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Alabama

| PB Cast | PB Counted | Percent counted | Provisional Vote/Total
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6560</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All data in the tables are drawn from information in the Election Day Survey, Chapter 6, and the Electionline document “Election Reform Briefing 10: Solution or Problem? Provisional Ballots in 2004.”

This was the first general election in which Alabama allowed full provisional ballots to be cast, switching from a previous affidavit ballot system that had allowed voters whose names were not on the rolls to cast a ballot if they signed an affidavit to verify their identity and registration status. The number of ballots cast was unusually low for a state without a statewide voter registration database. The percentage counted put Alabama in the bottom quarter of the country. It did not count ballots cast outside the correct precinct. Ballots were verified by county election boards that checked the registration and address reported on the provisional ballot.

The percent counted in the general election was much lower than in the primary elections held earlier in the year, in which about half of the provisional ballots were counted. The general election also had more than 6 times as many provisional ballots cast as the primaries. Provisional ballots were supposed to be distributed if the voter had applied for an absentee ballot but not received it, lacked valid ID (not photo ID necessarily), was not on the registration rolls, or was challenged by a poll watcher.

The percentage of provisional ballots counted was lower in urban counties, such as Jefferson County (Birmingham), than in rural counties. Areas with the greatest concentration of African-American voters were less likely than other areas to have provisional ballots counted.\(^1\) Problems with access to provisional ballots were concentrated in Birmingham and Montgomery, affecting blacks and students most severely.\(^2\) The cause of these problems seems to have been that newly registered voters were not always listed on the current rolls.

The only outcome that appears to have depended on provisional ballots was the vote on proposed Amendment 2. This effort to strike segregation-era provisions from the state constitution failed, by a margin smaller than the number of provisional ballots.\(^3\) If a higher percentage of provisional ballots had been counted, the likelihood of the amendment’s passage would have increased dramatically.

Election officials received specific training in how to handle and count provisional ballots.\(^4\) Whether this training will be provided regularly in the future remains to be determined. Alabama had a very efficient system whereby voters could see if their vote counted, using a toll-free number that has results within 10 days, much faster than in most other states. But this notification system is based solely on policy and depends heavily on efficient county officials; it has no legal backing to make sure that it continues in other elections.

---

1 Birmingham News (Alabama), November 13, 2004 Saturday, LOCAL NEWS; Pg. 11A, “JEFFCO ELECTION OFFICIALS REJECT 84% OF PROVISIONAL BALLOTS”
2 See http://www.flcv.com/alabama.html
3 The Associated Press State & Local Wire, November 5, 2004, “Provisional count next week could determine Amendment 2”
4 Birmingham News (Alabama), October 24, 2004 Sunday, NEWS, 388 words, METRO BRIEFS
Elections in Alaska allow what are called “questioned ballots,” similar to the provisional ballots mandated by HAVA. This practice is not new, giving Alaska an experience different from other states that are new to fail-safe forms of voting. Alaska led the nation in provisional balloting in two different ways: It had the highest percentage of provisional ballots cast, as those ballots accounted for 7.2% of the total votes in the state. Provisional ballots were counted at the highest rate in the country, 97% of those cast. This is nearly 30 percent higher than the national average of 68%. Alaska probably had such a high percentage of provisional ballots cast because it has a fairly strict ID regime. It requires all voters to show one of the HAVA-approved forms of identification, at the polling place in order to cast a regular ballot. The application of ID requirements to all voters means that those without ID will boost the number of provisional ballots cast by properly registered voters who failed to bring their ID with them. This ID requirement can be waived if the polling place workers know the voter.

Provisional ballots are available to a wide range of individuals. Anyone without ID can cast a provisional ballot, even if the voter is not in the proper precinct. These ballots are sent to a bipartisan review board that determines if the voter was registered in the state and if the signature on the ballot matches the signature on record. After the review board verifies the ballots, the Elections Division informs the voter if the vote counted by a hotline within 30 days of the election and by letter within 60 days. (This notification system will change by the 2006 midterm elections, when a website will be used to inform voters if their votes were counted.) Any vote cast within the correct jurisdiction, defined quite broadly in this state that lacks counties, is eligible to be counted. Nevertheless, the state made precinct verification possible through the Elections Division’s website in an attempt to minimize the difficulty of having people vote outside their correct precinct. It also informed voters of ID requirements in an attempt to reduce questioned voting. Even outside the precinct, voter registration could still be verified through the state’s voter registration database.

States with statewide registration databases might be expected to have recourse to fewer provisional ballots because the process of on-the-spot verification would be more efficient. In Alaska, this was not the case because the ID regime seems to trump the efficiency of a database. Provisional balloting attracted almost no media coverage inside the state, suggesting that the process lacked controversy. This is probably attributable either to the high percentage of votes counted or because provisional balloting was not new for the 2004 election.
Arizona was fourth in the nation in provisional ballots cast, and, at 3.66%, third in the portion of its total vote. The state counted 73% of the provisional ballots cast, second highest among states with a statewide voter registration database and third highest among states that disqualified votes cast outside the correct precinct. The Number of provisional ballots is probably large because of its large Hispanic population. The Election Day Study found that “predominantly Hispanic jurisdiction had the highest rate of casting provisional ballots.\(^5\)

Provisional ballots were given to voters whose names were not on the registration rolls at the polling location. They are later verified by confirming the voter’s registration information and polling location as printed on the ballot envelope.

The state website disseminated little information about provisional voting, the state’s ID requirements (not photo), or the location of precincts. Groups like the National Council of La Raza and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund informed Latino voters about provisional opportunities. The League of United Latin American Citizens sued after the election seeking to have votes cast in the incorrect precinct counted. It lost in U.S. District Court.\(^6\)

The electoral system in Arizona is changing dramatically with the passage of Proposition 200, which modifies the state’s voter ID laws. Passed in November 2004, it requires all voters to provide identification before voting. The Proposition did not exempt provisional ballots from this requirement. Provisional voters in the future will have to display ID in order to cast something less than a regular ballot.

The state Attorney General delayed implementing the law because he believed that it violated federal voting regulations like HAVA and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, under which certain Arizona counties receive greater scrutiny for failing part of the Section 4 formula that determines “covered jurisdictions” under Section 5.\(^7\) Nevertheless, the Department of Justice approved the bill’s ID measures, saying that it did not violate the VRA by placing minority groups, 25.3% Latino, 5% American Indian, and 25.9% that speak a language other than English at home, in a worse position that they had been previous to its enactment, the so-called non-retrogression principle. The Governor vetoed a later bill to implement the law, saying that the bill violated HAVA’s provisional ballot clauses. An agreement has finally been reached. It exempts Native Americans from the new ID requirements, but all other voters, including provisional voters, must produce ID.\(^8\)

---

\(^{5}\) See Election Day Survey, Chapter 6, p. 10.
\(^{6}\) League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) v. Arizona Secretary of State Jan Brewer
\(^{7}\) The Section 4 Formula, as described by the US Department of Justice, [http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/voting/sec_5/about.htm](http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/voting/sec_5/about.htm). “The first element in the formula was that the state or political subdivision of the state maintained on November 1, 1964, a “test or device,” restricting the opportunity to register and vote. The second element of the formula would be satisfied if the Director of the Census determined that less than 50 percent of persons of voting age were registered to vote on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 percent of persons of voting age voted in the presidential election of November 1964.” Amendments since the original passage of the bill have updated the dates used to decide which jurisdictions receive stricter scrutiny.
Arkansas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7675</td>
<td>3678</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arkansas had no statewide registration database, counted ballots cast outside the proper precinct, and was not new to provisional voting. The state’s election website provided information about provisional balloting, but it did not describe the state’s ID requirements (non-photo). Nor could voters verify their registration or find their proper polling place on the website.

