

**The Impact of  
The National Voter Registration Act of 1993  
on the  
Administration of Elections for Federal Office  
2001-2002**



**A Report to the 108<sup>th</sup> Congress**

**The Impact of  
The National Voter Registration Act of 1993  
on the  
Administration of Elections for Federal Office  
2001-2002**

This report is submitted to the United States Congress  
pursuant to the Provisions of the National Voter Registration  
Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-31)



Ellen L. Weintraub  
Chair  
Federal Election Commission

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
GENERAL .....	1
HIGHLIGHTS OF THIS REPORT .....	1
Mail Registration .....	1
Motor Voter .....	2
Agency Registration.....	2
List Maintenance.....	2
Fail-Safe Voting.....	3
Recommendations.....	3
<b>SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SECTION 2: APPLICABILITY OF THE NVRA.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SECTION 3: BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>5</b>
THE PURPOSES AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT .....	5
Expanding the Opportunities to Register to Vote .....	5
Fair and Effective Voter Registration File Maintenance.....	6
"Fail-Safe" Voting Procedures.....	6
THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION .....	7
<b>SECTION 4: COMPARING DATA .....</b>	<b>9</b>
CAUTIONS ABOUT MAKING COMPARISONS ACROSS YEARS .....	9
CAUTIONS ABOUT MAKING COMPARISONS ACROSS STATES .....	10
<b>SECTION 5: SURVEY RESULTS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
OVERALL VOTER REGISTRATION RATES.....	10
SOURCES OF VOTER REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS .....	11
MOTOR VOTER REGISTRATION PROGRAMS .....	13
AGENCY VOTER REGISTRATION PROGRAMS.....	14
LIST MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS .....	15
<b>SECTION 6: FEC RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>TABLES.....</b>	<b>26</b>
TABLE 1 - VOTING AGE POPULATION AND VOTER REGISTRATION .....	26
TABLE 2 - SOURCES OF VOTER REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS.....	38
TABLE 3 - DELETIONS FROM VOTER REGISTRATION LISTS .....	51
TABLE 4 - COMPLETENESS OF NUMERICAL DATA REPORTED 2001-2002 .....	54

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document is a report to the United States Congress on the impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (NVRA) on the administration of elections for federal office during the preceding two-year period election cycle.

This fifth report is based on survey results from 44 States and the District of Columbia. Six (6) States are not included because they are exempt from the provisions of the Act.

## General

States reported a total of 147,843,598 active registered voters for the 2002 federal general election, an increase in active voter registration in those States covered by the NVRA rose by 6,765,098. Registration of the Voting Age Population<sup>1</sup> declined slightly to 70.01% compared to 71.55% in the last mid-term election (1998), while active voter registration nationwide (including those States not covered by the NVRA) also declined slightly to 68.61% in 2002 from the non-Presidential election year high of 70.15% in 1998.

According to the study, during 2001 and 2002:

- There were 37,473,694 registration applications or transactions processed nationwide.
- Over half, or 19,703,912, were new registrations (i.e., registrations that were new to the local jurisdiction, as either first time registrants or registrations across jurisdictional lines).
- The States reported that 8.74% of registration applications were duplicate requests for registration by successfully registered voters.
- The remaining 38.68% of the transactions were primarily changes of name and address.
- A total of 15,009,935 names were deleted from the registration lists under the list verification procedures of the law, while another 20,596,513 registrants were declared "inactive."

## Highlights of this Report

### Mail Registration

The mail registration provisions of the NVRA accounted for more than one-quarter (27.64%) of all voter registration applications from 2001 through 2002, which reflects the increasing availability of the national and State registration forms on the Internet and elsewhere.

---

<sup>1</sup> Voting Age Population statistics are estimates based on the Bureau of Census figures, which are rounded to the nearest 1000.

Additionally, a small number of States implemented changes to improve the mail registration process. States reported few problems with mail registration beyond the ongoing and routine problems of incomplete, illegible, or ineligible applications. The States submitted no recommendations regarding mail registration.

## **Motor Voter**

Voter registration applications received through motor vehicle offices during 2001-2002 yielded the highest volume of applications ever reported by a single registration method mandated by the NVRA, accounting for 42.77% of the total number of registration applications received in the United States. A small number of States reported developing innovative approaches to improve various aspects of their motor voter programs. Several States noted they had implemented programs to retrain motor vehicle office employees in their duties under the NVRA, and some States noted that better communications with motor vehicle offices and clearer instructions improved the success rate of their motor voter programs. Survey results indicated a significant decrease in the number of problems reported with motor vehicle registration programs compared to problems reported in 1999-2000 election cycle. However, the failure of motor vehicle offices to transmit completed voter registration applications in a timely manner appeared to be a recurrent problem among the States that did report challenges. The States submitted no recommendations regarding motor voter registration.

## **Agency Registration**

Agencies mandated in Section 7 of the NVRA accounted for 5.83% of voter registration applications received during this reporting period, a decline from 7.58% in 1999-2000. Of these agencies, State designated agencies accounted for 2.77% of all applications, public assistance offices represented 2.67% of the total, disability service offices added .25% to this figure, and armed forces recruitment offices accounted for .14%. A number of States reported making various improvements to increase the effectiveness of their agency registration programs. Some States also reported agency delays in transmitting completed voter registration applications to the appropriate election authority, an high number of duplicate registration applications from agency clients who felt compelled to fill out a new form on each visit to the agency, and problems with the declination forms required under NVRA Section 7(a)(6)(A) and (B). In response to problems with the declination forms, four States recommended that the NVRA be revised to eliminate this requirement.

## **List Maintenance**

The numbers reported in 2003 by covered States for confirmation notices sent (20,570,205), deletions made (15,009,935), and number of "inactive" voters remaining (20,596,513) suggest an increasing effort by States to verify their voter registration lists. Almost a third of the reporting States made some adjustments to improve their list maintenance process. The most common change was the introduction or enhancement of a State-level computerized database to improve the voter registration file maintenance. Several States reported success in implementing list maintenance requirements, with the most common success involving the benefits of or improvements to a State voter registration database. Survey results indicated that several States faced challenges in maintaining accurate lists, mostly with various aspects of the mailings required under the NVRA. Six States submitted recommendations for improving list

maintenance, most of which focused on revising the procedures required by the NVRA before a registrant's name may be removed from the list.

## **Fail-Safe Voting**

States continued to pursue different approaches to implementing fail-safe voting, with several States reporting that they had made various adjustments to their procedures. The most popular change was to implement provisional voting. A few States noted success in administering this program during 2001-2002, while some reported challenges, most of which involved the failure of poll workers to follow proper procedures. Two States submitted recommendations to improve fail-safe voting.

## **Recommendations**

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 incorporated, in whole or in part, three of the FEC's seven previous recommendations for: (1) implementing a computerized statewide voter registry that is linked, where possible, with other agency databases; (2) employing the last four digits of the social security number in voter registration records; and (3) offering provisional balloting at the polling place. The FEC will not pursue two other recommendations because the implementation of the Help America Vote Act addresses both problems, which adversely affected the right to vote, that prompted these recommendations: (1) the removal of an eligible voter from the registry; and (2) the lack of timely transfer of voter registration applications from motor vehicle offices.

Accordingly, the FEC reiterates only two recommendations of those previously offered, one that was offered in the last three reports and one that was offered for the first time in the last report:

- That the U.S. Postal Service (1) create a new class of mail for "official election material" that encompasses all mail items requisite to the NVRA and provides the most favorable reduced rates affordable for the first class treatment of such mailings; and (2) provide space in their postal lobbies free of charge to State and local election officials for voter registration material.
- That States develop and implement an on-going, periodic training program for relevant motor vehicle and agency personnel regarding their duties and responsibilities under the NVRA as implemented by the State's law.

The rationale for these recommendations is provided in Section 6 of this report.

# The Impact of The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 on the Administration of Elections for Federal Office 2001 - 2002

## SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

This document is a report to the United States Congress on the impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-31, 42 U.S.C. 1973gg) on the administration of elections for federal office during the period of 2001 through 2002. It is the fifth in a series of such reports to be submitted biennially by the Federal Election Commission pursuant to the provisions of that Act, which reads in part:

SEC 9... (a) In General—The Federal Election Commission--

(3) not later than June 30 of each odd-numbered year, shall submit to the Congress a report assessing the impact of this Act on the administration of elections for Federal office during the preceding 2-year period and including recommendations for improvements in Federal and State procedures, forms, and other matters affected by this Act;

Accordingly, the Federal Election Commission, in 1994, promulgated rules identifying the information we considered necessary to obtain from the States in order to generate useful reports to the Congress (11 CFR 8.7). We further described and explained our need for these data elements in a communication to the affected State election officials in October of 1995 (see Appendix B).

State and local election officials were cooperative in providing the information requested in our 2003 survey of the States. There were some difficulties in gathering and maintaining necessary data, either by small, uncomputerized local registration offices, or due to the inability of some computer programs used by local jurisdictions to produce the needed data.

## SECTION 2: APPLICABILITY OF THE NVRA

This report is based on survey results from 44 States and the District of Columbia. Of the 6 States not covered by this report:

- **North Dakota** does not have voter registration and therefore is exempt from the NVRA under Section 4(b)(1) of the Act;

- **Minnesota and Wisconsin** each had election day registration at the polls in effect before March 11, 1993, and are therefore exempt from the NVRA under the original Section 4(b)(2) of the Act;
- **Wyoming** had enacted legislation, that took effect before March 11, 1993 which had the effect of implementing election day registration at the polls only upon the subsequent passage of the NVRA and is therefore exempt under the original Section 4(b)(2) of the Act; and
- **Idaho and New Hampshire** enacted legislation subsequent to March 11, 1993, which implemented election day registration at the polls retroactive to March 11, 1993, and were therefore specifically exempted by a 1996 amendment to the NVRA.

## **SECTION 3: BACKGROUND**

### **The Purposes and Requirements of the National Voter Registration Act**

The objectives of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (NVRA) are:

- to establish procedures that will increase the number of eligible citizens who register to vote in elections for Federal office;
- to protect the integrity of the electoral process by ensuring that accurate and current voter registration rolls are maintained; and
- to enhance the participation of eligible citizens as voters in elections for Federal office [Section 2(b)].

The Act pursues these objectives by:

- expanding the number of locations and opportunities whereby eligible citizens may apply to register to vote;
- requiring voter registration file maintenance procedures that, in a uniform and nondiscriminatory manner, accurately identify and remove the names of those individuals who are no longer eligible to vote; and
- providing certain "fail-safe" voting procedures to ensure that an individual's right to vote prevails over current bureaucratic or legal technicalities.

### **Expanding the Opportunities to Register to Vote**

Prior to enactment of the Act, the locations and opportunities for eligible citizens to register to vote had varied widely throughout the States. Evidence from State experimentation suggested that expanding the number of locations and opportunities for voter registration results in increased registration.

Accordingly, the Act requires that an individual be given an opportunity to apply for voter registration in elections for federal offices when he or she applies for or renews a driver's license, or when applying for (or receiving) services at certain other public offices. NVRA also requires States to accept registration by mail.

Driver's license offices were selected on the basis of statistics from the Department of Transportation indicating that approximately 87% of persons eighteen years or older have driver's licenses, while an additional three or four percent have, in lieu of a driver's license, an identification card issued by the State motor vehicle agency. Moreover, several States had already adopted a version of this "motor voter" approach [H.Rept. 103-9, at page 4].

Public assistance programs, state-funded disability programs, and other public agencies were selected in order to ensure that "the poor and persons with disabilities who do not have driver's licenses" will "not be excluded from those for whom registration will be convenient and readily available" [H.Rept. 103-66 (Conf.), at page 19].

And finally, because "registration by mail was already in place in approximately half the states, and there was substantial evidence that this procedure not only increased registration but successfully reached out to those groups most under-represented on the registration rolls, this method of registration was considered appropriate as a national standard" [H.Rept. 103-9, at page 4].

"By combining the driver's license application approach with mail and agency-based registration, the Committee felt that any eligible citizen who wished to register would have ready access to an application" [H.Rept. 103-9, at page 5].

### **Fair and Effective Voter Registration File Maintenance**

The Act requires States to "conduct a program to maintain the integrity of the rolls" [S.Rept. 103-6, at page 18]. Any such program, however, "may not remove the name of a voter from the list of eligible voters by reason of a person's failure to vote. States are permitted to remove the names of eligible voters from the rolls at the request of the voter or as provided by State law by reason of mental incapacity or criminal conviction. In addition, States are required to conduct a general program that makes a reasonable effort to remove the names of ineligible voters from the official lists by reason of death or change of residence" [S.Rept. 103-6, at page 18].

The Act requires that any such program be "uniform, nondiscriminatory, and in compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965..."[Section 8(b)(1)]. "The purpose of this requirement is to prohibit selective or discriminatory purge programs." "The term 'uniform' is intended to mean that any purge program or activity must be applied to an entire jurisdiction. The term 'nondiscriminatory' means that the procedure complies with the requirements of the Voting Rights Act of 1965" [H.Rept. 103-9, at page 15].

### **"Fail-Safe" Voting Procedures**

Prior to 1993, individual registrants were sometimes denied the right to vote on election day either because of some oversight on their part or because of clerical error by the election office. Registrants who changed residence within the registrar's jurisdiction often mistakenly

assumed they were still entitled to vote, only to discover on election day that their failure to re-register from their new address made them ineligible to vote. Similarly, registrants who may have failed to receive or return certain election office mailings were purged from the lists. Clerical errors, such as erroneous change of address in the registration files, often resulted either in the loss of the right to vote or else in an elaborate and daunting bureaucratic ordeal.

In order to solve such problems, the Act permits certain classes of registrants to vote despite bureaucratic or legal technicalities. The Congress incorporated these "fail-safe" provisions based on the principle that "once registered, a voter should remain on the list of voters so long as the individual remains eligible to vote in that jurisdiction" [H.Rept. 103-9, at page 18].

## **The Role of the Federal Election Commission**

Prior to the effective date of the amendments made by the Help America Vote Act of 2002, Section 9(a) of the Act states that the Federal Election Commission:

- 1) shall, in consultation with the chief election officers of the States, develop a mail voter registration application form for elections for Federal office;
- 2) not later than June 30 of each odd-numbered year, shall submit to the Congress a report assessing the impact of this Act on the administration of elections for Federal office during the preceding 2-year period and including recommendations for improvements in Federal and State procedures, forms, and other matters affected by this Act;
- 3) in consultation with the chief election officers of the States, shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out paragraphs (2) and (3); and
- 4) shall provide information to the States with respect to the responsibilities of the States under this Act.

