

League of Women Voters' Annual Meeting  
Early Voting Feedback and Listening Session 2 –  
Saturday, May 30, 2009  
Manitowoc, WI

Notes & Feedback

- **Current In-Person Absentee Process: Issues & Comments**

1. To quote a respondent, “In-person absentee early voting is here to stay, so let’s make sure that we’re doing it right.” The audience felt that there could be improvements to the process of early voting and were thus open to considering our options.
2. A respondent pointed out that there are issues with current system of absentee voting having security holes in terms of poll workers being able to associate voters and ballots since the envelope contains identifying information as to what ballot belongs to what voter. The elimination of the envelope was highly encouraged to remove this possibility.
3. This group also felt positively about e-poll lists whether any other changes were made, with some caveats regarding cost and feasibility in smaller municipalities. The audience felt that additional poll worker training regarding e-poll lists should be required if e-poll lists are adopted.
4. The audience seemed to agree that Wisconsin voters prefer the optical scan machine, and would be loathe to discontinue use of such systems.

- **General Reactions and Questions about True Early Voting**

1. We were asked about the time frame for implementation of pilot program and early voting. We said that we hoped to have a

pilot in April 2010 and have it implemented in November 2010. The audience seemed to feel this was ambitious, but no objections were raised.

2. Concerns about DRE security were again brought up. The audience seemed to feel that, if DRE had to be used, that paper trails and regular audits of the machines were absolutely necessary. Having a DRE that displayed the paper audit to the voter as they were voting was discussed. (Note, talked to Ross, this is what happens currently. As each vote is cast, a paper record is automatically printed for viewing. When the voter casts their vote the paper record is hidden from the next voter. Audits count these paper tapes to verify vote counts.)
3. Questions about campaigns and whether early voters being available upon request gives candidates with more money an advantage in their campaigns were asked. A major concern was that if a list of early voters is given out that it would facilitate targeted calling (and even voter harrassment) by campaigns. It was suggested that any statute should include a prohibition that the list of early voters list is not released until the day after the election, to avoid this scenario.
4. Questions about multiple ballot styles with Automark machines were brought up. We did not know for certain how many ballot styles the Automark can hold. We research before our next presentation.
5. A respondent suggested that any legislation must make sure that the current observer rules still apply to any early voting sites.
6. As with the other LWV group, this one had no issues with closing the early voting process on Friday instead of 5 PM on Monday.
7. The audience felt it was important, no matter what option or combination of options are chosen, that training be extended to clerks and poll workers due to new procedures, to make sure that any changes are appropriately implemented.

8. Questions about mobile voting sites arose, with the audience split. The audience was undecided about whether this would be a workable solution in Wisconsin. Many felt that it would lead to more confusion than assisting voters.
9. A respondent felt that it is important to have civic locations as opposed to non-civic locations (i.e., a mall or commercial property) to keep the sense of “ritual” in voting alive.
10. One respondent wanted to know how far away we are from cell phone voting or internet voting. We responded that currently the technological hurdles are such that it is impossible, but we look forward to seeing what the future may hold. That said, we said that even in the long-term, it is unlikely.
11. We were asked how the early voting implementation process will work, from an investigative and legislative point of view. We explained our Listening Tour and gave out the dates and locations to the audience. We also promised to forward this information to the LWV main office, so that they could disseminate the information for their members.

- **Opinions & Comments About Specific Early Vote Options Presented**

1. One respondent felt that rural areas might like to combine A & B, so that the governing bodies of municipalities could opt into regional voting districts.
2. Also regarding rural and smaller municipalities, it was asked if early voting would be in the home of the clerk, should that municipality be required to opt out of opt-in early voting? The audience seemed to feel this was sensible.
3. As with the previous day’s audience, this audience emphasized that they felt an opt-in/opt-out scenario would cause a significant amount of confusion for voters.

4. Questioning how the early voting fact-finding process operated. We explained that the documentation included in their binders represented research by the G.A.B. staff on the subject, which informed our presentation. The next step is our listening tour presentations, where clerk and public feedback would be incorporated into any draft legislation. Based upon our research and feedback, we would then draft legislation to take to the G.A.B. for their input and approval. Once approved by the G.A.B., proposed early voting would then go to the legislature to be approved.