The state’s low percentage of ballots counted might suggest problems in the system. Pulaski County (Little Rock) is the state’s most populous. Its supply of provisional ballots did not arrive until a short time before the election. The county then ran out of provisional ballots on Election Day. Similar problems of timing and resources affected other counties. Arkansas left notification about whether or not provisional votes counted up to the individual counties.

---

9 Pulaski County without provisional ballots, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, October 20, 2004, Wednesday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 570 words, By JAMES JEFFERSON, Associated Press Writer, LITTLE ROCK
10 Provisional ballots provide bump in otherwise smooth voting in state, Arkansas Democrat-Gazette (Little Rock), November 3, 2004 Wednesday, ARKANSAS, 1396 words, BY CHARLIE FRAGO ARKANSAS DEMOCRAT-GAZETTE
California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent Counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66,408</td>
<td>491,765</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California’s provisional ballots made up approximately 1/3 of the total cast in the country. They accounted for 3.96% of the total votes cast in the state, second highest in the country behind Alaska. Its Percent Counted was 6% higher than the national average, which put it in the top quarter of states without a statewide voter registration database.

Reliance on provisional ballots was heavy for several reasons.

- The registration deadline was only 15 days before the election (in previous years it had been 29 days). The short time between the close of registration and the election would have stretched the capacity of election officials to handle the paperwork and increased the number of voters left off registration rolls.\(^{11}\) Since California lacks a statewide voter registration database, poll workers unable to verify registration would have to give out provisional ballots.
- The state counted votes cast outside the correct precinct, likely increasing counting rates.
- The large Latino population was well-informed about the possibilities of provisional voting and took advantage of the opportunity.\(^{12}\)
- Local poll workers received training at the county level.\(^{13}\) That the training process was overhauled after the election indicates that it may have proved insufficient. State officials have now created stricter standards for poll worker training.

Counties were responsible for notifying voters if their provisional votes were counted. The California elections website informed voters about the possibilities of provisional voting, a system that was not new in California, and helped voters verify their precinct location. Nevertheless, state law still required that provisional ballots cast in an incorrect precinct be counted so long as they were within the proper county.

The state had only minimal ID requirements, asking only for the HAVA-mandated identification for first-time voters who did not present it while registering, though this requirement was not spelled out on the state’s elections website. Similarly, because of the lack of a registration database, voters were incapable of verifying their registration before going to the polls through a website.

Since the election, demands for election reform have been few (the state is consumed by the debate over redistricting). In San Diego there is an effort to tighten voter ID laws, a move initiated by the former mayor.\(^{14}\)

---

\(^{11}\) [http://www.ss.ca.gov/elections/ror_102102.htm](http://www.ss.ca.gov/elections/ror_102102.htm)

\(^{12}\) See Election Day Survey, Chapter 6, p. 10, which states that “predominantly Hispanic jurisdictions had the highest rate of casting provisional ballots.”

\(^{13}\) [http://www.igs.berkeley.edu/library/htPollWorkerTraining.html](http://www.igs.berkeley.edu/library/htPollWorkerTraining.html)

\(^{14}\) Horn cites border fence in wide-ranging speech; State of N. County address pulls in 150, The San Diego Union-Tribune, March 4, 2005 Friday, ZONE; Pg. NC-3; NI-3, 327 words, Daniel J. Chacon, STAFF WRITER, VALLEY CENTER
Colorado

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent Counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51,477</td>
<td>39,163</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The counting rate in Colorado ranks it fifth among states without a statewide registration database and places it solidly above the national average. Provisional ballots accounted for 1.84% of the total vote, in the top quarter nationwide.

Provisional ballots were open to voters who were not on the registration rolls. The lack of a registration database made it impossible to verify registration at the polling place. The provisional ballot was also open to first-time voters who lacked proper ID. Notification about ballot status was left up to individual counties.

Colorado used a new provisional balloting system in 2004, replacing an older system in which provisional ballots could be obtained under limited circumstances, essentially for voters who had recently moved. Colorado required provisional ballots be cast in the correct precinct. The state elections website provided information about provisional ballots and the state’s ID requirements (non-photo), but did not help voters confirm their correct polling place. The website made a critical mistake about the state’s ID requirements, presenting the registration ID requirements for first-time voters as stricter than they in fact were.\(^\text{15}\) Despite the accessibility of information, the election was fraught with uncertainty and suspicion.

A poll taken a week before the November election found that 46% of those surveyed considered voter fraud likely.\(^\text{16}\) One voter in five thought it likely his vote would not be counted. One in three thought she would be prevented from voting by legal technicalities. Contributing to this uncertainty were well-publicized reports that the official training manual for election judges had been released only one week before the election, after approximately half of all poll workers had been trained.\(^\text{17}\) This atmosphere of anxiety and suspicion led to discussion of election reform measures after the election. In fact, the system seems to have worked well in the November 2004 elections.\(^\text{18}\)

\(^\text{15}\) STATE’S VOTER REGISTRATION FORM CONTAINS ERROR ON ID REQUEST, Rocky Mountain News (Denver, CO), October 2, 2004 Saturday Final Edition, NEWS; Pg. 18A, 276 words, Julie Poppen, Rocky Mountain News

\(^\text{16}\) MANY COLORADO VOTERS FEAR FRAUD; ELECTION CONFIDENCE SHAKY, POLL SHOWS, Rocky Mountain News (Denver, CO), November 1, 2004 Monday Final Edition, NEWS; Pg. 4A, 847 words, Charlie Brennan, © 2004, Rocky Mountain News

\(^\text{17}\) Poll judges confused about rules Some observers say the state’s standards on voter IDs and provisional ballots are not being followed. The Denver Post, October 27, 2004 Wednesday, FINAL EDITION, A SECTION; Pg. A-07, 799 words, Susan Greene, Denver Post Staff Writer

\(^\text{18}\) EDITORIAL: Boost for election credibility, The Denver Post, June 12, 2005 Sunday, FINAL EDITION, PERSPECTIVE; Pg. E-06, 271 words
Connecticut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connecticut’s low percentage of provisional votes counted puts it into the lower half of states with statewide registration databases. Provisional ballots accounted for a small percentage of the final vote, in the bottom third nationwide. The 2004 general election was Connecticut’s first attempt at a provisional voting system. The state’s website provided voters with information about the new system and also explained the state’s ID requirement (non-photo).

Voters given provisional ballots are required to sign an affidavit that they are registered and are the person they are claiming to be. In this way, the Connecticut system resembles affidavit voting systems, formerly used in Alabama, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, and Texas. Provisional ballots are given to voters whose names do not appear on registration rolls. If the provisional ballots are cast outside the correct precinct, they are not counted. The validation process involves acceptance of the affidavit’s veracity by election officials after it is compared to state registration records. A toll-free phone can be used to determine if a ballot was counted.

Elections in Connecticut are centralized. Counties have no role and cities and towns are merely distributors of ballots. This system makes HAVA primarily relevant to the state government, while local administrators are not concerned with the federal legislation except as it is interpreted for them by state officials. Inconsistent application of procedures across jurisdictions is not an issue in Connecticut.
Delaware was last in the country in percentage of provisional ballots counted and third lowest in the country in the number cast. Delaware’s statewide registration database minimized the number of people who needed provisional ballots and it was accurate enough to increase the likelihood that those who did receive them were not actually registered. Delaware counted provisional ballots cast outside the correct precinct. The state’s elections website provided information about provisional voting and helped voters find their precinct. It did not explain the state’s ID requirements (non-photo) nor did it allow voters to verify registration, odd in a state with a statewide database.

The statewide voter registration database reduced the number of people who received provisional ballots because they were not of local rolls. Thus most of those who voted were, in fact, not actually registered. Their votes were not counted.
The District counted a high percentage of provisional ballots cast, placing it third in the country among areas with voter registration databases. These ballots accounted for 3.51% of the total vote, fourth in the nation. D.C. counted provisional ballots cast outside the correct precinct.