In order to meet its statutory obligation to implement the NVRA, the Commission quickly organized a number of concurrent projects to accomplish its responsibilities. Between 1993 and 1995, the Commission undertook a massive campaign to gather and distribute information for the States, develop and formally adopt regulations, and design and distribute the National Voter Registration Form. Some key events worthy of note include:

- On June 25-26, 1993, the Commission convened a 30-member Ad Hoc Discussion Group meeting for the purpose of airing the wide range of views and concerns about the requirements of the Act. That group included representatives of many of the advocacy groups that were behind the Act, State and local election officials, and representatives of the several federal agencies either directly or tangentially involved in the Act.
- In September and October of 1993, the FEC conducted 5 two-day regional workshops around the country to provide guidance for implementation of NVRA to State officials prior to their January State legislative sessions.

- On September 30, 1993, the Commission published in the Federal Register an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking seeking comments on the National Mail Registration Form and information to be reported by the States to the Commission.
- The Commission unanimously approved Final Rules on June 8, 1994.
- On July 8, 1994, the FEC formally requested from the States a certification of their voter registration eligibility requirements needed to complete the National Voter Registration Form.
- On August 5, 1994, the FEC conducted a second meeting of the Ad Hoc Discussion Group.
- The Commission approved the National Voter Registration Form on November 3.
- On December 5, the States received camera-ready copies of the English version of the National Voter Registration Form.
- In January 1995, the FEC distributed to the States a “starter kit” of 100 to 1000 printed copies of the English version of the National Voter Registration Form. Additionally, the Commission translated the form, in accordance with the language minority requirements of the Voting Rights Act, into:
  - ◆ Spanish;
  - ◆ Chinese;
  - ◆ Japanese;
  - ◆ Vietnamese; and
  - ◆ Tagalog.
- In March 1995, the States received both the 1994 reporting form and camera-ready copies of the appropriate translations of the National Voter Registration Form.
- In June 30 1995, submitted a report to Congress on the States’ preparations for implementing of the NVRA.

During this time, the Office of Election Administration worked both formally and informally with State and local election officials and State legislators to help clarify aspects of the Act and provide assistance in the implementation of the Act’s provisions.

Finally, in an effort to share the experiences of those States that had already experimented with programs required or encouraged by the NVRA, the Office of Election Administration published four studies: Motor Voter Registration Programs, Agency Voter Registration Programs, Mail Voter Registration Programs, and Using NCOA Files for Verifying Voter Registration Lists. The office also produced and provided to the States a major study of Alternative Models for Integrating Voter Registration Data Bases.

Since 1995, the Federal Election Commission, through its Office of Election Administration, has continued to provide the States with assistance and guidance in understanding their responsibilities under the NVRA, and has periodically updated the National Mail Voter Registration Form. As mandated by the Act, the FEC reported to the Congress in

1997, 1999, and 2001 on the impact of the NVRA on the administration of federal elections in 1996, 1998, and 2000. The Commission also provided the States a more detailed report in 1998.

With the enactment of The Help America Vote Act of 2002, all functions which the Federal Election Commission exercised under section 9(a) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg 7(a)) before the date of the enactment of this Act will be transferred to the new United States Election Assistance Commission once it is established.

## **SECTION 4: COMPARING DATA**

The results of the 2003 survey of the States are provided in Section 5 below and in the tables, along with baseline figures from 1992 and 1994, and survey results for the 1996, 1998, and 2000 election cycles. But in order to interpret the data properly, it is important to bear in mind certain limitations.

### **Cautions About Making Comparisons Across Years**

Historically, presidential elections always attract a greater registration and turnout than non-presidential federal elections. The significance of this pattern is that any comparison across years must be made between elections of the same type. The figures from 2002 should therefore be compared to the figures from 1998.

Additionally, 1992 and 1994 registration figures in Table 1 are inflated -- although no one can know to what extent. In 1992 and 1994, the vast majority of States did not maintain lists of "inactive" registrants. Instead, registration lists were periodically purged of persons who had not voted during a length of time specified in State law. As a result, total registration figures in 1992 and 1994 included an unknown number of people who had moved to a new jurisdiction, registered there to vote, but remained on the list in their previous jurisdiction (because their absence had not yet been reflected in their failure to vote within the specified time frame).

The NVRA, in contrast, prohibits the removal of names from the registry solely for failure to vote and replaces that purging process with a positive verification of the registry (either through the mails or else through the U.S. Postal Service's National Change of Address Files) at times and frequencies to be determined by the individual States. Persons reported by the USPS to have moved outside the registrar's jurisdiction are sent a confirmation mailing and may, at the option of the State, be placed on an "inactive" list (in order to permit them to vote should there have been a Postal Service error).

As a result of the NVRA, States covered by this report now conduct a positive verification of their registration lists -- although at different times and in different ways. Moreover, only 32 States opted to distinguish between active and "inactive" registrants (down from 35 for 1999-2000). The remaining 13 States did not distinguish between "active" and "inactive" registrants; hence, their active registration figures were inflated by the inclusion of the "inactives."

In order to simplify comparisons for the reader, we have calculated the number of "inactives" in those States that do not distinguish between "actives" and "inactives." We did so

in the following manner: (1) We identified the number of confirmation notices that each such State mailed out and subtracted the number of responses to them that they received (on the conservative assumption that respondents were deleted from the list). (2) Because the remaining number would have been placed on an “inactive” list had there been one, we subtracted that number from the “total registration” number in order to arrive at an estimated “active registration” number. The numbers in Table 1 reflect this procedure in the following States: Alaska, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and West Virginia.<sup>2</sup>

## **Cautions About Making Comparisons Across States**

Apart from the previously noted differences in list verification frequencies and procedures, the most significant problem in making comparisons of 2002 data across the States is the problem of incomplete reporting. Indeed, only 24 of the 45 States covered by this report indicated that their data were complete. The remainder reported problems in obtaining data from some of their local jurisdictions, either because these entities did not keep the necessary records, did not provide the information to the State election authority, or else experienced logistic, technological, or legal problems. (See Table 4).

As a result of this incomplete reporting, the total registration figures for 2002 provided in Table 1 will in some cases be at variance with 2002 registration figures reported elsewhere by the FEC and by other authoritative sources. But in order to make the “actives” plus the “inactives” equal the total, some States reported only the figures they received from their cooperative localities rather than the statewide total they knew to be true.

## **SECTION 5: SURVEY RESULTS**

What follows are a summary of the data gathered by the Federal Election Commission’s survey of the States regarding the impact of the NVRA on the administration of elections for federal office from the 2000 election cycle. The survey was conducted in March of 2003 pursuant to the requirements of the Act and regulations.

### **Overall Voter Registration Rates**

Active voter registration in those States covered by the NVRA rose by 6,765,098 individuals over the totals for the 1998 midterm election, but declined slightly as a percentage of the voting age population to 70.01% in 2002 compared to 71.55% in 1998. Active voter registration nationwide also declined slightly to 68.61% in 2002 from 70.15% in 1998.

The total registered voters in 2002 actually declined from 1998 levels in five States. Each of these States reported conducting comprehensive list maintenance programs in accordance with the NVRA.<sup>3</sup> The total number of inactive registrants (those who have been

---

<sup>2</sup> Kansas has begun to distinguish between active and “inactive”, and will include the information in future reports.

<sup>3</sup> The States reporting list maintenance programs were Alabama, Alaska, Michigan, Montana, and Ohio.

mailed, but have not responded to, a verification notice and have not appeared to vote as of the close of the 2002 general election) increased from 14,640,557 in 1998 to 20,596,513 in 2002.

## Sources of Voter Registration Applications

The reporting requirements of the NVRA, as reflected in the FEC's survey of the States, provide a panoramic view of voter registration activity throughout the nation. (See Table 2.) The covered States reported a total of 37,473,694 voter registration applications received from the close of the 2000 general election registration period to the close of the 2002 general election registration period.

It seems clear from the 2003 survey that, from 2001 through 2002, voter registration in motor vehicle offices continues to be the most productive feature of the NVRA. Registration in motor vehicle offices accounted for 16,026,407 (42.77%) of all voter registration applications.

Registration by mail also proved productive -- yielding 10,357,284 (27.64%) of all registration applications. These mail applications reflect the ready availability of the national and state voter registration forms over the Internet, from voter registration drives, and from people personally mailing in forms they obtained from public assistance agencies and elsewhere. In most States it is virtually impossible to detect where applicants obtained their mail-in forms.

Almost a quarter (23.77%), or 8,906,351, of all registration applications came from "Other Sources" which included organized registration drives, deputy registrars, and in-person registrations. (It should be noted, however, that this number is slightly inflated because some local jurisdictions failed to track the sources of applications and therefore reported all new applications in this "Other" category).

All the remaining agencies taken together accounted for only 2,183,652 (5.83%) of the registration applications, a decline from 3,460,531 (7.58%) in 1999-2000, 2,909,569 (8.22%) in 1997-1998, and 4,589,246 (11.07%) in 1995-1996. Of these agencies, other agencies designated by the State (libraries, schools, and such) yielded 1,038,269 (2.77%) of the applications in 2001-2002, public assistance offices provided 999,042 (2.67%), offices providing services to individuals with disabilities added 92,317 (.25%), and Armed Forces recruiting offices supplied 54,024 (.14%).

There was some initial concern that the NVRA's broad expansion of opportunities to register would result in significantly increasing the number of duplicates -- that is, applications from persons who were already registered under the same name at the same address. The number of duplicates reported (8.74%) while slightly up from last reporting period (7.72%), is still not significant. Nor did any one category of intake agencies seem to be responsible for a disproportionate percentage of duplicates than any other.

Finally, 14,493,458, over one third (38.68%) of the total number of applications, were changes to current voter registration information or rejected applications. The FEC calculated this figure by subtracting the total number of new registrations from the total number of non-duplicate applications received. The FEC does not want to burden local registrars by asking them to distinguish which applications were changes to the voter registration record versus which were rejected. Anecdotal evidence from conversations with election officials around the country,

however, suggests that the overwhelming majority of these transactions were changes of name or address. Thus, the NVRA facilitated millions of Americans in updating their voter registration records.

## Mail Registration Programs

The NVRA requires States to accept and use a national mail voter registration form [Section 6(a)(1)]. This form was developed by the FEC in consultation with chief State election officials [Section 9(a)(2)]. The FEC also made the national form available on its Web site on the Internet so that it could be downloaded, completed, and mailed to one of 42 States that accepted paper reproductions of the form during this reporting period.

States may use their own State mail registration form [Section 9(b)]. These, or the national form, are to be made available through governmental and private entities with particular emphasis on organized voter registration programs [Section 6(b)].

The NVRA allows States to require that an individual who registered by mail vote in person the first time. Seven States (Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Nevada, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia) have chosen that option.

Mail registration programs generated 10,357,284 applications, accounting for 27.64% of the total number of applications received during the 2001-2002 reporting period. Voter registration by mail continued to be the second most popular source of voter registration applications, second behind registration at motor vehicle offices.

Several States reported changes undertaken during this reporting period to improve the mail registration process:

- **The District of Columbia** updated its mail registration form to include an optional question inquiring as to the type of assistance needed for disabled voters.
- **Indiana** repealed its requirement that voter registration applications be submitted on durable card stock and enacted legislation to permit voter registration applications to be downloaded from the State web page, to be completed, signed, and forwarded to the county voter registration office.
- **Virginia** has begun to bar code voter registration applications. With the help of the State Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) bar code scanners have been placed at both the State Board of Elections and DMV to ensure better accountability of the state mail voter registration program.
- **Washington** made available on the Secretary of State web site State mail voter registration forms in Spanish, Chinese, Cambodian, Korean, Laotian, Russian and Vietnamese.

As in prior reports, States indicated very few problems with mail registration. A number of States indicated continuing problems with incomplete and/or illegible applications while another State reported regularly receiving batches of application cards damaged by United States Postal Service equipment while being processed. Unlike 1999-2000, there were significantly less

problems reported with private organizations making the national mail voter registration form available on their web sites in a manner that provided incomplete or inaccurate information. The FEC will watch for a recurrence of this problem during the 2003-2004 reporting period, because many more private voter registration efforts tend to spring up in the months preceding a U.S. Presidential election.

The States submitted no recommendations to improve registration by mail.

## Motor Voter Registration Programs

The NVRA requires that individuals be given the opportunity to register to vote (or to change their voter registration data) in elections for federal office when applying for or renewing a driver's license or other personal identification document issued by a State motor vehicle authority.

Motor voter agencies continued to yield the highest volume of registration applications among the agencies mandated by the NVRA, accounting for 42.77% of the total number of registration applications in the United States during 2001-2002.

Several States reported implementing innovative ideas to improve various aspects of their motor voter programs:

- **Arizona** developed their EZ Voter Registration program. Using Motor Vehicle Department (MVD) technology, individuals are able to register to vote over the internet if the user has a digitized signature on file with the MVD.
- **North Carolina** began using its State Election Information Management Systems (SEIMS) to electronically transfer to their counties, on a weekly basis, all DMV applications made during the previous week. The State Board of Elections reported that the electronic transfer of records saves both time and money, and ensures greater accuracy.
- **Texas** is preparing a pilot project to allow voters to change voter registration data via the internet, eliminating the need for hard copy exchange of information if the change is within the county of registration and if it is made while changing motor vehicle information.
- **Virginia** expanded its program to co-locate and re-locate voter registrar's offices to Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) facilities.<sup>4</sup> 11 Registrars are currently co-located and 5 have re-located within the State). This program has provided faster processing and fewer applications denied or returned due to insufficient information.
- **Hawaii** and **Rhode Island** reported developing programs to re-train motor vehicle office employees in their duties under the NVRA either in person or by videotape.

---

<sup>4</sup> Co-location is when a Registrar is given space at a DMV office or shares the information area in a DMV office. Re-location is when the Registrar completely moves their office within the DMV.

As noted in previous reports, one of the lessons learned from States with successful motor voter programs is the importance of adequate and continuing training for motor vehicle staff due to the high turnover rate for personnel in DMV offices throughout the nation. Other States reported that improved communications with motor vehicle offices and clearer instructions had improved the success rate of their motor voter programs.

Significantly fewer problems were reported with motor voter registration programs during this reporting period than were reported during 1999-2000. Nine States, however, still reported problems with completed voter registration applications not being forwarded in a timely manner, or never being forwarded to the appropriate local election official. As a consequence, some States again reported receiving complaints from individuals who stated that they had completed a registration application at a motor vehicle office, but whose names did not show up on the official list of registered voters. One State reported solving this problem by allowing individuals who did not appear on the voter rolls to cast a provisional ballot, required in the future by Sections 302(a) and (c) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002. Two other States enacted new laws requiring motor vehicle offices to forward completed registration forms to election authorities no later than 5 days after receipt. (Section 5(e) of the NVRA requires that applications be forwarded to the appropriate election official within ten days of acceptance, or, if accepted within five days of the close of registration, within five days of acceptance).

