45.5	48.5	50.4	50.7	63.9	47.9

The critical question with training is whether the poll workers felt that their training left them feeling confident in their ability to do their work on Election Day. In Table 2.6, we see that just over half of poll workers strongly agreed that they were confident in their ability to do their job on Election Day. Interestingly, 58% of presiding judges, who attend a longer,

more detailed training, report being 'very confident' after training, compared to 48% of poll workers. In Bernalillo County about half of all poll workers left training feeling confident in their ability to do their job on Election Day. This number is comparable to 2008, where 53% reported they strongly agreed to feeling confident. Poll workers in Santa Fe (54%), San Juan (58%) and Doña Ana Counties (39%) were ten to fifteen percent less likely to agree or strongly agree that they were confident in their ability than they were in 2008.

Table 2.6. Poll Worker Evaluation of Training

| | Percent Answering Strongly Agree | | | | | |
	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
After the training, I was confident in my ability to do my job on Election Day	51.8	40.6	50.4	58.7	58.3	50.8
The training was easy to understand	57.1	40.9	59.8	61.3	77.8	56.3
The training was hands on, not just a lecture	23.0	11.2	24.8	16.9	61.1	22.6
The training sessions spent enough time covering election law and procedures	41.1	31.0	39.3	42.7	75.0	40.9
The training sessions were boring or too long	7.7	3.9	4.1	9.3	11.1	6.9
I would have liked more training	13.3	14.3	4.1	8.1	22.2	11.0
The training prepared me well for Election Day	46.3	36.7	49.6	53.3	63.9	46.7
The training prepared me well for handling provisional ballots	42.3	37.8	44.3	50.7	60.0	43.4
The training prepared me well for handling spoiled ballots	44.2	41.4	48.8	55.4	72.7	46.6

Although overall confidence in poll worker ability remained the same, Bernalillo County did see improvements in some areas of training. Poll workers were ten percent more likely to strongly agree that training prepared them well for Election Day (46%), five percent more likely to strongly agree that training prepared them for handling provisional ballots (42%) and six percent more likely to strongly agree that training prepared them for handling spoiled ballots (44%) than they were in 2008. However, in 2010, only 23% of poll workers strongly agreed that training in Bernalillo County was hands on, compared to 38% in 2008. Poll workers were also nine percent less likely to strongly agree that training spent enough time on election law and procedures (41%). There were no major changes in poll worker evaluations on the ease of understanding the training presented, or how interesting or long the training sessions were.

Santa Fe County's evaluations were fairly comparable to 2008. For example, in 2008, about half of the poll workers in the survey strongly agreed that the training prepared them well for Election Day (51%) and that it trained them for handling provisional ballots (46%) and spoiled ballots (51%). All of these measures changed by less than three percent between 2008 and 2010. About six in ten (60%) poll workers felt that the training was easy to

understand, which is the same as in 2008, but poll workers were less likely to strongly agree that training left them confident in their ability, with only 50% in 2010 strongly agreeing, compared to a slightly higher 54% in 2008. There were virtually no differences in evaluations that training spent enough time on election law (40%) and that training was hands on (26%).

Doña Ana saw declines in most of the training measures in 2010. The largest change was in the evaluation of the training. In 2008, 30% of poll workers in Doña Ana strongly agreed that the training was hands on, but in 2010, only 11% of poll workers strongly agreed with this statement. In 2008, 58% of poll workers strongly agreed that the training was easy to understand, but in 2010, only 41% of poll workers strongly agreed with this statement. Additionally, poll workers in Doña Ana were less likely to strongly agree with the statements training spent enough time on election law (31%) and that training prepared them well for Election Day (37%), for handling spoiled ballots (41%) and for handling provisional ballots (38%) than it did in 2008. Interestingly, poll workers in Doña Ana were about as likely to report wanting additional training (14%) than they did in 2008 (16%) and half as likely to report that the training was boring (4%) than they did in 2008 (8%).

San Juan County poll workers were once again among the most likely to strongly agree that the training was easy to understand (61%) and that they were trained well to handle provisional ballots (51%) and spoiled ballots (55%). In 2008, 73% of poll workers in San Juan County stated that they strongly agreed that they were well prepared for Election Day, but in 2010 only 53% strongly agreed with this statement. The areas that produced the biggest changes in training evaluations in San Juan were the nature of the training, the ease of understanding the training and the amount of time spent on election law and procedures. In 2008, 48% of poll workers strongly agreed that the training was hands on, but in 2010, only 17% of poll workers strongly agreed. Seventy-six percent of poll workers in 2008 strongly agreed that the training was easy to understand, in 2010 that number fell to 61%.

Lincoln/Curry counties reported the highest percentage of 'strongly agree' answers in all areas except confidence, where they were only slightly lower than San Juan. Seventy-seven percent of poll workers in Lincoln/Curry counties reported that the training was hands-on and 75% strongly agree that training spent enough time covering election law and procedures. Additionally, nearly two-thirds of poll works strongly agree that the training prepared them well for handling spoiled ballots and six in ten (60%) strongly agreed that they were prepared to handle provisional ballots.

The survey data suggest that once again, there are some differences between San Juan County and Lincoln/Curry counties when compared to the other counties in the training related to spoiled and provisional ballots. Given that a voter who either casts a provisional ballot or has a spoiled ballot is likely to be troubled by the experience, encountering a less than well-trained poll worker could exacerbate the voter's concerns about this process. In 2008, we hypothesized that experience might have something to do with this finding. This prompted us to examine training evaluations by poll worker experience as well as the

number of training sessions attended. Lincoln/Curry and San Juan counties had the most experienced poll workers in 2010, specifically they had the largest percentage of poll workers that have worked more than six elections. San Juan also had the most experienced poll workers in the 2008 study. Upon examination, we found that experienced poll workers in all counties were much more likely than those who had worked only one prior election or less to say they strongly agreed that they were confident in their abilities, that they left training prepared for Election Day, that they were prepared to handle spoiled ballots and that they were prepared to handle provisional ballots. Interestingly, attending multiple training sessions did not produce the same results for all measures. There was no statistical difference between those who only attended one session when compared to those that attended two or more sessions in the confidence levels or feeling prepared to handle spoiled or provisional ballots. However, those who attended three or more training sessions were more likely to report feeling prepared for Election Day. It seems that more experience may help poll workers become more confident more so than more training during one election period. Thus, differences in results across year may reflect underlying changes in the population of poll workers.

We asked poll workers for their opinion about some possible changes to training that may improve their performance during elections. Possible additions or changes to training included in the survey ask about in-person simulations during training, having longer training sessions to cover more information, proficiency tests and offering online training and certification options. Studies have found that poll workers in counties with more hands-on training feel more confident in their ability to do their job.[25] Table 2.7 shows that poll workers in all counties seem to be favorable to the idea that hands on simulations would help them perform their job better. Overall, seven out of ten poll workers (73%) either very much or somewhat agree that simulations would help them perform their jobs better and 64% either somewhat or very much think that additional videos would help. Poll workers did not seem to respond as favorably to the idea of longer training sessions or additional readings, with 71% indicating that they did not think longer training would help very much or at all and 60% thinking that additional readings would not help. Responses were divided on the issues of online training proficiency tests. Fifty-two percent of poll workers think that online training would help prepare them at least somewhat, while 48% think it would not help very much or at all. Online training was particularly unpopular among poll workers from Santa Fe, where only 11% said that it would help very much, compared to 22% in Bernalillo County. Approximately 45% of poll workers thought that proficiency tests would help somewhat or very much, while 55% thought they would help very little or not at all. When asked if taking a self-directed online class, followed by a certification would be a good alternative to in-person training sessions, poll workers were divided, with 40% saying yes, it would be a good alternative, 38% saying no and 22% answering they don't know. Overall it seemed that in-person simulations were the most favored possible improvement or addition to current training practices.

---

[25] See Hall, Monson, Patterson (2009).

Table 2.7. Poll Worker Evaluations of Possible Improvements to Training

		Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
How much do you think any of the following would help to improve your performance as a poll worker on Election Day?							
In person simulations	Very much	40.4	33.1	40.5	39.4	37.1	39.1
	Somewhat	34.7	37.9	31.4	33.8	22.9	34.1
	Not very much	14.9	18.5	16.5	12.7	31.4	16.2
	Not at all	10.0	10.5	11.6	14.1	8.6	10.6
Longer training	Very much	9.3	9.1	4.3	5.8	2.9	8.0
	Somewhat	20.9	28.1	20.0	18.8	14.7	21.4
	Not very much	40.9	45.5	49.6	46.4	55.9	44.0
	Not at all	28.9	17.4	26.1	29.0	26.5	26.6
Online training	Very much	22.1	19.5	11.3	17.6	9.4	19.2
	Somewhat	31.6	32.5	37.4	36.8	15.6	32.4
	Not very much	23.8	30.1	31.3	22.1	46.9	26.7
	Not at all	22.5	17.9	20.0	23.5	28.1	21.7
Videos	Very much	20.8	18.9	10.4	20.0	12.5	18.6
	Somewhat	48.7	50.8	31.3	34.3	40.6	44.9
	Not very much	17.6	17.2	39.3	31.4	31.3	22.1
	Not at all	13.6	13.1	19.1	14.3	15.6	14.5
Additional reading materials	Very much	12.4	14.2	2.7	5.6	9.1	10.5
	Somewhat	27.8	31.7	33.6	33.8	21.2	29.5
	Not very much	39.3	33.3	45.1	35.2	51.5	39.4
	Not at all	20.5	20.8	18.6	25.4	18.2	20.6
Proficiency tests	Very much	17.0	22.0	7.0	8.7	5.9	15.1
	Somewhat	31.0	28.8	28.9	26.1	26.5	29.8
	Not very much	26.6	28.0	37.7	34.8	29.4	29.2
	Not at all	25.4	21.2	26.3	30.4	38.2	25.9
If an on-line training course that is self directed, in which you would be tested and then certified as a poll worker were an alternative to in-person training would you prefer this option?							
	Yes	41.8	45.4	34.5	36.0	22.2	40.1
	No	35.9	32.3	42.7	40.0	58.3	37.6
	Don't know	22.3	22.3	21.8	24.0	19.4	22.3

2.4. Election Day Procedures

Although poll workers are trained before Election Day, on Election Day all poll workers have a set of written instructions and procedures they must follow. In Table 2.8, we see that 71% of poll workers thought that the instructions for opening the polls were very clear while only 60% poll workers thought that the procedures for closing the polls were clear,

however closing is a more complex process. Three-fourths of poll workers thought that the instructions for securing the ballots during and after the election were clear. One of the weakest areas, where the instructions were thought to be least clear, was the procedures for reconciling the number of ballots cast and the number of voters who voted. A majority of poll workers—54%—said that those instructions were clear but this item was rated one of the lowest of all of the areas examined. This finding is consistent with our Election Day observations, where we witnessed problems with voter reconciliation during the closing process. When we compare how presiding judges and poll workers answered these questions, it appears that presiding judges are more likely to answer that the instructions are very clear (62%) than other poll workers (50%). Additionally, those who have worked more than 6 elections are more likely to say that the reconciling instructions are very clear (65%) than those who have worked fewer than 5 elections (54%). Finally, we see that only about 54% of poll workers also thought that the printed instruction materials used to answer procedural questions were very clear.

When we compare the attitudes of poll workers regarding the quality of the training and instructions in 2010 to the poll worker evaluations from 2008 and 2006, we see some significant differences. The percent of poll workers rating instructions as very clear for opening and closing the polls dropped in all counties (except Lincoln/Curry counties, which was not included in the previous reports), but there was an especially marked drop in Doña Ana County. However, it is important to note that in Doña Ana County, poll workers perceived major improvement in the quality of the poll opening in 2008 and this year's numbers are more reflective of the results in 2006 (69% in 2006, 81% in 2008, 69% in 2010) The same pattern holds true for the poll closing instructions (64% in 2006, 71% in 2008, 60% in 2010). Santa Fe County also received higher marks for the quality of the instructions for securing the ballots in 2008 and then dropped again this year (81% in 2006, 86% in 2008, 81% in 2010).

The three counties examined in 2006, 2008 and 2010 showed a decline in the evaluation of the instructions for reconciling the ballots at the end of the day yet again. The evaluation on this metric in Bernalillo County declined from 71% in 2006 to 56% in 2008 to 53% in 2010. In Doña Ana County, it declined from 74% to 54% to 47% and in Santa Fe County, it declined from 78% to 72% to 55%.[26] As the Secretary of State and County Clerks look forward to 2012, reconciliation is one area where instructions need to be improved, to be made clear and easy to follow. This may be one area where a hands on, interactive exercise during training may be beneficial.

One clear way of evaluating the quality of training is to know if the poll workers perceived their Election Day experiences as being different from the training that they received. Very few poll workers (5%) thought that their election experiences were very different from

---

[26] Theorizing that these declines may be related to a decrease in experienced poll officials, we checked to see if there were significant differences in the amount of experience poll workers had in 2008 compared to 2010. There was no statistical difference in experience, measured as the number of elections worked, among presiding judges or poll workers for those years.

their training, but in most counties between 21% (in San Juan, Doña Ana, and Santa Fe counties) and 26% (in Bernalillo County) thought that their training was at least somewhat different from their Election Day experience. These numbers are very similar to those we saw in 2008.

Table 2.8. Election Day Procedures by County

		Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
The instructions for opening the polls	Very clear	70.2	69.0	70.2	70.3	91.7	70.9
When to ask a voter for his or her identification before voting	Very clear	71.8	57.4	72.4	79.5	83.3	70.8
The instructions for closing the polls at the end of the day	Very clear	58.1	61.7	61.8	61.6	83.3	60.6
The printed instruction materials we used when we had a procedural question	Very clear	52.9	42.5	59.3	53.4	78.4	53.4
The instructions for reconciling the number of voters voting and the number of ballots cast	Very clear	52.5	48.4	53.2	60.8	73.0	53.6
Securing the ballots during and after the election	Very clear	69.3	78.7	80.5	83.6	97.1	74.9
How different was your training from your experience on Election Day?	Very different	4.8	6.2	2.4	4.0	2.7	4.5
	Somewhat different	25.8	24.8	25.6	21.3	8.1	24.4
	Not too different	46.8	47.3	43.2	36.0	40.5	45.1
	Not at all different	20.6	18.6	24.8	36.0	45.9	23.4
	I didn't attend training	2.1	3.1	4.0	2.7	2.7	2.6

2.5. Polling Place Supplies and Responsiveness of County Election Office

So how did the poll workers experience Election Day in terms of getting all of the supplies, materials, and support from their fellow poll workers and the county election office staff? In Table 2.9, we see that in all counties, at least 90% of poll workers thought that they had enough poll workers at their polling place. Across counties, between 84% and 97% of poll workers said that all of their poll workers showed up on time. This is an improvement over 2008 when poll workers in Doña Ana County reported only 78% of fellow poll workers showed up on time. In Doña Ana County, 28% of poll workers stated that there were conflicts between poll workers, this is an improvement over 2008, when over one-third

(38%) reported conflicts; in Bernalillo and Lincoln Counties 19% of poll workers said there were conflicts between poll workers and in Santa Fe and San Juan it was only around 12%. On a more positive note, almost all poll workers said that the legal oath of office was administered to them.

We also see that a small but significant number of poll workers said that there were problems with voting equipment, ballots, and the procedures associated with handling ballots. Just over 17% of poll workers said that they had a problem with their AutoMARK voting device over the course of the day. Similar numbers of poll workers noted problems with their optical scan ballot reader over the course of their day, however this is a slight improvement over 2008, when about 20% of poll workers reported problems with both machines. Similar to 2006 and 2008, about 10% of poll workers said that their polling place was missing supplies, the most common being enough pens to last throughout the day (see Appendix 2.1). Poll workers reported that over seven in ten voters in San Juan and Santa Fe counties who were tagged as inactive voters filled out a new voter registration form, but only 58% of poll workers did so in Bernalillo and only 63% in Doña Ana counties and 67% in Lincoln/Curry counties did the same.

How often did poll workers have to contact the county election office? The answer is simply, a lot. Almost nine out of ten (88%) poll workers said that they called the county election office during the day; 96% of San Juan County poll workers said that they contacted the office during the day, up from 92% in 2008. There is great variation across counties in how easy it was to get through to their county office and how responsive they viewed the county office to their concerns. Only 46% of Bernalillo poll workers thought their county election office was easy to contact compared to 61% in 2008, however 83% report that they were very responsive once they got through. This is consistent with observations we made on Election Day where poll workers reported that the number they were provided to reach Bernalillo County was not answered by a live person until 8:00 AM, but that the county was very helpful once they got through. Poll workers more easily reached election officials in Santa Fe (76%) and Doña Ana (73%) and easiest in San Juan County (94%) and Lincoln/Curry counties (96%). Responsiveness was above 90% in all of those counties. This trend is not a surprise, however, as it is the larger counties where it appears harder to get through to the Clerk's office. Some counties, especially larger counties, should consider implementing a rapid response center for taking and returning calls from poll workers on Election Day to improve quick contact and response.

Table 2.9. Polling Place Supplies and County Clerk Responsiveness

	Percent Answering "Yes"					
	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
Did your polling location have all of the poll workers you needed?	89.9	94.5	95.0	93.2	97.2	92.0
Did all of the poll workers arrive on time?	84.1	84.1	86.0	82.2	97.2	84.8
Did the AutoMARK work the whole day?	75.5	90.9	92.6	91.5	96.9	82.6
Were there ever any conflicts between any of the poll workers?	19.3	28.0	12.3	11.3	18.2	18.9
Were you administered the oath of office?	95.9	97.6	99.2	98.6	100.0	97.1
Did any voters who were tagged as inactive voters fill out a voter registration form?	57.5	62.5	93.5	75.4	66.7	66.7
Did your optical scan ballot reader work the whole day?	84.2	85.5	79.8	82.6	90.9	83.9
Were you missing any supplies at your polling location?	9.5	13.2	7.5	12.7	0.0	9.6
Did you or another poll worker need to call the clerk or the county election office at any time while you were working?	87.2	82.9	94.2	95.8	82.9	88.2
If yes, was it very easy to get through (% very easy)	46.4	69.4	77.0	92.5	96.6	61.4
If yes, how responsive was the county election office? (% Very Responsive)	82.7	88.5	93.9	94.1	100.0	87.3

2.6. Problems and Successes on Election Day

In Table 2.10, we can see how the poll workers evaluated activities on Election Day. We first see that 92% of poll workers said that there were no problems setting up the optical scanners and similar percentages (94%) said there were no problems shutting down the optical scanners, this is similar to the numbers in 2008. Likewise, most poll workers said that the AutoMARK was easy to set up. Overall, less than 10% of poll workers find the equipment somewhat or very problematic to set up and this is an improvement over 2008. Because the equipment has now been used in several elections, familiarity with the optical scanner and the AutoMARK machine may be leading to these positive changes in polling place setup and break down.

We also see that most poll workers either strongly (22%) or somewhat (53%) agreed that the AutoMARK worked well, but fewer than 3 in 10 (29%) encouraged voters who made mistakes and spoiled their ballot to use the machine to cast their second ballot. Given that the AutoMARK is present to assist voters, poll worker training should include specific references to when poll workers should encourage voters to use it as an alternative to the normal pen and paper method.

We found that 92% of the poll workers thought that voters were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the optical scan voting system. This is identical to 2008.

Table 2.10. Poll Worker Evaluations of Election Day (in %)

		Total
There were problems setting up the optical ballot scanner in my voting location	Somewhat disagree	45.0
	Strongly disagree	47.2
There were problems shutting down the optical ballot scanner at the end of the day and reporting the results	Somewhat disagree	45.8
	Strongly disagree	47.7
There were many provisional ballots resulting from voter identification challenges	Somewhat disagree	52.4
	Strongly disagree	37.2
There were problems setting up the AutoMARK in my voting location	Somewhat disagree	46.3
	Strongly disagree	46.7
Voters who used the AutoMARK thought it worked well	Strongly agree	21.9
	Somewhat agree	52.9
	Somewhat disagree	14.1
	Strongly disagree	11.1
We encouraged voters who spoiled a ballot to vote using the AutoMARK	Strongly agree	7.9
	Somewhat agree	21.0
	Somewhat disagree	45.9
	Strongly disagree	25.2
Voter privacy was NOT compromised when a voter cast his or her ballot.	Strongly agree	63.9
	Somewhat agree	26.8
	Somewhat disagree	6.0
	Strongly disagree	3.3
Generally speaking voters were satisfied with the paper ballots and optical scan voting process	Strongly agree	51.5
	Somewhat agree	40.9
	Somewhat disagree	4.9
	Strongly disagree	2.7

2.7. Polling Place Facilities

Table 2.11 shows the poll worker evaluations of the quality of the polling places across counties. Here, we see that only 57% of poll workers rated their polling place as "excellent" for access by individuals with disabilities. This is down slightly from 2008. In general, 46% to 60% of poll workers rated the temperature, noise, parking, space, and lighting in the polling place to be excellent, with temperature being consistently ranked the lowest across counties.

Table 2.11. Evaluation of Polling Place Facilities by County (in %)

	Percent Rating Facilities Excellent					
	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
Its accessibility for people with disabilities	55.5	61.2	53.7	62.2	55.6	56.7
The general condition of the facility	53.7	56.3	41.5	62.2	58.3	53.2
The noise level of the facility	46.5	45.3	35.8	58.1	50.0	45.9
The availability of parking at the facility	54.6	61.2	67.5	66.2	69.4	59.2
Adequate space to operate the polls	55.9	43.4	54.9	69.9	63.9	55.4
Provided voter privacy	57.1	43.4	43.0	59.5	66.7	53.6
The temperature	39.1	41.1	32.5	44.6	36.1	38.8
The lighting	50.9	50.8	37.2	47.3	44.4	48.3

2.8. Confidence and Satisfaction

One key bottom line metric for evaluating the experience of poll workers on Election Day is to consider their satisfaction with their own performance as a poll worker and their confidence that the votes in the election were counted accurately. We see in Table 2.12 that, in 2010, almost all poll workers were very satisfied (80%) or somewhat satisfied (18%) with their performance as a poll worker. These performance ratings are similar to poll worker evaluations from 2008.

To examine poll worker confidence that the votes were counted accurately, we asked three separate confidence questions. First, we asked if the poll workers thought that the votes were counted accurately *in their voting location*. Second, we asked if the poll workers were confident that votes were counted correctly in other polling locations in *their county*. Third, we asked the poll workers if they were confident that the votes were counted accurately in *other counties* in New Mexico.

We ask these questions because the implementation of the election process is highly decentralized and, on Election Day, it is the poll workers who implement the election process in precincts all across a given jurisdiction. These workers are, in many ways, the best people to evaluate the election process because (1) they can evaluate the experience at the polling place that others cannot easily observe, (2) they have been with other poll workers in training and have a sense of the quality of workers in other locations, and (3) they have a sense of the overall quality of the state laws and procedures that have to be implemented to make elections function well. Given the research on poll worker quality and their role in the voting process—and because they are in a position to evaluate that process—we ask these questions across multiple contexts.