Provisional ballots were distributed to voters not on the rolls, voters in the hospital, voters who could not get absentee ballots, and others who were similarly disadvantaged. The District had one of the most comprehensive elections websites in the country, with a wealth of information to help voters. The site spelled out provisional balloting, even though the system was not new in DC. It allowed voters to verify their registration, possible because of the registration database, and helped voters find their precincts. By combining all of this information in one place, it is no surprise that DC could have so many voters who were knowledgeable enough to obtain provisional ballots and fill them out in such a way as to avoid disqualification.

Ballots were evaluated verifying the registration information listed on the provisional ballot envelope. Voters could check the DC elections website to discover if their vote was counted.
Florida counted provisional ballots at the seventh lowest rate of states without a voter registration database. Among states that disqualified ballots cast in the wrong precinct, it was much closer to the median. The state’s disqualification of votes cast in improper precincts came after a lengthy court battle over the definition of “jurisdiction.” Its elections website informed voters of the state’s photo ID requirement, but it did not provide information about provisional voting or give voters the ability to verify registration or locate the precinct in which they were required to vote.

Provisional ballots were given to first-time voters without ID, voters not on registration rolls, and challenged voters, a sizable demographic in this battleground state. The County Canvass Board of each county used signature matching to verify provisional ballots against registration records. Voters were then informed by these same boards as to the status of their provisional ballot, though how this was done varied from county to county.

Election reform efforts in Florida are inextricably tied up with views about the 2000 election. As questions about purge lists and voting machines dominated the headlines, those issues became critical in the passage of HAVA. At the same time, the provisional ballot system that did exist in Florida prior to HAVA attracted little attention as to why it did not serve as a fail-safe for registered voters whose name did not appear on the rolls. Florida experienced much litigation leading up to the 2004 election. This litigation, much more than legislation, shaped Florida’s voting rules by delineating the counting principles that would apply across the state. Among other rules, this litigation caused courts to rule that voters in an incorrect precinct were entitled to a provisional ballot, but they were not entitled to have it counted.

---

20 Advocacy organizations continue to object to the resolution of this litigation. See [www.aclu.org/Files/getFile.cfm?id=16802](http://www.aclu.org/Files/getFile.cfm?id=16802)
Georgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12893</td>
<td>3839</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though Georgia counted ballots cast outside the correct precinct, its number of provisional ballots counted is low. It has a voter registration database. Among similar states, Georgia’s 30% counting rate is only slightly below the median, but it is next to last among states that count provisional ballots cast outside the correct precinct. Provisional ballots made up .12% of the total vote in Georgia, below the national median.

Georgia, a state using provisional ballots for the first time, counted provisional ballots by verifying the information given by voters on sworn affidavits signed at the polling precinct. Voters were then informed by county officials if their vote counted. The reliance on the counties increased the variety of notification procedures across the state. The state had an informative elections website, helping voters verify registration, locate precincts, and discover the states ID requirements (non-photo).

Despite little evidence of complaints about vote fraud in 2004, the state enacted tighter ID requirements. These new standards gave Georgia one of the highest ID barriers in the nation by requiring all voters to show government-issued photo ID in order to vote. This new law is now awaiting pre-clearance by the Department of Justice’s Civil Rights Division. This clearance process is opposed by a variety of groups that represent minorities, including NAACP and MALDEF, individual rights groups like the ACLU, and labor unions, including the AFL-CIO.

---

22 Perdue signs ID bill; Justice Department will review matter, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, April 23, 2005 Saturday, Home Edition, Pg. 1B; 701 words, SONJI JACOBY, CARLOS CAMPOS
23 Foes rip passage of voter ID bill, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, April 1, 2005 Friday, Home Edition, Pg. 1D; 542 words, SONJI JACOBS, CARLOS CAMPOS
Hawaii's percent counted was second lowest in the nation. Provisional ballots accounted for .01% of the total vote in the state, also second lowest nationwide. Hawaii has a voter registration database. It did not count provisional ballots cast outside the correct precinct. Provisional balloting is new to Hawaii. Hawaii’s elections website did not provide easily accessible information about provisional balloting, though it did explain the state’s photo ID requirements and helped voters find their precinct.

Those who cast a provisional ballot in Hawaii were not on the rolls or were first-time voters that did not meet the HAVA ID requirements. These voters filled out an affidavit to attest to their identity and registration status. Officials then verified these affidavits with the state’s registration database in order to see which votes should count. Voters could call a phone number to see if their vote counted. Only 25 were counted out of the 346 cast. Hawaii’s database was effective in limiting the number of provisional ballots cast. One factor that surprisingly did not raise the percent counted in the state was the confluence of the ID requirement with provisional ballots. Though the state required photo ID from voters, those who lacked ID could vote provisionally, without the requirement to return later and show ID. In this situation, it appears that the success of the database in solving provisional ballot-inducing problems ahead of time trumps the state’s leniency about voters returning later with the proper identification required to cast a regular ballot.
Illinois

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43464</td>
<td>22167</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illinois’ number of provisional ballots cast was just out of the top 10 nationwide. Illinois was a first-time provisional ballot state, it lacked a statewide voter registration database, and it counted provisional ballots cast outside the correct precinct. Verification standards that were easier to meet than those employed by many other states probably encouraged poll workers to be more helpful in passing out provisional ballots. The state’s elections website also offered information about provisional ballots, and voters could visit the site to determine if their ballots had been counted.

Illinois used affidavits in the verification process, allowing vote counters to check the information about which the voter had sworn in order to count the vote. Voters could check a website to determine if their votes counted.

Illinois offers an instructive lesson in the relationship between ID requirements and allegations of fraud. East St. Louis has generated voting-related criminal conspiracy convictions, while Chicago remains plagued with accusations that the dead continue to be politically active. Nevertheless, state ID requirements remain lax, only asking for HAVA requirements for first-time voters, requiring other voters to sign in. For a state lacking a registration database, the possibilities of multiple voting seem high. Provisional ballots have not been linked to fraud in Illinois; the relatively low percent counted makes them appear, at least on the surface, to be relatively secure.

---

24 Voting problems alive, well in heart of Illinois, The Pantagraph (Bloomington, Illinois), January 11, 2005 Tuesday, EDITORIAL; Pg. A8, 346 words
Indiana lacked a statewide database and did not count ballots cast outside the correct precinct, which held down the verification rate. Provisional ballots are new to Indiana. The state’s website provided little information for voters, especially about the state’s new provisional voting system or the state’s ID requirements.

Provisional ballots were given to those not on registration rolls or lacking ID. Also, those who lacked identification were required to return to the precinct later. The ballots of all those who did not return were disqualified automatically. After returning with ID, voters then had to have their registration verified, through comparison with local records. At this point, Indiana provisional voters were able to call a toll-free phone number in order to discover if their ballot had been counted. Since the election, the state has overhauled parts of its system related to voter identification, though the basic provisional ballot structure remains intact.

The state has adopted a requirement of photo ID.25

---

25 Daniels signs voter ID bill; ICLU plans lawsuit, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, April 28, 2005, Thursday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 350 words, INDIANAPOLIS
Iowa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15406</td>
<td>8038</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iowa’s percent counted was near the median for states without a voter registration database and slightly above the median for states that disqualified ballots cast outside the correct precinct. Iowa enacted provisional voting before the passage of HAVA. The state’s elections website provided information about provisional voting and ID requirements, but the lack of registration database made it impossible for voters to verify their registration or find their polling place online.

Provisional ballots were chiefly available to voters not on the registration rolls, though challenged voters, relatively common in this battleground state, also could vote provisionally. Provisional voters brought ID later in order for their ballots to count, if they were first-time voters who still needed to provide ID. They were then notified by mail if the ballot had been counted.