The States submitted no recommendations to improve motor voter registration.

## **Agency Voter Registration Programs**

The NVRA requires that individuals be given the opportunity to register to vote (or to change their voter registration address) when applying for (or receiving) services or assistance: at any office in the State that provides public assistance; at or through any office in the State that provides State funded programs primarily engaged in providing services for those with disabilities; at certain other offices designated by the State; and at armed forces recruitment offices.<sup>5</sup>

Individuals must be provided this opportunity not only at the time of their original application for services, but also when filing any rectification, renewal, or change of address related to such services.

Applications received at all agency sites combined to represent only 5.83% of the total number of voter registration applications in the United States in 2001-2002. Agencies designated by the States (such as public libraries, public high schools, unemployment offices, tax revenue offices, marriage license bureaus) accounted for 2.77% of all applications; public assistance agencies accounted for 2.67%; public disability service offices accounted for .25%; and armed forces recruitment offices accounted for .14%.

---

<sup>5</sup> There is some ambiguity regarding what constitutes a public assistance office. The statute itself is silent on the extent to which this phrase should be applied to the variety of state agencies, particularly as such agency's missions and structures often vary from state to state. The FEC Guide to Implementing the NVRA provided guidance to States as to what agencies were designated by the statute, but concluded "States must decide for themselves what other of their offices meet the definition of 'public assistance offices'".

A number of States reported improvements made during 2001-2002 to increase the effectiveness of their agency voter registration programs:

- **California** counties have taken a more proactive approach to their agency voter registration programs by ensuring that agencies have voter registration applications available for their clients, and by implementing new procedures for easy restocking of voter registration application cards.
- **Colorado** printed and distributed posters in both English and Spanish for all NVRA designated agencies to be placed in a prominent location within agency offices notifying the public that "Voter Registration Services Offered Here."
- **Oklahoma** produced a new training video for agency personnel and broadcasted a special training program to Department of Human Services employees engaged in voter registration activities.
- **Washington** has continued its quality maintenance program for agency voter registration in which Secretary of State personnel conduct site visits to various agencies to verify compliance with provisions of the NVRA.

Four States reported problems with the timely transmission of completed voter registration applications from agency offices to local election offices as required by Section 7(d)(1)&(2) of the Act. (As with motor vehicle agencies, all public assistance agencies covered under Section 7 of the NVRA are required to transmit completed applications to the appropriate election authority within ten days of acceptance, or within five days of acceptance if the applications are received within five days of the close of registration). In addition to delayed transmission, several States again reported having a number of duplicate registrations from agency clients who felt compelled to fill out a new registration application each time they visited an agency office. In response to problems with agencies being required to seek and retain declinations from clients each time they refuse an application to register to vote, four States submitted a specific recommendation for Congress to eliminate the NVRA's provisions requiring the declination form, contained in Section 7(a)(6)(B).

## List Maintenance Programs

One of the purposes of the NVRA, as stated in the accompanying House and Senate committee reports, is to ensure that once citizens are registered to vote, they remain on the voting list as long as they remain eligible to vote in the same jurisdiction [H. Rept. 103-9, at page 18, and S. Rept. 103-6, at pages 17 and 19]. The statute's list maintenance provisions prohibit States from removing names from the voter registration list:

- for failure to vote [Section 8(b)(2)]; or
- for change of address to another location within the registrar's jurisdiction [Section 8(f)].

The law requires registrars who receive information on a voter's change of address within the registrar's jurisdiction to update the registrant's voting address [Section 8(f)]. The House

Committee report makes it clear that this is to be done without requiring the registrant to reregister or otherwise to notify the registrar of the change [H. Rept. 103-9, at page 18].

Another stated purpose of the list maintenance provisions is to ensure the accuracy and currency of the voter registration rolls. The Act requires that driver's license changes of address requests serve as change of voter registration address, unless the individual indicates that the change is not for voter registration purposes [Section 5(d)]. The law also requires States to conduct a uniform and non-discriminatory general program [Section 8(b)(1)] to remove the name of an ineligible voter:

- upon his or her death [Section 8(a)(4)(A)];
- upon their written confirmation that his or her address has changed to a location outside the registrar's jurisdiction [Sections 8(a)(4)(B) and 8(d)(1)(A)]; and
- upon a failure to respond to certain confirmation mailings along with a failure to offer to vote in any federal general elections subsequent to the mailing [Sections 8(a)(4)(B) and 8(d)(1)(B)]. (The confirmation mailing in this case is that mailed out to registrants who, based on information received from the Postal Service, has changed his or her address to a location outside the registrar's jurisdiction.)

The NVRA also permits States to remove the names of a registrant:

- upon the request of the registrant [Section 8(a)(3)(B)];
- for mental incapacity of the registrant, as provided for in State law, [Section 8(a)(3)(B)]; and
- upon criminal conviction of the registrant, as provided for in State law [Section 8(a)(3)(B)].

Other than these provisions, the law grants States latitude in when, where, and how these functions will be performed.

States reported mailing 20,570,205 confirmation notices and receiving 4,507,651 responses to those notices (a 21.91% response rate) during the 2001-2002 election cycle, the most notices and second highest response rate reported since most States implemented the NVRA in 1995. These figures suggest an increasing effort by the States to maintain up-to-date lists. This is comparable with the 18,892,331 notices and 23.05% response rate in 1999-2000, the 17,801,458 notices and 16.35% response rate in 1997-1998, and the 11,469,948 notices and 19.5% response rate in 1995-1996.

States also reported moving 8,549,405 persons from the "active" list of registrants to the "inactive" list, deleted 4,526,562 from the "inactive" list, and deleted 1,933,968 registrants who were not identified as active or inactive. In sum, a total of 15,009,935 names were removed from registration lists during 2001-2002. This compares to total deletions of 13,014,912 in 1999-2000, 9,063,326 in 1997-1998, and 8,723,301 in 1995-1996.

Furthermore, reporting States disclosed that, as of the close of the November 2002 general election, 20,596,513 of the 163,984,789 registered voters remained on the "inactive" list

(12.56%), many of whom will be removed from the lists after the 2004 general election.<sup>6</sup> This compares to 11.2% of registered voters remaining on the “inactive” list in 1999-2000, 9.6% in 1997-1998, and 5.6% in 1995-1996.

States covered by this report continued to approach list maintenance differently; however, it appears that many persisted in seeking the techniques that are most effective to update the lists of registered voters in their own communities. Fourteen States indicated that they had made adjustments, since the general election of 2000, in order to improve their list maintenance program. While the nature of these alterations varied, the most commonly reported involved:

- The implementation or enhancement of computerized voter registration databases and computer-assisted techniques to update voter registration files, statewide (4 States- *Florida, South Dakota, Texas, and Washington*).
- The increased role of State election offices in:
  - ♦ training local election officials in the NVRA requirements and list maintenance techniques (2 States -- *Massachusetts and Montana*); and
  - ♦ conveying to local election offices the death records, criminal conviction records, and lists of individuals registered more than once within the State that are needed to maintain accurate lists (2 States – *Texas and Washington*).
- Using a mailing to all registered voters, following precinct and district changes as a result of reapportionment, to identify potential “deadwood” (3 States – *Louisiana, Maryland, and Michigan*).

In addition, the following States disclosed the implementation of various new State laws or procedures to improve list maintenance:

- In *Arizona*, one county changed the timing for the deletion of inactive voters from the registry.
- *Arkansas* delegated the list maintenance process to counties.
- *California* used sample ballot mailings with the U.S. Postal Service’s address change service to identify possible address changes.
- *Kansas* began requiring that inactive voters be designated as such on the voter’s registration file.
- *Pennsylvania* enacted a new law that required consistency among all counties in processing all changes of address received up to 30 days before an election, to send cancellation notices to the election official in the county of a registrant’s former

---

<sup>6</sup> An “inactive” voters can be removed from the rolls if, after failing to respond to a confirmation notice, the voter has not voted in either of the next two federal general elections. Some States have chosen not to immediately purge voters from their lists at the earliest date possible.

residence, to transfer a copy of a registrant's cancelled voter registration record to the county of the elector's new residence. Pennsylvania began allowing counties to use newspaper obituaries and letters testamentary or letters of administration issued by the office of register of wills to remove deceased registrants from the list. Pennsylvania also began using a unique identifier, which is assigned for life, for each qualified elector who becomes registered.

Eight States noted the following successes in implementing the NVRA list maintenance requirements:

- Three States disclosed the benefits of their State voter registration database, with:
  - ◆ *California* noting that the Secretary of State's database continued to import voter address changes and new registrants from the motor vehicle department, and transmit this data to the counties; and that counties continued to make technological enhancements to process the new and updated information being captured;
  - ◆ *Kentucky* reporting that its centralized electronic database makes record-keeping simple and accurate; and
  - ◆ *Texas* indicating that the State now has 152 (of 254) counties connected on-line in real-time with the Secretary of State's voter registration database.
- Two States reported that the list maintenance requirements helped them remove inactive voters with:
  - ◆ *Hawaii* noting that the procedures allowed them to conduct the first large-scale removal of names from the voter registration list (roughly 103,000 were removed after the 2002 general election, which will be reported by the State officially in the report for the 2004 election cycle); and
  - ◆ *Maine* indicating that procedures have helped to decrease the percentage of registered voters to Voting Age Population from 106% in 1996 to 96% in 2002.
- *Arizona* reported that some counties used information provided by poll workers, or by cities and towns when they have their elections, to help identify registrants who have moved or who have died.<sup>7</sup>
- *Massachusetts* noted that the training and support provided by the State led to a better understanding of the steps that must be completed before names can be deleted from the registry.

---

<sup>7</sup> States must exercise caution to ensure that list maintenance procedures are uniform, nondiscriminatory, and in compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965. "This requirement may not be avoided by a registrar conducting a purge program or activity based on lists provided by other parties where such lists were compiled as the result of a selective, non-uniform, or discriminatory program or activity." [Hse. Rpt., Section 8, page 15.]

- *Washington* State stated that its “Suspected Multi-County” voter registration process has improved communication about registrants who may be on the rolls in more than one county, streamlined the cancellation process, and saved staff hours and postage costs.

Six States reported challenges in maintaining accurate voter registration lists during 2001-2002, down from thirteen in both the report following the 2000 elections, and the report following the election of 1998, and twenty-six for the 1996 election. Four of these States reported the following problems related to using the postal service to conduct registration functions:

- *Kentucky* objected to the expensive and time consuming process for confirming registrants’ addresses. In particular, the state objected that the requirement that they send a confirmation notice to an address after a piece of mail has been returned undeliverable is wasteful and expensive.
- *Louisiana* indicated that the U.S. Postal Service appeared to record the wrong new addresses on some of the returned election mail.
- *Mississippi* noted problems with some registrants who still have rural route numbers, rather than street addresses, making it difficult to ensure mail delivery. The state was additionally concerned with people not providing forwarding addresses when they move.
- *North Carolina* reported following postal service directions for mailings that affect the list maintenance process only to find, on numerous occasions, that postal service personnel around the State did not understand postal service policies for reduced rates or were inconsistent in applying postal rates to election mail and postal policies regarding returned mailings.

Others difficulties disclosed included:

- *Indiana* lacking the resources needed to help identify registrants who may be on the rolls in more than one county.
- *Montana* having difficulties implementing the NVRA list maintenance requirements in light of the differing, although compatible, provisions in State law.

Six States forwarded recommendations to address list maintenance problems. Five States recommended the following adjustments to the NVRA list maintenance requirements:

- *California* recommended that election offices be allowed to promptly cancel voter registrations for those whose residence address and county of residence can no longer be confirmed.
- *Hawaii* recommended eliminating the requirement for a forwardable confirmation notice to be sent to registrants when the U.S. Postal Service confirms that the registrants have non-forwardable addresses or when the Postal Service has no forwarding order.

- *Kansas* recommended that election offices be allowed to remove the names of registrants if they have failed to vote in the past two consecutive national/State elections.
- *Kentucky* recommended that States be allowed to include the forwardable confirmation mailing in any first notice mailed to registrants, such as the notice verifying acceptance of a voter registration application that the NVRA currently does not allow to be forwarded to a new address.
- *Louisiana* recommended that States be allowed to remove “inactive” voters earlier.
- *Arizona*, recommended reduced postal rates for election mailings, to help with increasing mailing costs.

Recommendations that focused on the procedures required by the NVRA before a registrant’s name may be removed from the registry would require Congressional action to change. The U.S. Postal Service could implement the recommendation regarding postal rates, although Congressional action could effect such a change.

The Commission addressed a variety of list maintenance challenges in its March 1998 report entitled *Implementing the National Voter Registration Act: A Report to State and Local Election Officials on Problems and Solutions Discovered 1995-1996*. This report explored, in detail, the benefits and problems of various solutions to address problems like the ones that have arisen during this survey. Some concerns can be resolved by adjusting the way the State or local jurisdiction implements the list maintenance provisions of the NVRA and by implementing the computerized statewide voter registration list that is required by the Help America Vote Act. Other problems are not so easily rectified. For example, the standards employed by the U.S. Postal Service to qualify mailings for reduced postage continue to be an obstacle to reducing postal costs in many jurisdictions.

## Fail-Safe Voting Programs

The NVRA provides for voting by registrants who may not have responded to certain notices sent to confirm their address or whose addresses may not be recorded correctly on the registry [Sections 8(c)(1)(B)(i), 8(d)(1)(B), 8(d)(2)(A), 8(e), and 8(f)]. These provisions are in keeping with one of the principles of the NVRA that, once registered, citizens remain on the rolls as long as they are eligible to vote in that jurisdiction. While the law secures the right of these voters to vote, it places some restrictions on where they are to vote, and it leaves most decisions concerning the way such persons are to vote to the States.

As in the past, the States continue to pursue different approaches to this matter. Ten States reporting adjustments in order to improve the administration of fail-safe voting. Nine of these States revised or clarified their balloting procedures:

- Four States implemented provisional voting during the 2001-2002 election cycle (*Florida, Maryland, Nebraska, Utah*).

- *Arizona* reported that one county allowed voters to update their name or address by means of their Early Ballot request card.
- *Kansas* clarified the procedures that county boards of canvassers use to determine the validity of provisional ballots.
- *Montana* worked with its counties and motor vehicle department extensively to ensure that people would be able to vote despite the fact that their motor-voter registration applications may not have been forwarded in a timely manner.
- *Pennsylvania* reported a new law that clarified its fail-safe voting procedures.
- *Texas*, a State with early voting, noted that voters can no longer be added to the “inactive” list once voting for the November General Election has begun.