At the level of the poll worker's voting location, there is a high level of confidence among the poll workers. Approximately 87% of the poll workers were very confident that the

votes were counted accurately in their polling place. This is almost the same as 2008, when 86% of poll workers were very confident in the counting of votes in their precinct. San Juan and Lincoln/Curry counties had the highest ratings, with approximately 95% of poll workers saying they are very confident. More importantly, it should be noted that there were not any poll workers, in any county, that stated that they were "not at all" confident, and very few that reported they were "not very" confident that the votes in their polling place were counted accurately.

Table 2.12. Poll Worker Satisfaction in Percentages by County

		Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Satisfaction with Performance as Poll Worker	Very Satisfied	80.7	76.1	83.2	79.5	78.9	80.2
	Somewhat Satisfied	18.2	20.9	15.3	19.3	21.1	18.4
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	0.8	3.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.1
	Very Dissatisfied	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.3
Confidence Votes Counted Accurately in Their Voting Location	Very confident	85.8	89.4	84.7	95.2	94.7	87.4
	Somewhat confident	12.6	7.6	14.5	3.6	5.3	11.0
	Not very confident	0.8	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
	Not at all confident	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Don't know	0.8	0.0	0.8	1.2	0.0	0.7
Confidence Votes Counted Accurately in Other Voting Locations in County	Very confident	38.5	31.6	47.3	67.5	84.2	43.4
	Somewhat confident	37.3	40.6	27.1	15.7	15.8	33.4
	Not very confident	2.8	3.8	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.5
	Not at all confident	0.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
	Don't know	21.3	23.3	23.3	16.9	0.0	20.6
Confidence Votes Counted Accurately in Other Counties in New Mexico	Very confident	19.7	10.5	20.8	16.9	23.7	18.4
	Somewhat confident	38.7	45.9	40.8	47.0	39.5	40.9
	Not very confident	7.3	5.3	3.8	1.2	2.6	5.7
	Not at all confident	1.4	0.8	0.8	1.2	0.0	1.1
	Don't know	32.9	37.6	33.8	33.7	34.2	33.9

While these numbers are similar to 2008, they are much higher than what was reported in 2006. In 2006, only 57% of poll workers in Bernalillo County, 58% in Doña Ana County, and 75% in Santa Fe County indicated that they were "very confident" that the ballots in their voting location were counted correctly. The confidence levels in 2010 and 2008 suggest that prolonged use of the optical scan machines and paper ballots may instill higher confidence compared 2006, when confidence was only between 57% and 75%, when the paper ballot and scanners were new.[27]

---

[27] See Atkeson, Lonna Rae, R. Michael Alvarez, Thad E. Hall, Lisa A. Bryant, Yann Kereval, Morgan Llewellyn, David Odegaard, 2008, "The 2008 New Mexico Post Election Audit Report," Typescript, University of New Mexico."

It is not surprising that poll workers might be confident that the ballots were counted correctly in their own precinct. After all, they are being asked if they have confidence in themselves. To tap into other aspects of confidence and allow us to determine how familiarity with the process influences attitudes about the election administration process more generally, we asked a second question: if the poll workers were confident that votes were counted accurately in other polling locations in the county. Here, we see that the likelihood of saying "very confident" drops significantly when compared to their own precinct. We also see large differences in confidence across the counties. The Lincoln County poll workers were the most confident (84%) that the votes in the other polling places in the county were counted accurately, followed by San Juan County (68%). The poll workers in Doña Ana County were once again least likely to answer that they were very confident (32%) that the votes in other precincts in the county were counted accurately; the most common answer in Doña Ana County was "somewhat confident."

Third, we asked the poll workers if they were confident that the votes were counted accurately in other counties in New Mexico. Across all of the counties, the most common answer among the poll workers across all counties was somewhat confident (41%) in vote counting accuracy across other counties in New Mexico. Just under one in five (18%) of the poll workers said that they were very confident that the votes were counted accurately across the other counties.

Compared to New Mexico voters, who we also surveyed, poll workers were much more confident that the votes in their polling place were counted accurately. Only 51% of voters, but nearly 9 in 10 poll workers, indicated they were very confident that the votes in their polling place were counted accurately. However, when it came to confidence in vote counting in other precincts in the county and in other counties in the state, this was not the case. Forty percent of voters reported being "very confident" that votes were counted correctly in other counties across the state, compared to only 19% of poll workers. Although many poll workers were still very confident in their county and somewhat confident in other counties, many also opted for, "don't know" to these questions, something that most voters typically did not do.

2.9. *Voter Identification Attitudes*

Once again, we asked three questions to learn more about poll worker attitudes toward voter identification. We did this for two reasons. First, we did this so we could compare voter and poll worker attitudes. Because poll workers experienced the process from an alternative perspective, as street level bureaucrats, poll worker attitudes may be distinctly different. Second, because attitudes are often related to behavior, we wanted to see if attitudes toward voter identification influenced voter identification procedures at the polling place.

Similar to voters (50%), half of all poll workers think that photo identification should be required of each voter. However, this is a significant decrease from 2008, when 72% of poll workers indicated that photo ID should be required. Slightly more than half (56%) of poll workers believe that proof of citizenship should be required of each voter when they

register to vote (see Appendix 2.1). However, when we ask which is more important ensuring that everyone who is eligible has the right to vote or protecting the system against fraud—three in five (60%) poll workers say ensuring the franchise is more important than protecting the system against fraud. This is significantly higher than voters where only 44% of voters believed that ensuring the franchise is more important than protecting the system against fraud. Thus, poll workers were somewhat less supportive of voter identification and slightly more supportive of ensuring access than voters.

Interestingly, we find that a number of poll worker characteristics help explain these differences in attitudes. Table 2.13 shows agreement and disagreement with requiring photo identification and proof of citizenship compared by race. In 2008, we found that Native Americans show the highest support for requiring photo identification at the polls (80%), and although the number has dropped significantly, 63% of Native Americans still agree with a photo ID requirement. Whites show the strongest support for a proof of citizenship requirement for registration (71%) and this is actually an increase in support for a registration ID requirement over 2008, when only 63% of whites supported it. Hispanics are least likely to agree with proof of citizenship requirement, but also show the most ambivalent with nearly one-in-five neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the policy.

Table 2.13. Poll Worker Attitudes Toward Voter Identification

		Native American	Hispanic	White	All
Photo identification should be required of each voter at the polls.	Agree	63.2	67.8	69.3	68.9
	Neither agree nor Disagree	15.8	13.4	13.3	13.5
	Disagree	21.1	18.8	17.5	17.7
Proof of citizenship should be required of each voter when they register to vote.	Agree	63.2	58.4	71.4	68.8
	Neither agree nor Disagree	10.5	18.1	10.2	11.8
	Disagree	26.3	23.5	18.4	19.4
Which is more important?	Ensuring that everyone who is eligible has the right to vote	73.7	69.0	61.8	63.1
	Protecting the voting system against fraud	26.3	31.0	38.2	36.9

We also see important differences in these attitudes by partisanship, differences that are consistent with elite rhetoric about voter identification.[28] Democratic leaders tend to be less supportive of voter identification policies than Republican leaders. Table 2.14 shows that, in all cases, Republican poll workers support policies that are more restrictive compared to Democratic poll workers. The gap between the partisan groups is large, a 34 point difference for the proof of citizenship question, and has increased since 2008 when the gap was 25 points. The gap for the photo identification requirement to vote is nearly as large at 32 points, a 12 point increase over 2008 when it was only 20 points. As expected, there is also a clear difference when it comes to access to the franchise versus protection against fraud, with 81% of Democratic poll workers favoring ensuring access to the franchise compared to 42% of Republicans. In fact, a majority of Republicans believe that protecting the system against fraud is more important (58%) that ensuring everyone who is eligible has the right to vote. This is a change from 2008 when only 46% indicated that protecting the system was more important.

Table 2.14. Poll Worker Attitudes Toward Voter Identification

		Democrat	Independent	Republican
Photo identification should be required of each voter at the polls.	Agree	54.1	73.8	85.8
	Neither agree nor Disagree	16.5	13.8	9.4
	Disagree	29.3	12.3	4.8
Proof of citizenship should be required of each voter when they register.	Agree	53.6	69.2	87.7
	Neither agree nor Disagree	15.2	12.3	6.8
	Disagree	31.2	18.5	5.5
Which is more important?	Ensuring that everyone who is eligible has the right to vote	81.0	63.3	42.0
	Protecting the voting system against fraud	19.0	36.7	58.0

Similar to the pattern we see for partisanship, when we look at ideology, we see that more conservative poll workers are more likely to support more restrictive voter identification policies. Nearly one-third of self-reported 'very liberal' poll workers agree with the proof of citizenship policy (32%) and 29% agree that photo identification should be presented. However, about 8 in 10 (89%) self-identified 'very conservative' poll workers agree that voters should present photo identification and 94% agree that proof of citizenship should be required. Meanwhile, a majority (72%) of those poll workers who self-identified as being very conservative thought that it was more important to protect the system against fraud, as did half (50%) of those who indicated they were somewhat conservative, but a

---

[28] See Liebschutz, Sarah and Daniel J. Palazzolo. 2005. "HAVA and the State," *Publius* Fall: 497-514.

minority of all other ideological groups shared that opinion. By comparison, for those who self-identify as being very liberal, only 8% believed that protecting the system against fraud is more important. These numbers show a shift in support for restrictive policies along party lines when compared to 2008, when only 57% of 'very conservative' and 64% of 'very liberal' poll workers supported a photo requirement policy. Conservatives are now more supportive of a photo ID requirement, while liberals are less supportive than in 2008.

We also find an interesting effect for age. While there are fairly small differences across age groups for the photo identification question, 73% of older poll workers (65 and over) agreed that proof of citizenship was a good policy, but only 52% of young poll workers (16 to 34) shared this opinion. Age does not seem to make as large a difference when it comes to ensuring the franchise with about seven out of ten (73%) younger poll workers favored ensuring the franchise over protecting the system against fraud and six in ten (62%) of older poll workers sharing that view.

Last, we consider the effect of education on attitudes regarding voter identification at the polls. Once again, poll workers and voters show similar attitudes on the general policy questions about photo voter identification and proof of citizenship. Individuals with higher levels of education show somewhat less support for these policies. For example, 72% of poll workers with a high school education or less supported photo-identification policies and 75% supported proof of citizenship. However, only 65% of poll workers with more than a college degree supported photo identification and the same number supported proof of citizenship. There is a still a gap between poll workers with higher and lower levels of education, but the gap is decreasing. In 2008 there was an 18 point gap regarding a photo identification and in 2010 there is only a 7 point gap. Those with higher levels of educational attainment were also more likely to say that ensuring the right to vote was more important (67%) than fraud than those with only high school or less (55%).

2.10. Voter Identification Implementation

New Mexico requires that all voters be identified at the polls (§ 1-12-7.1 (D)). However, there is a range of acceptable forms of identification allowed under New Mexico law (§ 1-1-24).

First, a voter can show a physical form of identification, including an original or copy of a current and valid photo identification with or without an address (if there is an address, it does not have to match the voter rolls). Identification can also include any of the following physical forms that include both a name and address (again, the address is not required to match the address that appears on the voter rolls): (1) utility bill, (2) bank statement, (3) government check, (4) paycheck, (5) student identification card, or (6) other government documents (e.g. ID issued by an Indian nation, tribe, or Pueblo). Second, a voter can merely provide a verbal or written statement of his or her name, address, and year of birth.

In Table 2.15, we see the ways in which poll workers asked voters to provide identification, assuming that the voter did not approach the poll worker and present identification. According to the statute, poll workers can use many methods for identifying voters.

However, it is the voter, not the poll worker, who has the choice of determining the way to authenticate herself to the poll worker. The minimal requirement under law is for the voter to state his/her name, address, and birth year.   However, it was more prevalent for voters to be asked for their name or their name and address than the full minimum requirement. Table 2.15 shows the frequency and the average score of requests for different forms of identification. The average score is coded from one (1) through four (4) such that a higher number means more often and the options in the table are ordered from most to least frequent forms of identification used. As Table 2.15 makes clear, poll workers report using the minimum requirement a fair amount of the time (42%) of the time, but not as often as just having the voter state their name (68%). The use of the minimum requirement as a way to identify voters is similar to 2008 when it was used only 45% of the time. It is also clear that many different forms of identification were requested by the poll workers—some of which were inappropriate as a first-level means of identifying voters—including photo identification, which was requested over one-quarter of the time either very (11%) or somewhat (14%) often. Asking for a voter registration card was used another 22% of the time when considering very or somewhat often. Even identification methods such as "had the voters look up their number in the rolls," were used by poll workers either "somewhat often" or "very often" nearly 15% of the time.

Table 2.15. Poll Workers Reported Use of Voter Identification Methods

	Very Often	Somewhat Often	Hardly At All	Never	Average
State Name	67.7	14.1	7.5	10.7	3.4
State Name & Address	48.5	21.3	15.7	14.5	3.0
State Name and Birth Year	42.2	18.0	19.3	20.5	2.8
State Name, Address & Birth Year	42.4	14.6	22.5	20.5	2.8
Photo ID	11.4	14.4	33.9	40.3	2.0
Registration Card	8.7	13.4	33.6	44.3	1.9
Had voters look up their number in rolls	6.3	9.1	20.1	64.5	1.6
None, knew the voter personally	3.8	7.4	16.5	72.2	1.4

The lack of consistency in the voter identification process is also confirmed by a follow-up question we asked, "Did you ask a voter for any identification for any of the following reasons?" Table 2.16 shows all the reasons and the average of yes responses. Of course, first time voters by law have to provide identification that includes their address, so the fact that 54% of poll workers verified the identity of first time voters is consistent with the law.

However, one troubling finding is that 46% of poll workers indicated they did not check the identification of first-time voters. All of the other reasons to ask for physical identification are incorrect. If the voter cannot be found in the voter rolls, the voter should move to provisional balloting status but this does not mandate further identification. Lack of recognition of the voter should not influence whether a poll worker asks for ID or not. Likewise, poll workers should be following the law and thus, authenticating voters to "prevent fraud" is inappropriate, but nearly one-third (29%) of poll workers report doing

so. Finally, about one in five poll workers (20%) asked for identification because they could not hear well or because it was easier to read the voter's name from a physical form of identification. Thus, this once again confirms what we saw on Election Day: the voter identification law was not always administered consistently or correctly.

Of course, one important question is whether certain types of poll workers may be more likely to request a physical form of identification then others. We continue to find that minority poll workers were more likely to ask for a physical form of ID than were white poll workers across as many as eight (8) of our voter identification variables. We can say conclusively that white poll workers appear to be the least likely to ask for identification.

When we examine some of the reasons for requesting voter identification by political party, we find that Independents are the most likely to believe that voter identification is required to vote (41%) and Democrats are the least likely (32%). We also find that Independents are more likely to ask for voter identification to prevent fraud (40%), than Democrats (29%) or Republicans (30%), however these differences are not statistically significant.

Table 2.16. Reasons for Requesting Voter Identification

	Percentage Yes
Verify identity of first time voters	53.6
Couldn't find the voter in the rolls	49.2
Verify identity of provisional voter	43.8
Information didn't match the voter rolls	37.7
It's required by law to verify the identity of voters	34.2
To prevent fraud	29.4
Trouble hearing/Easier to read name from ID	20.1
I did not recognize the voter	13.9

2.11. Privacy

A sense of privacy has been found to be important to voters, especially in terms of confidence in the electoral process.[29] In past election observations we found that privacy was a potential problem in many precincts. This was due to many factors, including the use of an optical scan counting machine and procedures that necessitate that a poll worker watch each voter insert the ballot to ensure that the machine tabulates each ballot. The data we collected from poll workers confirms these observations on a broader scale: voter privacy needs improvement.

---

[29] See Charles Stewart, R. Michael Alvarez and Thad Hall, 2010, "Voting Technology and the Election Experience: The 2009 Gubernatorial Races in New Jersey and Virginia." VTP Working Paper #99. Accessible through the CalTech/MIT Voting Technology Project http://vote.caltech.edu/drupal/ and Bryant, 2010, "Voter Confidence and the Use of Absentee Ballots and Electronic Voting Equipment: An Experimental Study," Presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington D.C., September 2-5, 2010.

We asked a number of questions to determine how poll workers gauged voter privacy. We asked poll workers if they "strongly agree," "somewhat agree," "somewhat disagree," or "strongly disagree" with the following question: "Voter ballot privacy was NOT compromised when a voter cast his or her ballot." We found that poll workers see some problem with privacy; about 9% of poll workers strongly or somewhat disagreed. This in an improvement over 2008 when about 15% of poll workers saw some problem with ballot privacy. Although the privacy concern has decreased, it is still important to understand this issue more specifically. We asked three yes/no questions to identify specific problems related to voter privacy that may exist. The responses to these questions are shown in Table 2.17. Each figure is the percent of "yes" responses.

Table 2.17. Frequency of Specific Voter Privacy Issues

	Percentage Yes
Did you ever look at a voter's completed ballot, a spoiled ballot, or a provisional ballot?	20.2
Did you ever help a voter find a problem with their ballot?	44.4
Did you ever help a voter complete a ballot?	14.5

Almost half (44%) of poll workers indicated that they helped a voter find a problem with their ballot. Unless these voters explicitly asked the poll worker to help in this way—which was not the general process that was observed in precincts on Election Day—this finding suggests that up to half of the poll workers may have violated a voter's privacy. In addition, 20% of poll workers stated that they looked at a voter's completed, spoiled, or provisional ballot. Again, this finding suggests that some poll workers may have violated voter privacy. Given these numbers, it is clear that poll workers, for various reasons, are not as aware as they should be about the procedures they should follow to maintain voter privacy. The survey also found that 15% of poll workers helped a voter complete a ballot. Such help can be very important and it is critical that the poll workers document these events correctly. All in all, the data suggest that voter privacy is likely a problem in many precincts. Better training and careful consideration of privacy issues with the use of a paper ballot need to be considered.

2.12. Election Reform

We asked poll workers about their attitudes regarding four different types of potential election reforms, just as we did on the voter survey. We did this to gauge how the experience of the process may alter attitudes towards election reform. Poll workers and voters were asked how they felt about (1) all-mail elections, (2) Election Day registration, (3) automatic voter registration by the government, and (4) Election Day vote centers.

About half of poll workers support automatic voter registration by the government (48%) as is shown in Table 2.18. Support for all mail elections and same day voter registration was fairly low. Only 17% of voters and 13% of poll workers preferred all mail elections and about 15% of voters and 23% of poll workers supported same day voter registration. Only poll workers were asked, "The State of New Mexico should change to vote centers for

Election Day," and they appear to be largely ambivalent with the most common response being "neither agree nor disagree."

Table 2.18. Poll Worker Opinions about Election Reforms by County

		Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
I would prefer all mail elections	Agree	15.8	5.8	15.0	13.7	0.0	13.3
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	22.1	21.7	28.3	17.8	16.7	22.3
	Disagree	62.1	72.5	56.7	68.5	83.3	64.4
Voters should be able to register on Election Day to vote	Agree	23.0	23.0	29.4	13.7	13.9	22.7
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	10.5	9.8	10.1	12.3	11.1	10.5
	Disagree	66.5	67.2	60.5	74.0	75.0	66.8
The government should be able to register all citizens over 18 to vote	Agree	46.9	47.1	57.1	36.1	50.0	47.6
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	21.9	21.8	17.6	23.6	13.9	21.1
	Disagree	31.2	31.1	25.2	40.3	36.1	31.3
The State of New Mexico should change to vote centers for Election Day	Agree	16.9	18.3	23.7	16.2	14.7	17.9
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	47.6	41.7	49.1	47.1	29.4	46.1
	Disagree	35.5	40.0	27.2	36.8	55.9	36.0

Table 2.19 shows how poll worker opinions differed by party. Democrats were slightly more likely to support all mail elections and vote centers, but much more likely to support same day registration and government registration over individual registration. Independents tend to fall somewhere in the middle on most of the reforms, however, they are the least supportive of the move to vote centers. Democrats seem to be generally more supportive of election reform than are other partisans.

When we examine support for election reform among various ethnic sub-groups of poll workers, we found some interesting trends. African-American and Native-American poll workers are, overall, more supportive of election reform than are Hispanics and Whites. Somewhat surprisingly, Hispanics look very much like whites in their support for the different election reforms. Fifty percent of African-Americans and 42% of Native-Americans support Election Day registration, compared to only about 24% of Hispanics

and 21% of Whites. Native-Americans also show the greatest amount of support for vote centers as well, with 26% of Native Americans agreeing they would be a good reform, compared to 13% of African Americans, and 18% of Hispanics and whites. All mail elections are not popular among any of the groups, support ranging from 16% among Native Americans to only 11% among Hispanics.

Table 2.19. Poll Worker Opinions about Election Reforms by Partisanship

		Democrats	Independents/ Other Partisans	Republicans
I would prefer all mail elections	Agree	18.2	6.2	8.1
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	20.9	36.9	21.5
	Disagree	61.0	56.9	70.4
Voters should be able to register on Election Day to vote	Agree	32.4	27.7	9.4
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	12.6	13.8	8.4
	Disagree	55.1	58.5	82.1
The government should be able to register all citizens over 18 to vote	Agree	56.1	48.4	38.6
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	22.4	18.8	20.6
	Disagree	21.6	32.8	40.8
The State of New Mexico should change to vote centers for Election Day	Agree	20.7	9.4	16.7
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	48.3	65.6	41.6
	Disagree	30.9	25.0	41.6

Looking at poll worker support for election reform by age group, we continue to find some interesting variation among different sub-groups. Nearly half (44%) of 18 to 34 year old poll workers support Election Day registration compared to only 19% of poll workers 65 years and older. Voters who are 35-49 are more supportive of the adoption of vote centers (30%) than any other age group, who tend to range in support from 16-19%, however they are much less likely to be supportive of all mail elections (4%) than other groups who hover around 14% supporting that reform.   There is much less variation among the various age groups in terms of support for automatic government registration, which ranges from 44% support (16-34) to 49% support (65 and older).

Difference in educational attainment seems to have very little effect on support of reforms. The largest difference is seen among attitudes towards Election Day registration, where 28% of poll workers with some graduate-level education support EDR, compared to only 20% of poll workers with a high school education or less. There is virtually no difference in support for automatic registration by the level of education received, with about half of the poll workers in all groups supporting this policy. In terms of all mail elections, 16% of

those with some graduate education support all mail elections compared to 11% for those with a high school education and 10% for those with some college. Additionally, 20% of those with a graduate education support a move to vote centers, compared to 16% of poll workers with a high school degree or less. Thus, education does not have much, if any, substantive influence on support for election reforms.

2.13. Election Fraud

We asked poll workers and voters similar questions about their perceptions of different types of election fraud that may take place in their counties. We did this so that we could compare how being a street level bureaucrat compares to voter attitudes as the experience with the election process may help to shape and alter attitudes.

We asked each group how often they think (1) voters cast more than one ballot, (2) how often individuals tamper with ballots to change votes, (3) how often someone pretends to be another person and cast a vote for that person, and (4) how often a non-U.S. citizen votes. A majority of poll workers and voters think election fraud rarely or never takes place in their communities. However, there is still a large difference between voter and poll worker perceptions of fraud. In general, voters continue to think much more fraud takes place than do poll workers, suggesting that experience with the process of administration alters attitudes. Around 4% of presiding judges and 3% of poll workers, respectively, think either that voters cast more than one ballot or that ballots are tampered with at least some of the time, compared to approximately 23% to 21% of voters, respectively, who think the same. In addition, 5% of all poll workers think that, at least some of the time, someone pretends to be another person and votes for them or a non-U.S. citizen votes. Approximately 32% of voters hold the attitude about voter impersonation. It should be noted that while voters still seem to believe that fraud takes place, the numbers are much lower than in 2008, and suspicion among poll workers are now almost non-existent.