Iowa can be considered a fairly typical state, representative of most procedures and most outcomes nationally.
Kansas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45563</td>
<td>31805</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provisional Vote/Total Vote 2.68

Kansas’ percent counted placed it fifth among states that did not count votes cast outside the correct precinct. It was also in the top ten among states that did not have a statewide voter registration database. Provisional ballots accounted for 2.68% of the final vote, sixth in the nation. All of the states with higher percentages were also states that previously had provisional systems.

Provisional ballots in Kansas were widely distributed, going to first-time voters without ID, those not on registration rolls, voters who recently moved or changed names, challenged voters, and others. Provisional voters in Kansas who lacked ID were required to return to the polling place later with proper identification. After the ballots had been tallied, counties contacted provisional voters in their own way; there was no unified notification system across the state. Given the wide distribution of provisional ballots to a range of voters who give all appearances of proper registration, it is not surprising that Kansas had so many provisional ballots, nor is it unusual that such a high percentage were part of the final tally.

On the whole, questions of ID and provisional voting attracted little attention in Kansas, and for that matter, most of the Midwest is unconcerned with the issue. The lack of close presidential races in states like Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma is a possible explanation of this unconcern.
Kentucky

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1494</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kentucky’s percent counted and the percentage of the final vote accounted for by provisional ballots both ranked near the bottom in the nation, fifth and sixth lowest respectively. For Kentucky, provisional balloting is a slight switch, as the state shifted away from an affidavit voting system after HAVA. Also after HAVA, the state created a statewide voter registration database. It chose not to count provisional ballots cast outside the correct precinct. The state’s election website allowed voters to determine where the correct precinct was, also allowing voters to verify registration and gain information about provisional voting procedures.

Provisional ballots only went to the HAVA-mandated primary target, voters not on registration rolls. The statewide registration database meant that these voters were likely never registered, and the process’ results back that conclusion. The state still used affidavits in the verification process, making its provisional balloting system similar to what was previously in place. The state informed voters about the status of their provisional ballots through a website.
Louisiana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5971</td>
<td>2411</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The low number of provisional ballots and the relatively low percentage counted places Louisiana toward the middle of states with a statewide voter registration database. Provisional ballots made up .12% of the final vote in the state, slightly below the national median. The state’s elections website located precincts and gave information about provisional voting, but it did not describe the state’s photo ID requirement.

Provisional ballots went to those not on the rolls and to first-time voters without ID. Officials later verified these voters’ date-of-birth and address to determine identity and vote status. After the counting ended, voters could call a phone number to find out if their vote counted.

The Secretary of State predicted before the election that most provisional votes would not be counted.26 The election in New Orleans was characterized as a “catastrophe.”27 Problems mostly centered around inoperable voting machines, but there were also charges that poll workers told all first-time voters had to vote provisionally. These charges were raised by Louisiana Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, ACORN, and the Election Protection Coalition.

---

26 McKeithen: most provisional ballots won't count, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, November 1, 2004, Monday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 644 words, By BRETT MARTEL, Associated Press Writer, NEW ORLEANS
27 Nov. 2 N.O. election called 'catastrophe', New Orleans CityBusiness (New Orleans, LA), November 15, 2004 Monday, NEWS, 1091 words, Richard A. Webster
Maryland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48936</td>
<td>31860</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percent counted put the state almost exactly at the national average, though slightly below the average for states that had did not have registration databases and counted votes cast outside the correct precinct. Provisional balloting was not new to Maryland, further distinguishing it from the one-third of states that began the procedure in 2004. The state’s elections website disseminated information about provisional voting and identification.

First-time voters without ID and those not on the rolls could vote provisionally. These voters were required to return later with ID for their vote to count. They could check the website or call a phone number to learn if their provisional ballot counted or not.
## Massachusetts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10060</td>
<td>2319</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state had a voter registration database and did not count votes cast outside the correct precinct. 2004 was the state’s first attempt at provisional balloting. The state’s elections website provided information about provisional voting and gave voters the means to verify the location of precincts.

Massachusetts administers elections from the top-down. HAVA implementation is decided exclusively at the state level, removing counties completely from the process. This system is common throughout New England. Uniformly election administration increases consistency across the state. Provisional ballots went to voters whose names were not on registration rolls, though the database helped to limit the number somewhat. Provisional voters filled out an affidavit, whose information was later compared with the database. Voters could call a phone number to determine if their vote counted or not.

Massachusetts was one of the many states that did not have much public discussion about provisional voting.
Michigan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5610</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Michigan had the voter registration database that inspired the HAVA requirement, and it recently switched from affidavit balloting to provisional balloting in fail-safe situations. It did not count provisional ballots cast outside the correct precinct, surviving court challenges that sought to change the counting standards for the state.

Provisional voters were required to return to polling places later with ID and were notified by mail if their ballots counted or not. Michigan’s system had two striking features, one of the nation’s best databases and an outstanding website.

Michigan’s voter registration database, known as the Qualified Voter File, was conceived in 1994, under Public Act 441, as an answer to the highly decentralized registration process in the state. Implemented in time for the 1998 midterm elections, the system was intended to serve five goals (as stated by Secretary of State Candice S. Miller):

- “The elimination of all duplicate voter registration records in the system.
- The streamlining of the state's voter registration cancellation process.
- The elimination of time-consuming record maintenance activities.
- The elimination of registration forwarding errors and duplicative tasks.
- Sizable cost gains on the local level.”

For comparison, Louisiana, despite a much smaller population and a similar database, had 5,971 ballots cast. Because local officials can more easily and accurately determine voter registration, the number of provisional ballots cast is lowered instantly. This database served as the model for the HAVA requirement of databases in each state and was awarded by the CalTech/MIT Voting Technology Project as the Best Practice in Managing Voter Registration.

On September 5, 2002, Michigan unveiled its path-breaking Voter Information Center. This built upon previous efforts to create a statewide voter registration database, allowing the public to access voter registration information, precinct and polling locations, and other crucial election resources through a single source. By combining all of these features, the Michigan website allows voters to know that mail-in registration was received, to overcome the difficulties of locating the correct polling place, and to access information about races that are being decided in the election. Because of this central location for information, Michigan considers it acceptable to disqualify provisional ballots cast outside the correct precinct, assuming that voters should not have nearly as much difficulty determining their correct precinct as do those in other states.

---

29 http://www.vote.caltech.edu/media/documents/july01/Best_Practices.pdf
Mississippi did not report its provisional vote totals. Though the state has had public and contentious debates about voter ID requirements, its provisional voting has flown beneath the radar. There has been no vocal Republican-Democratic split on the issue, as has been true with ID, nor has there been a similar Governor-Legislature clash. Instead, provisional voting in Mississippi has gone unnoticed, and its non-reporting of vital statistics has drawn no press. Rather, the state stands as a large blank spot in national coverage of the issue, and until numbers allow some insight into the process’ successes and failures, we are unable even to speculate about what really happened on Election Day in Mississippi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25,975</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Cannot be known</td>
<td>Cannot be known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 Special sessions appear to fuel dissension at Capitol; srb/stf/ew, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, November 22, 2004, Monday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 563 words, By SHELIA HARDWELL BYRD, Associated Press Writer
Missouri did not have a statewide voter registration database, and it did not count provisional ballots cast in an incorrect precinct. It was using provisional ballots for the first time, complying with the newly established HAVA requirements. The state’s election website provided information about provisional voting and voter ID requirements, though voters could not verify their registration status or easily locate their polling place.

Provisional ballots were given out to first-time voters who lacked ID (the state had a non-photo ID requirement) and to voters who were not on the registration rolls. After the provisional ballots had been cast, officials checked a voter’s registration records to determine if the ballot should count. Voters could call a toll-free phone number to find out if his or her vote counted. Considering the state’s percent counted, surprisingly low in a state without a database but in line with the correct precinct standard, most of the phone calls revealed that the ballot did not count in the final tally.