One State, *California*, reported training poll workers and election staff in fail-safe voting procedures, as well as providing fail-safe voting information to voters in person and on election office web sites.

Three States disclosed the following successes in administering fail-safe voting:

- *Arkansas* touted the benefits of continuing to stress fail-safe procedures in poll worker training.
- *Montana* indicated that coordinating with the motor vehicle department generally ensured that people could still vote if their motor voter registration applications were not forwarded timely.
- *Utah* noted the success of provisional balloting, stating that 78% of all provisional ballots cast were accepted and that the procedure eliminated the need for election judges to call the motor vehicle office on election day to verify registrations.

Four States reported challenges in implementing fail-safe voting during the 2001-2002 election cycle. This equals the four States reporting problems in the 1998 midterm election, but is down from the number of States reporting problems in past presidential elections (seven for 2000 and eighteen for 1996). The majority of the comments for this report concerned the implementation of the fail-safe voting provisions by poll workers:

- *Arizona* reported that, in one county, election workers need to encourage voters to fill out the proper forms when the voters have a change of address.
- *California* disclosed that many counties find that volunteers who work at the polls provide incorrect information to voters, thereby disenfranchising the voters, because the workers are faced with the process on an intermittent basis and have difficulty becoming familiar with all of the fail-safe scenarios and procedures.
- *Indiana* reported that poll workers made mistakes when administering fail-safe voting provisions, a problem the State hopes to rectify with more poll worker training and materials.

One State, *Virginia*, reported a problem that is specific to the unique way the State chose to implement the fail-safe voting provisions. The State pointed to the NVRA's requirement that fail-safe voting must be provided to registrants who have moved within the same registrar's jurisdiction and the same congressional district. Virginia followed the letter of the law and did not extend the fail-safe voting provisions to voters who remained in the same registrar's jurisdiction, but moved to a new congressional district. Consequently, when congressional district boundaries were redrawn after the 2000 census, fewer voters qualified for fail-safe voting in 2002. Virginia noted that this problem is likely to affect the 2004 election as well.

Two States submitted recommendations regarding fail-safe voting:

- *California* recommended providing federal funding for training on the fail-safe voting process.<sup>8</sup> The State also recommended that Congress consider amending the NVRA fail-safe voting procedures to be consistent with new fail-safe voting provisions in the Help America Vote Act of 2002.
- *Virginia* recommended amending the NVRA to delete the reference to congressional district in section 8(e)(2)(A) [42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6(e)(2)(A)].

The Commission addressed fail-safe voting challenges in its March 1998 report to the States. The report underscored the importance of ensuring that fail-safe voting programs meet the requirements of federal law. The Commission's June 2001 report recommended that States implement provisional balloting at the polls. Subsequently, the Help America Vote Act of 2002 included a requirement that States implement provisional balloting elections for federal office held on and after January 1, 2004 [42 U.S.C. 15482(a), (c), and (d); and 15483(b)(2)(B) and (d)(2)].

## SECTION 6: FEC RECOMMENDATIONS

The FEC offers two recommendations to address problems identified by the 2002 survey.<sup>9</sup> Both of these recommendations have been previously offered, one was offered in the last three reports and one appeared for the first time in the last report.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Funds appropriated under Title I of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 ("HAVA") may be used for this training [42 U.S.C. 15301(b)]. Title II requirements state that payments may also be used for this training, once the State certifies that the State has implemented all the title III requirements or that the amount expended with regard to such other activities does not exceed the amount equal to the minimum payment applicable to the State under HAVA section 252(c) [42 U.S.C. 15402(c)].

<sup>9</sup> States were invited to describe any problems they may have encountered and any ideas or recommendations they might have for improving the administration of the Act. The bulk of their responses focused on some of the more technical procedures associated with list maintenance, fail-safe voting, and the agency declination procedure. Many of these technical recommendations depend upon how individual States have chosen to implement various provisions of the Act. Because this report is directed to the United States Congress and not to individual State legislatures, we limit our recommendations to those universal enough to be applicable to all States covered by the Act.

**RECOMMENDATION 1: The U.S. Postal Service should (1) create a new class of mail for “official election material” that encompasses all mail items requisite to the NVRA and provide the most favorable reduced rates affordable for the first class treatment of such mailings; and (2) provide space in their postal lobbies free of charge to State and local election officials for voter registration materials.**

A number of State and local registration officials have voiced concerns (either in response to our survey, in professional meetings, or in personal communications with Commission staff) regarding the costs attendant on the mailings required by the NVRA.

The NVRA requires that local election officials employ at least four kinds of mailings:

- incoming mail registration forms (as single items coming in);
- outgoing acknowledgment forms (in response to each registration application);
- outgoing confirmation notices (which the Act requires be “forwardable”); and
- incoming confirmation postcards (as single items in response to the outgoing confirmation notices).

In addition, some jurisdictions may employ “non-forwardable” mailings as a means of periodically verifying their registration lists as required by the Act.

At the same time, Section 8(h)(1) of the Act amends 39 U.S.C. §3629 to read “The Postal Service shall make available to a State or local voting registration official the rate for any class of mail that is available to a qualified nonprofit organization under section 3626 for the purpose of making a mailing that the official certifies is required or authorized by the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.”

Accordingly, the Postal Service revised its Domestic Mail Manual to read, in part “As with all matters authorized to mail at the special rates, only third-class matter, deposited in prescribed minimum quantities and prepared in accordance with postal regulations, is eligible for these rates.”

After consultations with various postal authorities, it is the Commission’s understanding that:

- the rates available to qualified nonprofit organizations apply only to outgoing mailings of at least 200 items or more that are sorted by zip code or other order convenient to the Postal Service and that are delivered to a special officer at the Post Office;

---

<sup>10</sup> The Commission offered seven recommendations in its last report. Three of these recommendations were incorporated, in whole or in part, into the Help America Vote Act of 2002. Additionally, HAVA addresses problems that two other previous recommendations were attempting to address.

- such items would have to be generic and devoid of references to personal or unique information (the very sort of information that a confirmation mailing would have to contain); and
- the rate applies only to the original outgoing mailing and would not pertain to any “forwardable” or “address correction” services. Such services would cause a surcharge for each piece of mail so treated, to be assessed to the original mailer on top of the nonprofit rate.

It would appear, then, that the “Reduced Postal Rate” offered in Section 8(h)(1) of the NVRA would not pertain, either for technical or practical reasons, to most of the mailings required or authorized by the Act. And the volume of all mailings required by the Act results in substantial costs to local jurisdictions.

Although it is impossible to fully calculate the costs that are incurred for mailings required by the Act, a simplified estimate can help illustrate the costs that NVRA imposes on local jurisdictions. From 2001 through 2002, a nationwide total of 20,570,205 confirmation notices were mailed out by registrars to persons who were reported to have moved. These confirmation notices, in turn, induced 4,507,651 postcard responses with postage also paid by the registrars. At a very minimum, then, registrars collectively bore additional mailing costs for the confirmation process that easily reached into seven figures. The NVRA also requires that all voter registration applications be acknowledged by the registrar, although many States already required this. Still, from 2001 through 2002, this procedure triggered 37,473,694 acknowledgment mailings from registrars nationwide at a cost, again, in seven figures.

Viewed nationwide, the size and scope of the mailings required is very large:

- Quadrennial verification mailings to a minimum of 160,000,000 people.
- Biennial confirmation mailings to a minimum of 20,000,000 people.
- Biennial return postage on confirmation postcards from a minimum of 4,000,000 people.
- Biennial acknowledgment mailings to a minimum of 37,000,000 people.

It is not hard to perceive that total postage costs (not to mention printing and handling costs) have now become and will continue to be a major item in every election budget. The U.S. Postal Service’s current standards to qualify mailings for reduced postage continue to be an obstacle to reducing postal costs for many jurisdictions.

In view of these matters, the Federal Election Commission recommends that the U.S. Postal Service create a new class of mail for items containing the new “Official Election Mail” logo; that this new class of mail encompass at a minimum all mail items requisite to the NVRA; and that the USPS provide the most favorable reduced rates affordable for the first class treatment of such mailings regardless of their number or point of origin.

In a related matter, a number of State and local election officials have remarked that they are now being charged for providing voter registration materials in post offices -- apparently because of a legally binding requirement to do so in the Postal Operations Manual (POM). In

view of the other intake efforts required by the NVRA (in motor vehicle offices, public assistance agencies, and the like), the Commission recommends that the Postal Service provide space in their postal lobbies for voter registration materials free of charge to State and local election officials.

**RECOMMENDATION 2: States develop and implement an on-going, periodic training program for relevant motor vehicle and agency personnel regarding their duties and responsibilities under the NVRA as implemented by the State's law.**

Several States reported that motor vehicle offices in some areas failed to transmit voter registration applications or changes of address to the appropriate election authorities in a timely manner. Some States also noted similar problems with other agencies charged with offering voter registration. The result, unfortunately, was the effective disenfranchisement of those citizens who had duly applied but whose registrations were not processed by election day. Furthermore, there has been an unexplained decline in both the percentage and number of voter registration applications from agencies distinct from motor vehicle departments. As in 2000, it seems reasonable to suspect that these problems may have resulted both from personnel turnover in the motor vehicle offices and other agencies and from simple inattention, now that the novelty of the process has worn off. A few States are considering some form of "receipt" system for persons who register at motor vehicle or agency offices. But we feel that, at a minimum, the problem needs to be addressed by an ongoing, periodic training program geared to new motor vehicle and agency employees.

---

<sup>11</sup> The Help America Vote Act, at 42 U.S.C. 15483(a)(5)(A)(ii) and 15483(a)(5)(D), provides for exceptions to this requirement for registrants who have neither a driver's license number nor a social security number or who live in States that are permitted to use the full social security number on applications for voter registration, in accordance with section 7 of the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a note).

TABLE 1  
VOTING AGE POPULATION AND VOTER REGISTRATION

## NOTES ON THE DATA ELEMENTS IN TABLE 1

- Data on all States are presented whether or not the State is covered by the NVRA. The names of the States exempt from the NVRA are printed in italics.
- VAP refers to Voting Age Population. The figures for 1992, 1994, and 1996 are from the U.S. Bureau of Census Estimated Voting Age Population based on the November 1996 Current Population Survey. The figures for 1998 and 2000 are Census projections of State voting age populations and are subject to revision when Census issues its estimated populations – typically in the year following. The figures for 2002 are were provided by Census in June of 2003, and will be included in its upcoming report on the 2002 election. VAP figures include a significant number of persons *not eligible* to vote including resident aliens, convicted felons (in most States), and those individuals who have been declared *non compos mentis* by a court of law. The numbers of such persons – especially resident aliens – vary remarkably from State to Stae.
- Registration figures were provided by the States themselves and may be incomplete owing to incomplete local reporting. As a result of this incomplete reporting, total registration figures for all years will in some cases be at variance with registration figures reported elsewhere by the FEC and by other authoritative sources.
- Registration figures are reported in total registrants as well as in “active” and “inactive” registrants. “Inactive” registrants are essentially those who remain on the list but who, based on information provided the Postal Service that they have moved, have been mailed a confirmation notice but have neither responded nor offered to vote in the subsequent federal election.

**Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration**

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002
<b>ALABAMA</b>						
Total VAP	3,080,000	3,138,000	3,220,000	3,293,000	3,333,000	3,379,000
Total Active		2,306,419	2,477,355	2,316,598	2,539,902	2,327,974
% Active		73.50%	76.94%	<b>70.35%</b>	76.20%	<b>68.90%</b>
Total Inactive		328,639	255,234	858,251	360,809	290,459
Total REG	2,367,972	2,635,058	2,732,589	3,174,849	2,900,711	2,618,433
% REG	76.88%	83.97%	84.86%	96.41%	87.03%	77.49%
<b>ALASKA</b>						
Total VAP	405,000	429,000	425,000	437,000	430,000	451,000
Total Active		336,226	414,815	456,914	478,232	417,051
% Active		78.37%	97.60%	<b>104.56%</b>	111.22%	<b>92.47%</b>
Total Inactive			54,216	46,054	107,699	43,804
Total REG	315,058	336,226	469,031	502,968	585,931	460,855
% REG	77.79%	78.37%	110.36%	115.10%	136.26%	102.19%
<b>ARIZONA</b>						
Total VAP	2,812,000	2,923,000	3,145,000	3,547,000	3,625,000	3,980,000
Total Active		2,073,442	2,247,662	2,265,879	2,193,767	2,216,435
% Active		70.94%	71.47%	<b>63.88%</b>	60.52%	<b>55.69%</b>
Total Inactive		242,320	254,932	327,104	454,386	491,326
Total REG	1,964,949	2,315,762	2,502,594	2,592,983	2,648,153	2,707,761
% REG	69.88%	79.23%	79.57%	73.10%	73.05%	68.03%
<b>ARKANSAS</b>						
Total VAP	1,774,000	1,817,000	1,873,000	1,882,000	1,929,000	2,033,000
Total Active		1,274,885	1,369,459	1,412,617	1,441,213	1,455,882
% Active		70.16%	73.12%	<b>75.06%</b>	74.71%	<b>71.61%</b>
Total Inactive				59,354	102,464	125,583
Total REG	1,317,944	1,274,885	1,369,459	1,471,971	1,543,677	1,581,465
% REG	74.29%	70.16%	73.12%	78.21%	80.02%	77.79%
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>						
Total VAP	22,521,000	23,225,000	22,826,000	23,665,000	24,873,000	25,664,000
Total Active		14,723,784	15,662,075	14,983,950	15,707,307	15,249,354
% Active		63.40%	68.62%	<b>63.32%</b>	63.15%	<b>59.42%</b>
Total Inactive			1,025,952	2,415,236	3,190,481	4,055,535
Total REG	15,101,473	14,723,784	16,688,027	17,399,186	18,897,788	19,304,889
% REG	67.06%	63.40%	73.11%	73.52%	75.98%	75.22%
<b>COLORADO</b>						
Total VAP	2,579,000	2,713,000	2,862,000	2,961,000	3,067,000	3,355,000
Total Active		2,033,094	1,911,651	2,099,364	2,248,856	2,247,944
% Active		74.94%	66.79%	<b>70.90%</b>	73.32%	<b>67.00%</b>
Total Inactive			434,602	464,077	635,092	642,214

**Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration**

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002
Total REG	2,003,375	2,033,094	2,346,253	2,563,441	2,883,948	2,890,158
% REG	77.68%	74.94%	81.98%	86.57%	94.03%	86.14%
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>						
Total VAP	2,508,000	2,486,000	2,479,000	2,464,000	2,499,000	2,588,000
Total Active		1,791,685	1,881,323	1,806,750	1,901,203	1,847,247
% Active		72.07%	75.89%	<b>73.33%</b>	76.08%	<b>71.38%</b>
Total Inactive			95,426	189,532	157,381	244,307
Total REG	1,961,503	1,791,685	1,976,749	1,996,282	2,058,584	2,091,554
% REG	78.21%	72.07%	79.74%	81.02%	82.38%	80.82%
<b>DELAWARE</b>						
Total VAP	521,000	534,000	548,000	568,000	582,000	618,000
Total Active		348,122	419,508	445,067	477,593	508,727
% Active		65.19%	76.55%	<b>78.36%</b>	82.06%	<b>82.32%</b>
Total Inactive			18,426	22,321	26,079	10,937
Total REG	342,088	348,122	401,082	467,388	503,672	519,664
% REG	65.66%	65.19%	73.19%	82.29%	86.54%	84.09%
<b>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</b>						
Total VAP	467,000	452,000	422,000	414,000	411,000	459,000
Total Active		361,890	361,419	353,503	354,410	363,168
% Active		80.06%	85.64%	<b>85.39%</b>	86.23%	<b>79.12%</b>
Total Inactive			34,273	65,982	77,406	132,143
Total REG	340,953	361,890	395,692	419,485	431,816	495,311
% REG	73.01%	80.06%	93.77%	101.32%	105.06%	107.91%
<b>FLORIDA</b>						
Total VAP	10,422,000	10,856,000	11,030,000	11,383,000	11,774,000	12,831,000
Total Active		6,559,598	7,484,341	7,494,005	8,430,260	8,677,799
% Active		60.42%	67.85%	<b>65.84%</b>	71.60%	<b>67.63%</b>
Total Inactive			593,536	726,261	322,457	657,015
Total REG	6,541,825	6,559,598	8,077,877	8,220,266	8,752,717	9,334,814
% REG	62.77%	60.42%	73.24%	72.22%	74.34%	72.75%
<b>GEORGIA</b>						
Total VAP	5,006,000	5,159,000	5,418,000	5,678,000	5,893,000	6,292,000
Total Active		3,003,527	3,811,284	3,910,740	3,856,676	3,758,718
% Active		58.22%	70.34%	<b>68.88%</b>	65.45%	<b>59.74%</b>
Total Inactive				281,967	791,534	967,365
Total REG	3,177,061	3,003,527	3,811,284	4,192,707	4,648,210	4,726,083
% REG	63.47%	58.22%	70.34%	73.84%	78.88%	75.11%
<b>HAWAII</b>						
Total VAP	866,000	900,000	890,000	878,000	909,000	949,000

**Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration**

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002
Total Active		488,889	544,916	601,404	533,860	551,156
% Active		54.32%	61.23%	<b>68.50%</b>	58.73%	<b>58.08%</b>
Total Inactive		61,620	17,127	0	103,489	125,086
Total REG	464,495	550,509	562,043	601,404	637,349	676,242
% REG	53.64%	61.17%	63.15%	68.50%	70.12%	71.26%
<b>IDAHO</b> <i>(exempt from the NVRA)</i>						
Total VAP	750,000	803,000	858,000	888,000	921,000	971,000
Total Active		625,803	700,430	661,433	728,085	679,535
% Active		77.93%	81.64%	<b>74.49%</b>	79.05%	<b>69.98%</b>
Total Inactive						
Total REG	611,121	625,803	700,430	661,433	728,085	679,535
% REG	81.48%	77.93%	81.64%	74.49%	79.05%	69.98%
<b>ILLINOIS</b>						
Total VAP	8,598,000	8,712,000	8,754,000	8,755,000	8,983,000	9,346,000
Total Active		6,119,001	6,663,301	6,493,881	7,150,468	7,003,115
% Active		70.24%	76.12%	<b>74.17%</b>	79.60%	<b>74.93%</b>
Total Inactive			797,513	1,186,143	1,790,076	1,590,828
Total REG	6,600,358	6,119,001	7,460,814	7,680,024	8,940,544	8,593,943
% REG	76.77%	70.24%	85.23%	87.72%	99.53%	91.95%

<b>Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration</b>						
	<b>1992</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2002</b>
<b>INDIANA</b>						
Total VAP	4,209,000	4,298,000	4,374,000	4,410,000	4,448,000	4,564,000
Total Active		2,976,255	3,488,088	3,377,956	3,830,096	3,812,080
% Active		69.25%	79.75%	<b>76.60%</b>	86.11%	<b>83.52%</b>
Total Inactive				316,026	170,713	196,556
Total REG	3,180,157	2,976,255	3,488,088	3,693,982	4,000,809	4,008,636
% REG	75.56%	69.25%	79.75%	83.76%	89.95%	87.83%
<b>IOWA</b>						
Total VAP	2,073,000	2,112,000	2,138,000	2,157,000	2,165,000	2,239,000
Total Active		1,640,533	1,741,949	1,763,827	1,841,346	1,809,824
% Active		77.68%	81.48%	<b>81.77%</b>	85.05%	<b>80.83%</b>
Total Inactive			34,464	97,593	127,853	156,635
Total REG	1,703,532	1,640,533	1,776,433	1,861,420	1,969,199	1,966,459
% REG	82.18%	77.68%	83.09%	86.30%	90.96%	87.83%
<b>KANSAS</b>						
Total VAP	1,840,000	1,889,000	1,897,000	1,925,000	1,983,000	2,019,000
Total Active		1,314,213	1,438,894	1,403,682	1,505,714	1,480,404
% Active		69.57%	75.85%	<b>72.92%</b>	75.93%	<b>73.32%</b>
Total Inactive				110,003	117,909	135,294
Total REG	1,365,847	1,314,213	1,438,894	1,513,685	1,623,623	1,615,698
% REG	74.23%	69.57%	75.85%	78.63%	81.88%	80.02%
<b>KENTUCKY</b>						
Total VAP	2,798,000	2,857,000	2,928,000	2,990,000	2,993,000	3,161,000
Total Active		2,132,152	2,391,190	2,512,318	2,556,815	2,649,084
% Active		74.63%	81.67%	<b>84.02%</b>	85.43%	<b>83.81%</b>
Total Inactive			4,896	48,021	165,742	159,913
Total REG	2,076,263	2,132,152	2,396,086	2,590,339	2,722,557	2,808,997
% REG	74.21%	74.63%	81.83%	86.63%	90.96%	88.86%
<b>LOUISIANA</b>						
Total VAP	3,045,000	3,100,000	3,131,000	3,149,000	3,255,000	3,297,000
Total Active		2,151,955	2,480,033	2,511,141	2,566,602	2,524,187
% Active		69.42%	79.21%	<b>79.74%</b>	78.85%	<b>76.56%</b>
Total Inactive			78,638	175,420	229,949	282,015
Total REG	2,292,129	2,151,955	2,558,671	2,686,561	2,796,551	2,806,202
% REG	75.28%	69.42%	81.72%	85.31%	85.92%	85.11%
<b>MAINE</b>						
Total VAP	932,000	931,000	945,000	957,000	968,000	1,015,000
Total Active		940,569	1,001,292	882,329	947,189	950,059
% Active		101.03%	105.96%	<b>92.20%</b>	97.85%	<b>93.60%</b>
Total Inactive				60,200	117,179	60,275

<b>Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration</b>						
	<b>1992</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2002</b>
Total REG	974,603	940,569	1,001,292	942,528	1,064,368	1,010,334
% REG	104.57%	101.03%	105.96%	98.49%	109.96%	99.54%
<b>MARYLAND</b>						
Total VAP	3,705,000	3,750,000	3,820,000	3,824,000	3,925,000	4,078,000
Total Active		2,299,580	2,577,191	2,569,316	2,725,184	2,768,946
% Active		61.32%	67.47%	<b>67.19%</b>	69.43%	<b>67.90%</b>
Total Inactive			110,060	241,884	265,584	240,923
Total REG	2,463,010	2,299,580	2,687,251	2,811,200	2,990,768	3,009,869
% REG	66.48%	61.32%	70.35%	73.51%	76.20%	73.81%
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>						
Total VAP	4,616,000	4,564,000	4,649,000	4,731,000	4,749,000	4,964,000
Total Active		3,153,341	3,494,927	3,378,165	3,447,595	3,600,649
% Active		69.09%	75.18%	<b>71.40%</b>	72.60%	<b>72.54%</b>
Total Inactive			329,749	340,363	329,556	372,108
Total REG	3,351,918	3,153,341	3,824,676	3,718,528	3,777,151	3,972,757
% REG	72.62%	69.09%	82.27%	78.60%	79.54%	80.03%
<b>MICHIGAN</b>						
Total VAP	6,947,000	6,983,000	7,072,000	7,266,000	7,358,000	7,480,000
Total Active		6,207,662	6,677,079	6,838,858	6,810,367	6,635,948
% Active		88.90%	94.42%	<b>94.12%</b>	92.56%	<b>88.72%</b>
Total Inactive				76,755	48,965	161,345
Total REG	6,147,083	6,207,662	6,677,079	6,915,613	6,859,332	6,797,293
% REG	88.49%	88.90%	94.42%	95.18%	93.22%	90.87%
<b>MINNESOTA</b> <i>(exempt from the NVRA)</i>						
Total VAP	3,272,000	3,362,000	3,422,000	3,483,000	3,547,000	3,768,000
Total Active		2,857,463	3,067,802	2,667,692	3,265,324	2,844,428
% Active		84.99%	89.65%	<b>76.59%</b>	92.06%	<b>75.49%</b>
Total Inactive						
Total REG	3,138,901	2,857,463	3,067,802	2,667,692	3,265,324	2,844,428
% REG	95.93%	84.99%	89.65%	76.59%	92.06%	75.49%
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>						
Total VAP	1,873,000	1,905,000	1,967,000	2,014,000	2,047,000	2,111,000
Total Active		1,625,640	1,731,852	1,729,200	1,496,414	1,683,928
% Active		85.34%	88.05%	<b>85.86%</b>	73.10%	<b>79.77%</b>
Total Inactive			94,101	77,918	243,444	181,454
Total REG	1,640,150	1,625,640	1,825,953	1,807,118	1,739,858	1,865,382
% REG	87.57%	85.34%	92.83%	89.73%	85.00%	88.36%
<b>MISSOURI</b>						
Total VAP	3,851,000	3,902,000	3,995,000	4,042,000	4,105,000	4,275,000
Total Active		2,952,642	3,342,849	3,240,657	3,415,236	3,391,153

<b>Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration</b>						
	<b>1992</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2002</b>
% Active		75.67%	83.68%	<b>80.17%</b>	83.20%	<b>79.33%</b>
Total Inactive				395,334	445,436	469,660
Total REG	3,067,955	2,952,642	3,342,849	3,635,991	3,860,672	3,860,813
% REG	79.67%	75.67%	83.68%	89.96%	94.05%	90.31%
<b>MONTANA</b>						
Total VAP	600,000	623,000	656,000	658,000	668,000	693,000
Total Active		514,051	590,751	494,763	512,516	<b>514,668</b>
% Active		82.51%	90.05%	<b>75.19%</b>	76.72%	<b>74.27%</b>
Total Inactive				144,478	185,744	109,880
Total REG	529,822	514,051	590,751	639,241	698,260	624,548
% REG	88.30%	82.51%	90.05%	97.15%	104.53%	90.12%
<b>NEBRASKA</b>						
Total VAP	1,164,000	1,192,000	1,211,000	1,231,000	1,234,000	1,290,000
Total Active		919,321	1,015,056	981,160	1,040,023	1,037,814
% Active		77.12%	83.82%	<b>79.70%</b>	84.28%	<b>80.45%</b>
Total Inactive				75,191	45,194	45,730
Total REG	951,395	919,321	1,015,056	1,056,351	1,085,217	1,083,544
% REG	81.73%	77.12%	83.82%	85.81%	87.94%	84.00%
<b>NEVADA</b>						
Total VAP	1,011,000	1,088,000	1,212,000	1,314,000	1,390,000	1,601,000
Total Active		625,842	722,608		762,884	869,801
% Active		57.52%	59.62%		54.88%	<b>54.33%</b>
Total Inactive			56,416		116,086	172,200
Total REG	649,913	625,842	779,318		878,970	1,042,001
% REG	64.28%	57.52%	64.30%		63.24%	65.08%
<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE (exempt from the NVRA)</b>						
Total VAP	838,000	843,000	871,000	890,000	911,000	967,000
Total Active		677,620	754,771	763,845	856,519	690,159
% Active		80.38%	86.66%	<b>85.83%</b>	94.02%	<b>71.37%</b>
Total Inactive						
Total REG	660,985	677,620	754,771	763,845	856,519	690,159
% REG	78.88%	80.38%	86.66%	85.83%	94.02%	71.37%
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>						
Total VAP	5,964,000	5,974,000	6,034,000	6,075,000	6,245,000	6,463,000
Total Active		3,905,435	4,111,031	4,126,782	4,266,216	4,194,089
% Active		65.37%	68.13%	<b>67.93%</b>	68.31%	<b>64.89%</b>
Total Inactive			198,789	406,470	447,329	387,773
Total REG	4,060,337	3,905,435	4,309,820	4,533,252	4,713,545	4,581,862
% REG	68.08%	65.37%	71.43%	74.62%	75.48%	70.89%
<b>NEW MEXICO</b>						

**Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration**

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002
Total VAP	1,121,000	1,167,000	1,224,000	1,250,000	1,263,000	1,355,000
Total Active		713,645	738,525	821,006	883,052	839,592
% Active		61.15%	60.34%	<b>65.68%</b>	69.92%	<b>61.96%</b>
Total Inactive			99,269	95,180	90,481	111,151
Total REG	706,966	713,645	837,794	916,186	973,533	950,743
% REG	63.07%	61.15%	68.45%	73.29%	77.08%	70.17%
<b>NEW YORK</b>						
Total VAP	13,705,000	13,646,000	13,564,000	13,590,000	13,805,000	14,544,000
Total Active		8,818,691	9,567,988	9,553,665	10,027,385	10,180,636
% Active		64.62%	70.54%	<b>70.30%</b>	72.64%	<b>70.00%</b>
Total Inactive			592,135	1,187,123	1,235,431	1,065,726
Total REG	9,193,391	8,818,691	10,160,123	10,740,788	11,262,816	11,246,362
% REG	67.08%	64.62%	74.91%	79.03%	81.59%	77.33%
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>						
Total VAP	5,190,000	5,364,000	5,519,000	5,685,000	5,797,000	6,251,000
Total Active		3,635,875	4,225,765	4,349,290	4,722,355	4,684,399
% Active		67.78%	76.57%	<b>76.50%</b>	81.46%	<b>74.94%</b>
Total Inactive			92,243	403,323	483,696	354,427
Total REG	3,817,380	3,635,875	4,318,008	4,752,613	5,206,051	5,038,826
% REG	73.55%	67.78%	78.24%	83.60%	89.81%	80.61%
<b>NORTH DAKOTA (exempt from the NVRA)</b>						
Total VAP	462,000	467,000	476,000	476,000	477,000	487,000
Total Active						
% Active						
Total Inactive						
Total REG						
% REG						
<b>OHIO</b>						
Total VAP	8,207,000	8,313,000	8,347,000	8,401,000	8,433,000	8,541,000
Total Active		6,250,545	6,842,272	6,058,808	6,514,723	6,377,144
% Active		75.19%	81.97%	<b>72.12%</b>	77.25%	<b>74.67%</b>
Total Inactive				1,055,497	830,071	733,757
Total REG	6,542,931	6,250,545	6,842,272	7,114,305	7,344,794	7,110,901
% REG	79.72%	75.19%	81.97%	84.68%	87.10%	83.26%
<b>OKLAHOMA</b>						
Total VAP	2,352,000	2,394,000	2,426,000	2,463,000	2,531,000	2,620,000
Total Active		1,706,194	1,985,535	1,737,229	1,736,490	1,687,477
% Active		71.27%	81.84%	<b>70.53%</b>	68.61%	<b>64.41%</b>
Total Inactive		337,398		320,944	502,748	384,689
Total REG	2,302,279	2,043,592	1,985,535	2,058,173	2,239,238	2,072,166
% REG	97.89%	85.36%	81.84%	83.56%	88.47%	79.09%

**Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration**

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002
<b>OREGON</b>						
Total VAP	2,220,000	2,311,000	2,411,000	2,484,000	2,530,000	2,666,000
Total Active		1,254,265	1,962,155	1,965,981	1,954,006	1,872,615
% Active		54.27%	81.38%	<b>79.15%</b>	77.23%	<b>70.24%</b>
Total Inactive		578,509	140,394	191,325	185,817	380,318
Total REG	1,775,416	1,832,774	2,102,549	2,157,306	2,139,823	2,252,933
% REG	79.97%	79.31%	87.21%	86.85%	84.58%	84.51%
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>						
Total VAP	9,161,000	9,212,000	9,197,000	9,118,000	9,155,000	9,472,000
Total Active		5,879,093	6,747,839	6,966,461	7,128,926	7,043,735
% Active		63.82%	73.37%	<b>76.40%</b>	77.87%	<b>74.36%</b>
Total Inactive			57,749	292,361	633,071	792,040
Total REG	5,993,002	5,879,093	6,805,612	7,258,822	7,781,997	7,835,775
% REG	65.42%	63.82%	74.00%	79.61%	85.00%	82.73%
<b>RHODE ISLAND</b>						
Total VAP	768,000	764,000	751,000	751,000	753,000	830,000
Total Active		552,638	602,692	629,786	665,424	617,125
% Active		72.33%	80.25%	<b>83.86%</b>	88.37%	<b>74.35%</b>
Total Inactive				3,169	6,188	55,825
Total REG	554,664	552,638	602,692	632,955	671,612	672,950
% REG	72.22%	72.33%	80.25%	84.28%	89.19%	81.08%
<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>						
Total VAP	2,669,000	2,740,000	2,771,000	2,886,000	2,977,000	3,128,000
Total Active		1,499,589	1,814,776	2,021,763	2,270,013	2,047,368
% Active		54.73%	65.49%	<b>70.05%</b>	76.25%	<b>65.45%</b>
Total Inactive		103,950	213,599	63,407	83,663	382,816
Total REG	1,537,140	1,499,564	1,814,777	2,085,170	2,353,676	2,430,184
% REG	57.59%	54.73%	65.49%	72.25%	79.06%	77.69%
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>						
Total VAP	505,000	522,000	535,000	538,000	543,000	565,000
Total Active		430,539	462,858	452,785	471,152	475,365
% Active		82.48%	86.52%	<b>84.16%</b>	86.77%	<b>84.14%</b>
Total Inactive			16,087	43,001	49,729	51,891
Total REG	448,292	430,539	478,945	495,786	520,881	527,256
% REG	88.77%	82.48%	89.52%	92.15%	95.93%	93.32%
<b>TENNESSEE</b>						
Total VAP	3,796,000	3,913,000	4,035,000	4,120,000	4,221,000	4,393,000
Total Active		2,693,003	3,011,195	3,057,008	3,181,108	3,134,104
% Active		68.82%	74.63%	<b>74.20%</b>	75.36%	<b>71.34%</b>
Total Inactive			86,141	187,254	219,379	320,423

<b>Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration</b>						
	<b>1992</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2002</b>
Total REG	2,726,449	2,693,003	3,097,336	3,244,262	3,400,487	3,454,527
% REG	71.82%	68.82%	76.76%	78.74%	80.56%	78.64%
<b>TEXAS</b>						
Total VAP	12,681,000	13,166,000	13,597,000	14,299,000	14,850,000	15,678,000
Total Active		8,641,848	9,551,191	9,582,505	10,267,639	10,334,773
% Active		65.64%	70.24%	<b>67.02%</b>	69.14%	<b>65.92%</b>
Total Inactive			989,487	1,955,730	2,097,596	2,228,686
Total REG	8,440,143	8,641,848	10,540,678	11,538,235	12,365,235	12,563,459
% REG	66.56%	65.64%	77.52%	80.69%	83.27%	80.13%
<b>UTAH</b>						
Total VAP	1,169,000	1,246,000	1,333,000	1,432,000	1,465,000	1,603,000
Total Active		921,981	1,070,586	1,045,071	1,120,761	1,118,175
% Active		74.00%	80.31%	<b>72.98%</b>	76.50%	<b>69.76%</b>
Total Inactive				112,159	183,474	194,287
Total REG	965,211	921,981	1,070,586	1,157,210	1,304,235	1,312,462
% REG	82.57%	74.00%	80.31%	80.81%	89.03%	81.88%
<b>VERMONT</b>						
Total VAP	429,000	429,000	445,000	448,000	460,000	477,000
Total Active		373,442	385,328	389,191	421,561	403,177
% Active		87.05%	86.59%	<b>86.87%</b>	91.64%	<b>84.52%</b>
Total Inactive				11,030	5,793	15,541
Total REG	383,371	373,442	385,328	400,221	427,354	418,718
% REG	89.36%	87.05%	86.59%	89.34%	92.90%	87.78%
<b>VIRGINIA</b>						
Total VAP	4,855,000	4,967,000	5,083,000	5,165,000	5,263,000	5,514,000
Total Active		3,000,560	3,180,862	3,470,660	3,824,676	3,840,484
% Active		60.41%	62.58%	<b>67.20%</b>	72.67%	<b>69.65%</b>
Total Inactive			140,910	255,261	270,511	375,586
Total REG	3,045,662	3,000,560	3,321,772	3,725,921	4,096,676	4,216,070
% REG	62.73%	60.41%	65.35%	72.14%	77.84%	76.46%
<b>WASHINGTON</b>						
Total VAP	3,812,000	4,000,000	4,115,000	4,257,000	4,368,000	4,556,000
Total Active		2,896,519	3,078,128	3,119,562	3,147,814	3,209,648
% Active		72.41%	74.80%	<b>73.28%</b>	72.07%	<b>70.45%</b>
Total Inactive			147,233	268,108	185,900	555,350
Total REG	2,814,680	2,896,519	3,225,361	3,387,670	3,333,714	3,764,998
% REG	73.84%	72.41%	78.38%	79.58%	76.32%	82.64%
<b>WEST VIRGINIA</b>						
Total VAP	1,376,000	1,389,000	1,417,000	1,406,000	1,416,000	1,413,000
Total Active		884,315	950,548	951,581	1,031,736	975,255

<b>Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration</b>						
	<b>1992</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2002</b>
% Active		63.67%	67.08%	<b>67.68%</b>	72.86%	<b>69.02%</b>
Total Inactive			20,197	56,230	34,613	85,637
Total REG	956,172	884,315	970,745	1,007,811	1,066,349	1,060,892
% REG	69.49%	63.67%	68.51%	71.68%	75.31%	75.08%
<b>WISCONSIN</b> (exempt from the NVRA)						
Total VAP	3,675,000	3,777,000	3,824,000	3,877,000	3,930,000	4,103,000
Total Active						
% Active						
Total Inactive						
Total REG						
% REG						
<b>WYOMING</b> (exempt from the NVRA)						
Total VAP	329,000	343,000	356,000	354,000	358,000	376,000
Total Active		337,863	228,554	230,360	220,012	241,200
% Active		98.50%	64.20%	<b>65.07%</b>	61.46%	<b>64.15%</b>
Total Inactive						
Total REG	234,260	337,863	240,711	230,360	220,012	241,200
% REG	71.20%	98.50%	67.62%	65.07%	61.46%	64.15%
<b>TOTALS FOR ALL STATES</b>						
Total VAP	189,529,000	193,650,000	196,498,000	200,929,000	205,815,000	215,473,000
Total Active		129,431,244	142,983,699	140,946,508	149,476,705	147,843,598
% Active		66.84%	72.77%	<b>70.15%</b>	72.63%	<b>68.61%</b>
Total Inactive		1,652,436	8,138,763	14,640,557	18,274,197	20,596,513
Total REG	133,801,584	130,979,705	151,122,462	156,685,527	167,750,902	168,440,111
% REG	70.60%	67.64%	76.91%	77.98%	81.51%	78.17%
<b>TOTALS FOR THE NVRA STATES</b>						
Total VAP	179,774,000	183,626,000	186,246,000	190,961,000	195,671,000	204,801,000
Total Active	0	124,559,053	136,791,845	136,623,178	144,406,765	143,388,276
% Active	0	67.83%	73.45%	<b>71.55%</b>	73.80%	<b>70.01%</b>
Total Inactive	0	1,652,436	8,138,763	14,640,557	18,274,197	20,596,513
Total REG	128,772,946	126,107,514	144,680,496	151,973,006	162,680,962	163,984,789
% REG	71.63%	68.68%	77.68%	79.58%	83.14%	80.07%

TABLE 2  
SOURCES OF VOTER REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS  
2001-2002

**Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 2001-2002**

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
<b>ALABAMA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	24,020	8.56%	616	2.56%	
By mail	73,863	26.33%	2,087	2.83%	
Public Assistance Offices	13,621	4.86%	796	5.84%	
Disability services	3,426	1.22%	130	3.79%	
Armed Forces Offices	694	0.25%	15	2.16%	
State Designated Sites	3,414	1.22%	180	5.27%	
All other sources	161,447	57.56%	4,054	2.51%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>280,485</b>		<b>7,878</b>	<b>2.81%</b>	<b>184,106</b>
<b>ALASKA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	46,946	22.33%	1,046	2.23%	
By mail	34,164	16.25%	1,562	4.57%	
Public Assistance Offices	102	0.05%	5	4.90%	
Disability services	38	0.02%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	2	0.00%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	6,761	3.22%	156	2.31%	
All other sources	122,229	58.14%	6,636	5.43%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>210,242</b>		<b>9,405</b>	<b>4.47%</b>	<b>54,121</b>
<b>ARIZONA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	88,160	14.23%	2,349	2.66%	
By mail	383,814	61.93%	12,297	3.20%	
Public Assistance Offices	9,351	1.51%	219	2.34%	
Disability services	3,311	0.53%	60	1.81%	
Armed Forces Offices	2,094	0.34%	159	7.59%	
State Designated Sites	27,709	4.47%	755	2.72%	
All other sources	105,295	16.99%	2,804	2.66%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>619,734</b>		<b>18,643</b>	<b>3.01%</b>	<b>267,066</b>
<b>ARKANSAS</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	91,471	37.59%	10,289	11.25%	
By mail	63,547	26.12%	4,712	7.41%	
Public Assistance Offices	8,623	3.54%	580	6.73%	
Disability services	812	0.33%	107	13.18%	
Armed Forces Offices	609	0.25%	16	2.63%	
State Designated Sites	8,428	3.46%	212	2.52%	
All other sources	69,826	28.70%	8,201	11.74%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>243,316</b>		<b>24,117</b>	<b>9.91%</b>	<b>132,087</b>

<b>Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 2001-2002</b>					
	<b>Number of Applications</b>	<b>Percent of Total Apps</b>	<b>Number of Duplicates</b>	<b>Percent Duplicates</b>	<b>Total New Registrations</b>
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	912,085	18.64%	174,075	19.09%	
By mail	2,221,735	45.40%	436,337	19.64%	
Public Assistance Offices	45,976	0.94%	1,719	3.74%	
Disability services	2,998	0.06%	147	4.90%	
Armed Forces Offices	3,278	0.07%	361	11.01%	
State Designated Sites	95,142	1.94%	8,472	8.90%	
All other sources	1,612,579	32.95%	128,234	7.95%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,893,793</b>		<b>749,345</b>	<b>15.31%</b>	<b>1,804,686</b>
<b>COLORADO</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	634,150	53.11%	56,332	8.88%	
By mail	230,234	19.28%	18,861	8.19%	
Public Assistance Offices	56,801	4.76%	800	1.41%	
Disability services	7,048	0.59%	400	5.68%	
Armed Forces Offices	231	0.02%	11	4.76%	
State Designated Sites	33,506	2.81%	1,114	3.32%	
All other sources	232,061	19.44%	6,907	2.98%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,194,031</b>		<b>84,425</b>	<b>7.07%</b>	<b>491,038</b>
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	44,160	11.47%	2,283	5.17%	
By mail	141,359	36.72%	3,509	2.48%	
Public Assistance Offices	11,603	3.01%	1,103	9.51%	
Disability services	374	0.10%	14	3.74%	
Armed Forces Offices	1,139	0.30%	8	0.70%	
State Designated Sites	11,825	3.07%	420	3.55%	
All other sources	174,510	45.33%	6,112	3.50%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>384,970</b>		<b>13,449</b>	<b>3.49%</b>	<b>431,417</b>
<b>DELAWARE</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	163,159	76.44%	34,595	21.20%	
By mail	45,724	21.42%	1,232	2.69%	
Public Assistance Offices	1,601	0.75%	103	6.43%	
Disability services	53	0.02%	2	3.77%	
Armed Forces Offices	43	0.02%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	2,872	1.35%	113	3.93%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>213,452</b>		<b>36,045</b>	<b>16.89%</b>	<b>42,789</b>

**Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 2001-2002**

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
<b>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	285,958	84.25%	15,550	5.44%	
By mail	29,680	8.74%	7,550	25.44%	
Public Assistance Offices	4,454	1.31%	116	2.60%	
Disability services	166	0.05%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	15	0.00%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	152	0.04%	25	16.45%	
All other sources	18,976	5.59%	526	2.77%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>339,401</b>		<b>23,767</b>	<b>7.00%</b>	<b>43,803</b>
<b>FLORIDA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	1,361,439	51.83%	17,871	1.31%	
By mail	615,420	23.43%	14,200	2.31%	
Public Assistance Offices	59,460	2.26%	1,966	3.31%	
Disability services	4,930	0.19%	103	2.09%	
Armed Forces Offices	853	0.03%	8	0.94%	
State Designated Sites	26,962	1.03%	593	2.20%	
All other sources	557,849	21.24%	8,671	1.55%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,626,913</b>		<b>43,412</b>	<b>1.65%</b>	<b>1,501,565</b>
<b>GEORGIA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	508,446	44.41%	81,233	15.98%	
By mail	307,865	26.89%	11,312	3.67%	
Public Assistance Offices	35,802	3.13%	2,127	5.94%	
Disability services	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	50	0.00%	28	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	61,474	5.37%	3,013	4.90%	
All other sources	231,196	20.19%	16,343	7.07%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,144,833</b>		<b>114,056</b>	<b>9.96%</b>	<b>420,635</b>
<b>HAWAII</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	47,810	23.90%	9,295	19.44%	
By mail	60,996	30.49%	6,281	10.30%	
Public Assistance Offices	277	0.14%	13	4.69%	
Disability services	465	0.23%	23	4.95%	
Armed Forces Offices	545	0.27%	67	12.29%	
State Designated Sites	1,746	0.87%	218	12.49%	
All other sources	88,236	44.10%	10,256	11.62%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>200,075</b>		<b>26,153</b>	<b>13.07%</b>	<b>53,536</b>

**Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 2001-2002**

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
<b>IDAHO</b>					
<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>					
<b>ILLINOIS</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	1,006,796	49.41%	71,946	7.15%	
By mail	234,499	11.51%	17,819	7.60%	
Public Assistance Offices	13,891	0.68%	1,792	12.90%	
Disability services	18,510	0.91%	2,093	11.31%	
Armed Forces Offices	371	0.02%	41	11.05%	
State Designated Sites	2,056	0.10%	283	13.76%	
All other sources	761,670	37.38%	49,579	6.51%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,037,793</b>		<b>143,553</b>	<b>7.04%</b>	<b>1,123,393</b>
<b>INDIANA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	192,823	38.88%	14,969	7.76%	
By mail	195,224	39.36%	4,796	2.46%	
Public Assistance Offices	13,281	2.68%	752	5.66%	
Disability services	1,183	0.24%	109	9.21%	
Armed Forces Offices	223	0.04%	27	12.11%	
State Designated Sites	15,766	3.18%	925	5.87%	
All other sources	77,464	15.62%	4,539	5.86%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>495,964</b>		<b>26,117</b>	<b>5.27%</b>	<b>257,097</b>
<b>IOWA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	350,738	36.75%	11,055	3.15%	
By mail	282,319	29.58%	2,091	0.74%	
Public Assistance Offices	9,655	1.01%	174	1.80%	
Disability services	955	0.10%	18	1.88%	
Armed Forces Offices	328	0.03%	3	0.91%	
State Designated Sites	1,238	0.13%	5	0.40%	
All other sources	309,265	32.40%	4,182	1.35%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>954,498</b>		<b>17,528</b>	<b>1.84%</b>	<b>269,224</b>
<b>KANSAS</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	144,644	42.39%	10,874	7.52%	
By mail	91,714	26.88%	12,848	14.01%	
Public Assistance Offices	4,661	1.37%	382	8.20%	
Disability services	664	0.19%	60	9.04%	
Armed Forces Offices	74	0.02%	20	27.03%	
State Designated Sites	3,555	1.04%	529	14.88%	
All other sources	95,922	28.11%	19,656	20.49%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>341,234</b>		<b>44,369</b>	<b>13.00%</b>	<b>158,425</b>

<b>Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 2001-2002</b>					
	<b>Number of Applications</b>	<b>Percent of Total Apps</b>	<b>Number of Duplicates</b>	<b>Percent Duplicates</b>	<b>Total New Registrations</b>
<b>KENTUCKY</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	657,798	50.60%	-	0.00%	
By mail	23,541	1.81%	-	0.00%	
Public Assistance Offices	27,269	2.10%	-	0.00%	
Disability services	2,390	0.18%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	73	0.01%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	8,340	0.64%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	580,684	44.66%	-	0.00%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,300,095</b>			<b>0.00%</b>	<b>220,232</b>
<b>LOUISIANA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	184,739	58.52%	15,245	8.25%	
By mail	65,253	20.67%	2,382	3.65%	
Public Assistance Offices	10,522	3.33%	603	5.73%	
Disability services	1,785	0.57%	57	3.19%	
Armed Forces Offices	124	0.04%	4	3.23%	
State Designated Sites	15,379	4.87%	316	2.05%	
All other sources	37,907	12.01%	116	0.31%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>315,709</b>		<b>18,723</b>	<b>5.93%</b>	<b>283,234</b>
<b>MAINE</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	106,294	47.02%	4,040	3.80%	
By mail	36,754	16.26%	920	2.50%	
Public Assistance Offices	7,839	3.47%	-	0.00%	
Disability services	68	0.03%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	2,668	1.18%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	72,458	32.05%	2,234	3.08%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>226,081</b>		<b>7,194</b>	<b>3.18%</b>	<b>111,452</b>
<b>MARYLAND</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	200,030	55.06%	25,995	13.00%	
By mail	85,310	23.48%	4,979	5.84%	
Public Assistance Offices	1,151	0.32%	34	2.95%	
Disability services	255	0.07%	15	5.83%	
Armed Forces Offices	71	0.02%	2	2.82%	
State Designated Sites	41,493	11.42%	2,261	5.45%	
All other sources	34,993	9.63%	1,586	4.53%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>363,303</b>		<b>34,872</b>	<b>9.60%</b>	<b>354,936</b>

**Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 2001-2002**

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	291,119	49.67%	-	0.00%	
By mail	180,282	30.76%	40,254	22.33%	
Public Assistance Offices	13,521	2.31%	1,108	8.19%	
Disability services	1,129	0.19%	98	8.68%	
Armed Forces Offices	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	985	0.17%	74	7.51%	
All other sources	99,090	16.91%	39,144	39.50%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>586,126</b>		<b>80,678</b>	<b>13.76%</b>	<b>586,126</b>
<b>MICHIGAN</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	1,294,133	88.91%	155,359	12.00%	
By mail	40,602	2.79%	5,971	14.71%	
Public Assistance Offices	30,127	2.07%	2,903	9.64%	
Disability services	5,259	0.36%	444	8.44%	
Armed Forces Offices	805	0.06%	165	20.50%	
State Designated Sites	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	84,690	5.82%	8,587	10.14%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,455,616</b>		<b>173,429</b>	<b>11.91%</b>	<b>845,092</b>
<b>MINNESOTA</b>	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>				
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	14,508	11.16%	2,265	15.61%	
By mail	44,724	34.39%	2,885	6.45%	
Public Assistance Offices	21,242	16.33%	1,682	7.92%	
Disability services	2,022	1.55%	56	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	-	0.00%	41		
State Designated Sites	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	47,550	36.56%	5,101	10.73%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>130,046</b>		<b>12,030</b>	<b>9.25%</b>	<b>156,754</b>
<b>MISSOURI</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	409,746	50.05%	17,247	4.21%	
By mail	90,631	11.07%	5,947	6.56%	
Public Assistance Offices	34,923	4.27%	1,617	4.63%	
Disability services	544	0.07%	16	2.94%	
Armed Forces Offices	462	0.06%	23	4.98%	
State Designated Sites	1,359	0.17%	111	8.17%	
All other sources	280,979	34.32%	31,855	11.34%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>818,644</b>		<b>56,816</b>	<b>6.94%</b>	<b>435,953</b>

**Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 2001-2002**

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
<b>MONTANA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	28,184	61.10%	366	1.30%	
By mail	9,996	21.67%	142	1.42%	
Public Assistance Offices	3,207	6.95%	105	3.27%	
Disability services	327	0.71%	44	13.46%	
Armed Forces Offices	41	0.09%	2	4.88%	
State Designated Sites	1,884	4.08%	65	3.45%	
All other sources	2,485	5.39%	346	13.92%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>46,124</b>		<b>1,070</b>	<b>2.32%</b>	<b>49,008</b>
<b>NEBRASKA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	114,287	45.77%	5,535	4.84%	
By mail	30,154	12.08%	861	2.86%	
Public Assistance Offices	2,527	1.01%	344	13.61%	
Disability services	668	0.27%	32	4.79%	
Armed Forces Offices	217	0.09%	55	25.35%	
State Designated Sites	57	0.02%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	101,770	40.76%	802	0.79%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>249,680</b>		<b>7,629</b>	<b>3.06%</b>	<b>122,485</b>
<b>NEVADA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	49,630	24.25%	-	0.00%	
By mail	37,589	18.37%	-	0.00%	
Public Assistance Offices	39,444	19.28%	-	0.00%	
Disability services	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	28,268	13.81%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	49,707	24.29%	-	0.00%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>204,638</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>163,031</b>
<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE</b>	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>				
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	71,318	10.36%	8,288	11.62%	
By mail	47,403	6.89%	7,971	16.82%	
Public Assistance Offices	11,611	1.69%	928	7.99%	
Disability services	1,344	0.20%	213	15.85%	
Armed Forces Offices	1,327	0.19%	11	0.83%	
State Designated Sites	339,156	49.29%	31,513	9.29%	
All other sources	215,962	31.38%	5,734	2.66%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>688,121</b>		<b>54,658</b>	<b>7.94%</b>	<b>481,846</b>

**Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 2001-2002**

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
<b>NEW MEXICO</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	5,731	3.02%	122	2.13%	
By mail	69,889	36.87%	9,471	13.55%	
Public Assistance Offices	3,719	1.96%	14	0.38%	
Disability services	480	0.25%	4	0.83%	
Armed Forces Offices	264	0.14%	4	1.52%	
State Designated Sites	4,456	2.35%	20	0.45%	
All other sources	105,016	55.40%	24,637	23.46%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189,555</b>		<b>34,272</b>	<b>18.08%</b>	<b>128,736</b>
<b>NEW YORK</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	738,044	28.48%	128,955	17.47%	
By mail	1,546,170	59.67%	-	0.00%	
Public Assistance Offices	164,924	6.36%	31,354	19.01%	
Disability services	9,137	0.35%	1,068	11.69%	
Armed Forces Offices	81	0.00%	4	4.94%	
State Designated Sites	26,169	1.01%	2,613	9.99%	
All other sources	106,585	4.11%	301,086	282.48%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,591,110</b>		<b>465,080</b>	<b>17.95%</b>	<b>1,140,922</b>
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	430,541	59.20%	11,885	2.76%	
By mail	75,574	10.39%	16,044	21.23%	
Public Assistance Offices	23,781	3.27%	21	0.09%	
Disability services	2,557	0.35%	75	2.93%	
Armed Forces Offices	336	0.05%	19	5.65%	
State Designated Sites	9,453	1.30%	203	2.15%	
All other sources	184,989	25.44%	13,120	7.09%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>727,231</b>		<b>41,367</b>	<b>5.69%</b>	<b>727,231</b>
<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>				
<b>OHIO</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	454,598	31.33%	39,396	8.67%	
By mail	284,332	19.60%	37,441	13.17%	
Public Assistance Offices	24,391	1.68%	2,304	9.45%	
Disability services	1,122	0.08%	144	12.83%	
Armed Forces Offices	247	0.02%	45	18.22%	
State Designated Sites	100,911	6.96%	4,580	4.54%	
All other sources	585,208	40.34%	43,126	7.37%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,450,809</b>		<b>127,036</b>	<b>8.76%</b>	<b>698,309</b>

**Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 2001-2002**

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
<b>OKLAHOMA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	135,417	25.78%	552	0.41%	
By mail	148,136	28.20%	1,088	0.73%	
Public Assistance Offices	9,633	1.83%	102	1.06%	
Disability services	89	0.02%	1	1.12%	
Armed Forces Offices	5	0.00%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	1,443	0.27%	5	0.35%	
All other sources	230,529	43.89%	1,779	0.77%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>525,252</b>		<b>3,527</b>	<b>0.67%</b>	<b>244,103</b>
<b>OREGON</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	192,810	24.18%	13,169	6.83%	
By mail	267,930	33.60%	19,838	7.40%	
Public Assistance Offices	53,538	6.71%	4,914	9.18%	
Disability services	1,928	0.24%	702	36.41%	
Armed Forces Offices	-	0.00%	39		
State Designated Sites	2,010	0.25%	1,222	60.80%	
All other sources	279,081	35.00%	2,405	0.86%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>797,297</b>		<b>42,289</b>	<b>5.30%</b>	<b>278,707</b>
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	610,879	53.06%	102,705	16.81%	
By mail	302,504	26.27%	11,226	3.71%	
Public Assistance Offices	16,207	1.41%	1,496	9.23%	
Disability services	1,640	0.14%	124	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	860	0.07%	76	8.84%	
State Designated Sites	7,922	0.69%	248	0.00%	
All other sources	211,334	18.36%	15,206	7.20%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,151,346</b>		<b>131,081</b>	<b>11.39%</b>	<b>1,047,162</b>
<b>RHODE ISLAND</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	18,907	18.59%	239	1.26%	
By mail	8,741	8.59%	164	1.88%	
Public Assistance Offices	2,240	2.20%	28	1.25%	
Disability services	684	0.67%	3	0.44%	
Armed Forces Offices	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	71,158	69.95%	573	0.81%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>101,730</b>		<b>1,007</b>	<b>0.99%</b>	<b>48,632</b>

**Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 2001-2002**

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	113,649	47.21%	-	0.00%	
By mail	83,926	34.86%	-	0.00%	
Public Assistance Offices	16,253	6.75%	-	0.00%	
Disability services	2,946	1.22%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	77	0.03%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	23,882	9.92%	-	0.00%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>240,733</b>			<b>0.00%</b>	<b>241,087</b>
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	4,755	3.86%	164	3.45%	
By mail	26,342	21.38%	554	2.10%	
Public Assistance Offices	9,020	7.32%	882	9.78%	
Disability services	664	0.54%	115	17.32%	
Armed Forces Offices	264	0.21%	19	7.20%	
State Designated Sites	3,021	2.45%	51	1.69%	
All other sources	79,147	64.24%	6,801	8.59%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>123,213</b>		<b>8,586</b>	<b>6.97%</b>	<b>69,043</b>
<b>TENNESSEE</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	158,151	25.86%	6,627	4.19%	
By mail	230,632	37.71%	6,549	2.84%	
Public Assistance Offices	52,373	8.56%	2,450	4.68%	
Disability services	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	1,446	0.24%	49	3.39%	
State Designated Sites	24,264	3.97%	714	2.94%	
All other sources	144,682	23.66%	1,900	1.31%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>611,548</b>		<b>18,289</b>	<b>2.99%</b>	<b>412,384</b>
<b>TEXAS</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	2,530,120	58.30%	254,049	10.04%	
By mail	1,246,686	28.73%	69,439	5.57%	
Public Assistance Offices	97,644	2.25%	6,807	6.97%	
Disability services	8,618	0.20%	542	6.29%	
Armed Forces Offices	7,211	0.17%	1,031	14.30%	
State Designated Sites	109,703	2.53%	6,359	5.80%	
All other sources	339,931	7.83%	23,113	6.80%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,339,913</b>		<b>361,340</b>	<b>8.33%</b>	<b>2,165,586</b>

**Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 2001-2002**

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
<b>UTAH</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	134,096	40.56%	11,024	8.22%	
By mail	54,664	16.53%	2,992	5.47%	
Public Assistance Offices	3,750	1.13%	93	2.48%	
Disability services	520	0.16%	31	5.96%	
Armed Forces Offices	315	0.10%	67	21.27%	
State Designated Sites	30,493	9.22%	611	2.00%	
All other sources	106,775	32.30%	8,840	8.28%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>330,613</b>		<b>23,658</b>	<b>7.16%</b>	<b>147,655</b>
<b>VERMONT</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	3,482	22.37%	689	19.79%	
By mail	3,642	23.40%	-	0.00%	
Public Assistance Offices	143	0.92%	-	0.00%	
Disability services	3	0.02%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	62	0.40%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	626	4.02%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	7,607	48.87%	-	0.00%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15,565</b>		<b>689</b>		<b>22,119</b>
<b>VIRGINIA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	998,948	81.08%	138,279	13.84%	
By mail	111,533	9.05%	6,681	5.99%	
Public Assistance Offices	15,817	1.28%	1,836	11.61%	
Disability services	1,048	0.09%	67	6.39%	
Armed Forces Offices	825	0.07%	55	6.67%	
State Designated Sites	6,083	0.49%	986	16.21%	
All other sources	97,775	7.94%	4,505	4.61%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,232,029</b>		<b>152,409</b>	<b>12.37%</b>	<b>792,923</b>
<b>WASHINGTON</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	171,688	35.71%	12,029	7.01%	
By mail	192,187	39.97%	15,155	7.89%	
Public Assistance Offices	13,067	2.72%	613	4.69%	
Disability services	157	0.03%	7	4.46%	
Armed Forces Offices	94	0.02%	55	58.51%	
State Designated Sites	660	0.14%	33	5.00%	
All other sources	102,980	21.42%	8,441	8.20%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>480,833</b>		<b>36,333</b>	<b>7.56%</b>	<b>440,887</b>

<b>Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 2001-2002</b>					
	<b>Number of Applications</b>	<b>Percent of Total Apps</b>	<b>Number of Duplicates</b>	<b>Percent Duplicates</b>	<b>Total New Registrations</b>
<b>WEST VIRGINIA</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
By mail	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
Public Assistance Offices	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
Disability services	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	53,289
<b>WISCONSIN</b>	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>				
<b>WYOMING</b>	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>				
<b>UNITED STATES</b>					
Motor Vehicle Offices	16,026,407	42.77%	1,468,602	9.16%	
By mail	10,357,284	27.64%	826,448	7.98%	
Public Assistance Offices	999,042	2.67%	74,885	7.50%	
Disability services	92,317	0.25%	7,124	7.72%	
Armed Forces Offices	54,024	0.14%	2,530	4.68%	
State Designated Sites	1,038,269	2.77%	68,885	6.63%	
All other sources	8,906,351	23.77%	827,850	9.30%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>37,473,694</b>		<b>3,276,324</b>	<b>8.74%</b>	<b>19,703,912</b>

TABLE 3  
DELETIONS FROM VOTER REGISTRATION LISTS  
2001-2002

**Table 3 - Deletions from Voter Registration Lists 2001-2002**

	Number of Confirmation Notices Sent	Number of Responses Received	Percent	Number Deleted from Active List	Number Deleted from Inactive List	Number of Other Deletions *	Total Number Deleted
ALABAMA	1,294,924			157,679	72,544		230,223
ALASKA	81,582	37,778	46.31%				
ARIZONA	2,952,748	564,748	19.13%	106,425	86,089		192,514
ARKANSAS				51,623	28,751		80,374
CALIFORNIA	1,508,358	599,886	39.77%	674,395	694,736	87,168	1,456,299
COLORADO	481,465	108,130	22.46%	158,734	159,209		317,943
CONNECTICUT	331,362	103,507	31.24%	128,318	45,034	16,064	189,416
DELAWARE	23,209	12,272	52.88%	25,019			25,019
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	145,021	3,371	2.32%	15,457	34,031		49,488
FLORIDA	803,418	146,403	18.22%	979,763			979,763
GEORGIA	836,158	74,430	8.90%	389,906	168,039		557,945
HAWAII	55,180	9,479	17.18%		20,354		20,354
IDAHO	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>						
ILLINOIS	493,170	130,522	26.47%	167,382	538,099	2,829	708,310
INDIANA	219,916	23,360	10.62%	84,438			84,438
IOWA	191,869	12,534	6.53%	130,151	82,358		212,509
KANSAS	204,197	68,903	33.74%	134,156			134,156
KENTUCKY	78,225	3,013	3.85%	159,946	37,833		197,779
LOUISIANA	368,718	76,132	20.65%		75,915	178,570	254,485
MAINE	44,098	13,382	30.35%		100,704	100,704	100,704
MARYLAND	249,267				193,076		193,076
MASSACHUSETTS	429,072	30,611	7.13%	310,907	289,547		600,454
MICHIGAN	192,718	31,373	16.28%	638,048			638,048
MINNESOTA	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>						
MISSISSIPPI	210,563	84,730	40.24%			144,264	144,264
MISSOURI	461,245	215,599	46.74%	294,636	93,226		387,862
MONTANA	81,696	16,719	20.46%	13,386	27,592		40,978
NEBRASKA	83,245	37,515	45.07%	124,158			124,158
NEVADA	122,927	15,401	12.53%	130,067	38,581		168,648
NEW HAMPSHIRE	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>						
NEW JERSEY	476,462	127,436	26.75%	196,330	188,118	43,539	427,987
NEW MEXICO	91,969	23,525	25.58%	47,938	56,057		103,995
NEW YORK	1,138,392	484,494	42.56%			1,105,195	1,105,195
NORTH CAROLINA	494,425	139,998	28.32%	335,628	229,919		565,547
NORTH DAKOTA	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>						
OHIO	1,021,102	287,345	28.14%	1,187,524			1,187,524

**Table 3 - Deletions from Voter Registration Lists 2001-2002**

	Number of Confirmation Notices Sent	Number of Responses Received	Percent	Number Deleted from Active List	Number Deleted from Inactive List	Number of Other Deletions *	Total Number Deleted
OKLAHOMA	300,300	36,746	12.24%	111,512	296,441		407,953
OREGON	291,682	84,404	28.94%	97,281	115,634		212,915
PENNSYLVANIA	875,013	82,973	9.48%	316,802	208,373		525,175
RHODE ISLAND	18,813	3,507	18.64%	50,952			50,952
SOUTH CAROLINA	413,792	243,819	58.92%		176,721		176,721
SOUTH DAKOTA	52,718	3,280	6.22%	36,137	18,874		55,011
TENNESSEE	299,202	79,383	26.53%	223,049	135,295		358,344
TEXAS	1,830,165	292,868	16.00%	467,115	377,133		844,248
UTAH	374,086	29,658	7.93%			62,559	62,559
VERMONT	19,615	4,074	20.77%	21,465			21,465
VIRGINIA	432,494	14,273	3.30%	304,590	113,784		418,374
WASHINGTON	367,962	108,045	29.36%	245,044	92,973		338,017
WEST VIRGINIA	127,662	42,025	32.92%	33,444	25,302		58,746
WISCONSIN	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>						-
WYOMING	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>						-
UNITED STATES	20,570,205	4,507,651	21.91%	8,549,405	4,526,562	1,933,968	15,009,935

\* Number deleted that does not distinguish between active and inactive deletions

TABLE 4  
COMPLETENESS OF NUMERICAL DATA REPORTED  
2001-2002

**Table 4 - Completeness of Numerical Data Reported 2001-2002**

<b>ALABAMA</b>	Data are incomplete because, though all counties reported data during the covered time period, not all counties reported all of their data for the covered time period.
<b>ALASKA</b>	Data are complete
<b>ARIZONA</b>	Data are complete
<b>ARKANSAS</b>	Data are incomplete because there is no automated process provided to the counties to obtain data on confirmation notices and responses. While all counties reported, several counties integrated new voter registration systems and in some cases are unable to extract all the requested information for specific timeframes. Also, some systems do not allow retrieval of specific information, such as the source of duplicated registrations. Some counties have not tracked the number of deletions and some systems will not allow for the retrieval of the requested information.
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>	
<b>COLORADO</b>	Data are complete
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>	Data are incomplete because the town of Shelton, CT did not respond to written request or follow-up telephone calls.
<b>DELAWARE</b>	Data are complete
<b>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</b>	Data are complete
<b>FLORIDA</b>	Data are complete
<b>GEORGIA</b>	Data are complete
<b>HAWAII</b>	Data are complete

**Table 4 - Completeness of Numerical Data Reported 2001-2002**

IDAHO	<i>is exempt from the NVRA.</i>
ILLINOIS	Data are incomplete because Washington County experienced severe problems with running the report. GVS is the vendor and at the time of this report, they were still working on the problem.
INDIANA	Data are incomplete because Benton County and Union County, Indiana, reported total numbers of voter registration applications processed, but due to computer software problems were unable to retrieve data to report the numbers of applications received from each type of voter registration agency or other source.
IOWA	Data are complete
KANSAS	Data are complete
KENTUCKY	Data are complete
LOUISIANA	Data are incomplete because the statewide computer system counts all changes made to a record regardless of the reason or source. At this time the system cannot distinguish between active and inactive voters one they have been cancelled due to other various reasons.
MAINE	Data are incomplete because two of the 519 jurisdictions, Brighton Twp. and Cannon Twp., failed to report their data. The Municipal Registrars are unable to identify duplicate registrations from specific sources because, except for DMVs, the same State form is used for all registration venues in order to protect the confidentiality of applicants who receive some form of assistance. The State does not ask municipalities to distinguish between "active list" and "inactive list" deletions.
MARYLAND	Data are incomplete because the local election boards in Maryland do not report deletions or removals from the "Active" or "Inactive" rolls. The data is simply reported as a deletion on the monthly voter registration activity report.
MASSACHUSETTS	Data are incomplete because the system used for processing voter registrations from motor vehicle offices does not specify the number of duplicates. The State did not receive voter registration information from Armed Forces recruiting offices.

**Table 4 - Completeness of Numerical Data Reported 2001-2002**

<b>MICHIGAN</b>	Data are incomplete because 567 of the 1,514 jurisdictions did not report information.
<b>MINNESOTA</b>	<i>is exempt from the NVRA.</i>
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>	Data are incomplete because 81 of 82 counties provided either incomplete data or none at all.
<b>MISSOURI</b>	Data are complete
<b>MONTANA</b>	Data are incomplete because 4 of the 56 counties did not report. A number of the counties indicated that they could not find the data requested. Some jurisdictions that reported indicated that their numbers were incomplete, generally due to turnover in office personnel.
<b>NEBRASKA</b>	Data are complete
<b>NEVADA</b>	Data are incomplete because one of the 16 jurisdictions, Eureka County, was unable to report data as all voter registration records were seized from their office by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on November 18, 2002. As of March 28, 2003, those records had not been returned to the County Clerk's office. Due to software problems, thirteen jurisdictions were unable to report the numbers of new valid registrations, the number of responses received by mail and the number of registrants deleted from the list.
<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE</b>	<i>is exempt from the NVRA.</i>
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>	Data are complete
<b>NEW MEXICO</b>	Data are complete
<b>NEW YORK</b>	Data are complete
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>	Data are complete

**Table 4 - Completeness of Numerical Data Reported 2001-2002**

<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>	<i>is exempt from the NVRA.</i>
<b>OHIO</b>	Data are complete
<b>OKLAHOMA</b>	Data are complete Data are incomplete because one of the 10 jurisdictions did not report data. The State cited a difference in procedures for being unable to process information available from the Armed Forces recruiting offices. Also, the number of new registrations listed in question #5 is based on Oregon's "sweeps week" surveys from each county - 4 weeks spaced out over the year
<b>OREGON</b>	- and the total is extrapolated from these figures.
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>	Data are complete
<b>RHODE ISLAND</b>	Data are incomplete because one jurisdiction did not submit a report for each month as required by the State of Rhode Island.
<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>	Data are complete
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>	Data are incomplete because all jurisdictions reported but some were missing one or more of the requested data elements.
<b>TENNESSEE</b>	Data are complete
<b>TEXAS</b>	Data are incomplete because 4 of 254 jurisdictions consistently fail to report. The total voter registration for these counties is less than 1 percent of the total registered voters of the state. Data are incomplete because several counties have experienced technical difficulties transmitting the data to the state. A few others converted to new systems and were unable to input data due to training issues. In addition, only eight counties in the state report active voters and the remaining 21 counties do not distinguish between active and inactive voters. Therefore, the number of active voters is skewed.
<b>UTAH</b>	
<b>VERMONT</b>	Data are incomplete because 105 of the 246 jurisdictions did not submit information survey by the required date.

**Table 4 - Completeness of Numerical Data Reported 2001-2002**

<b>VIRGINIA</b>	Data are complete
<b>WASHINGTON</b>	Data are complete. (Note: The "duplicates" data provided for public assistance agencies, agencies serving persons with disabilities, and other agencies designated by the State are computed by percentage of total applications.)
<b>WEST VIRGINIA</b>	Data are incomplete because voter registration totals were not separated by active and inactive voters for reporting purposes. Due to data conversion issues, accurate application totals from each agency was not available. The State has 55 counties and all 55 are included in the total registration figures. However, some counties did not report the numbers of new valid registrations, the number of responses received by mail and the number of registrants deleted from the list.
<b>WISCONSIN</b>	<i>is exempt from the NVRA.</i>
<b>WYOMING</b>	<i>is exempt from the NVRA.</i>