Although there appears to be little suspicion of fraud among poll workers, some of the variation among poll worker perceptions of fraud can be explained by partisan and demographic characteristics. In Table 2.20, we see that Democratic poll workers are much less likely to think that various types of fraud occur at least some of the time compared to Independents and Republicans. Nearly 17% of Republicans think that non-US citizens vote at least some of the time, compared to only 2% of Democrats. We also see that about 8% of Republican poll workers think people impersonate others to vote compared to about 2% of Democratic poll workers, and over 5% of Republicans think voters cast more than one ballot at least some of the time compared to less than 1% of Democrats. Independents tend to perceive similar, but slightly lower, levels of fraud than Republicans.

Table 2.20. Poll Worker Attitudes about Election Fraud by Partisanship

		Democrats	Independents	Republicans
A voter casts more than one ballot	All/Some of the time	0.5	4.7	5.5
	Not much of the time/Never	81.1	78.1	73.1
	Don't Know	18.4	17.2	21.4
Tampering with ballots to change votes	All/Some of the time	0.3	1.6	2.3
	Not much of the time/Never	82.7	78.1	80.0
	Don't Know	17.0	20.3	17.7
Someone pretends to be another person and casts a vote for them	All/Some of the time	1.6	6.2	7.7
	Not much of the time/Never	68.8	60.0	64.5
	Don't Know	29.7	33.8	27.7
A non-US citizen votes	All/Some of the time	2.4	13.8	16.8
	Not much of the time/Never	54.9	43.1	41.1
	Don't Know	42.8	43.1	42.1

2.14. Vote Centers

We asked poll workers a series of questions about their attitudes regarding the adoption of Election Day vote centers in New Mexico, just as we did on the voter survey. To begin, we asked poll workers if it was more important to provide voters convenient options or to make sure elections were cost-effective for taxpayers.   Seven out of ten (70%) poll workers said that providing convenient options was more important than cost effectiveness (30%). When this is further examined by partisanship, shown in Table 2.22, it is clear that Democrats and Independents overwhelmingly favor convenient voting options. Although the majority of Republicans still favor convenient options for voters, four out of ten said that cost-effective elections were more important.

Table 2.21. Poll Worker Attitudes regarding convenience of Voting versus Cost of Voting

		Democrats	Independents/	Republicans
Which is more important?	Providing convenient voting options to voters	78.9	78.6	58.4
	Ensuring that elections are cost-effective to the taxpayer	21.1	21.4	41.6

To examine support for vote centers we asked a series of seven questions. Poll workers were provided the following information, "Vote centers are a polling place at which any registered voter in the county may vote. They are similar to early voting locations, placed in large buildings and offer many voting stations. Many counties and states in the nation are moving from traditional precinct voting to vote centers," and asked to place themselves on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 represented no support for the move to vote centers, and 10 represented strong support for the move to vote centers. Poll workers were then provided a series of information statements about how to change to vote center would influence election administration on Election Day and after each statement were asked to answer how this new piece of information changed their opinion. The information provided and results of the scale are presented in Table 2.22.

Table 2.22. Poll Worker Attitudes about Vote Centers by County

	Average Rating on Scale 0 (No support) to10(Strongly support)						
	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total	Average change from initial measure
New Mexico should change from precinct voting to vote center voting on Election Day	5.1	4.9	5.8	4.2	3.4	5.0	
You would no longer have a traditional precinct to vote in on Election Day.	6.0	5.6	6.4	4.9	4.2	5.8	+.80
Vote Centers will allow you to vote at locations near work, child's school, etc.	5.3	5.1	5.7	4.0	3.6	5.2	+.13
Vote centers offer a way to improve voter experience by allowing more oversight by the county.	5.8	5.7	6.2	4.8	4.1	5.7	+.66
Vote centers cost significantly less to run than traditional precincts	6.1	5.7	6.2	5.1	4.1	5.9	+.84
Your precinct might be closed down, forcing you to travel or possibly vote absentee	4.9	4.5	5.4	3.8	3.3	4.8	-.28
Knowing all of these facts, how do you feel about vote centers now	5.7	5.5	6.0	4.5	4.0	5.5	+.47

An initial average placement of 5 shows that poll workers neither support nor oppose vote centers. Initial measures ranged from 3.4 in Lincoln/Curry, which are very rural counties, to 5.8 in Santa Fe. By comparison, voters had an initial average placement of 4.8, slightly lower than poll workers. When poll workers were told that there would no longer be traditional Election Day precincts, support increased across all counties an average of .8, or almost one point. In fact all new information resulted in positive increases except for the idea that poll workers would have to travel farther to vote or may have to vote absentee. This information resulted in a decrease in support by .3, or one-third of a point on the scale. The final measure asked where poll workers stood after being presented with all of the facts, and on average, poll workers were one-half a point more supportive. This is similar to the results found with voters, who increased their overall average by .7 after being presented with all the facts.

Table 2.23 further examines support for vote centers by partisanship of the poll worker. Overall, Democrats are slightly more favorable toward vote centers, showing an average of about one point more supportive on all measures than Republicans. But, the overall growth in support is the same at .5. Interestingly, Independents fall clearly between the two parties on all measures but a little closer to Democrats, being an average of .3 points lower than Democrats and .6 higher than Republicans in their attitudes.

Table 2.23. Poll Worker Attitudes about Vote Centers by Party

	Average Rating on Scale 0 (No support) to10 (Strongly support)		
	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
New Mexico should change from precinct voting to vote center voting on Election Day	5.6	5.3	4.4
You would no longer have a traditional precinct to vote in on Election Day.	6.4	5.9	5.3
Vote Centers will allow you to vote at locations near work, child's school, etc.	5.7	5.4	4.6
Vote centers offer a way to improve voter experience by allowing more oversight by the county.	6.2	5.9	5.2
Vote centers cost significantly less to run than traditional precincts	6.5	5.9	5.3
Your precinct might be closed down, forcing you to travel or possibly vote absentee	5.2	5.0	4.3
Knowing all of these facts, how do you feel about vote centers now	6.1	5.6	4.9

2.15. Conclusion

On the positive side, nearly all the poll workers in our study were confident that the ballots were counted accurately in the election and were satisfied with their experience on Election Day and they have almost no suspicion of fraud in elections. There still appears to be lack of clarity among poll workers regarding when to ask voters for identification is a serious issue, however, the misapplication of the law appears to be decreasing. Also decreasing is the general disconnect some poll workers saw between the poll worker training and the actual Election Day experience. This disconnect may be responsible for other problems poll workers reported, such as problems opening and closing the polling place as well as with ballot reconciliation. It is important to note that overall, poll workers seemed less satisfied with their training and expressed the desire for more hands on

training through in-person simulations. Election officials should examine their training processes and methods to see if they can address the issues identified by the poll workers in this study.

Appendix 2.1. Poll Worker Methodology

In the 2010 November general election, the county clerks included a letter to all poll workers asking for their participation in the survey either with their materials on Election Day or in their pay-checks send after the election. The University of New Mexico sent two follow up post card reminders on December 16 and January 5. The survey closed January 16, 2011. The below table highlights the number of poll workers who were sent reminder postcards and the number of poll workers who responded to our request.

Table A2.1. Information about the Sample of Poll Workers

	Bernalillo	Santa Fe	Doña Ana	San Juan	Lincoln	Curry
Number of Poll Workers	2589	444	550	423	92	0
Total Number of Registered Voters	395298	90570	100580	65175	13163	20205
Surveys Received	529	132	134	84	32	7
Response Rate	20.4	29.7	24.6	19.9	34.7	NA

Appendix 2.2. 2010 Poll Worker Survey Frequency Report

1. Were you the election official in charge/presiding judge or were you an assistant to the election official in charge (e.g. a clerk or judge)?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Election official in charge/Presiding judge	27.1	25.6	26.4	23.8	30.6	26.6
Election official assistant/Clerk or judge	72.9	74.4	73.6	76.3	69.4	73.4

2. Did you work at an early voting location or on Election Day at a precinct or both?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Early voting location	3.3	0.0	1.5	1.2	0.0	2.2
Election Day	87.1	96.3	89.3	89.2	94.7	89.3
Early voting location and Election Day	9.6	3.7	9.2	9.6	5.3	8.5

3. Overall, how satisfied are you with your job performance as an election worker in the November 4th election?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very Satisfied	80.6	76.1	83.2	79.5	78.9	80.2
Somewhat Satisfied	18.2	20.9	15.3	19.3	21.1	18.4
Somewhat Dissatisfied	0.8	3.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.1
Very Dissatisfied	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.3

4. How confident are you that votes in the voting location you worked in during the November general election were counted correctly?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very confident	85.8	89.4	84.7	95.2	94.7	87.4
Somewhat confident	12.6	7.6	14.5	3.6	5.3	11.0
Not very confident	0.8	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Not at all confident	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Don't know	0.8	0.0	0.8	1.2	0.0	0.7

5. How confident are you that votes in other precincts in your county during the November general election were counted correctly?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very confident	38.5	31.6	47.3	67.5	84.2	43.4
Somewhat confident	37.3	40.6	27.1	15.7	15.8	33.4
Not very confident	2.8	3.8	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.5
Not at all confident	0.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Don't know	21.3	23.3	23.3	16.9	0.0	20.6

6. How confident are you that votes in other counties in New Mexico were counted correctly during the November general election?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very confident	19.7	10.5	20.8	16.9	23.7	18.4
Somewhat confident	38.7	45.8	40.8	47.0	39.5	40.9
Not very confident	7.3	5.3	3.8	1.2	2.6	5.7
Not at all confident	1.4	0.8	0.8	1.2	0.0	1.1
Don't know	32.9	37.6	33.8	33.7	34.2	33.9

7. How were you first recruited as a poll worker? Were you recruited by:

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
A political party official	2.6	13.0	3.9	3.7	7.9	4.6
Another poll worker	23.9	18.3	30.2	29.6	36.9	25.1
An advertisement in the local media	9.5	20.6	5.4	7.4	0.0	10.0
A teacher or professor	4.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1
An official job posting by the county	3.2	1.5	5.4	1.2	0.0	2.9
At a precinct caucus meeting	0.0	0.0	0.8	3.7	2.6	0.6
I was a poll watcher or challenger and was recruited when a scheduled poll worker didn't arrive	0.4	1.5	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.6
I wasn't recruited by anyone, I sought the job on my own	44.5	32.9	41.1	29.6	26.3	40.1
Some other way	11.9	6.9	13.2	23.6	26.3	13.0

8. Thinking about your decision to be a poll worker, please mark if each of these reasons was very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not at all important in your decision to be a poll worker

8a. I found it exciting

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very important	34.6	20.5	28.9	25.6	31.6	30.7
Somewhat important	35.4	41.6	39.8	48.8	39.5	38.3
Not very Important	20.8	22.7	21.9	18.3	15.7	20.8
Not at all important	8.6	15.2	9.4	6.1	13.2	9.7
Don't know	0.6	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.5

8b. I wanted to learn about the election process

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very important	56.3	42.0	55.8	44.4	55.3	53.0
Somewhat important	30.9	44.2	30.2	38.3	28.9	33.3
Not very Important	7.8	4.6	9.3	9.9	13.2	8.0
Not at all important	4.6	9.2	3.9	7.4	2.6	5.4
Don't know	0.4	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.3

8c. I was asked by someone in my political party

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very important	7.2	10.2	4.2	3.9	11.1	7.1
Somewhat important	8.1	15.0	8.3	9.2	16.7	9.7
Not very Important	17.9	20.5	15.8	26.3	16.7	18.7
Not at all important	53.1	48.0	63.4	46.1	44.4	52.8
Don't know	13.7	6.3	8.3	14.5	11.1	11.7

8d. I like to be with people who share my ideals

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very important	21.5	13.8	18.0	20.0	23.6	19.8
Somewhat important	30.1	30.0	37.5	35.0	21.1	31.3
Not very Important	24.9	24.7	27.3	18.7	42.1	25.4
Not at all important	21.7	30.0	16.4	22.5	13.2	21.8
Don't know	1.8	1.5	0.8	3.8	0.0	1.7

8e. I think it is my duty as a citizen

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very important	69.6	73.5	68.5	71.7	76.3	70.5
Somewhat important	24.4	21.2	30.7	25.9	18.4	24.7
Not very Important	3.8	2.3	0.8	1.2	5.3	3.0
Not at all important	1.8	3.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.6
Don't know	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2

8f. I am the kind of person who does my share

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very important	57.7	57.3	59.4	65.9	65.8	59.0
Somewhat important	33.5	30.5	32.8	31.7	26.3	32.5
Not very Important	6.6	6.9	3.9	1.2	7.9	5.7
Not at all important	1.8	3.8	2.3	1.2	0.0	2.1
Don't know	0.4	1.5	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.7

8g. I wanted to make some extra money

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very important	31.9	22.1	17.3	23.7	10.5	26.7
Somewhat important	37.4	34.4	30.8	22.5	23.7	34.0
Not very Important	19.1	19.1	29.1	32.5	34.2	22.4
Not at all important	10.6	22.1	22.0	21.3	31.6	15.9
Don't know	1.0	2.3	0.8	0.0	0.0	1.0

8h. I received recognition from people I respect

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very important	14.5	9.8	11.7	10.1	16.2	13.1
Somewhat important	25.9	22.8	38.3	22.8	18.9	26.7
Not very Important	30.3	31.8	23.4	36.7	27.0	30.0
Not at all important	24.7	31.8	25.8	29.1	37.9	26.8
Don't know	4.6	3.8	0.8	1.3	0.0	3.4

8i. I can be with people I enjoy

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very important	24.2	18.5	22.5	22.5	31.6	23.3
Somewhat important	35.4	36.9	42.6	41.2	34.2	37.2
Not very Important	25.1	24.6	22.5	22.5	26.3	24.4
Not at all important	14.5	19.2	11.6	11.3	7.9	14.2
Don't know	0.8	0.8	0.8	2.5	0.0	0.9

8j. I get to meet new people

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very important	35.7	25.4	33.8	34.1	39.5	33.9
Somewhat important	42.6	42.3	40.8	47.6	42.1	42.8
Not very Important	12.0	23.8	16.2	13.4	7.9	14.3
Not at all important	9.3	8.5	9.2	4.9	10.5	8.8
Don't know	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2

8k. I did not want to say no to someone who asked

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very important	6.3	3.9	6.6	6.4	5.4	6.0
Somewhat important	6.7	5.5	7.4	10.3	8.1	7.0
Not very Important	20.6	18.2	18.2	28.2	21.6	20.6
Not at all important	57.3	61.4	64.5	51.3	64.9	58.8
Don't know	9.1	11.0	3.3	3.8	0.0	7.6

9. How likely are you to work as a poll worker in the next election?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very likely	78.8	81.1	85.4	85.1	89.5	81.2
Somewhat likely	15.8	15.1	10.8	9.9	10.5	14.2
Not very likely	2.0	3.0	1.5	2.5	0.0	2.0
Not at all likely	1.4	0.8	0.8	0.0	0.0	1.0
Don't know	2.0	0.0	1.5	2.5	0.0	1.6

10. On a scale from 1 to 10 where 1 is "very poor" and 10 is "excellent," how would you rate the overall performance of your fellow poll workers?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2	0.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
3	1.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
4	1.4	0.8	0.8	1.3	0.0	1.1
5	4.3	1.5	1.6	2.5	0.0	3.2
6	1.8	5.3	4.7	1.3	2.6	2.7
7	7.3	12.9	3.9	6.2	5.3	7.5
8	20.3	18.1	18.7	15.0	5.3	18.6
9	28.4	31.1	26.6	27.5	26.3	28.4
10	34.9	28.7	43.7	46.2	60.5	37.4
Mean	8.6	8.5	8.9	9.0	9.4	8.7

11. On a scale from 1 to 10 where 1 is "very poor" and 10 is "excellent," how would you rate the overall performance of your presiding judge?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
1	1.8	3.1	0.0	1.3	0.0	1.6
2	0.6	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.8
3	2.5	2.4	0.0	1.3	0.0	1.9
4	1.6	1.6	0.8	0.0	0.0	1.3
5	3.5	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.4
6	2.5	6.3	0.8	2.5	7.9	3.0
7	3.7	6.3	4.0	1.3	0.0	3.8
8	10.6	11.8	9.5	7.5	10.5	10.3
9	25.8	16.5	27.0	26.1	23.7	24.5
10	47.4	48.0	56.3	60.0	55.3	50.4
Mean	8.7	8.4	9.2	9.3	9.1	8.8

12. In what election year did you first work as a poll worker? (If you are not sure, give the best estimation possible)

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
1940-1950	0.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
1951-1960	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
1961-1970	1.2	1.6	3.1	0.0	8.1	1.7
1971-1980	3.4	1.6	1.6	5.0	2.7	3.0
1981-1990	5.7	3.9	3.1	7.5	8.1	5.3
1991-2000	17.6	15.7	16.5	25.0	13.5	17.7
2001-2010	71.5	76.4	75.7	62.5	67.6	71.9

13. Including the recent 2010 November general election, in how many elections have you worked as a poll worker?(If you are not sure, give the best estimation possible)

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
0	7.8	6.1	4.6	8.3	5.1	7.0
1	19.6	18.9	19.1	15.5	5.1	18.4
2-5	36.8	44.7	42.0	38.1	46.2	39.3
6-10	23.8	21.2	21.3	21.4	25.7	22.9
More than 10	12.0	9.1	13.0	16.7	17.9	12.4

14. Your local election official sponsored training sessions for election workers prior to the election to teach workers about election procedures and how to use the bubble paper ballot machines. How many training sessions did you attend?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Zero training sessions	3.0	2.3	5.6	2.7	2.8	3.2
One training session	69.4	69.7	64.8	69.2	69.4	68.8
Two training sessions	10.5	17.4	9.6	14.7	8.3	11.7
Three training sessions	3.8	5.3	2.4	2.7	2.8	3.7
More than three training sessions	13.3	5.3	17.6	10.7	16.7	12.6

15. How much do you think any of the following would help to improve your performance as a poll worker:

15a. In-person simulations:

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very Much	40.4	33.1	40.5	39.4	37.1	39.1
Somewhat	34.7	37.9	31.4	33.8	22.9	34.1
Not very much	14.9	18.5	16.5	12.7	31.4	16.2
Not at all	10.0	10.5	11.6	14.1	8.6	10.6

15b. Longer training:

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very Much	9.3	9.1	4.3	5.8	2.9	8.0
Somewhat	20.9	28.1	20.0	18.8	14.7	21.4
Not very much	40.9	45.5	49.6	46.4	55.9	44.0
Not at all	28.9	17.3	26.1	29.0	26.5	26.6

15c. On-line training:

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very Much	22.1	19.5	11.3	17.6	9.4	19.2
Somewhat	31.6	32.5	37.4	36.8	15.6	32.4
Not very much	23.8	30.1	31.3	22.1	46.9	26.7
Not at all	22.5	17.9	20.0	23.5	28.1	21.7

15d. Videos:

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very Much	20.8	18.9	10.4	20.0	12.5	18.6
Somewhat	48.6	50.8	31.3	34.3	40.6	44.8
Not very much	17.0	17.2	39.2	31.4	31.3	22.1
Not at all	13.6	13.1	19.1	14.3	15.6	14.5

15e. Additional reading materials:

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very Much	12.4	14.2	2.7	5.6	9.1	10.5
Somewhat	27.8	31.7	33.6	33.8	21.2	29.5
Not very much	39.3	33.3	45.1	35.2	51.5	39.4
Not at all	20.5	20.8	18.6	25.4	18.2	20.6

15f. Proficiency tests:

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very Much	17.0	22.0	7.0	8.7	5.9	15.1
Somewhat	31.0	28.8	28.9	26.1	26.5	29.8
Not very much	26.6	28.0	37.8	34.8	29.4	29.2
Not at all	25.4	21.2	26.3	30.4	38.2	25.9

16. Did you receive any manuals, booklets, or video/DVD at your training session or from your county clerk to help you learn more about the election procedures?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
Yes	94.6	97.0	95.2	94.7	91.6	94.9
No	3.8	0.8	3.2	4.0	5.6	3.4
I didn't attend a training session or receive any materials from my county clerk	1.6	2.2	1.6	1.3	2.8	1.7

17. How much of the materials did you read prior to Election Day?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
All of them	68.7	71.2	69.9	68.0	72.3	69.3
Most of them	18.6	21.2	23.7	24.0	11.1	19.9
Some of them	8.1	6.8	2.4	4.0	0.0	6.4
None of them	2.0	0.0	2.4	1.3	8.3	2.0
I didn't receive any written materials	2.6	0.8	1.6	2.7	8.3	2.4

18. How much of the materials did you watch prior to Election Day?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
All of them	40.3	25.8	10.5	25.7	55.6	33.1
Most of them	4.9	8.3	5.6	5.4	5.6	5.6
Some of them	3.0	2.3	2.4	4.1	0.0	2.8
None of them	2.8	.8	3.2	4.1	0.0	2.6
I didn't receive any video materials	49.0	62.8	78.3	60.7	38.8	55.9

19. If you viewed any of the media on training, which did you find most useful?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Video demonstrations	26.5	5.6	2.6	8.5	22.2	18.2
Training Manual	36.9	34.8	40.5	19.7	52.7	36.3
Power Point Presentation	14.5	25.4	0.0	38.0	5.6	15.8
Other	2.5	5.6	6.0	8.5	2.8	4.0
None/Didn't Use Them	19.6	28.6	50.9	25.3	16.7	25.7

20. If the training sources that are currently in use were to be available for use online would you be more or less willing to utilize these resources, or would it be about the same?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
More willing	36.3	33.3	27.2	30.7	8.3	32.9
Less willing	18.2	18.2	22.4	18.7	27.8	19.2
About the same	45.5	48.5	50.4	50.6	63.9	47.9

21. If an online training course that is self directed, in which you would be tested and then certified as a poll worker were an alternative to in-person training, would you prefer this option?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
Yes	41.8	45.4	35.5	36.0	22.2	40.1
No	35.9	32.3	42.7	40.0	58.4	37.6
Don't Know	22.3	22.3	21.8	24.0	19.4	22.3

22. Thinking back on your poll worker and presiding judge training, please tell us whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements

22a. After the training, I was confident in my ability to do my job on Election Day

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Strongly agree	51.7	40.6	50.4	58.7	58.3	50.8
Somewhat agree	42.4	53.8	43.9	37.3	38.9	43.8
Somewhat disagree	4.3	4.7	4.1	4.0	0.0	4.1
Strongly disagree	1.6	0.9	1.6	0.0	2.8	1.3

22b. The training was easy to understand

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Strongly agree	57.1	40.9	59.8	61.3	77.8	56.4
Somewhat agree	34.5	47.3	36.1	34.7	22.2	36.1
Somewhat disagree	7.4	10.2	3.3	4.0	0.0	6.6
Strongly disagree	1.0	1.6	.8	0.0	0.0	.9