Accusations of vote fraud have lingered in Missouri – particularly concerning St. Louis - since the 2000 election, when several figures involved in the city’s electoral administration were convicted of conspiracy to commit vote fraud. These problems have created calls for electoral reform, particularly from Republican officials in the state.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8183</td>
<td>3292</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

31 VOTER RIGHTS AND VOTER FRAUD, St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri), May 24, 2002 Friday Five Star Lift Edition, EDITORIAL; Pg. C18.
Montana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Montana used provisional voting only lightly. The state did not have a voter registration database, nor did it count votes cast outside the correct precinct. The state was using provisional ballots for the first time. Its elections website gave voters information about the state’s ID requirements, though it did not provide precinct locations, give a mechanism for verifying registration status, nor provide information about the new provisional voting system.

Provisional ballots are given to voters who are not on the registration rolls, are challenged, or chose not to vote absentee despite applying for the ballots. County officials then verify the voter’s registration, and the voter must bring ID later. After the verification process, the state informed voters by mail if their provisional ballots counted or not.

Montana has recently shifted to an Election Day registration system. This change aligns Montana with Wisconsin, Wyoming, Idaho, Maine, New Hampshire, and Minnesota. These EDR states have different approaches to provisional balloting. Idaho, New Hampshire, and Minnesota are exempt completely under Section 302(a)(5) of HAVA, while the other three allow provisional voting under some narrow circumstances but are still basically exempt. The federal government has not yet indicated into which category Montana will fall.
Nebraska

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17003</td>
<td>13298</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nebraska’s provisional ballots made up an unusually high percentage of the final vote for a state that disqualified provisional ballots cast in an incorrect precinct. The state also lacked a voter registration database, which tends to increase the number of ballots cast provisionally. The current system replaced an earlier limited provisional ballot system. Its elections website provided little information for voters, especially about provisional voting and ID requirements and did not offer information to verify registration or determine precinct locations.

Provisional ballots went to those who were not on the registration rolls. The high percentage counted implies that a great number of registration errors had been made by elections officials in the state, especially since votes in the wrong precinct were automatically disqualified. The state requires provisional voters to complete an affidavit which is verified in order to determine if a vote should count. Voters can check the status of their votes through either a website or a phone number.
**Nevada**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6154</td>
<td>2447</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevada was new to provisional balloting, having no similar system before HAVA. The state lacked a registration database and did not count votes cast outside the correct precinct. Its elections website did not give easy access to information about the new provisional voting system or about the state’s ID requirements. Similarly, voters could not verify their registration nor locate their precinct.

Provisional votes went to first-time voters without ID and to those not on registration rolls. These voters filled out an affidavit in order to cast a provisional ballot. The affidavit was later verified to determine if the ballot should be counted. Voters could either call a phone number or check the state’s website to find out if their vote counted.

Nevada has passed election reform measures since November 2004, trying to correct public perceptions of a flawed process.\(^{32}\) The state is trying to learn from its mistakes in its first attempt with provisional ballots. The new reforms hope to finish the creation of the HAVA-mandated database, decrease the number of provisional ballots via pre-emptive use of the database, and inject confidence into the counting process by clarifying verification procedures. The state has not emphasized questions of ballot security, arguing that the current system already did a good job sifting out those who were not actually registered. (In the case of Las Vegas, the problem was sorting out large numbers of out-of-state tourists who attempted to vote locally.)

---

\(^{32}\) Nevada committees take up election reform, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, May 5, 2005, Thursday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 636 words, By ELIZABETH WHITE, Associated Press Writer, CARSON CITY, Nev
New Jersey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64217</td>
<td>35485</td>
<td>55.26</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state was extending and revamping an earlier provisional system. It lacked a registration database and did not count ballots cast in an incorrect precinct. The state’s elections website contained information on ID requirements and provisional voting, though it did not allow voters to verify registration or locate precincts.

Provisional ballots were given to first-time voters without ID and voters whose names were not on local registration rolls. Provisional voters brought ID later in order for their votes to count. After the counting process ended, voters could check a website or call a phone number in order to discover if their vote counted or not.

Complaints were reported in both Essex and Middlesex Counties, home to two of Rutgers University’s campuses. Students argued that their registrations, completed in recent campus drives, had not been processed by elections officials in a timely manner, shunting many students to provisional ballots. In response to these problems, some have called for Election Day Registration in New Jersey. As of yet, EDR has not generated reform bills in the state legislature.

New Mexico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15360</td>
<td>8767</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Mexico’s percentage of ballots cast provisionally places it in the top third in the nation. The state counted votes cast outside the correct precinct, after changing its previous policy following a suit brought by Latino civil rights groups, most prominently the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund.\(^{35}\) The state had a voter registration database and was following in a previous tradition of provisional balloting. New Mexico’s elections website explained the state’s ID requirements and how provisional balloting worked, emphasizing how open the possibility was to voters who lacked other options.

Provisional ballots were offered to voters left off registration rolls and to first-time voters who could not meet the HAVA ID requirement. Provisional voters were required to bring ID later in order to verify their ballots. Voters could then call a phone number to discover if their ballot counted or not.

Since the election, the state has passed an important election reform bill.\(^{36}\) This new act tightens up the state’s ID requirements, requiring voters to either present a driver’s license, a bank statement, or recite their name, date of birth, and last four digits of their social security number. Opponents of the legislation argued that it did not go far enough to insure ballot security. Supporters responded that the measure was sufficient to guarantee the integrity of the ballot without denying access to those less likely to be able to produce photo identification. This bill was passed in response to complaints about the counting of provisional ballots after the election. By front-loading the ID process, state elections officials hope to avoid future complaints by preempting possibilities of later partisan manipulation.


\(^{36}\) Gov. Signs Voting Standards Bill, Albuquerque Journal (New Mexico), April 7, 2005 Thursday, FINAL; Pg. C3, 424 words, Andy Lenderman Journal Politics Writer
New York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>243450</td>
<td>98003</td>
<td>40.30</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Yorkers cast the second highest number of provisional ballots in the nation, though the percentage of the final vote only ranked fifth. The state did not have a voter registration database and did not count votes cast outside the correct precinct. New York was not new to provisional balloting, having had a fail-safe system before HAVA. The elections website provided little information to voters, especially about provisional voting possibilities and voter identification.

Provisional ballots went to first-time voters without ID, voters not on rolls, and those who had recently moved. These voters filled out affidavits that were later verified by elections officials. The verification rate was probably low because of the exclusion of votes cast in an incorrect precinct, a particular problem in New York City. With multiple polling places in a single large room, voting in an incorrect precinct was a common occurrence. The state website did not make it easy to verify precinct location. After the provisional votes were counted, voters received mail reporting if their provisional ballot counted.

New York’s provisional ballots received extra attention in a state Senate race in Westchester County.37 After months of litigation, the election was settled, but the attention to provisional ballots did not die away. Likely election reform to clarify verification rules and solve public outcry about the precinct requirement is imminent. Though proposals have not yet passed, New York is likely to change its election laws in response to the experience in 2004.

---

37 Three months after Election Day, Spano is sworn in again as senator, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, February 9, 2005, Wednesday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 724 words, By JOEL STASHENKO, Associated Press Writer
North Carolina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77469</td>
<td>42348</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state lacked a voter registration database, but it did count votes cast outside the correct precinct. Of course, legal developments since the November election make the above facts and figures somewhat debatable because of arguments about rules for counting provisional ballots. As the state struggled with the issue of counting out-of-precinct provisional ballots, the number counted listed above is open to revision. The state’s elections website allowed voters to verify registration and locate precincts, although it did not disseminate information about provisional ballots or identification requirements.