22c. The training was hands on, not just a lecture

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
Strongly agree	23.0	11.2	24.8	16.9	61.1	22.6
Somewhat agree	26.9	27.2	16.5	46.5	27.7	27.2
Somewhat disagree	29.0	24.0	29.8	23.9	5.6	26.9
Strongly disagree	21.1	37.6	28.9	12.7	5.6	23.3

22d. The training sessions spent enough time covering election law and procedures

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Strongly agree	41.1	31.0	39.3	42.6	75.0	40.8
Somewhat agree	39.2	41.3	46.8	36.0	16.7	39.4
Somewhat disagree	14.5	21.4	13.1	18.7	8.3	15.5
Strongly disagree	5.2	6.3	.8	2.7	0.0	4.3

22e. The training sessions were boring or too long

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
Strongly agree	7.7	3.9	4.1	9.3	11.1	6.9
Somewhat agree	24.2	26.8	20.5	14.7	8.3	22.5
Somewhat disagree	38.3	40.9	41.8	49.3	27.8	39.8
Strongly disagree	29.8	28.4	33.6	26.7	52.8	30.8

22f. I would have liked more training

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
Strongly agree	13.3	14.3	4.1	8.1	0.0	11.0
Somewhat agree	28.4	34.9	27.9	27.0	22.2	28.9
Somewhat disagree	33.9	38.1	41.8	39.2	55.6	37.2
Strongly disagree	24.4	12.7	26.2	25.7	22.2	22.9

22g. The training prepared me well for Election Day

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Strongly agree	46.3	36.8	49.6	53.4	63.8	46.6
Somewhat agree	42.7	48.4	42.3	40.0	30.6	42.8
Somewhat disagree	9.5	14.8	6.5	5.3	5.6	9.4
Strongly disagree	1.5	0.0	1.6	1.3	0.0	1.2

22h. The training prepared me well for handling provisional ballots

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Strongly agree	42.3	37.8	44.2	50.6	60.0	43.4
Somewhat agree	33.3	34.6	41.8	26.7	31.4	34.1
Somewhat disagree	19.6	19.7	11.5	16.0	5.7	17.5
Strongly disagree	4.8	7.9	2.5	6.7	2.9	5.0

22i. The training prepared me well for handling spoiled ballots

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Strongly agree	44.3	41.3	48.7	55.3	72.7	46.6
Somewhat agree	33.8	38.3	39.7	25.7	27.3	34.4
Somewhat disagree	17.5	14.1	9.1	12.2	0.0	14.6
Strongly disagree	4.4	6.3	2.5	6.8	0.0	4.4

22j. The training prepared me well for precinct opening

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Strongly agree	53.3	44.9	57.8	63.8	77.1	54.6
Somewhat agree	34.4	43.3	30.6	27.8	17.1	33.9
Somewhat disagree	10.4	8.7	9.1	5.6	2.9	9.2
Strongly disagree	1.9	3.1	2.5	2.8	2.9	2.3

22k. The training prepared me well for precinct closing

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Strongly agree	47.2	45.2	52.4	56.7	62.8	49.2
Somewhat agree	34.4	39.7	32.8	31.1	28.6	34.4
Somewhat disagree	13.3	11.9	10.7	9.5	2.9	11.9
Strongly disagree	5.1	3.2	4.1	2.7	5.7	4.5

22i. The training prepared me well for problems I encountered as a poll worker

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Strongly agree	38.3	26.0	32.5	45.3	57.1	37.0
Somewhat agree	41.2	48.0	55.0	37.3	40.0	43.8
Somewhat disagree	15.9	21.3	8.3	10.7	2.9	14.6
Strongly disagree	4.6	4.7	4.2	6.7	0.0	4.6

23. Were the instructions and training for the following jobs you performed on Election Day very clear, somewhat clear, not very clear or not at all clear?

23a. The instructions for reconciling the number of voters voting and the number of ballots cast

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very clear	52.5	48.4	53.2	60.8	73.0	53.6
Somewhat clear	34.7	36.7	36.3	32.4	24.3	34.6
Not very clear	10.9	13.3	9.7	6.8	2.7	10.4
Not at all clear	1.9	1.6	.8	0.0	0.0	1.4

23b. The instructions for opening the polls

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very clear	70.2	69.0	70.2	70.3	91.6	70.9
Somewhat clear	23.9	24.0	27.4	24.3	5.6	23.7
Not very clear	5.3	7.0	2.4	5.4	2.8	5.0
Not at all clear	.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	.4

23c. When to ask a voter for his or her identification before voting

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very clear	71.8	57.3	72.3	79.5	83.3	70.9
Somewhat clear	22.7	31.8	22.8	15.0	13.9	23.0
Not very clear	4.4	7.0	4.9	5.5	2.8	4.9
Not at all clear	1.1	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2

23d. The instructions for closing the polls at the end of the day

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very clear	58.0	61.8	61.8	61.6	83.3	60.6
Somewhat clear	31.3	27.3	32.5	28.8	11.1	29.8
Not very clear	8.1	10.9	3.3	8.2	2.8	7.6
Not at all clear	2.6	0.0	2.4	1.4	2.8	2.0

23e. The printed instruction materials we used when we had a procedural question

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very clear	52.9	42.5	59.3	53.4	78.4	53.4
Somewhat clear	40.3	45.7	35.8	30.2	21.6	38.8
Not very clear	5.7	10.2	4.9	16.4	0.0	7.0
Not at all clear	1.1	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	.8

23f. Securing the ballots during and after the election

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
Very clear	69.2	78.8	80.5	83.6	97.1	74.9
Somewhat clear	25.8	17.3	17.9	12.3	2.9	21.1
Not very clear	4.1	3.1	.8	4.1	0.0	3.3
Not at all clear	.9	.8	.8	0.0	0.0	.7

24. How different was your training from your experience on Election Day?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very different	4.8	6.2	2.4	4.0	2.7	4.5
Somewhat different	25.8	24.8	25.6	21.3	8.1	24.4
Not too different	46.7	47.3	43.2	36.0	40.6	45.1
Not at all different	20.6	18.6	24.8	36.0	45.9	23.4
I didn't attend training	2.1	3.1	4.0	2.7	2.7	2.6

25. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is excellent, how would you rate your polling facility in regards to the following?

25a. Its accessibility for people with disabilities

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
1	2.3	2.3	4.1	2.7	2.8	2.6
2	3.2	2.3	7.3	4.1	2.8	3.7
3	13.0	10.1	13.0	6.8	8.3	11.8
4	26.0	24.0	22.0	24.3	30.6	25.2
5	55.5	61.3	53.6	62.1	55.5	56.7
Mean	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.3

25b. The general condition of the facility

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
1	1.5	0.0	.8	4.1	2.8	1.4
2	4.2	1.6	7.3	1.4	2.8	3.9
3	12.6	11.7	24.4	13.5	8.3	14.1
4	28.1	30.5	26.0	18.9	27.8	27.3
5	53.6	56.2	41.5	62.1	58.3	53.3
Mean	4.3	4.4	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.3

25c. The noise level of the facility

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
1	1.9	1.6	4.9	5.4	8.3	2.9
2	4.6	3.1	6.5	2.7	8.3	4.7
3	18.3	18.0	22.8	8.1	8.3	17.6
4	28.6	32.0	30.1	25.7	25.0	28.9
5	46.6	45.3	35.7	58.1	50.1	45.9
Mean	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.3	4.0	4.1

25d. The availability of parking at the facility

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
1	2.5	1.6	3.3	5.4	2.8	2.7
2	3.6	3.9	4.9	5.4	8.3	4.2
3	13.4	11.6	10.6	9.5	2.8	11.9
4	25.9	21.7	13.8	13.5	16.7	22.0
5	54.6	61.2	67.4	66.2	69.4	59.2
Mean	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.3

25e. Adequate space to operate the polls

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
1	4.6	5.4	6.6	4.1	2.8	4.9
2	6.3	7.0	8.2	9.6	0.0	6.7
3	9.9	14.7	10.7	2.7	5.6	9.9
4	23.3	29.5	19.7	13.7	27.8	23.1
5	55.9	43.4	54.8	69.9	63.8	55.4
Mean	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.4	4.5	4.2

25f. The temperature

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
1	7.3	3.1	9.8	4.1	0.0	6.4
2	6.1	6.2	10.6	8.1	8.3	7.0
3	20.3	20.2	24.3	18.9	16.7	20.6
4	27.2	29.5	22.8	24.3	38.9	27.1
5	39.1	41.0	32.5	44.6	36.1	38.9
Mean	3.8	4.0	3.6	4.0	4.0	3.8

25g. The lighting

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
1	3.8	2.3	4.1	1.4	2.8	3.4
2	5.1	7.0	9.1	5.4	16.7	6.5
3	13.5	9.4	22.3	14.9	13.9	14.3
4	26.7	30.5	27.3	31.1	22.2	27.6
5	50.9	50.8	37.2	47.2	44.4	48.2
Mean	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.2	3.9	4.1

25h. Voter privacy

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln /Curry	Total
1	1.3	2.3	3.3	6.8	0.0	2.2
2	3.4	9.3	3.3	2.7	0.0	4.1
3	10.9	19.4	25.6	10.8	2.8	14.0
4	27.3	25.6	24.8	20.2	30.6	26.2
5	57.1	43.4	43.0	59.5	66.6	53.5
Mean	4.4	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.6	4.3

26. Please answer yes or no to each of the following questions:

26a. Did your polling location have all of the poll workers you needed?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	87.5	93.0	93.5	93.2	97.2	90.2
No	9.8	5.4	4.9	6.8	2.8	7.8
Don't know	2.7	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.0	2.0

26b. Did all of the poll workers arrive on time?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	81.7	82.2	84.6	81.0	97.2	82.7
No	15.4	15.5	13.8	17.6	2.8	14.9
Don't know	2.9	2.3	1.6	1.4	0.0	2.4

26c. Did the AutoMARK work the whole day?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	63.7	77.5	70.7	73.0	86.1	68.6
No	20.7	7.8	5.7	6.7	2.8	14.5
Don't know	15.6	14.7	23.6	20.3	11.1	16.9

26d. Were there ever any conflicts between any of the poll workers?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	18.6	27.1	12.2	11.1	16.7	18.3
No	77.6	69.8	87.0	87.5	75.0	78.5
Don't know	3.8	3.1	.8	1.4	8.3	3.2

26e. Were you administered the oath of office?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	94.5	96.1	98.4	98.6	100.0	95.9
No	4.0	2.3	.8	1.4	0.0	2.9
Don't know	1.5	1.6	.8	0.0	0.0	1.2

26f. Did you ever look at a voter's completed ballot or a spoiled ballot or a provisional ballot?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	24.8	12.5	13.8	20.3	8.3	20.2
No	73.5	86.7	86.2	78.3	91.7	78.6
Don't know	1.7	.8	0.0	1.4	0.0	1.2

26g. Did you ever help a voter find a problem with their ballot?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	50.1	43.4	30.6	43.2	22.2	44.4
No	48.8	55.0	66.9	55.4	77.8	54.3
Don't know	1.1	1.6	2.5	1.4	0.0	1.3

26h. Did you ever help a voter complete a ballot?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	20.1	4.7	4.9	17.6	2.8	14.5
No	78.8	93.7	94.3	82.4	97.2	84.5
Don't know	1.1	1.6	0.8	0.0	0.0	1.0

26i. Did any voters who were tagged as inactive voters fill out a voter registration form?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	38.8	46.5	81.3	58.1	55.6	48.7
No	28.8	27.9	5.7	18.9	27.7	24.3
Don't know	32.4	25.6	13.0	23.0	16.7	27.0

26j. Did your optical scan ballot reader work the whole day?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	74.8	78.1	74.0	77.0	83.4	75.7
No	14.1	13.3	18.7	16.2	8.3	14.6
Don't know	11.1	8.6	7.3	6.8	8.3	9.7

27a. Were you missing any supplies at your polling location?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	8.8	12.5	7.3	12.0	0.0	9.0
No	83.5	82.0	89.5	82.7	94.6	84.6
Don't know	7.7	5.5	3.2	5.3	5.4	6.4

27b. If you were missing any supplies at your polling location, what was it? (Note: This is calculated on only those that were missing supplies.)

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/ Curry	Total
"I Voted" Stickers	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	1.4
Office Supplies/Pens	56.2	57.2	22.3	37.5	0.0	50.0
Magnifying Sheets	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	1.4
Posters/Signs	12.2	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	8.3
Bags/Envelopes for ballots/tapes	4.9	7.1	11.1	0.0	0.0	5.6
Voter Registration Cards	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
Ballots	2.4	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8
Forms (Closing, Balancing, Etc.)	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
Opitical Scan Machine/AutoMARK/Accessories	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	1.4
Privacy Booths	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	1.4
Voter Rosters	2.4	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2
Extension cords/power cords	4.9	0.0	22.2	12.5	0.0	6.9
Other	12.2	14.3	11.1	25.0	0.0	13.8

28. Did you or another poll worker need to call the clerk or the county election office at any time while you were working?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	80.1	76.4	91.9	91.8	80.5	82.3
No	11.7	15.7	5.7	4.1	16.7	11.0
Don't know	8.2	7.9	2.4	4.1	2.8	6.7

28a. If you or another poll worker needed to call the clerk or the county election office while you were working how easy was it to get a hold of them?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very easy	46.4	69.4	77.0	92.5	96.6	61.4
Somewhat easy	42.1	27.6	16.8	6.0	3.4	30.7
Not too easy	9.1	2.0	3.5	1.5	0.0	6.0
Not easy at all	2.4	1.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	1.9

28b. If you or another poll worker needed to call the clerk or the county election office while you were working were they very responsive, somewhat responsive, not too responsive, or not at all responsive?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very responsive	82.7	88.6	93.8	94.2	100.0	87.4
Somewhat responsive	13.5	7.3	4.4	2.9	0.0	9.4
Not too responsive	3.5	3.1	1.8	2.9	0.0	2.9
Not at all responsive	0.3	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3

29a. Was there a problem balancing the number of voters with the number of ballots cast at the end of the night?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	16.9	16.5	18.5	13.5	8.1	16.4
No	75.8	81.9	79.1	85.1	89.2	78.7
Don't know	7.3	1.6	2.4	1.4	2.7	4.9

29b. If there was a problem balancing the number of voters with the number of ballots cast at the end of the night how was the problem resolved?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Other	11.8	14.3	27.4	22.3	0.0	15.4
Don't know how resolved	6.6	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	5.4
Compared signature roster with tabulator results	11.8	4.8	22.7	11.1	0.0	12.3
Adding/removing spoiled or provisional ballots from count	3.9	9.5	4.5	0.0	0.0	4.6
Adding/removing absentee ballots from count	1.3	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
Hand counted ballots	1.3	0.0	9.1	11.1	0.0	3.1
Recounted everything	19.8	33.3	9.1	22.2	50.0	20.8
Added a new counter/worker to the process	1.3	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	1.5
Presiding judge fixed alone	14.6	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.2
Called County Clerk	3.9	14.3	0.0	11.1	50.0	6.2
Referred to instructions/instructions unclear	1.3	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	1.5
Never reconciled	22.4	9.5	18.2	0.0	0.0	17.7

30. Many voters offered a physical form of identification, like a driver's license or voter registration card, without being asked. How often did this happen in your voting location?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very often	34.8	43.0	23.6	36.5	38.9	34.8
Somewhat often	45.5	43.7	48.8	50.0	44.4	46.0
Hardly at all	11.8	9.4	20.3	8.1	13.9	12.5
Never	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Don't know	6.8	3.9	7.3	5.4	2.8	6.1

31. When a voter approached without any form of identification, how often did you use each of the following methods to identify a voter at your polling location?

31a. Asked voters to show their registration card

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very often	7.7	6.5	6.9	11.4	5.9	7.7
Somewhat often	10.8	12.9	12.1	10.0	23.5	11.8
Not very often	30.5	20.1	35.3	25.7	38.2	29.5
Not at all	37.5	46.0	37.9	42.9	26.5	38.8
Don't know	13.5	14.5	7.8	10.0	5.9	12.2

31b. Asked voters to show a form of photo identification

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very often	13.3	2.4	6.2	10.0	12.1	10.2
Somewhat often	14.6	11.3	8.0	10.0	18.2	12.9
Not very often	31.0	26.6	31.8	27.1	36.4	30.3
Not at all	29.6	49.2	46.0	42.9	24.2	36.0
Don't know	11.5	10.5	8.0	10.0	9.1	10.6

31c. Asked voters to state their name

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very often	58.2	59.5	75.2	62.5	63.6	61.5
Somewhat often	13.3	17.4	7.7	8.3	18.2	12.9
Not very often	8.2	4.1	3.4	9.7	3.0	6.8
Not at all	10.7	9.1	4.3	13.9	9.1	9.7
Don't know	9.6	9.9	9.4	5.6	6.1	9.1

31d. Asked voters to state their name and address

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very often	43.5	36.5	52.9	44.6	35.3	43.6
Somewhat often	17.6	28.6	18.6	9.5	29.4	19.2
Not very often	15.6	10.3	9.2	21.6	8.8	14.1
Not at all	13.2	12.7	10.9	14.8	14.7	13.0
Don't know	10.1	11.9	8.4	9.5	11.8	10.1

31e. Asked voters to state their name and birth year

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very often	37.8	24.8	56.3	29.7	34.2	37.8
Somewhat often	14.9	18.2	14.3	18.9	25.7	16.1
Not very often	18.4	21.5	9.2	20.3	8.6	17.2
Not at all	18.4	23.1	10.1	21.6	22.9	18.4
Don't know	10.5	12.4	10.1	9.5	8.6	10.5

31f. Asked voters to state their name, address, and birth year

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very often	40.6	24.4	44.6	31.1	32.4	37.5
Somewhat often	11.6	11.4	12.6	14.9	32.4	12.9
Not very often	20.8	17.9	19.3	24.2	5.9	19.8
Not at all	15.4	32.5	14.3	17.6	17.5	18.1
Don't know	11.6	13.8	9.2	12.2	11.8	11.7

31g. I knew the voter personally and didn't ask for any form of identification

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very often	2.2	2.4	6.8	5.4	5.9	3.4
Somewhat often	4.4	9.7	6.8	8.1	17.6	6.5
Not very often	12.6	19.4	15.4	16.2	14.7	14.5
Not at all	67.1	54.8	61.6	60.8	55.9	63.2
Don't know	13.7	13.7	9.4	9.5	5.9	12.4

31h. Asked voters to look-up their number in the voter rolls

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very often	6.1	0.8	3.4	15.3	2.9	5.6
Somewhat often	8.1	6.4	11.0	9.7	0.0	8.1
Not very often	17.5	15.2	22.0	15.3	20.6	17.7
Not at all	55.2	64.8	55.1	51.4	70.6	57.0
Don't know	13.1	12.8	8.5	8.3	5.9	11.6

32. Did you ask a voter for any identification for any of the following reasons?

32a. Trouble hearing/Easier to read name from ID

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	22.1	23.1	13.6	15.5	14.7	20.1
No	59.4	62.9	77.1	64.8	79.4	63.9
Don't know	18.5	14.0	9.3	19.7	5.9	16.0

32b. Verify identity of first time voter

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	56.3	40.3	53.0	61.2	52.9	53.6
No	24.4	45.2	35.9	19.4	38.3	29.4
Don't know	19.3	14.5	11.1	19.4	8.8	17.0

32c. Verify identity of provisional voter

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	46.3	37.9	45.8	34.7	44.1	43.8
No	29.4	38.7	39.8	36.1	47.1	33.7
Don't know	24.3	23.4	14.4	29.2	8.8	22.5

32d. It's required by law to verify the identity of voters

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	37.0	25.8	25.0	43.1	40.0	34.2
No	45.5	56.7	59.5	38.8	45.7	48.7
Don't know	17.5	17.5	15.5	18.1	14.3	17.1

32e. To prevent fraud

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	31.2	23.3	23.7	36.6	32.4	29.4
No	50.4	61.7	60.2	46.5	52.9	53.3
Don't know	18.4	15.0	16.1	16.9	14.7	17.3

32f. I did not recognize the voter

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	14.2	4.1	11.1	28.6	24.2	13.9
No	68.5	76.1	75.2	48.5	60.6	68.5
Don't know	17.3	19.8	13.7	22.9	15.2	17.6

32g. The information they gave didn't match the voter rolls

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	35.8	43.9	35.0	40.3	44.1	37.7
No	42.1	40.7	50.5	37.5	47.1	42.9
Don't know	22.1	15.4	14.5	22.2	8.8	19.4

32h. I couldn't find the voter in the voter rolls

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	49.7	50.8	45.7	47.3	52.9	49.2
No	32.2	33.1	40.7	33.3	35.3	33.8
Don't know	18.1	16.1	13.6	19.4	11.8	17.0

33. Thinking back on your experience during the 2008 November general election, please tell us whether you agree or disagree with the following statements

33a. There were problems setting up the optical ballot scanner in my voting location

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strongly agree	2.0	0.8	3.3	1.4	0.0	2.0
Somewhat agree	7.5	3.2	5.0	4.1	2.8	5.8
Somewhat disagree	46.6	46.8	40.8	36.5	48.6	45.0
Strongly disagree	43.9	49.2	50.9	58.0	48.6	47.2

33b. There were problems shutting down the optical ballot scanner at the end of the day and reporting the results

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strongly agree	2.2	1.6	0.8	4.1	0.0	2.0
Somewhat agree	5.1	2.4	5.0	4.1	2.9	4.5
Somewhat disagree	47.9	46.8	43.3	32.3	52.9	45.8
Strongly disagree	44.8	49.2	50.9	59.5	44.2	47.7

33c. There were many provisional ballots resulting from voter identification challenges

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strongly agree	2.7	4.9	3.4	1.4	0.0	2.9
Somewhat agree	8.7	9.8	5.0	1.4	5.7	7.5
Somewhat disagree	54.8	47.1	53.8	45.9	48.6	52.4
Strongly disagree	33.8	38.2	37.8	51.3	45.7	37.2

33d. There were problems setting up the AutoMARK in my voting location

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strongly agree	2.0	0.8	1.7	1.4	0.0	1.6
Somewhat agree	8.2	2.4	0.9	2.7	0.0	5.4
Somewhat disagree	46.8	47.6	47.8	40.5	42.9	46.3
Strongly disagree	43.0	49.2	49.6	55.4	57.1	46.7

33e. Voters who used the AutoMARK thought it worked well

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strongly agree	21.5	18.7	21.2	23.7	36.3	21.9
Somewhat agree	56.5	54.2	44.4	42.4	45.5	52.9
Somewhat disagree	14.0	10.3	20.0	18.6	3.0	14.1
Strongly disagree	8.0	16.8	14.4	15.3	15.2	11.1

33f. We encouraged voters who spoiled a ballot to vote using the AutoMARK

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strongly agree	11.5	5.4	0.0	1.4	9.1	7.9
Somewhat agree	26.5	15.2	9.9	13.0	21.2	21.0
Somewhat disagree	45.0	44.6	50.5	42.0	54.5	45.9
Strongly disagree	17.0	34.8	39.6	43.6	15.2	25.2

33g. Voter ballot privacy was NOT compromised when a voter cast his or her ballot

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strongly agree	61.4	66.1	65.3	67.1	77.1	63.9
Somewhat agree	29.9	24.0	26.3	17.8	17.1	26.8
Somewhat disagree	5.8	7.4	4.2	9.6	2.9	6.0
Strongly disagree	2.9	2.5	4.2	5.5	2.9	3.3

33h. Generally speaking voters were satisfied with the paper ballots and optical scan voting process

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strongly agree	48.6	50.9	60.5	45.2	74.2	51.5
Somewhat agree	42.1	43.5	35.3	46.6	22.9	40.9
Somewhat disagree	6.2	3.2	3.4	2.7	2.9	4.9
Strongly disagree	3.1	2.4	0.8	5.5	0.0	2.7

34. Which party members worked as poll watchers or poll challengers at your voting location?
    (Note: Numbers do not add to 100 because multiple options apply. Each entry is percentage present at location)

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Democratic Poll Watcher	34.5	55.2	39.7	8.3	5.1	34.6
Democratic Poll Challenger	14.6	35.8	19.8	1.2	2.6	16.7
Republican Poll Watcher	33.6	58.2	32.8	6.0	12.8	33.7
Republican Poll Challenger	19.0	43.3	28.2	1.2	5.1	21.6
Tea Party Poll Watcher	2.1	5.2	1.5	2.4	5.1	2.6
Tea Party Poll Challenger	1.9	3.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.6

35. Did you ever feel intimidated by the poll watchers and/or poll challengers?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Yes	5.3	8.1	17.6	7.7	0.0	7.6
No	94.7	91.9	82.4	92.3	100.0	92.4

36. Please indicate whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the following:

36a. Photo identification should be required of each voter at the polls to prevent voter fraud

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strongly agree	55.4	54.1	32.8	41.1	36.1	49.7
Somewhat agree	18.5	18.0	21.8	16.4	27.8	19.1
Neither agree or disagree	11.1	13.1	16.8	17.8	25.0	13.5
Somewhat disagree	5.0	6.6	11.8	13.7	0.0	6.8
Strongly agree	10.0	8.2	16.8	11.0	11.1	10.9

36b. Proof of citizenship should be required of each voter when they register to prevent voter fraud

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strongly agree	59.0	59.9	41.1	56.2	61.1	56.3
Somewhat agree	12.4	9.0	15.1	13.7	13.9	12.5
Neither agree or disagree	10.7	17.2	11.8	9.6	11.1	11.8
Somewhat disagree	5.9	4.1	7.6	8.2	8.3	6.2
Strongly disagree	12.0	9.8	24.4	12.3	5.6	13.2

36c. I would prefer all mail elections

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strongly agree	7.7	3.3	9.2	9.6	0.0	7.1
Somewhat agree	8.1	2.5	5.8	4.1	0.0	6.2
Neither agree or disagree	22.1	21.7	28.3	17.8	16.7	22.3
Somewhat disagree	16.6	17.5	10.8	13.7	8.3	15.3
Strongly agree	45.5	55.0	45.9	54.8	75.0	49.1

36d. Voters should be able to register on Election Day to vote

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strongly agree	11.6	10.7	18.5	8.2	5.6	11.9
Somewhat agree	11.4	12.3	10.9	5.5	8.3	10.8
Neither agree or disagree	10.5	9.8	10.1	12.3	11.1	10.5
Somewhat disagree	16.0	17.2	12.6	6.8	8.3	14.5
Strongly agree	50.5	50.0	47.9	67.2	66.7	52.3

36e. The government should be able to register all citizens over 18 to vote

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strongly agree	30.7	26.9	40.4	23.6	38.9	31.3
Somewhat agree	16.2	20.2	16.8	12.6	11.1	16.3
Neither agree or disagree	21.9	21.8	17.6	23.6	13.9	21.1
Somewhat disagree	11.1	16.8	6.7	8.3	8.3	10.9
Strongly agree	20.1	14.3	18.5	31.9	27.8	20.4

36f. The state of New Mexico should change to vote centers for Election Day.

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strongly agree	9.6	9.2	10.5	8.8	8.8	9.5
Somewhat agree	7.3	9.2	13.2	7.4	5.9	8.4
Neither agree nor disagree	47.6	41.6	49.1	47.1	29.4	46.1
Somewhat disagree	12.3	15.8	5.3	13.2	20.6	12.3
Strongly disagree	23.2	24.2	21.9	23.5	35.3	23.7

37. Which is more important?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Providing convenient voting options for the voters.	59.9	70.5	69.5	66.7	55.5	63.3
Ensuring that elections are cost-effective to the taxpayer.	31.7	19.7	22.0	23.6	30.6	27.7
Don't know	8.4	9.8	8.5	9.7	13.9	9.0

38. Which is more important?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Ensuring that everyone who is eligible has the right to vote	55.9	65.5	65.8	64.4	66.6	60.1
Protecting the voting system against fraud	38.5	32.0	29.2	28.8	27.8	34.8
Don't know	5.6	2.5	5.0	6.8	5.6	5.1

39. Below is a list of possible illegal election activities that may or may not take place in your community Please tell me how often you think each event occurs in your county?

39a. A voter casts more than one ballot

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
All or most of the time	0.4	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.4
Some of the time	3.0	4.1	1.7	0.0	0.0	2.6
Not much of the time	9.5	9.9	8.3	11.0	5.7	9.3
Never	65.3	71.1	70.9	71.2	77.2	68.0
Don't know	21.8	14.9	18.3	17.8	17.1	19.7

39b. Tampering with ballots to change votes

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
All or most of the time	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Some of the time	1.7	0.8	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.4
Not much of the time	6.9	6.6	2.5	5.5	5.7	6.0
Never	72.9	76.2	79.1	79.4	80.0	75.2
Don't know	18.5	16.4	16.7	15.1	14.3	17.4

39c. Someone pretends to be another person and casts a vote for them

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
All or most of the time	0.9	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Some of the time	5.4	4.1	1.7	0.0	0.0	3.9
Not much of the time	9.7	9.8	11.7	11.0	8.3	10.1
Never	53.6	55.8	53.3	71.2	72.3	56.3
Don't know	30.4	29.5	33.3	17.8	19.4	29.1

39d. A non US citizen votes

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
All or most of the time	3.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
Some of the time	6.9	13.1	5.8	4.1	0.0	7.1
Not much of the time	9.7	8.2	12.5	13.7	5.6	10.1
Never	38.2	26.2	39.2	52.1	44.4	38.1
Don't know	42.2	49.2	42.5	30.1	50.0	42.5

40a. On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means you do not support the move to vote centers in New Mexico and 10 means do support the move to vote centers, where do you put yourself on this matrix?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
0	19.8	19.8	12.5	25.0	27.7	19.5
1	3.9	1.7	4.2	8.3	13.9	4.4
2	5.9	5.8	5.8	6.9	11.1	6.2
3	4.1	9.1	0.8	2.8	2.8	4.2
4	1.7	5.0	5.0	5.6	2.8	3.1
5	19.3	16.5	17.5	18.1	16.6	18.3
6	5.4	5.8	7.5	2.8	5.6	5.6
7	7.6	5.0	9.2	6.9	5.6	7.3
8	12.8	14.0	10.0	11.1	2.8	12.0
9	5.4	4.1	6.7	5.6	2.8	5.3
10	14.1	13.2	20.8	6.9	8.3	14.1
Mean	5.09	4.94	5.83	4.17	3.42	5.02

40b. Election Day vote centers might allow you to vote near your work, your child's school, your supermarket or near your home. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
0	12.4	15.1	11.2	18.1	14.3	13.2
1	4.3	4.2	1.7	4.2	14.3	4.3
2	2.9	4.2	5.2	8.3	14.3	4.4
3	5.2	9.2	1.7	9.7	8.5	5.8
4	2.9	2.5	4.3	4.2	2.9	3.2
5	14.2	10.1	10.3	12.5	17.1	13.0
6	6.1	7.6	6.0	4.2	2.9	6.0
7	6.5	5.0	12.1	6.9	2.9	7.0
8	16.8	16.0	15.5	13.8	5.6	15.7
9	7.6	7.6	11.2	5.6	2.9	7.8
10	21.1	18.5	20.8	12.5	14.3	19.6
Mean	6.05	5.62	6.39	4.89	4.17	5.85

40c. If vote centers were established, you would no longer have a traditional precinct to vote in on Election Day. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
0	16.5	16.9	11.3	25.4	22.8	16.9
1	4.7	4.2	4.3	7.0	17.1	5.4
2	6.1	5.9	10.3	5.6	17.1	7.2
3	6.3	11.0	5.2	7.0	2.9	6.8
4	3.4	3.4	4.3	4.2	5.7	3.7
5	14.7	13.6	10.3	19.8	8.6	14.0
6	5.4	5.1	5.2	4.2	2.9	5.1
7	6.1	4.2	8.6	7.0	0.0	6.0
8	14.0	13.7	10.3	11.3	5.7	12.8
9	4.1	7.6	11.2	2.8	2.9	5.5
10	18.7	14.4	19.0	5.7	14.3	16.6
Mean	5.34	5.12	5.74	4.01	3.57	5.17

40d. Vote centers cost significantly less than traditional precincts because there are fewer of them. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
0	14.1	11.8	10.4	15.5	20.0	13.6
1	3.9	5.9	1.7	9.9	14.3	4.9
2	4.3	4.2	4.3	8.5	14.3	5.1
3	4.8	4.2	4.3	4.2	2.9	4.5
4	2.7	5.0	3.4	2.8	2.9	3.2
5	15.2	16.0	13.8	19.7	11.4	15.3
6	5.7	8.4	8.6	4.2	5.7	6.4
7	8.6	5.9	8.6	7.0	2.9	7.8
8	13.6	12.6	17.2	14.1	5.7	13.7
9	6.6	8.4	7.8	1.4	8.5	6.6
10	20.5	17.6	19.9	12.7	11.4	18.9
Mean	5.82	5.71	6.24	4.76	4.11	5.70

40e. Vote centers offer county officials more oversight than traditional precincts because there are fewer of them. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
0	10.9	10.9	10.4	15.3	11.8	11.3
1	4.1	5.0	4.3	5.6	17.6	5.0
2	3.9	4.2	2.6	6.9	11.8	4.4
3	4.8	10.9	1.7	6.9	8.8	5.6
4	3.9	2.5	6.0	4.2	8.8	4.2
5	12.0	13.4	16.4	16.6	8.8	13.2
6	5.7	5.0	3.4	4.2	5.9	5.1
7	9.8	7.6	11.2	8.3	2.9	9.2
8	16.1	14.3	11.2	15.3	11.8	14.9
9	9.1	8.4	12.9	5.6	0.0	8.8
10	19.7	17.8	19.9	11.1	11.8	18.3
Mean	6.13	5.73	6.24	5.07	4.15	5.90

40f. With the implementation of vote centers your precinct might be closed down, possibly forcing you to travel farther than usual to vote or to vote absentee.. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
0	18.1	19.4	14.7	32.8	28.6	19.5
1	7.0	5.0	4.3	5.7	20.0	6.8
2	6.1	7.6	7.8	4.3	5.7	6.4
3	5.9	9.2	6.0	4.3	11.4	6.5
4	4.7	4.2	1.7	8.6	0.0	4.3
5	14.0	16.8	15.5	12.9	8.6	14.3
6	5.2	8.4	6.0	5.7	0.0	5.6
7	7.2	5.9	9.5	4.3	5.7	7.0
8	14.0	8.4	11.2	11.4	5.7	12.1
9	4.5	4.2	8.6	1.4	2.9	4.7
10	13.3	10.9	14.7	8.6	11.4	12.6
Mean	4.92	4.55	5.39	3.80	3.34	4.76

40g. Knowing all these facts how do you feel about vote centers now?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
0	14.2	16.6	11.9	20.5	22.8	15.2
1	3.6	4.2	3.4	8.2	11.4	4.4
2	5.2	4.2	4.2	5.5	8.6	5.1
3	6.3	7.5	4.2	9.6	5.7	6.5
4	3.2	2.5	3.4	2.7	8.6	3.3
5	14.0	15.0	16.1	16.4	17.1	14.8
6	4.3	3.3	5.9	1.4	2.9	4.1
7	7.9	6.7	11.9	9.6	0.0	8.1
8	14.9	15.0	11.9	9.6	2.9	13.4
9	8.6	10.0	10.2	5.5	2.9	8.5
10	17.8	15.0	16.9	11.0	17.1	16.6
Mean	5.71	5.47	5.93	4.52	4.03	5.52

41. How old are you?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
16 to 34	7.5	9.2	1.8	0.0	0.0	5.9
35 to 49	7.0	4.2	6.2	5.6	8.8	6.4
50 to 64	37.3	35.8	41.6	45.8	47.1	38.9
65 years or more	48.2	50.8	50.4	48.6	44.1	48.8
Mean	76.0	61.5	63.7	63.0	62.9	3.3

42. Are you:

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Male	38.6	44.6	38.8	29.2	20.0	37.9
Female	61.4	55.4	61.2	70.8	80.0	62.1

43. Generally speaking, do you consider yourself to be a(n):

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Strong Democrat	23.4	21.5	21.7	20.7	11.4	22.1
Democrat, not so strong	12.6	14.9	18.3	19.4	17.1	14.6
Independent leaning Democrat	9.9	11.6	19.1	9.7	8.6	11.4
Independent	7.1	12.4	10.4	5.6	5.7	8.2
Independent leaning Republican	7.7	9.1	9.6	5.6	0.0	7.7
Republican, not so strong	12.8	10.7	5.2	16.7	14.3	11.8
Strong Republican	21.9	15.7	12.2	18.1	37.2	19.8
Other	4.6	4.1	3.5	4.2	5.7	4.4

44. Thinking in political terms, would you say that you are very liberal, somewhat liberal, moderate, somewhat conservative, or very conservative?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very liberal	13.7	6.7	15.8	6.9	0.0	11.7
Somewhat liberal	17.0	20.0	25.4	20.9	20.0	19.1
Moderate	20.3	31.6	29.9	22.2	31.4	24.0
Somewhat conservative	23.2	20.8	14.9	22.2	20.0	21.5
Very conservative	22.7	16.7	11.4	20.9	28.6	20.3
Don't know	3.1	4.2	2.6	6.9	0.0	3.4

45. What is the highest grade of education you have completed?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Less than a High School degree	2.9	5.8	0.9	0.0	0.0	2.6
High School degree	13.5	5.0	4.3	9.6	17.2	10.7
Some college	22.0	23.3	13.8	43.9	31.4	23.4
Completed trade school/associates degree	9.8	6.7	8.6	12.3	5.7	9.2
College degree	17.7	16.7	18.1	11.0	31.4	17.6
Some graduate	9.8	10.0	11.2	8.2	2.9	9.6
Completed masters or professional degree	18.8	20.0	32.8	12.3	5.7	19.9
Advanced graduate work (MD PhD)	5.5	12.5	10.3	2.7	5.7	7.0

46. How would you describe your current employment status?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Employed full time	13.5	10.8	20.0	12.3	17.1	14.1
Employed part time	9.3	9.2	9.6	13.7	2.9	9.4
Unemployed/Looking for work	8.8	5.0	7.0	5.5	0.0	7.3
Student	4.9	9.2	1.7	1.4	0.0	4.5
Retired	59.5	63.3	59.1	57.5	71.4	60.4
Homemaker	4.0	2.5	2.6	9.6	8.6	4.3

47. What racial or ethnic group best describes you?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Black/African-American	0.9	0.9	1.8	1.4	0.0	1.0
Native American/American Indian	1.6	0.9	0.0	17.4	0.0	2.6
Hispanic/Latino	23.4	21.3	17.3	4.4	6.1	19.7
Asian	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
White/Anglo	68.6	76.0	73.6	73.9	93.9	72.1
Other	4.8	0.9	7.3	2.9	0.0	4.2

47b. If you indicated Hispanic/Latino, would you describe your Hispanic/Latino origin as:

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Mexican	20.2	54.1	5.9	0.0	50.0	24.2
Cuban	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.7
Central American	1.1	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
Latin American	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1
Puerto Rican	2.1	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1
Spanish	68.1	29.2	76.5	100.0	50.0	63.1
Something else	5.3	8.3	11.7	0.0	0.0	6.4

48. Did you take time off your job to work at the polls or was Election Day your regular day off?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
I took Election Day off	35.5	27.7	36.4	25.9	32.0	33.5
Election Day was my normal day off	64.5	72.3	63.6	74.1	68.0	66.5

49. How often do you use the Internet?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Once or more a day	73.8	73.1	82.1	71.2	77.1	74.9
A few times a week	15.8	21.8	10.3	13.7	14.3	15.6
A few times a month	2.9	3.4	6.0	9.6	5.7	4.1
Hardly ever	5.5	1.7	1.6	4.1	2.9	4.1
Never	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	1.3

50. Generally speaking, how comfortable do you feel with a computer?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
Very comfortable	59.4	66.4	76.1	58.9	51.4	62.6
Somewhat comfortable	32.3	27.7	21.3	31.5	40.0	30.2
Not very comfortable	5.7	5.0	2.6	5.5	5.7	5.1
Not at all comfortable	2.6	0.9	0.0	4.1	2.9	2.1

51. Did you work at the polling location where you would normally vote on Election Day or were you at a different location?

	Bernalillo	Doña Ana	Santa Fe	San Juan	Lincoln/Curry	Total
I worked at the polling location where I normally vote on Election Day	52.1	68.1	52.6	51.4	71.4	55.4
I worked at a different polling location	47.9	31.9	47.4	48.6	28.6	44.6

Part 3: Statewide Voter Experiences

Principal Authors:

Lonna Rae Atkeson
Alex N. Adams

This part of our report on the 2010 November, general election in New Mexico focuses on the assessments and experiences of New Mexico voters with the election process. In 2010, the voter survey included 813 New Mexico voters, randomly selected from all over the state who answered the survey over the Internet or by US mail after the election. They were asked about their voting experience, their confidence in the voting process, their attitudes toward voter identification, their feelings about fraud, and their attitudes toward alternative voting methods and requirements. The Internet/mail survey was in the field between November 5, 2010 and January 5, 2011, with 99% of responses completed before the Christmas holdays. The survey employed random sampling from the statewide voter registration file provided by the Secretary of State after the final registration day for the November 2010 election (see Appendix 3.1 for the survey methodology details).

An additional strength of the 2010 survey is that it is the third in a series of surveys of New Mexico voters. In 2006, voters in the 1st Congressional District were surveyed and in 2008 we expanded our survey statewide. With multiple years of data, we are able to make comparisons of voter attitudes across time and determine how voter attitudes are changing as New Mexico continues to improve its electoral processes.

This report has 6 parts.

- Part 1 examines the voter experience with the election and the election administration process, including average wait times in line to vote, voter-ballot interactions, voter-poll worker interactions, absentee balloting, location of polling places, and differences between voting modes (absentee, Election Day, and early).

- Part 2 examines voter confidence in their ballots being counted as intended at multiple levels of election administration including the voter's ballot in his precinct, all the ballots in his precinct, all the ballots in the county, and all the ballots in the state. We also examine voter confidence and voter satisfaction over time, comparing the current results with data collected in 2006 and 2008.

- Part 3 examines voters' reports concerning the implementation of New Mexico's voter identification law.

- Part 4 examines voter attitudes toward fraud, including who voters think commit it, how often voters think it happens, and how voters think it can be solved.

- Part 5 examines opinions toward alternative election reform proposals, including proof of citizenship should be required to vote, election day voter registration, automatic registration, and all mail elections.

- Part 6 examines opinions about the implementation of vote centers.

3.1 The Voter Experience

The voting experience is a key factor in understanding the effectiveness and efficiency of election administration. Voter experience with the ballot, the quality of the polling site, and the quality of the interaction with poll workers provide important evidence about the voting process. These experiences are the primary means through which election officials influence voter confidence. When voters have problems voting—for example, because the ballot is confusing or too long, or poll workers are unhelpful—they are likely to feel less confident that their vote will be counted.[30] Therefore, this report begins with an examination of attitudes surrounding the voting experience.   This will provide a broad look at the overall quality of the vote experience as assessed by New Mexico voters.

Wait Times

New Mexican voters, on average, reported waiting 6 minutes in line to vote during the 2010 gubernatorial election. This is improved from an average of 12 minutes during the 2008 election. In past reports we found that the average wait time depends to a large extent on whether the individual voted before the election in early voting, or on Election Day.

- Election Day voters reported waiting, on average, 3.5 minutes to vote[31]. This is slightly less than the average of 5 minutes reported in 2008.

- In the 2008 general election, early voters waited substantially longer, with an average reported wait time of 15 minutes, but this number has decreased to 6 minutes in 2010.[32]

---

[30] See Lonna Rae Atkeson and Kyle L. Saunders, 2007, "Voter Confidence: A Local Matter?" *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40(October):655-660; Thad E. Hall, J. Quin Monson, and Kelly D. Patterson, 2007, "Poll Workers and the Vitality of Democracy: An Early Assessment," *PS: Political Science and Society*, 647-654; Thad E. Hall, J. Quin Monson, and Kelly D. Patterson, 2009, "The Human Dimension of Elections: How Poll Workers Shape Public Confidence in Elections," *Political Research Quarterly* 62(2): 507-522.

[31] The difference in wait times between early and Election Day voters is statistically significant at p <001 for all voters even though there is little substantive significance. Furthermore, of the five largest counties (Bernalillo, Dona Ana, Sandoval, Santa Fe, and San Juan) only Sandoval displays a statistically significant difference.

[32] Statewide, the decreases in wait times in both early and Election Day voting across years is statistically significant at p<.001 using a one-sample t-test. Furthermore, wait times at both early voting and Election Day precincts in Bernalillo, Dona Ana, and Sandoval are significantly different between years. However, wait times at both early voting and Election Day precincts in San Juan and Santa Fe are not statistically significant between years.

Although the decreased wait times are a sign of improvement, there is a great deal of variability in reported waiting times, with some early and Election Day voters waiting no time in line and other Election Day voters waiting as much as an hour in line.[33]

Over the past several election cycles, early voting has become increasingly popular in New Mexico. This is especially true when competitive races work to mobilize and encourage voters to vote early or absentee. This was the case in both the 2004 and 2008 election and is reflected in the percentage of voters choosing alternative voting modes such as voting early or by absentee. This trend continued in 2010 with a little over one-third of voters (35%) voting early (40% in Bernalillo county). In 2004, approximately three in ten voters (31%) voted early. In 2008, this number soared to just over four in ten voters (42%).[34] In 2006 when the only competitive race was in the First Congressional District, early voting made up only a quarter of the votes statewide, and only 21% of Bernalillo voters. Early vote centers have expanded significantly, especially in Bernalillo County where the County Clerk has continued to expand the number of early voting location centers for a total of 17 early voting locations in 2010. Given that early voting in Bernalillo remained roughly the same in 2008, while other counties saw a decline, it is likely that the additional early vote centers made a difference. A study of early voting in Bernalillo County showed that most voters who choose to vote early have a early vote center very close to their place of residence suggesting that increased use of early voting depends a great deal on the location of vote centers.[35] From a policy perspective this suggests that expanding the number of locations and placing locations in higher residential areas will likely attract a significant portion to vote early and expand the overall number of voter who take advantage of this opportunity .