North Carolina’s electoral system was the subject of a major suit about how provisional ballots should be counted. The state’s Supreme Court argued that pre-Election Day law required ballots cast in incorrect precincts be disqualified, while the state legislature demurred. The suit arose because a race fell within the margin of provisional ballots cast, allowing questions to be raised that would otherwise have been ignored given a larger margin of victory. The race in question was for the position of State Superintendent of Schools, a race was finally decided in favor of Democratic candidate June Atkinson.38 The state legislature took the position that eventually secured Atkinson’s victory by counting provisional ballots cast in an incorrect precinct39, while the state Supreme Court backed the disqualification of those ballots.40 This debate over separation of powers, the integrity of the electoral process, and the independence of the courts, raises questions about how robust the North Carolina system is. Simply put, the November election has two sides in North Carolina, and neither can even agree on what happened, let alone how it should be interpreted. In a state where the counting of provisional ballots is widely reported to have varied from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, the resulting unequal and fraud-ridden election should not be any surprise.

Ohio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent Counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158,642</td>
<td>123,548</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ohio did not have a statewide voter registration database, and --after several court tests-- did not count ballots cast outside the voter’s assigned precinct. The state adopted a new provisional voting system after the passage of HAVA to replace its previously limited provisional system. Its elections website provided information about provisional balloting and ID requirements, information circulated heavily by third-parties in get-out-the-vote efforts in this most contentious of battleground states.

Provisional ballots in Ohio went to voters whose names did not appear on registration rolls. These ballots were verified by county elections officials checking registration records to see if the voter was ever actually registered. Voters were able to call a phone number in order to determine if their ballots were counted.

The vote in Ohio was the subject of much litigation. Before the election, litigation challenged procedures for counting provisional ballots cast outside the correct precinct and the status of poll observers. Hanging over all of this was the lingering shadow of *Bush v. Gore* and its holding that states must have uniform counting procedures. In the critical case of *Sandusky County Democratic Party v. Blackwell*, a federal circuit court ruled that voters could cast a provisional ballot in an incorrect precinct, but the ballot did not have to be counted. The court heavily deferred to state prerogatives to determined what constituted an eligible ballot in that state. This provided the basis for the position already advocated by Secretary of State Kenneth Blackwell, the plaintiff, who opposed counting provisional ballots cast in an improper precinct. HE was also the subject of other controversy because of his close ties to the Bush campaign.

Since the election, the League of Women Voters has filed a suit that seeks changes in the state’s electoral machinery. As a result of the controversies and scrutiny in 2004, Ohio is likely to experience changes in its elections procedures, but the nature of those changes is still unclear.

Ohio was the target of accusations of vote fraud from the right and voter suppression from the left. The American Center for Voting Rights released a report alleging voter fraud in Cleveland and Columbus, the two most Democratic urban centers in the state. At the same time the Democratic Party released a report arguing that inequities in the distribution of voting machines and other problems put “democracy at risk.” Despite the allegations, the controversy has so far been limited to an exchange of charges and suspicions that has lacked conclusive evidence.

---

42 [http://www.ac4vr.com/reports/072005/default.html](http://www.ac4vr.com/reports/072005/default.html)
43 [http://a9.g.akamai.net/7/9/8082/v001/www.democrats.org/pdfs/ohvireport/fullreport.pdf](http://a9.g.akamai.net/7/9/8082/v001/www.democrats.org/pdfs/ohvireport/fullreport.pdf)
Oklahoma counted provisional ballots at the third lowest rate in the nation. These ballots constituted a low enough percentage of the final vote to place the state in the bottom ten nationally. Oklahoma has a voter registration database, and it did not count votes cast outside the correct precinct. The state was new to provisional balloting in 2004. The elections website provided information only about the state’s ID requirements, not helping voters verify registration status, locate precincts, nor did it explain the details of the new system of provisional voting.

Provisional ballots were given to first-time voters without proper ID and people not on local registration rolls. The state’s database helped keep the latter group to a minimum. After the ballots were cast, elections officials verified registration status using the database, and voters can call a phone number to learn if their ballot counted. The preemptive usage of the database probably means that most callers, because they were never really registered, would have discovered that their provisional ballots did not contribute to the final tally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2615</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oregon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8298</td>
<td>7077</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provisional votes were tallied at the second highest percentage in the nation. Oregon lacked a registration database, but it did count votes cast outside the correct precinct. The Oregon system continued its earlier versions of provisional voting.

Provisional ballots in Oregon are unusual because the state uses an all-mail voting system. Provisional ballots, then, are even more of an exception in the state than they are elsewhere. Laws in Oregon open provisional voting up widely, allowing first-time voters without ID, challenged voters, voters not on the rolls, voters who applied for absentee ballots, and others to vote provisionally. Voters must go to the county elections office in order to cast a provisional ballot. Verification involved a simple signature comparison between ballot envelopes and records. Voters learned by calling a phone number if their vote counted.

Oregon is an interesting example of provisional ballots in an uncommon electoral environment. With an all-mail voting system, the need for fail-safe forms of voting seems less likely; after all, voters are already able to avoid problems with finding the correct polling place and the ability to cast a ballot without being on a particular polling place’s registration roll. But in the end, a state dependent on the mail, and the attendant problems of voters losing ballots, needs more than most a “fail-safe” outlet. Provisional voting in Oregon suffices to cover a great host of voting sins by allowing voters to correct their mistakes on Election Day.
Pennsylvania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53698</td>
<td>26092</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state had some failed attempts with a voter registration database that are discussed below, attempts that both increased the numbers of ballots cast provisionally while decreasing the number counted. The state did count votes cast outside the correct precinct. Pennsylvania, as its struggles with the implementation of HAVA made clear, was new to fail-safe voting after the passage of HAVA. The state’s election website did provide information about the new system, and it provided information about the state’s ID requirements, which were only the HAVA minimums.

Pennsylvania voters were given provisional votes if their names were not on registration rolls, though the state’s database was supposed to fix this problem. Its failure in the election has led to broad calls for reform since the election, and it increased provisional vote totals in the state. It also probably decreased turnout in Philadelphia where the system had its biggest problems, making the entire voting process in the city slower than in other regions of the state. But nonetheless, if provisional voters were able to vote, officials would verify their registration by comparing the envelope’s information with the state’s database. Voters could call a phone number to find out if their vote counted.

Pennsylvania began its push toward a statewide voter registration database in 2001. In June 2001, the Statewide Uniform Registry of Electors (SURE) was passed in reaction to the Florida controversy of 2000. Pennsylvania had its own election problems in 2000, as its implementation of motor voter statutes confused voters while depressing registration and turnout. In January 2002, the new governor, Mark Schweiker, signed a law that specifically implemented the database portion of the earlier election reform package signed into law by Tom Ridge. On July 24, 2002, the Department of State awarded the contract to create the database to Accenture, Ltd., hoping to link registration in all 67 counties by the following fall. All of this activity led many in the state to believe they were “ahead of the curve,” as Secretary of State C. Michael Weaver said before a legislative panel in October 2002. But the system proceeded to fall apart.

The system was slow and ineffective, with glitches that undermined its performance.44 The key problem with the system has been the integration of large urban areas into the statewide database. Philadelphia generates enough registration traffic that it freezes up the system, making it inefficient both there and for all other counties at the same time. On January 26, 2005, following the system’s abysmal performance in the 2004 election, 33 eastern Pennsylvania county election offices petitioned the state to end the contract with Accenture, hoping that a different company could correct the problems generated by SURE.45 The program was faulty enough that 11 counties had already been granted a reprieve from using it until the errors in the system were corrected. These concerns were raised again on February 1, 2005, when county officials publicly objected

44 http://www.votersunite.org/article.asp?id=2657
to the system at Gov. Ed Rendell’s Election Reform Task Force meeting, calling for a new company to complete the system before January 1, 2006.
Rhode Island

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2147</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Provisional Vote/Total Vote in Rhode Island is slightly below the median nationwide as is the overall percent counted. The state counted votes cast outside the correct precinct but lacked a registration database. Counting outside the precinct makes the state’s percent counted look lower comparatively, though it remains near the median for states without a database. The state was new to provisional balloting. Its elections website gave information about ID requirements and provisional voting, though it did not help with registration verification or precinct location.