 The popularity of early voting and its potential benefits for relieving pressures on Election Day precinct voting makes it an important component of election administration in New Mexico. In our 2008 report, we noted that it was imperative that early vote centers be expanded and better resourced because of the discrepancies in wait times between early and election day voting. Even though we did not observe similar differences between early and Election Day in voter wait times in 2010, we do not necessarily know that our 2008 observation is not valid and something election official may want to continue being attentive to. Because of the large differences in turnout between the on and off year elections, differences may be more reflective of the overall number of voters participating and the relative demands and stress placed on the voting system than significant changes in procedures. There were 136,184 less Election Day and early voters in 2010 (a 20% decrease from 2008). Thus, it is important for election officials to continue to make sure

---

[33] Unfortunately, we do not have any data on the locations where voters waited in long lines. Election officials should closely look at their own data on this after the election and consider opening new voting locations in areas where there was particularly heavy turnout. Alternatively, as recommended in the election observations, election officials could strategically overstaff precincts that are expected to have higher turnout on Election Day.
[34] These data come from the New Mexico Secretary of State's web page and are available at: http://www.sos.state.nm.us/Results.html, accessed January 21, 2011.
[35] Lisa Bryant. 2010. "Voter Confidence and the Use of Absentee Ballots and Electronic Voting Equipment: An Experimental Study." Presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington D.C., September 2-5, 2010.

that early voting centers are fully resourced for demand so as to keep wait times between Election Day and early voting similar. As noted in the 2008 report, we realize that this may require better election funding at the state level and an increased number of early voting locations to better serve voters.

Voter-Ballot Interaction Issues: Early and Election Day Voters

Similar to 2008, we find that there were few problems reported by voters concerning their paper ballots. Election Day and early voters were asked if they made a mistake on a ballot and had to get a new one. Very few voters reported problems filling out their paper ballot**.** In the survey data, only 2% (1.3% in 2008) of voters indicated that they had to get a new ballot; half of these voters had made a mistake and over-voted.

Of course, 2% of early and Election Day voters is a little over 10,500 people. Even though voters who had problems with their ballots are a relatively small percentage of the total number of voters, it is a large number of affected voters. Therefore, it is important to consider ways to improve the process.

As noted in the observation section of the report, one helpful response to reduce over-votes would be to encourage greater use of the AutoMARK voting machines. In the Election Day and early voting observations, the research teams found that the AutoMARKs were generally underutilized and that many poll workers were not well trained on how to use it or which voters should be encouraged to use it. There were several instances where voters had visible problems working through the paper ballot with pen or pencil and the AutoMARK would have helped these voters. However, poll workers did not seem to think to suggest voting on the AutoMARK as an option. More training should go into how poll workers can assist voters by offering voters the option of voting on the AutoMARK.

Voter-Ballot Interaction Issues: Absentee Voters

Absentee voters also had few problems with their ballots. Absentee voters were asked how easy it was to follow the absentee voting ballot instructions.

- 66.7% of absentee voters indicated it was very easy to follow the instructions and an additional 29.3% indicated that it was somewhat easy to follow the instructions.

- Only about 4% of voters indicated they felt the instructions were "somewhat hard" and no one felt they were very hard.

Additionally, we asked absentee voters, "how concerned were you that your ballot would arrive at the County Clerk's office in time to be counted?" About two-thirds of absentee voters (66.2%) were not at all or not very concerned. However, one quarter of voters (26.4%) were somewhat concerned, and almost one in ten voters (7.5%) were very concerned that their ballot would not arrive in time to be counted. While we do not have further contextual data to

understand why respondents felt this way, it is problematic that some absentee voters are very concerned that their vote may not have arrived on time to be counted. Furthermore, those very concerned absentee voters represent a startling 6000 people and if we add in those who were somewhat concerned we get a total of 28000 voters or about one-third of all absentee voters. Both Bernalillo and Dona Ana County have an on-line system where voters can track whether their ballot has arrived back at the County Clerk's office. However, we did not find a difference between these absentee voters and the rest of the state. Thus, while this is a great policy, and we encourage other counties to adopt a similar online system, it is also important to advertise this service so that voters are aware of it. Further investigation into questions related to absentee voting needs to be considered in future studies.

New Mexico provides no-excuse absentee voting, allowing voters to choose the absentee voting option for any reason. When we asked voters to identify the reasons why they chose the absentee option, we found that two-thirds of absentee voters indicated that one of the primary reasons they vote early is convenience (see Table 3.1). Another one in five absentee voters indicated that it was due to health or disability issues. Work and travel obligations were also significant factors to explain this voting mode choice.

Table 3.1. Reasons for Voting Absentee

	Percent
Had to work on Election Day	15.6
Did not want to travel to precinct	19.2
Planned to be out of town	8.4
Convenience of doing it at home	64.2
Other reasons (mostly health and disability)	22.9

Note: numbers do not add to 100% because respondents were asked to mark all that apply.

Voter-Poll Worker Interactions

Poll worker-voter interactions are a key component of election administration and it is important that this interaction be a positive experience for the voter. Election Day and early voters were asked, "How helpful were the poll workers at your voting location?" The survey results show that, overall, the poll worker-voter interaction was very positive. Similarly to 2008 we find:

- 77.3% percent of voters found their poll workers to be very helpful and another 19.9% found them to be somewhat helpful.

- Only 2.7% of voters found their poll workers to be not too helpful or not at all helpful, which amounts to an estimated 14,176 poor voter-poll worker interactions in 2008.

- Using a 4 point sale, where 4 equals very helpful and 1 equals not at all helpful, the average evaluation of poll workers is 3.7.

Finding Polling Places

Both early and Election Day voters reported that they easily found their voting location and there was a slight increase from 2008. These voters were asked, "How hard was it to find your polling place to vote?"

- Almost 9 in 10 (86.4%) voters indicate that it was very easy to find their early vote location or their precinct on Election Day (84.7% in 2008).

- Only 1.8% of voters found it very or somewhat hard to find their voting location (2.6% in 2008).

- Older voters were more likely than younger voters to find their polling location easily. Older voters are more likely to be habitual voters and therefore more likely to be familiar with their polling place and its various locations in different election cycles and previous early voter locations.[36]

- There were no differences between Election Day and early voters in their ability to find their polling location. There were also no differences between first-time voters and repeat voters, between men and women, across different education groups, between Hispanics and non-Hispanics, and across voters who were contacted and encouraged to vote and those who were not.

It appears that, overall, County Clerks did an excellent job getting information to voters about both early voting locations and Election Day precincts.

3.2. *Voter Confidence*

Voter confidence is a necessary component of a democratic society. Voter confidence represents a fundamental belief in the fairness of the electoral process and ultimately the legitimacy of the government. Even if citizens are unhappy with the choices their leaders make, they should feel confident that the process that placed those individuals into power was fair and honest and that future elections can result in a change of leadership.

This portion of the study focuses on four levels of voter confidence.

- We asked: How confident are you that your vote, all the votes in your precinct, the county, and all the votes in the state were counted as the voter(s) intended? Responses were very confident, somewhat confident, not too confident and not at all confident.

- The first level is the most important because it represents how the voter feels about her own voting experience and its accuracy.

---

[36] We say various locations because in New Mexico precincts are consolidated depending on the expected turnout levels.

- The second level is voter confidence in how the vote was counted in the voter's precinct. This level is also important because how the voter feels about her own precinct may color evaluations of whether or not there is fraud in the system.

- The third level is voter confidence in the county's election system. The county is the election administrative unit for the state and is responsible for all matters related to election administration including: poll worker training, logic and accuracy testing of the tabulating machines, the counting of ballots, the qualification of provisional ballots, the county canvass, etc.

- The fourth level is confidence in the process at the state level and therefore is an aggregation of how voters feel about the election process outside of their own community and experiences.

- **T**he results are presented in Table 3.2 and show both the frequency of response and the confidence average across levels of administration and for each voting mode (Election Day, early, and absentee). The variables are coded on a 4-point scale so that a higher response indicates greater confidence. Overall, the results show that voters have very high confidence that their vote was counted correctly.

- A little more than half (54%) of voters were very confident and almost four in ten voters (39.1%) were somewhat confident that their vote was counted correctly.

- Less than one in ten voters (6.9%), or about 40,000 voters, were not too confident (5.2%) or not at all confident (1.7%).

The results also show that, moving up from (1) a personal vote being counted as intended to (2) all the votes in the voter's precinct being counted as intended to (3) all the votes in the county being counted as intended to (4) all the votes in the state being counted as intended, voter confidence significantly declines.[37]

- For example, 54% of voters are very confident that their vote was counted as intended.

- Only 50.9% of voters are very confident that their precincts votes were counted as intended.

- Only 51% of voters are very confident in the process at the county level.

- Only 39% of voters are very confident in the process at the state level.

In each case, however, a large majority of voters are either very or somewhat confident that their vote or all the votes were counted as intended and, conversely, a relatively small

---

[37] A paired t-test shows that there are significant declines across all voting modes as we move from personal voter and precinct confidence to county and state level voter confidence (most of these are p < .001). The one exception is with absentee-by mail voters where there is a much smaller n (n=110). In the case of absentee voters, the decline between personal vote confidence and precinct vote confidence and the decline between precinct vote confidence and county vote confidence does not change or is insignificant.

minority of voters is either not too confident or not at all confident. This is clearly seen by the mean of each confidence measure, which rests between somewhat and very confident.

Table 3.2. Frequency and Means of Personal, Precinct, County, and State Voter Confidence

	Your Vote	Votes in your precinct	Votes in your county	Votes across the State
Frequency				
(4) Very confident	54.0	50.9	45.1	39.7
(3) Somewhat confident	39.1	40.7	43.3	42.7
(2) Not too confident	5.2	6.5	9.7	13.2
(1) Not at all confident	1.7	1.9	1.9	4.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Averages				
Election Day voters	3.48	3.43	3.34	3.22
Early voters	3.49	3.45	3.34	3.18
Absentee voters	3.29	3.24	3.21	3.08
Overall Mean	3.46	3.41	3.32	3.18

At the bottom of Table 3.2 voter confidence is broken down by voting mode. Previous research has found that voting mode can influence voter confidence.[38] Specifically, studies have noted that especially absentee voters appear to be less confident than other voters that their ballots were counted correctly. In 2006, absentee voters in New Mexico were significantly less confident than other types of voters. In 2008, however, both Election Day and absentee voters shared the same level of confidence and early voters displayed significantly higher personal voter confidence. In 2010 absentee voters displayed attitudes similar to those in 2006, indicating significantly less confidence than both Election Day and early voters, while Election Day voters and early voters displayed the same level of confidence. At the county and state level, differences between confidences measures across voting mode are not statistically different by voting mode.

Voter Confidence 2006, 2008, and 2010

As noted above, the repeated surveys of voters over time allows us to make comparisons between voter confidence in 2006, 2008, and 2010. However, this analysis is primarily limited to the First Congressional District (CD1), which is largely Bernalillo county, because we only collected data for CD1 in 2006. Table 3.3 shows that on average voters displayed the same amount of confidence in 2010 as they did in 2008. The numbers for each category are slightly different, but in a statistical sense are indistinguishable, as shown by the overall means (3.42 and 3.46). When we look at the percentages of voters that are very and somewhat confident, 2010 and 2008 are identical (94%). Finally, when we look at the

---

[38] See Atkeson and Saunders, 2007; R. Michael Alvarez, Thad E. Hall and Morgan Llewellyn (2008), "Are Americans Confident Their Ballots are counted?" *The Journal of Politics* 70, 3: 754–766.

statewide numbers for 2010 and 2008, the results are very similar to those found for Bernalillo and CD1

Table 3.3. Percentage and Average Voter Confidence Over Time

	2010 Voter Confidence Bernalillo County	2008 Voter Confidence Congressional District 1	2006 Voter Confidence Congressional District 1	2010 Voter Confidence Statewide	2008 Voter Confidence Statewide
Very confident	49.8	53.5	39.4	54.0	53.4
Somewhat confident	44.1	40.1	44.9	39.1	39.2
Not too confident	3.8	4.9	11.8	5.2	5.1
Not at all confident	2.3	1.5	3.9	1.7	2.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Averages	3.42	3.46	3.20	3.46	3.44

Voter Experiences and Voter Confidence

Experience with the ballot, the polling site, and interactions with poll workers are the objective experiences the voter has with the voting process.[39] These experiences are the core local factors that influence voter confidence. When voters have problems voting such as making a mistake on a ballot, having difficulty understanding the instructions, being unable find their polling place, having to deal with unhelpful poll workers, or perhaps having to wait too long in line, voters are likely to feel less confident that their vote will be counted. Therefore, we examine the possible relationships between voter confidence and these experiential factors.

Voter Confidence and Poll Workers

The interaction with poll workers forms the basis of the voter's personal voting experience and is a likely influence on voter's confidence that their ballot is counted. Table 3.4 shows the relationship between voter confidence (collapsed into a 3 point scale, with "not at all confident" and "not too confident" combined), and the perceived helpfulness of the poll worker at the voting location, collapsed into a 2-point scale ("not helpful at all" and "not too helpful" are combined and "somewhat helpful" and "very helpful" are combined).

---

[39] See Atkeson and Saunders, 2007. Also see, Hall, Thad E., J. Quin Monson, and Kelly D. Patterson. 2007. "Poll Workers and the Vitality of Democracy: An Early Assessment. *PS: Political Science and Society*, 647-654

Table 3.4. Crosstabulation of Voter Confidence by Perceived Helpfulness of Poll Workers

	Not too or Not at all Helpful	Very or Somewhat Helpful
Very Confident	38.9	55.8
Somewhat Confident	61.1	38.2
Not too or Not at All Confident	0.0	6.0
Total	100.0	100.0
Means	2.36	2.50

The results show that voters who report poor interactions with poll workers have lower confidence.

- A little over half of voters (56%) voters who perceived their poll workers as being very helpful or somewhat helpful were very confident, which is comparable to 2008 (58%), while less than half of voters (40%) who perceived their poll worker as being not too helpful or not at all helpful indicated they were very confident.

- However, when we look at the means for the truncated vote confidence measure (three point scale) by poll worker helpfulness, there is little substantive difference. However, voters who perceive their poll workers to be very or somewhat helpful are on average slightly more confident than those who perceive the poll workers to be not too or not at all helpful, though this is a statistically insignificant difference.

The clear association between voter confidence and the voter poll worker interaction suggest that county clerks need well-trained, knowledgeable, polite, and helpful poll workers interacting with voters.

Voter Confidence and Polling Locations

Because context matters so much in understanding the voter experience, it might be expected that difficulty finding their polling location is associated with voter confidence. However, there is no relationship between the two in the survey data. Similarly, it also might be expected that long waits are associated with lower voter confidence, but again there is no evidence for such effects in this survey or previous surveys. When comparing average voter confidence levels between voters who waited above the average or median wait time, there is no difference in their confidence levels and when we allow this variable to be continuous we find no difference in confidence levels. Voters who waited in line very little and voters who waited in line quite a long time do not significantly vary in their voter confidence. Similar to 2008, we find:

- Voters who waited in line above the median wait time had an average confidence level of 3.5, the same voter confidence level as those who waited below the median wait time.

- Voters who waited in line above the average wait time had an average confidence level of 3.4 but those who waited in line below the average wait had an average confidence level of 3.5, an insignificant difference.

Even though it is often assumed that long lines suggest potential administrative issues that need to be dealt with, there is little evidence that long lines, in and of themselves, are associated with a decline in voter confidence. However, long lines may suggest other problems to election officials that need to be dealt with and so may be an important administrative indicator.[40]

Voter Confidence and Ballot Problems

It is also logical to think that voter interactions with their ballots might be correlated with voter confidence. However, the data show that spoiling a ballot for some reason and having to obtain a new one is not associated with lower voter confidence. The only factor that seemed to make a difference was whether an absentee voter thought that the instructions for filling out and returning their ballot were easy or hard to follow. Those that thought the instructions were somewhat hard were less confident than those who thought the instructions were very easy or fairly easy. This suggests that providing clear instructions about using an absentee ballot is an important component of voter confidence and one in which election administrators should spend extra time to ensure it is being communicated effectively.

In addition to problems with the actual ballot, perceptions matter to vote confidence. We find that voters who were very concerned that their ballot would not arrive in time to be counted reported lower levels of vote confidence than voters who were not concerned about this issue.[41]

Given that absentee voters display the lowest level of confidence these results suggest that election official must take a close look at policies or procedures as they are applied to absentee voters. Educating absentee voters on how to fill out their ballot properly and creating mechanisms for them to determine whether or not their absentee ballot has arrived may be critical to improving the overall personal voter confidence of these individuals.

Voter Confidence and Demographics

---

[40] See, for example, Heather K. Gerken (2009), *The Democracy Index.* Princeton: Princeton University Press who argues that wait times may be an important factor in a democracy index.

[41] The difference of 0.7 (on a 4 point scale) was not statistically significant, but we attribute this to the small n of absentee voters (116) answering this question. However, the difference is substantively different enough that we expect this difference would be statistically significant if the sample size were increased.

Finally, it is important to consider whether voter demographic characteristics are associated with higher or lower voter confidence. We found that education, gender, age, and income are not associated with different levels of voter confidence in the survey data. Furthermore, there were no differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanics. Generally, these findings are consistent with our findings in 2008. Nevertheless, in 2008 we found that education and voter confidence were significantly related. Since, we did not have any explanation for this finding and it has disappeared in the 2010 data, we conclude that the 2008 result may be an aberration. That said, this relationship between education and voter confidence needs to be explored further in future research.

Voter Satisfaction

An alternative measure of the voter experience is to ask about voter satisfaction with the voting experience: "How would you rate your voting experience overall?" We found that overall voters had a very positive election experience in both 2010 and 2008 and that these ratings of the overall experience are better than it was in 2006. The results are shown in Table 3.5. As before, we include parallel information on the First Congressional District (CD1) for 2006 and 2008 and information on Bernalillo County in 2010.

Table 3.5. How Would You Rate Your Overall Voting Experience

	Bernalillo County 2010	Congressional District 1 2008	Congressional District 1 2006	Statewide 2010	Statewide 2008
Excellent	47.9	52.1	25.1	51.6	52.5
Good	45.4	44.9	56.8	43.5	43.0
Fair	6.4	2.7	14.3	4.5	3.7
Poor	0.3	0.3	3.8	0.4	0.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average	3.41	3.49	3.03	3.46	3.47

- Almost half of voters (47.9% - see column labeled "Bernalillo County 2010 Internet/Mail Survey") in 2010 rated their voting experience as excellent and another 45.4% of voters rated their voting experience as good.

- This compares very favorably to 2008. Even though fewer voters rate their experience as excellent, over nine in ten voters in both 2010 and 2008 rate their experience as "Excellent" or "Good" ratings.

- More favorably, both 2010 and 2008 voters rate their experience higher than in 2006. In 2006 only a quarter (25%) of voters rated their experience as excellent and over half (57%) rated it as good with an additional 18% rating it either fair or poor.

- Statewide, the results are very similar to those of CD1 and Bernalillo County across years. Nevertheless, in 2010 voters statewide were slightly more likely to rate their experience as excellent than in Bernalillo County.

This suggests that both the 2010 and 2008 elections were overall a much more positive experience for voters than the 2006 elections.

3.3. Voter Identification

In both 2006 and 2008, survey data showed that the New Mexico voter identification law was not implemented uniformly across precincts. Men, Hispanics, and early voters reported being more likely to show—and to be asked to show—a physical form of identification, like their voter registration card, or a driver's license than were Election Day voters, non-Hispanics or women. Additionally, in 2008, in the Election Day observations, there once again was inconsistency in the implementation of voter identification laws. Although some precincts followed the law and allowed voters to choose the identification mode most comfortable to them, in many other cases poll workers would ask for a physical form of identification from voters. In some cases, workers changed this criterion across voters within the same precinct. Thus, one voter might have been asked for photo identification while another voter was only required to give her name. Again, in 2010, we find in both Election Day observations and with survey data that the law is not being uniformly applied.

The complexity of the voting law, which provides many different identification options to voters—and, consequently, options for poll worker administration—led to a decision to ask slightly different questions in our 2008 study compared to our 2006 one, using a multi-tiered question to measure more accurately the authentication of voters and the processes we witnessed at the polls. In 2010, we used the same question text.

 The minimum identification required for each voter under state law is for her to state her name, registration address, and birth year. Voters could also choose to show a physical form of identification, such as a voter registration card, driver's license, or utility bill. If the voter opted for a photographic identification, it did not have to contain the voter's address and if the voter opted for a non-photo form of identification, the document had to include an address, but it did not have to match the voter registration rolls (§ 1-1-24 NMSA 1978).

In both the 2010 and 2008 surveys, respondents were asked the following two-part question: "When you went to vote were you ASKED to show PHOTO-identification, like a driver's license, did you just provide a PHOTO-ID to the poll worker without them asking or were you identified in some other way?"

Those who said some other way in response to that first question were asked a follow up question with a list of choices: "If you were not asked to show photo-identification or did not just automatically provide ID to the poll worker, how were you identified at the polls? Did you:

- show your voter registration card,

- state your name,

- state your name and address,

- state your name and birth year,

- I handed my id to the poll worker before they asked, or

- I did it another way.

These responses were collapsed so that voters were classified as being identified correctly or incorrectly. Voters who provided an ID to poll workers, such as a voter registration card, without being asked as well as those who correctly answered the verbal or written statement were identified as correct. Those who indicated they were asked to show photo identification or did not comply with all the verbal requirements were counted as incorrect. We asked those who did it another way to explain how. Most of those voters indicated that they personally knew the poll worker and so did not show any form of identification. These were coded as incorrect as well.

The results once again demonstrate that the law was often not applied correctly.

- Just under half of all in-person voters (44.9%) were identified correctly and

- Just over half 55.1% were not identified correctly.

- But, this varied by whether a voter voted at an early voting site or on Election Day. A majority of Election Day voters (61.7%) were identified incorrectly whereas a majority of early voters (51.4%) were identified correctly.

In Table 3.6, we examine how this identification law was applied across Hispanic and non-Hispanic voters. There is evidence that Hispanics were more likely than non-Hispanic voters to be identified incorrectly when they were early voters. Data on Election Day voting indicated that self-identified Hispanics and non-Hispanics were identified correctly or incorrectly equally, there were no differences in the application of voter identification. Overall, Hispanics were more likely than non-Hispanics to be identified incorrectly.

- A little over half (51.2%) of self-identified non-Hispanics were identified correctly but

- Only a third (34.6%) of self-identified Hispanics were identified correctly.

Table 3.6. Frequency of Correct Voter Identification by Ethnicity for Election Day Voters

	Non-Hispanic	Hispanic
Early Voting		
Correct	56.5	31.3
Incorrect	43.5	68.7
Total	100.0	100.0
Election Day		
Correct	39.4	36.1
Incorrect	60.6	63.9
Total	100.0	100.0
Both Election Day and Early Voting		
Correct	48.8	34.6
Incorrect	51.2	65.4
Total	100.0	100.0

Of course, all voters should have to go through an identification process that complies with the law. The complexities of the New Mexico identification law, which has so many options for voters and, hence, so many options for poll workers, suggests that a better law would require the same form of identification, either verbal, written, or a stronger form of identification, such as a physical form of identification or photo identification like a driver's license, of all voters and would not allow for so many choices.[42]

Attitudes Toward Voter Identification

Voter identification laws are one tactic taken to ensure the integrity of the election process. The Help America Vote Act established a minimum threshold for voter identification in federal elections. Many states have since mandated higher standards for voter identification in polling places, such as those in Indiana and Georgia, which require a government-issued photo identification card.

Recently the US Supreme Court ruled that these laws are constitutional, which has paved the way for other strict voter identification laws to emerge across other states and in other local jurisdictions. For example, the court ruled that an Albuquerque city photo-identification law can move forward and was implemented in the fall 2009 Mayoral contest. Our observation of that election indicated no problems with implementation and we are aware of no voters that were turned away because of identification problems.[43]

---

[42] See Lonna Atkeson, Yann Kerevel, R. Michael Alvarez and Thad E. Hall, (2010), "Who Asks for Voter ID?" presented at the 2010 Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting in Chicago, April 22-25.

[43] See Lonna Atkeson, et al, 2010. "The City of Albuquerque 2009 Mayoral Election Administration Report," University of New Mexico.

However, the mayoral race represents a low turnout election and therefore inferences cannot be made from it to a statewide election. Importantly, the national debate on this issue has taken on partisan overtones as Democratic leaders have focused on voter access and the possibility of disenfranchising some voters who may not have adequate identification and Republicans have focused on protecting the system against fraud.

To assess attitudes toward the trade-off between vote fraud and voter access we repeated a question that we asked respondents in both 2006 and 2008 "Which is more important ensuring that everyone who is eligible has the right to vote or protecting the system against fraud?" Our results echoed what we found previously in our statewide survey:

- Just over four in ten voters (44.2%) of voters thought that protecting voter access was most important and

- Just over one-half (52.5%) also thought that preventing voter fraud was more important.

Table 3.7. Voter Attitudes toward Voter Identification?

Which is more important?	
Ensuring that everyone who is eligible has the right to vote	44.2
Protecting the voting system against fraud	52.5
Don't know	3.3

Further analysis shows that partisanship affects attitudes about whether ensuring everyone has the right to vote or protecting against fraud is more important. Almost six in ten Democrat voters (58.8%) thought protecting voter access is most important compared to only three in ten of Republican voters (28.0%). Conversely, almost seven in ten Republican voters (69.3%) thought that preventing voter fraud was more important compared to only 37.6% of Democrat voters. Independent voters attitudes are between Democrat and Republican voters, but are closer to Republican attitudes, with six in ten of Independent voters (59.2%) agreeing that protecting against fraud is more important.

Despite the fact that some voters think that ensuring access is more important than protecting fraud, most voters support voter identification laws when they are asked about them as a specific policy issue. When voters were asked to agree or disagree with the following statement, "Photo identification should be required of each voter at the polls to prevent voter fraud," almost seven in ten (68.8%) voters strongly agreed that photo identification should be required and another 19.5% of voters somewhat agreed. Slightly more than one in 10 voters (11.7%) disagreed with this statement.

Moreover, most voters carry some form of identification, like a driver's license. We asked, "How often do you carry some kind of government issued identification (for example a driver's license, passport, or state-issued ID card) with you when you leave home every day?" Over nine in ten voters (92.8%) indicated all of the time and another 5.6% indicated

most of the time indicating that over 98.4% of the voters in our survey carried a government issued identity card. Importantly, we found no significant difference between Hispanic and non-Hispanics, older and younger voters, more and less educated voters, male and female voters, and higher income voters. With similar results in 2008, we feel confident that in New Mexico, all types of voters appear to carry a government issued identification card equally.

To assess how voters feel about the current New Mexico Voter ID law, we asked "New Mexico's voter id law requires voters to identify themselves. The minimum identification is to state their address, name, and birth year. Do you think the minimum identification is: too strict, just right, or not strict enough." We find that about two in five voters (39%) think that the law is just right, and three in five voters (60.6%) think that the law is not strict enough[44].

It is important to note that the 2010 findings about voter attitudes are highly influenced by partisan identification. Table 3.8 shows that Republicans (82.9%) and Independents (71.8%) are more likely than Democrats (39.4%) to state that the law is not strict enough. Thus, the national framing of the debate has influenced individual attitudes on this issue.

Table 3.8. Voter Attitudes toward New Mexico Voter ID Law By Partisanship

Is the New Mexico voter id:

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
Not strict enough	39.4	71.8	82.9
Just right	59.8	28.2	17.1
Too strict	0.8	0.0	0.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

The 2008 and 2010 survey results suggest that the public wants a fair **and** accessible election process. They want to solve the tension between access and integrity by ensuring every eligible voter has a chance to participate but also protect the system against fraud.

3.4. Fraud

Fraud is a serious concern with regard to election integrity. Fraud has been an on-going concern in American politics, especially during the progressive era reforms of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, in which many reforms to prevent voter fraud were implemented. During this period voter registration laws were first enacted to prevent voters from going to the polls multiple times.[45] More recently, fraud became a prominent national issue after the presidential elections in 2000 and 2004, when

---

[44] While we did ask a similar question in 2008, we changed the question wording, which makes it difficult to directly compare the 2008 and 2010 results to this question.

[45] See John A. Lapp (1909), "Election-Identification of Voters," *American Political Science Review* 3:1 and Alexander Keyssar (2000), *The Right to Vote: The Contested History of Democracy in the United States* (New York: Basic Books).

procedural irregularities, the purging of voter rolls, and the reliability and validity of new voting equipment came into question.

Election fraud also continues to be a prominent issue in New Mexico. For example, New Mexico the former United States Attorney for the District of New Mexico, David Iglesias, was fired for not prosecuting voter fraud cases in which he argued there was no evidence that systematic voter fraud existed. Also, in 2008, the Republican Party of New Mexico raised questions about possible voter fraud in relation to questionable voter registration forms submitted to the Bernalillo County Clerk by the group ACORN.[46] In addition, the new Republican Governor Susana Martinez and the new GOP Secretary of State Dianna Duran have made voter photo identification laws a top priority.[47] While there have been no serious questions raised about fraud in the 2010 election, this is still an important issue that needs to be evaluated in every election.

Research on voter fraud consistently shows that there is very little evidence to support that it is widespread or that it is a problem within our election system.[48] Nevertheless, the survey data indicate that many voters, despite the lack of concrete evidence, see fraud as a potential problem in our election system. In 2010, we find that almost a third of voters (28.5%) think that an election outcome in which they have participated has been altered due to election fraud. And, when asked, "In the last ten years, in how many elections have you witnessed what you think to be election fraud," over one in five (21.7%) of voters indicated they had witnessed one or more fraudulent election incidents in the past 10 years.

To ascertain the type of fraudulent activities that voters might believe occur during the election process, we asked a series of questions related to possible fraud activities that might take place in the voters' community and whether they think that activity occurs, "all or most of the time," "some of the time," "not much of the time," or never." The results are presented in Table 3.9.

---

[46] See: Jeff Jones, "1,100 Voter Cards Suspect; County Clerk Notified N.M., Federal Officials," *Albuquerque Journal*, September 17, 2008, accessed via Lexis/Nexis January 26, 2009 and Heath Hausaman, "FBI Probing 1400 Voter Registration Forms," October 10, 2008, available at: http://newmexicoindependent.com/4239/fbi-probing-1400-voter-registration-forms

[47] See "Committee Vote on Voter ID Bill Postponed," *The New Mexico Independent*, http://newmexicoindependent.com/68916/committee-vote-on-voter-id-bill-postponed. Accessed February 21, 2011 and "voter Id Bill Derailed in House," *Albuquerque Journal February 18, 2011,*

http://www.abqjournal.com/news/xgr/182130253418newsxgr02-18-11.htm, access February 21, 2011.

[48] For an overview of this literature, see R. Michael Alvarez, Thad Hall, Susan Hyde, editors, 2008, *Election Fraud: Detecting and Preventing Electoral Manipulation*, (Brookings Institution Press); also see Lorraine C. Minnite, 2010, *The Myth of Voter Fraud*, Cornell University Press.

Table 3.9. Frequency on Beliefs about Fraud Activities in Your Community – 2010

	A voter casts more than one ballot	Tampering with ballots to change votes	Someone pretends to be another person and casts a vote for them	A non-U.S. citizen votes
All or most of the Time	4.9	3.0	6.0	8.3
Some of the time	18.0	18.1	26.2	23.3
Not much of the time	33.7	30.4	31.3	25.9
Never	13.1	15.5	6.7	10.1
Don't know	30.3	33.0	29.7	32.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

- Few voters think fraud occurs all or most of the time.

- In 2010, only between 19.2% and 31.1% of voters think fraud never takes place, across our 4 possible questions on vote fraud.

- Voters believe that it is most likely that someone pretends to be another person and casts a vote for them.

- Voters think that it is least likely that outright ballot tampering occurs.

- About 10% of voters think that a non-US citizen participates in the voting process all or most of the time, the measure with the highest degree of certainty across our 4 questions.

Table 3.10 displays that attitudes about fraud activities in 2010 and the results are very similar to those of 2008. Comparing the means of the four questions (using a four-point scale) shows that the means are within 0.1 points between the years.

Table 3.10. Means of Beliefs about Fraud Activities in Your Community

Year	2010	2008
A voter casts more than one ballot	2.16	2.21
Tampering with ballots to change votes	2.04	2.13
Someone pretends to be another person and casts a vote for them	2.47	2.45
A non-U.S. citizen votes	2.57	2.44

Note:4 points scale from 1 Never to 4 All or most of the time

Partisanship appears to be the strongest predictor in explaining the differences across voters in their attitudes toward these four dimensions of fraud.

- Republicans are the most likely to think that fraud happens all or most of the time.

- Democrats are the least likely to think that fraud happens all or most of the time.

- Independents have attitudes about fraud that fall somewhere in-between.

For example, taking the average of all four of the fraud measures, on average, 8.0% of Republicans, 10.4% of independents, and 18.2% of Democrats think that fraud never takes place.

Voters also are concerned about the potential for fraud in the absentee mail-in voting process.

- About two-thirds (66%) of voters think that voter fraud is most likely to take place with vote by mail absentee ballots as opposed to in-person voting at a polling place. This is equally true for both Democrats and Republicans with approximately 65% indicating that vote by mail absentee ballots are the most likely place for fraud to occur.

- Only one in eight (12%) voters thinks that in person voter fraud is more prevalent than absentee voting fraud, which is consistent with our findings in 2008. Republicans are slightly more likely (15%) to believe that it happens with in-person voting than Democrats and independents (10% and 11%).

- Nearly a third (29%) of voters think that the fact that voter identification rules only apply to in-person and not absentee voters is a large problem with another two in five voters (37%) perceiving it as a somewhat of a problem.

- Cleary the "black box" of absentee voting, which is not visible to voters, is a concern for many voters. It appears that this voting mode raises a number of concerns relative to other voting modes. Any policy that addresses voter identification will have to carefully consider how to handle absentee voters.

Given what we see above it is clear that more research is needed to determine what voters define as fraud, which elections have been fraudulent and what voting experiences leads to these feelings. These results indicate a some disturbing amounts of distrust in the functioning of the electoral system and it is important that we pin down the exact nature of these perceived deficiencies and address them.

3.5. Voter Attitudes toward Election Reforms

With many election reform proposals being considered in the New Mexico statehouse and in other statehouses across the country, as well as in the US Congress, a section of the survey focuses on voter attitudes toward a variety of alternative voting modes and additional voter requirements. It is important to keep in mind that voters, as a general rule, are conservative in nature, favoring the policies with which they are familiar over new and unknown policies. Thus, if these measures are of interest to intense minorities, it may be important that they educate the public on the strengths and weakness of the processes proposed in relation to current practices. Because voters do not think of these issues often, some amount of persuasion and education will have to occur for them to feel comfortable with potential changes. We asked about a variety of election reform proposals and used a scale where we asked people whether they (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) neither agree

nor disagree, (4) disagree, or (5) strongly disagree, to test these proposals. The results are presented in Table 4.10.

Proof of Citizenship

In addition to voter identification laws, states have considered other measures to prevent voter fraud. One commonly considered measure is proof of citizenship either at the polls or when registering. This is a very popular measure among the public, with about half (50.1%) strongly agreeing with this proposal and another 19.8% agreeing somewhat.

Election Day and Automatic Voter Registration

Election Day registration (EDR) is an election reform that allows voters to register on Election Day in a precinct and many states have successful EDR programs. States that use EDR have increased turnout relative to states that do not and have many fewer provisional ballots, since most voters who are not on the poll list can simply choose this option instead of a provisional ballot.[49] The survey results found that about three in ten voters (30%) support moving to an EDR system, but that a large majority of voters (70%) do not currently support moving to an EDR system.

Voters, however, are more mixed on whether the government should be responsible for citizenship registration. Automatic registration is when the government registers citizens to vote instead of citizens being responsible for this activity. In the voter survey about 45% of voters agree that the government should automatically register eligible citizens and about half (56%) disagree.

Vote by Mail

Voters do not support moving to all-mail in elections by a fairly large margin. In the survey, a little more than eight in ten voters (83.1%) are opposed to all vote by mail elections and one-sixth of voters (16.9%) support such a change in the election process.

This finding may reflect a lack of understanding by voters on how such an election would be conducted effectively and their lack of experience with this voting option. Although

---

[49] See, for example, R. Michael Alvarez and Stephen Ansolabehere, California Votes: The Promise of Election Day Registration (Dēmos, 2002); R. Michael Alvarez, Jonathan Nagler and Catherine Wilson, Making Voting Easier: Election Day Registration in New York, (Dēmos, 2004); M.J. Fenster, "The Impact of Allowing Day of Registration Voting on Turnout in U.S. Elections from 1960 to 1992," *American Politics Quarterly* 22(1) (1994): 74-87; B. Highton, "Easy Registration and Voter Turnout," *The Journal of Politics* 59(2) (1997): 565-575; Lorraine C. Minnite, An Analysis of Voter Fraud in The United States (Dēmos, 2004), http://www.demos.org/pubs/Analysis.pdf; Dēmos, Election Day Registration: A Ground Level View (2007), http://www. demos.org/pubs/EDR%20Clerks.pdf; S. Knack, "Election-Day Registration: The Second Wave," *American Politics Quarterly* 29(1) (2001): 65-78.

mail-in elections happen on occasion in New Mexico, most elections allow for multiple voting modes, including Election Day and early voting options as well as absentee mail-in ballots. Most voters choose to vote in-person, either at an early voting location or at their precinct on Election Day. Given that most voters are less experienced with mail-in balloting, it is not too surprising that there is no support for this measure.

In addition, most voters view absentee voting as the most likely place where voter fraud occurs and a majority of voters thought it was either "a big problem" (29.1%) or "somewhat of a problem" (37.1%) that absentee voters do not have any authentication process to ensure they are the person who they say they are. Further, over one in three absentee voters (33.9%) are somewhat or very concerned that their ballot did not arrive in time to be counted. Thus, voters see a variety of problem with absentee voting that likely influence their opinion on this election reform.

Finally, it may also reflect that voters prefer to process their ballot themselves with the machine. Studies repeatedly show that absentee voters are less confident their ballot is counted than in-person voters. Thus, overall, voters may more suspicious and less confident of elections in which the only voting option is by mail.

Table 3.11. Frequency of Support for Various Election Reform Measures

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree
Proof of citizenship should be required at the polls to prevent voter fraud	50.1	19.8	16.4	13.7
Voters should be able to register on Election Day to vote	15.4	14.3	20.1	50.2
The government should automatically register all eligible citizens over 18 to vote	21.0	23.5	20.3	35.2
I would prefer elections be all absentee mail-in ballots	6.7	10.2	29.6	53.5

These high profile problems with absentee voting likely skewed results against this option. Without education explaining to voters how this option would work and how this option would protect the system against fraud, it is hard to imagine voter support increasing for this alternative voting method.

3.6. Voter Attitudes toward Vote Centers

In this last section we examine voter attitudes towards vote centers. As we describe at the beginning to this last section of the survey, "Vote centers are a polling place at which any registered voter in the county may vote. They are similar to early voting locations, placed in large buildings and offer many voting stations. Many counties and states in the nation are moving from traditional precinct voting to vote centers."

To measure attitudes about centers, we asked respondents to initially place themselves on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 represented no support for the move to vote centers, and 10

represented strong support for the move to vote centers. We then asked the voters to consider additional arguments or statements about the strengths and weaknesses of vote centers and how each new question alters their opinion on whether New Mexico should change from precinct voting to vote center voting on Election Day. In total we had seven questions related to vote centers in the survey. The text of each argument or statement is:

- "Election Day vote centers might allow you to vote near your work, your child's school, your supermarket, or near your home. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?"
- "If vote centers were established, you would no longer have a traditional precinct to vote in on Election Day. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?"
- "Vote centers cost significantly less than traditional precincts because there are fewer of them. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?"
- "Vote centers offer county officials a way to improve the voter's experience because poll workers can be monitored more easily and they can be better trained. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?"
- "With the implementation of vote centers your precinct might be closed down, possibly forcing you to travel farther than usual to vote or to vote absentee. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?"

Our last question asked voters to reassess their attitudes about vote centers after considering all the various arguments, we asked, "Knowing all these facts how do you feel about vote centers now?"

Table 3.12 displays the average scores for the vote center prompts. In general average voters place themselves on average toward the center of the scale suggesting that they are neither unsupportive nor supportive, therefore they may be ambivalent and open to this new means of voting. With the zero to ten scale, a selection of five is the exact mid-point and on average the respondents are very close to five for all questions, with the initial or baseline question (4.82) exhibiting the lowest score and the question dealing with a potential cost savings by the movement to vote centers (5.63) garnering the highest score. Interestingly, there is a positive shift (0.63) in average scores from the first to last question[50], suggesting that on average the overall strength of the arguments in favor of vote centers were more persuasive than arguments against the move to vote centers. Furthermore, on average, females, those above the survey income median, Democrats, and residents of Bernalillo County are more supportive of vote centers. Residents of Bernalillo County are those most likely to have had experience with an early vote location in the 2010 election, which may have created a more favorable impression of vote centers by these voters. There is no relationship between education and ethnicity, and attitudes towards vote centers.

---

[50] This difference is significantly different using paired t-test.

Table 3.12. Average Scores for Vote Center Prompts

Vote Center Questions	Average Scores	Average Difference From Baseline
1. Baseline-initial prompt	4.82	
2. Vote in any location	5.26	0.41
3. Non-traditional Precincts	5.56	0.70
4. Cost less	5.63	0.76
5. Improved Experience	4.96	0.11
6. Closed precincts	5.35	0.51
7. Final prompt	5.45	0.63

Table 3.13 shows the average approval rating for the different vote center prompts by whether the voter voted absentee, early, or on Election Day. Most strikingly, Election Day voters display the lowest levels of support for the implementation of vote centers, sometimes by more than a full point. Furthermore, on average early voters display the highest levels of support for the implementation of vote centers. Finally, on average absentee voters support the implementation of vote centers at rates closer to early than Election Day voters.

Table 3.13. Average Scores for Vote Center Prompts by Voting Mode

Vote Center Questions	Election Day	Absentee	Early
1. Initial prompt	4.02	5.31	5.40
2. Vote in any location	4.73	5.52	5.66
3. Non-traditional Precincts	5.02	5.83	5.97
4. Cost less	5.06	5.82	6.10
5. Improved Experience	4.33	5.67	5.31
6. Closed precincts	4.79	5.77	5.74
7. Final prompt	4.94	5.79	5.81

Not surprisingly based on the above results, voters who have voted early before are much more supportive of the implementation of vote centers than those who have never voted early before. Table 3.14 shows that early voters are more than a half-point more supportive for every prompt except "Improved Experience".

Table 3.14. Average Scores for Vote Center Prompts by Early Voting History

Vote Center Questions	Never Voted Early Before	Voted Early Before
1. Initial prompt	4.22	5.08
2. Vote in any location	4.88	5.43
3. Non-traditional Precincts	5.09	5.75
4. Cost less	5.16	5.84
5. Improved Experience	4.54	5.16
6. Closed precincts	4.94	5.55
7. Final prompt	5.06	5.61

These results show that on average, all voters are indifferent towards vote centers, even when presented with arguments about them. That said there is much variability for each question. For example, Table 3.15 shows that only one in five voters (23.6%) are completely indifferent towards the implementation of vote centers at initial prompt, and only 15.5% are indifferent at the final prompt. Additionally, on average, voters were more positive than negative in their evaluations of vote centers.

Table 3.15. Frequencies of Truncated Support for Vote Center Measures at the Initial and Final Prompt

	Initial Prompt	Final Prompt
0 – 4 – Negative Evaluation	37.2	35.8
5 – Indifferent	23.6	15.5
6 – 10 – Positive Evaluation	39.3	48.7

3.7. Conclusion

All in all the voter part of our study confirms and expands many of the interpretations and findings we presented earlier. Importantly, we find that most voters are confident that their ballots are counted correctly. Over 9 in 10 voters are either very or somewhat confident that their vote was counted correctly. And, we see that the level of confidence is very similar to what we saw in 2008 and substantially higher than what we found in 2006. We also find that there continue to be implementation problems with voter identification, given that many voters indicated they were requested to show a physical form of identification when this is not necessary according to the law. We also find that voters are largely ambivalent to the establishment of vote centers and when presented with a series of for and against statements overall increased their support for this method of voting on Election Day.

Appendix 3.1. Survey Methodology

Mixed Mode Survey Methodology

The 2010 New Mexico Election Administration Survey was based on a random sample of registered voters in New Mexico. Secretary of State Mary Herrera provided the voter registration list after the final registration day for the 2008 general election. On November 5, 2010 we sent out postcards to the sample respondents requesting their participation in our 2010 Election Administration Survey. The postcard provided sample respondents with a URL (vote2010.unm.edu) and explained that respondents could also request a mail survey by contacting us via a toll free number or by calling our offices. Sample registered voters who did not respond were re-contacted two times with an additional postcard. The second postcard was sent November 15th; the third was sent December 1st. In addition, we sent out only a mail survey to a small subset of voters and only allowed a small subset of voters to respond on line. The response rate was about 17.7% (n=813) using Response Rate 2 (RR2) as defined by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR 2008). It is important to note that this is the minimum response rate and includes all voters who we tried to contact, regardless of whether we were able to contact them or not. Seven in ten of respondents (71%) chose to answer the Internet survey while the remaining 3 in 10 respondents (29%) chose to answer the mail option. The frequency report was weighted by age, region, and ethnicity. The margin of error is plus or minus 3.8%.

Survey questions asked about their election experience (voter confidence, voting problems, method of voting, experience with poll workers, voter satisfaction), their faith in the election process, their attitudes toward fraud, voter access, voter identification as well as other political attitudes and behaviors including evaluations of the President, the congressional candidates and their local and state election administrators. They were also asked several questions related to the statewide contests (vote choice, candidate valuation, candidate ideology, etc.) and a variety of demographics. A copy of the survey and frequency responses for each question is located in the following appendix.