Voters whose names were not on the rolls received provisional ballots. After the election, state officials checked the information on the provisional ballot with registration records in order to verify the voter’s status. After this process ran its course, voters could check the state’s website to discover if their provisional ballot was counted in the final tally. Slightly less than half of the time, the answer was yes.

While this may sound redundant, Rhode Island exhibits all of the hallmarks of New England, excepting the Election Day Registration states of Maine and New Hampshire. Election administration is centralized at the state level. Counties are cut out of the process, while towns and cities administer the nuts and bolts of Election Day itself.
South Carolina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4930</td>
<td>3207</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state had a voter registration database, and it disqualified provisional ballots cast in an incorrect precinct. The state was not new to provisional balloting, instead building on a previous system. The state’s election website allowed voters to verify their registration status, get information about provisional ballots, and know the state’s ID requirements (strict photo ID, often described as the strictest in the nation.) The website did not help voters locate their precinct, a problem in a state that disqualified provisional ballots for being cast in an improper location.

Provisional voters in the state were chiefly peoples whose names were not on registration rolls. After casting a ballot, officials verified the voter’s registration status using the state’s database. Then a voter was able to check the state’s website to see if his or her vote counted in the election. In South Carolina, these voters would have seen their votes collectively counted at almost exactly the rate of the national average.

For example, see [http://www.jsonline.com/news/state/apr05/322607.asp](http://www.jsonline.com/news/state/apr05/322607.asp). Recent legal changes in Indiana and Georgia have increased the number of states with similar photo ID laws.
South Dakota was new to provisional balloting, but it did have a voter registration database. It did not count ballots cast outside the correct precinct, and among such states it had the third lowest percent counted. The state’s elections website helped voters find their precinct and gave information about provisional voting, though it did not discuss the state’s photo ID requirement.

Most provisional ballots went to voters whose names were not on local registration rolls. The existence of a database probably contributed to why these voters ended up having votes that did not count, as they were most likely not registered in the first place. Provisional voters filled out an affidavit, which was verified against the state’s database. Voters were sent letters explaining whether their provisional ballot had counted or not. Most of these letters indicated that the vote did not count.

South Dakota’s voter ID laws generated some controversy, with lawmakers arguing that they kept Native Americans from voting. These complaints were turned into bills, some to repeal the requirement entirely and others to exempt those living on the state’s large reservations. These bills did not pass before the 2004 election.

---

Tennessee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8778</td>
<td>3298</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state lacked a registration database and did not count ballots cast outside the correct precinct. It was new to provisional balloting, having no such system prior to the implementation of HAVA. The state’s elections website provided little information to voters, not informing them of the possibilities of provisional voting, the state’s ID requirements, the location of precincts, nor the voter’s registration status.

Provisional ballots were widely distributed, going to those in the hospital, first-time voters without ID, those not on registration rolls, and others. These voters filled out an affidavit as to their identity and registration status, and these affidavits were verified with registration records to determine their veracity. After the verification process concluded, Tennessee voters received a letter informing them of whether or not their vote had been counted.
Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36193</td>
<td>7770</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Texas modified a previous affidavit balloting system to comply with HAVA’s requirements of a more complete provisional voting system. The new system, however, still used affidavits. The state did not have a registration database, nor did it count provisional ballots cast outside the correct precinct. The disqualification of ballots cast in the wrong precinct was a critical factor in lowering the percent counted in the state. Its elections website disseminated information about ID requirements and provisional voting, but the lack of database made it impossible to verify registration or precinct location.

Provisional ballots went to voters who were not on registration rolls or voted for the first time but lacked ID. These voters filled out an affidavit as to their identity and registration status, which was later cross-checked by officials with registration records. After this process played out, voters were notified by mail if their vote had counted or not.

Texas has several large urban areas: seven among the fifty largest cities in the country are in the state. But only thirteen of the top fifty cities have registration databases, meaning we are uncertain of the impact of databases on large urban areas. We know that the Pennsylvania database failed in Philadelphia, the nation’s fifth largest city, because of the large number of changes being made right up to Election Day. But adding a database to Texas will have an unknown effect on the electoral process. The state already has remarkably low numbers of provisional votes.
Both percentages reported above are greater than the national average. The state lacked a voter registration database, and it counted provisional votes cast outside the correct precinct. The combination of these two factors make it understandable why Utah’s amount of provisional ballots and rate of counting was higher than would otherwise be expected, using averages to inform our expectations. Utah was new to provisional balloting, beginning the system only after the passage of HAVA. The state’s elections website was well-prepared to disseminate information about the changes to the system, providing information on provisional voting, ID requirements, and the location of precincts.

People not on local registration rolls were eligible to receive provisional ballots. After casting provisional ballots, voters had to return later with necessary ID. This ID was used in the verification process, after which voters could call a phone number in order to find out if their vote had counted. The notification system will change before the next election, by which time Utah plans to convert to a website.

The presidential election in Utah was not close, and it generated little electoral controversy.
Vermont

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state lacked a statewide voter registration database, and it counted provisional ballots cast in an incorrect precinct. Vermont was new to provisional balloting in the 2004 election. Its elections website provided voters with information about the state’s ID requirements and provisional voting, along with having a mechanism that enables voters to find their precinct on Election Day.

Voters whose names were not on local registration rolls could vote provisionally. Provisional voters in Vermont signed an affidavit attesting to their identity and registration status. These affidavits were compared with registration records to determine which votes to count and which to disqualify. Voters could then call a phone number to learn whether their provisional ballot made up part of the final vote tally.

Vermont falls into the New England system of top-down election administration, which removes variance from HAVA implementation. In Vermont, this system reduced the number of provisional voters dramatically, quite an achievement for a state without a database. But its percent counted was in the bottom quarter for such states, making Vermont an unusual example that combines few votes with few counted.
Virginia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4172</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Virginia did not have a voter registration database, nor did it count provisional ballots cast in improper precincts. Its percent counted was next to last among states without a voting database and in the lowest quarter among those who disqualified provisional ballots cast in an improper precinct. Virginia in 2004 was not new to provisional balloting, already having a system prior to the passage of HAVA. The state’s elections website disseminated information about provisional voting, ID requirements, and the location of precincts.

Virginia gave out provisional ballots to first-time voters without ID and those whose names were not on local registration rolls. These voters submitted an affidavit, later verified by elections officials. After the verification process, voters could call a phone number to see if their provisional ballot was counted.

Since the election, allegations of vote fraud surfaced in southwestern Virginia. Specifically, the former mayor of Gate City, population slightly over 2,000, has been indicted on 37 counts of vote fraud.48 He is accused of using absentee ballots to perpetrate his fraud and get himself elected. In this case, ID requirements would be ineffective in preventing this form of fraud.

---

## Washington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87393</td>
<td>69645</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Washington lacked a registration database, and it counted provisional ballots cast outside the correct precinct. Though Washington was not new to provisional voting, the process generated a massive amount of controversy across the state, setting up multiple controversial recounts in the gubernatorial race. The state’s elections website explained ID requirements, though it did not discuss provisional voting.

Washington voters could easily obtain provisional ballots, for reasons varying from hospitalization to absence from local rolls. Official procedure called for verification by comparing the information on the provisional envelope with registration records. Notification was left up to counties. But as future lawsuits clarified, official verification procedure was not always followed.

King County, home of Seattle, had poll workers mistakenly run provisional ballots through voting machines as if they were regular ballots, skipping the verification stage. The problem was so severe that the Election Commissioner for the county stated that we “may never know the number of illegal ballots.” This problem, and other accusations of vote fraud, were appealed to numerous state courts by eventual loser Dino Rossi. While the judge allowed for a wide range of possible accusations, in the end there was no justiciable solution to electoral problems.