Appendix 3.2. Selected Frequency Report for 2008 New Mexico Election Administration Mixed Mode Survey

1. Did you vote in this year's November 2nd election?
   Yes   100.0
   No   0.0

2. How interested were you in the 2010 election?
   Very interested   75.6
   Somewhat interested   19.9
   Not too interested   4.2
   Not interested at all   0.3

3. During the election season, on average, how many days a week did you watch network news?
   None   25.3
   One day   7.6
   Two days   7.4
   Three days   7.3
   Four Days   5.5
   Five days   9.7
   Six days   5.9
   Every day   27.4
   Don't know/Not sure   3.9

4. During the election season, on average, how many days a week did you watch cable news?
   None   31.4
   One day   8.9
   Two days   6.6
   Three days   7.7
   Four Days   4.8
   Five days   9.1
   Six days   5.1
   Every day   22.9
   Don't know/Not sure   3.5

5. During the election season, on average, how many days a week did you watch local TV news?
   None   18.6
   One day   7.0
   Two days   8.0
   Three days   6.7
   Four Days   7.1
   Five days   11.4
   Six days   6.2
   Every day   32.9
   Don't know/Not sure   2.1

6. During the election season, on average, how many days a week did you read a daily newspaper (in print or online)?
   None   17.5
   One day   10.7
   Two days   8.4
   Three days   7.5
   Four Days   3.7
   Five days   9.2

Six days 4.2
Every day 36.3
Don't know/Not sure 2.5

7. During the election season, on average, how many days a week did you discuss politics with family or friends?
None 5.6
One day 9.3
Two days 13.4
Three days 14.7
Four Days 13.4
Five days 17.4
Six days 6.3
Every day 18.5
Don't know/Not sure 1.4

8. During the election season, on average, how many days a week did you visit social networking sites?
None 57.9
One day 7.4
Two days 4.9
Three days 5.0
Four Days 2.4
Five days 3.8
Six days 2.4
Every day 12.3
Don't know/Not sure 3.9

9. During the election season, on average, how many days a week did you use a computer?
None 11.6
One day 1.8
Two days 2.9
Three days 3.0
Four Days 3.7
Five days 6.8
Six days 6.0
Every day 62.6
Don't know/Not sure 1.6

10. Thinking in political terms, would you say that you are very liberal, somewhat liberal, moderate, somewhat conservative, or very conservative?
Very liberal 12.7
Somewhat liberal 16.6
Moderate 21.9
Somewhat conservative 25.2
Very conservative 20.2
Don't know/Not sure 3.4

11. Was the November 2010 general election the first time you have ever voted?
Yes 2.0
No 97.6
Don't know/Not sure 0.4

12. How confident are you that YOUR VOTE in the November 2010 election was counted as you intended?
Very confident 51.9
Somewhat confident 37.7
Not too confident 5.0

Not at all confident 1.6
Don't know/Not sure 3.8

13. How confident are you that all the votes in the November 2010 election in your precinct were counted as the voters intended?
Very confident 48.3
Somewhat confident 38.6
Not too confident 6.2
Not at all confident 1.8
Don't know/Not sure 5.1

14. How confident are you that all the votes in the November 2010 election in your county were counted as the voters intended?
Very confident 42.7
Somewhat confident 40.8
Not too confident 9.1
Not at all confident 1.8
Don't know/Not sure 5.6

15. How confident are you that all the votes in the November 2010 election in the state were counted as the voters intended?
Very confident 37.4
Somewhat confident 40.3
Not too confident 12.4
Not at all confident 4.1
Don't know/Not sure 5.8

16. Did you vote in person at an early voting location, by absentee mail ballot or at your precinct on Election Day?
Early in person 42.6
Absentee by mail 14.9
On Election Day 42.0
Don't know/Not sure 0.5

17. [Absentee Voters Only] Overall, how easy was it to follow all the instructions necessary to complete your ballot and return it to be counted?
Very easy 66.7
Somewhat easy 29.3
Somewhat hard 4.0
Very hard 0.0

18. [Absentee Voters Only] How concerned were you that your ballot would arrive at the CC's office in time to be counted?
Very concerned 7.5
Somewhat concerned 26.4
Not very concerned 29.0
Not concerned at all 37.1

19. [Absentee Voters Only] Why did you vote absentee – MARK ALL THAT APPLY?
Have to work on Election Day 15.6
Did not want to travel to my precinct 19.2
Planned to be out of town 8.4
Convenience of doing it in my home 64.2
Something else 22.9

20. [Early and Election Day Voters Only] Did you use a pen or pencil to fill out your paper ballot or did you use a voter-assisted terminal?

	Total	Early	Election Day
Pen or pencil to fill out paper ballot	95.8	96.0	95.6
Voter-assisted terminal/Automark	1.6	1.4	1.8
Don't know/Not sure	2.6	2.6	2.6

21. [Early and Election Day Voters Only] Did you make a mistake on a ballot and have to get a new one?

	Total	Early	Election Day
Yes, over vote	1.0	0.6	1.5
Yes, other than over vote	0.9	1.2	0.6
No	95.5	95.4	95.6
Don't know/Not sure	2.6	2.8	2.3

22. [Early and Election Day Voters Only] How long did you wait in line at your polling place, in minutes? (Mean Wait = 4.63 minutes)

	Total	Early	Election Day
Zero/got right in	32.1	27.4	36.9
1-2 minutes	20.4	19.0	21.7
3-5 minutes	33.7	34.5	32.7
6-10 minutes	6.5	9.2	3.9
11-20 minutes	3.9	4.5	3.3
21-50 minutes	2.8	4.8	0.9
51 minutes or more	0.6	0.6	0.6

23. [Early and Election Day Voters Only] How helpful were the poll workers at your voting location?

	Total	Early	Election Day
Very helpful	75.8	78.0	73.4
Somewhat helpful	19.6	17.0	22.2
Not too helpful	2.2	1.2	3.2
Not at all helpful	0.4	0.6	0.3
Don't know/Not sure	2.0	3.2	0.9

24. [Early and Election Day Voters Only] How hard was it to find your polling place to vote?

	Total	Early	Election Day
Very easy	84.6	83.7	85.3
Fairly easy	11.6	11.6	11.7
Fairly hard	1.3	0.9	1.8
Very hard	0.3	0.6	0.0
Don't know/Not sure	2.2	3.2	1.2

25. [Early and Election Day Voters Only] When you went to vote were you asked to show photo ID, did you provide ID without being asked, or were you identified in some other way when you voted?

	Total	Early	Election Day
Asked to show photo ID	20.6	24.6	16.7
Provided ID without being asked	21.5	24.9	17.8
Identified in some other way	51.3	43.8	58.8
Don't know/Not sure	6.6	6.7	6.7

26. [Early and Election Day Voters Only] If you were not asked, then how were you identified at the polls?

	Total	Early	Election Day
Showed registration card	17.2	22.7	13.1
Stated name only	24.3	11.3	34.2
Stated name and address	23.2	20.7	25.1
Stated name and birth year	7.2	11.3	4.0
Stated name, address and birth year	20.1	28.0	14.1
I handed my ID to the poll worker before they asked	2.0	1.3	2.5
I did so in another way	6.0	4.7	7.0

27. How would you rate your voting experience overall?

Excellent	50.0
Good	42.2
Fair	4.4
Poor	0.3
Don't know/Not sure	3.1

28. Have you ever voted early in person (not by mail) before Election Day?

Yes	70.5
No	29.5

29. Compared to voting on Election Day, would you say that your experience voting early in person (not by mail) was more favorable, about the same, or less favorable?

More favorable	55.3
About the same	36.3
Less favorable	8.4

30. [Party Identification Summary]: Generally speaking do you think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an independent, or perhaps something else? Would you call yourself a strong Republican/Democrat or a not very strong Republican/Democrat? Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican Party or closer to the Democratic Party?

Strong Republican	19.0
Republican not so strong	12.0
Closer to Republican	10.2
Independent	9.0
Closer to Democrat	13.8
Democrat not so strong	12.4
Strong Democrat	22.6
Don't know/Not sure	1.0

31. We are interested in whether you strongly approve, approve, disapprove, or strongly disapprove of how the following are handling their jobs. The first person is:

31a. President Barack Obama

Strongly Approve	14.7
Approve	33.9
Disapprove	17.0
Strongly Disapprove	30.7
Don't know/Not sure	3.7

31b. Governor Bill Richardson
Strongly Approve	4.1
Approve	26.0
Disapprove	27.4
Strongly Disapprove	38.1
Don't know/Not sure	4.4

31c. The US Congress
Strongly Approve	1.4
Approve	18.5
Disapprove	32.3
Strongly Disapprove	40.7
Don't know/Not sure	7.1

31d. Your US House member
Strongly Approve	7.2
Approve	34.8
Disapprove	19.7
Strongly Disapprove	24.7
Don't know/Not sure	13.6

31e. Lt. Governor Diane Denish
Strongly Approve	6.1
Approve	31.2
Disapprove	20.9
Strongly Disapprove	26.2
Don't know/Not sure	15.6

31f. Dona Ana County DA Susana Martinez
Strongly Approve	11.2
Approve	34.2
Disapprove	11.7
Strongly Disapprove	11.4
Don't know/Not sure	31.5

31g. Your County Clerk
Strongly Approve	9.6
Approve	49.7
Disapprove	7.9
Strongly Disapprove	3.0
Don't know/Not sure	29.8

31h. Secretary of State Mary Herrera
Strongly Approve	2.1
Approve	21.3
Disapprove	18.9
Strongly Disapprove	27.9
Don't know/Not sure	29.8

31i. Political Commentator Sarah Palin
Strongly Approve	9.3
Approve	22.2
Disapprove	11.3
Strongly Disapprove	39.7
Don't know/Not sure	17.5

31j. NM State legislator

Strongly Approve	2.2
Approve	32.9
Disapprove	31.5
Strongly Disapprove	16.1
Don't know/Not sure	17.3

32. Thinking in political terms please rate the following leaders starting with:

32a. Diane Denish

Very Liberal	24.2
Somewhat Liberal	40.7
Moderate	21.9
Somewhat Conservative	2.9
Very Conservative	1.1
Don't Know/Not sure	9.2

32b. Susana Martinez

Very Liberal	2.3
Somewhat Liberal	2.6
Moderate	6.4
Somewhat Conservative	39.1
Very Conservative	37.2
Don't Know/Not sure	12.4

32c. Sarah Palin

Very Liberal	4.2
Somewhat Liberal	2.4
Moderate	2.6
Somewhat Conservative	10.1
Very Conservative	71.3
Don't Know/Not sure	9.4

32d. Barack Obama

Very Liberal	46.2
Somewhat Liberal	26.9
Moderate	18.8
Somewhat Conservative	3.0
Very Conservative	0.7
Don't Know/Not sure	4.4

32e. Democratic Party

Very Liberal	41.9
Somewhat Liberal	32.8
Moderate	14.5
Somewhat Conservative	4.1
Very Conservative	1.7
Don't Know/Not sure	5.0

32f. Republican Party

Very Liberal	1.6
Somewhat Liberal	4.5
Moderate	6.4
Somewhat Conservative	41.9
Very Conservative	39.2
Don't Know/Not sure	6.4

32g. Tea Party
    Very Liberal   4.2
    Somewhat Liberal   1.6
    Moderate   5.8
    Somewhat Conservative   12.1
    Very Conservative   62.8
    Don't Know/Not sure   13.5

33. Who did you vote for in the race for New Mexico Governor?
    Diane Denish   44.6
    Susana Martinez   53.3
    Someone else   2.1

34. Who did you vote for in the race for New Mexico Secretary of State?
    Marry Herrera   40.7
    Diana Duran   59.3

35. Who did you vote for in the race for the US House?
    Democratic Candidate   52.5
    Republican Candidate   47.5

36. How much of the time do you trust the government in Washington to do what is right?
    All or most of the time   3.8
    Some of the time   37.1
    Not much of the time   49.9
    Never   7.1
    Don't know/Not sure   2.1

37. Did you use the straight party option on the ballot to cast your votes?
    Yes   26.5
    No   73.5

38. Did someone contact you and encourage you to vote?
    Yes   59.1
    No   40.9

39. Did someone contact you and encourage you to vote **early**?
    Yes   40.8
    No   59.2

40. Did someone contact you and encourage you to vote **absentee**?
    Yes   23.6
    No   76.4

41. Did someone contact you and encourage you to vote **on election day**?
    Yes   36.4
    No   63.6

42. What was the most important issue to your vote for the governor this year?
    Economy   37.2
    Education   13.9
    Immigration   5.9
    Corruption   12.3
    Crime   0.3
    Health Care   6.6
    Taxes   2.1

State Budget	9.9
Unemployment	3.1
Other	8.7

43. How often do you carry some kind of government issued identification (for example a driver's license, passport, or state-issued ID card) with you when you leave home every day?

All of the time	92.0
Most of the time	5.6
Some of the time	1.0
Almost never	0.6
Don't know/Not sure	0.8

44. Which is more important?

Ensuring that everyone who is eligible has the right to vote	43.3
Protecting the voting system against fraud	51.5
Don't know/Not sure	5.2

45. New Mexico has a voter ID law that requires voters to identify themselves verbally by stating their name, address and birth year or to show a voter registration card or other identification card like a driver's license or utility bill. Do you think New Mexico's voter ID law is too strict, just right, or not strict enough?

Too strict	0.3
Just right	38.5
Not strict enough	59.8
Don't know/Not sure	1.4

46. One issue with voter ID rules is that they do not apply to absentee mail-in voters. How much of a problem is that for protecting the system against fraud?

A big problem	28.7
Somewhat of a problem	36.6
Not too big of a problem	14.6
Not a problem at all	6.5
Don't know/Not sure	13.6

47. I'm going to read a list of possible illegal election activities that may or may not take place in your community and I want you to tell me if you think each event occurs: all or most of the time, some of the time, not much of the time, or never.

47a. A voter casts more than one ballot

All or Most of the Time	3.7
Some of the Time	18.5
Not Much of the Time	29.3
Never	15.0
Don't know/Not sure	33.5

47b. Tampering with ballots to change votes

All or Most of the Time	2.7
Some of the Time	16.3
Not Much of the Time	26.8
Never	18.9
Don't know/Not sure	35.3

47c. Someone pretends to be another person and casts a vote for them

All or Most of the Time	6.0
Some of the Time	27.7
Not Much of the Time	27.5
Never	7.6
Don't know/Not sure	31.2

47d. A non-U.S. citizen votes
All or Most of the Time   10.8
Some of the Time   27.2
Not Much of the Time   20.8
Never   9.9
Don't know/Not sure   31.3

48. If election fraud happens at all, do you think it is more likely to take place with absentee or mail voting or
     in-person voting in a polling place?
Absentee or mail voting   64.6
In-person voting in a polling place   12.0
Don't know/Not sure   23.4

49. Please indicate if you participated in any of the following activities for the 2010 election?
49a. Wore a button, put a yard sign up, or a bumper sticker on your car
Yes   78.5
No   21.5

49b. Convince anyone else how to vote
Yes   67.3
No   32.7

49c. Contributed $200 or less
Yes   80.0
No   20.0

49d. Contributed $200 or more
Yes   93.1
No   6.9

50. In the last ten years, in how many elections have you witnessed what you believed to be election fraud?
0   25.1
1   10.3
2   5.3
3   1.5
More than 3   3.8
Don't know/Not sure   54.0

51. Do you think election fraud has changed the outcome of any election in which you have participated?
Yes   28.0
No   29.7
Don't know/Not sure   42.3

52. Please indicate whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree
    or strongly disagree with the following statements.

52a. Photo identification should be required of each voter at the polls to prevent voter fraud
Strongly Agree   67.5
Somewhat Agree   19.1
Somewhat Disagree   7.0
Strongly Disagree   4.4
Don't know/Not sure   2.0

52b. Proof of citizenship should be required of each voter at the polls to prevent voter fraud
Strongly Agree	48.9
Somewhat Agree	19.3
Somewhat Disagree	16.0
Strongly Disagree	13.4
Don't know/Not sure	2.4

52c. Public officials don't care much what people like me think
Strongly Agree	28.5
Somewhat Agree	39.8
Somewhat Disagree	22.5
Strongly Disagree	6.7
Don't know/Not sure	2.5

52d. I consider myself well qualified to participate in politics
Strongly Agree	43.7
Somewhat Agree	37.6
Somewhat Disagree	11.5
Strongly Disagree	4.8
Don't know/Not sure	2.4

52e. I would prefer elections be all absentee mail-in ballots
Strongly Agree	6.5
Somewhat Agree	9.9
Somewhat Disagree	28.8
Strongly Disagree	51.9
Don't know/Not sure	2.9

52f. I would prefer Election Day registration
Strongly Agree	15.1
Somewhat Agree	14.0
Somewhat Disagree	19.6
Strongly Disagree	49.0
Don't know/Not sure	2.3

52g. I would prefer automatic registration
Strongly Agree	20.5
Somewhat Agree	22.9
Somewhat Disagree	19.8
Strongly Disagree	34.2
Don't know/Not sure	2.6

53. Thinking back to the 2008 Presidential Election, who did you vote for?
John McCain	43.9
Barack Obama	51.2
Other	2.5
Didn't vote	2.4

54. We are interested in how people are getting along, would you say that your personal economic situation has gotten much better, somewhat better, stayed about the same, gotten somewhat worse, or much worse over the last four years?
Much better	2.1
Somewhat better	13.3
Same	42.7
Somewhat worse	29.2
Much worse	11.1
DK/NS	1.6

55. Now, thinking about the national economy, would you say it has gotten much better, somewhat better, stayed about the same, gotten somewhat worse, or gotten much worse over the last four years?

Much better	0.4
Somewhat better	16.3
Same	13.6
Somewhat worse	28.3
Much worse	39.4
Don't know/Not sure	2.0

56. Now, thinking about the state economy, would you say it has gotten much better, somewhat better, stayed about the same, gotten somewhat worse, or gotten much worse over the last four years?

Much better	0.2
Somewhat better	6.8
Same	13.3
Somewhat worse	32.1
Much worse	44.1
Don't know/Not sure	3.5

57. Vote centers are a polling place at which any registered voter in the county may vote. They are similar to early voting location, placed in large buildings and offer many voting station. Many counties and states in the nation are moving from traditional precinct voting to vote centers. Below we ask a series of question related to vote centers, please consider the question and then how each issue we introduce alters your opinion on whether New Mexico should change from precinct voting to vote center voting on Election Day.

57a. On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means you do not support the move to vote centers in New Mexico at all and 10 means you strongly support the move to vote centers, where would you place yourself on this scale?

0	20.0
1	4.3
2	4.5
3	4.9
4	2.3
5	22.9
6	3.6
7	8.5
8	10.9
9	3.8
10	11.4
No answer	2.9
Mean	4.8

57b. Election Day vote centers might allow you to vote near your work, your child's school, your supermarket, or near your home. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?

0	13.7
1	5.4
2	7.4
3	5.2
4	2.9
5	17.4
6	3.0
7	10.5
8	10.6
9	5.7
10	14.4
No answer	3.8
Mean	5.3

57c. If vote centers were established, you would no longer have a traditional precinct to vote in on Election Day. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?

0	11.0
1	4.7
2	5.0
3	6.0
4	5.2
5	15.9
6	4.5
7	9.7
8	12.1
9	6.8
10	14.3
No answer	4.8
Mean	5.6

57d. Vote centers cost significantly less than traditional precincts because there are fewer of them. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?

0	12.2
1	4.1
2	5.1
3	5.6
4	3.3
5	15.1
6	5.2
7	9.9
8	12.5
9	6.2
10	15.9
No answer	4.9
Mean	5.6

57e. Vote centers offer county officials a way to improve the voter's experience because poll workers can be monitored more easily and they can be better trained. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?

0	16.0
1	5.8
2	7.0
3	5.5
4	5.0
5	14.7
6	5.2
7	8.0
8	9.7
9	5.3
10	13.0
No answer	4.8
Mean	5.0

57f. With the implementation of vote centers your precinct might be closed down, possibly forcing you to travel farther than usual to vote or to vote absentee. Knowing this, where would you place yourself on the same scale now?

0	13.0
1	5.5
2	6.6
3	6.1
4	3.7
5	14.4
6	5.2
7	7.6
8	11.9
9	7.9
10	13.6
No answer	4.5
Mean	5.4

57g. Knowing all these facts how do you feel about vote centers now?

0	11.3
1	5.4
2	5.4
3	7.9
4	4.4
5	14.9
6	4.5
7	8.9
8	11.9
9	7.9
10	13.6
No answer	3.9
Mean	5.5

58. What is your age?

18 to 34	14.7
35 to 49	22.3
50 to 64	33.5
65 years or more	29.5

59. Are you male or female?

Male	48.4
Female	51.6

60. What is the highest grade of education you have completed?

Less than a High School degree	1.6
High School degree	12.5
Some college	21.0
Completed trade school/associates degree	11.3
College degree	28.9
Post graduate degree	22.6
Don't know/Not sure	2.1

61. Are you a born again Christian?

Yes	29.1
No	62.9
Don't know/Not sure	8.0

62. What racial or ethnic group best describes you?
Hispanic/Latino   28.4
Black/African American   0.9
Native American/American Indian   2.4
Asian   1.0
White/Anglo   63.7
Other   1.3
Mixed Race   1.5
Don't know/Not sure   0.8

63. [Hispanics and Latinos Only] Would you describe your Hispanic/Latino origin as:
Mexican   30.6
Cuban   0.4
Central American   0.0
Puerto Rican   0.0
Spanish   55.8
South American   0.0
Other   10.1
Don't know/Not sure   3.1

64. What is your marital status?
Married   62.7
Divorced   10.8
Never married/single   13.3
Widowed   6.2
Separated   0.4
Living with a Partner   3.8
Don't know/Not sure   2.8

65. To the best of your knowledge, what was your total family income before taxes in 2009, including yourself and all those living in your house?
Less than $21,000   10.3
$21,000 to $41,999   18.0
$42,000 to $59,999   19.2
$60,000 to $79,999   14.3
$80,000 to $99,999   10.9
Or over $100,000   15.3
Don't know/Not sure   12.0

Post-Script 2012 and Beyond

In 2006, we began a systematic ecosystem examination of the New Mexico election process. This provided many insights and recommendations on ways to enhance and improve the quality of the election experience for the voters and increased efficiency and performance of the election administrator. In 2008, we were able to expand our study and provide additional analyses of New Mexico's first post election audit. In 2010, we had to scale back some of our efforts, but managed to continue our statewide voter survey, poll worker survey in the four largest counties and Lincoln, and do an Election Day observation in Bernalillo County. Overall, we found a system that is fundamentally working and where election workers and voters have a high degree of confidence that votes were counted correctly. Over the course of our efforts, we have continued to see improvement in election administration and increasing comfort with the paper ballot system adopted in 2006. That being said, there is room for improvement and we have made every effort to detail these in this report. As we move into preparation for the 2012 election cycle and possibly smaller off year local contests, we hope that our report has provided useful insights and information to improve the quality of the election experience and create greater uniformity in election administration at the county and precinct level.

Critical to continued improvement of the process is consistent systematic feedback on the process. We note that our 2006 study provided a baseline from which to examine events of the 2008 and 2010 election and that, for the most part, we saw improvements in election administration, including poll worker training, that created a better experience for the poll worker and the voter resulting in greater confidence and satisfaction with the election. Nevertheless, it is important to continue to monitor the ecosystem to ensure continued progress and responsiveness to a system that is in on-going change due to changes in the law and in administrative guidelines. So, we call for more and more expanded research in future elections. The number of observable counties needs to be expanded as well as the number of early voting locations visited, especially since early voting encompasses a substantial share of the voters. In addition, an examination of election procedures including the voter registration process and the counting of absentee ballots should be added. Each of these dimensions of election administration in New Mexico merit independent study and analysis to create a long term analysis that feeds back into the election administration improvement process, which we hope will be facilitated in the 2012 Presidential election and thereafter.

Appendix A. Acknowledgements