---

50 Logan: King County may never know number of illegal ballots, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, April 26, 2005, Tuesday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 818 words, By REBECCA COOK, Associated Press Writer, OLYMPIA, Wash.
52 Borders v. King County
West Virginia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB Cast</th>
<th>PB Counted</th>
<th>Percent counted</th>
<th>Provisional Vote/Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13367</td>
<td>8378</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

West Virginia had a registration database, and it did not count provisional ballots cast outside the correct precinct. The state was continuing its previous provisional system from before the passage of HAVA. The state’s elections website gave information about provisional balloting but little else.

West Virginia, like Washington, widely distributed provisional ballots. These were counted by comparison to official records to verify the information given by the voter. Voters could call a phone number to discover the status of their provisional ballot.
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47. Colo. activists also "suspicious," analyzing vote, The Denver Post, November 12, 2004 Friday, FINAL EDITION, A SECTION; Pg. A-11, 230 words, Mike Soraghan Denver Post staff writer

75. AT THE POLLS Provisional-ballot questions dominate voting controversies, The Denver Post, November 3, 2004 Wednesday, FINAL EDITION, DENVER & THE WEST; Pg. B-01, 696 words, Chuck Plunkett Denver Post Staff Writer

90. Colorado election largely smooth; scattered problems reported, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, November 2, 2004 Tuesday, BC cycle, Political News, 704 words, By JON SARCHE, Associated Press Writer, DENVER

98. MANY COLORADO VOTERS FEAR FRAUD; ELECTION CONFIDENCE SHAKY, POLL SHOWS, Rocky Mountain News (Denver, CO), November 1, 2004 Monday Final Edition, NEWS; Pg. 4A, 847 words, Charlie Brennan, © 2004, Rocky Mountain News

102. Election becomes a test of TRUST Will your vote count? After weeks of missteps, will Colorado get it right? To be answered Tuesday., The Denver Post, October 31, 2004 Sunday, FINAL EDITION, A SECTION; Pg. A-01, 1475 words, Susan Greene and Erin Cox Denver Post Staff Writers


Your right to vote is in peril, The Denver Post, October 8, 2004 Friday, FINAL EDITION, DENVER & THE WEST; Pg. B-01, 650 words, Jim Spencer Denver Post Staff Columnist

Guarding democracy at the polls, The Denver Post, August 11, 2004 Wednesday, FINAL EDITION, DENVER & THE WEST; Pg. B-01, 622 words, Jim Spencer
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Connecticut Provisional Ballots


Rare protest to electoral vote count, Connecticut Post (Bridgeport, CT), January 9, 2005 Sunday, PETER URBAN, 1046 words

Patience required with provisional, presidential balloting, Connecticut Post (Bridgeport, CT), November 4, 2004 Thursday, LOCAL/REGIONAL NEWS, 727 words, BILL CUMMINGS and MEG BARONE, Staff writers

Provisional ballots to be available in state, Connecticut Post (Bridgeport, CT), October 31, 2004 Sunday, LOCAL/REGIONAL NEWS, 718 words, EDWARD J. CROWDER

Delaware:

Delaware Provisional Voting


District of Columbia:

District of Columbia Provisional Voting

No articles specifically on voting within the district.

Florida:


Advocacy organizations continue to object to the resolution of this litigation. See www.aclu.org/Files/getFile.cfm?id=16802

IN FLORIDA, PROVISIONAL BALLOTS FUTILE FOR MOST WHO CAST THEM, Palm Beach Post (Florida), November 10, 2004 Wednesday, MARTIN-ST. LUCIE EDITION, LOCAL; Pg. 3C, 622 words, By JANE MUSGRAVE Palm Beach Post Staff Writer

Untangling the ballots; Canvassing board performs a tough and necessary task, Sarasota Herald-Tribune (Florida), November 5, 2004 Friday, ALL EDITION, A SECTION; Pg. A16, 265 words
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49. Election imperfect, but improved, St. Petersburg Times (Florida), November 4, 2004 Thursday 0 South Pinellas Edition Correction Appended, CITY & STATE; Pg. 1B, 918 words, DAVID KARP; TAMARA LUSH; MATTHEW WAITE

96. To The Polls, With A Few More Twists, Tampa Tribune (Florida), November 2, 2004 Tuesday, FINAL EDITION, NATION/WORLD; Pg. 1, 924 words, WILLIAM MARCH, TAMPA

113. Provisional ballots cast doubt on vote; Election law experts say a fix for a problem in 2000 looks like more trouble., Florida Times-Union (Jacksonville), October 30, 2004 Saturday, City Edition, METRO; Pg. B-3, 565 words, DAVID DECAMP, The Times-Union


**Georgia:**

Georgia Provisional Ballots

7. GOP backs down, a bit, on photo ID requirement for voters, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, March 21, 2005, Monday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 380 words, By KRISTEN WYATT, Associated Press Writer, ATLANTA

9. OUR OPINIONS: Vote 'no' on photo IDs; Proposed state election reform is discriminatory and may not reduce the opportunities for fraud, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, March 21, 2005 Monday, Home Edition, Pg. 8A.; 492 words

11. LEGISLATURE '05: Lawsuits likely over vote ID bill, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, March 16, 2005 Wednesday, Home Edition, Pg. 1B.; 538 words, NANCY BADERTSCHER, CARLOS CAMPOS


31. ELECTIONS BOARD REJECTS 52 PAINE COLLEGE VOTERS, The Augusta Chronicle (Georgia), November 5, 2004 Friday, FINAL EDITION, METRO; Pg. B05, 309 words, By Tom Corwin Staff Writer

56. STEALING THE ELECTION?, The Augusta Chronicle (Georgia), October 24, 2004 Sunday, ALL EDITION, EDITORIAL; Pg. A04, 392 words

62. FAIL-SAFE VOTING SYSTEM BEGINS, The Augusta Chronicle (Georgia), October 20, 2004 Wednesday, ALL EDITION, NEWS; Pg. A11, 540 words, By Kate Lewis Staff Writer

**Hawaii:**

Hawaii Provisional Ballots


Honolulu County Election Incidents
https://voteprotect.org/index.php?display=EIRMapCounty&state=Hawaii&county=Honolulu&cat=ALL&tab=ALL

**Idaho:**

Idaho Provisional Ballots and Voter ID

Idaho does not have provisional ballots.

No coverage of local issues, but a lot of focus on problems in Washington. Also, some attention to bills to stiffen ID requirements in Georgia, Texas, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Mississippi, and New Mexico.
Illinois Provisional Ballots

Illinois:

10. Provisional ballots may affect district budgets, Chicago Daily Herald, February 1, 2005 Tuesday, Lake Edition, NEWS; Pg. 1, 425 words, C. L. Waller, Daily Herald Staff Writer
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56. Close presidential election brings 'provisional ballots' to America's attention, Chicago Tribune, November 4, 2004, Thursday, TB-BALLOTS-20041104, 566 words, By John McCormick


76. Long lines at polling places, no unusual problems reported, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, November 2, 2004, Tuesday, BC cycle, Political News, 531 words, By MAURA KELLY LANNAN, Associated Press Writer, CHICAGO

77. How to make sure your vote counts Federal voting laws solve old mistakes, Chicago Daily Herald, November 2, 2004 Tuesday, All Editions, NEWS; Pg. 1, 632 words, Eric Krol, Daily Herald Political Writer


110. Election officials must fix snafus before November, Chicago Sun-Times, August 9, 2004 Monday, EDITORIALS; Pg. 41, 479 words, Editorials
**Indiana:**

Indiana Provisional Ballots

1. Voter ID bill spurs two suits; Opponents of law claim it burdens elderly, poor, disabled, minorities., The Indiana Lawyer, May 18, 2005, Vol. 16; No. 5; Pg. 3, 1539 words, RON BROWNING

2. Daniels signs voter ID bill; ICLU plans lawsuit, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, April 28, 2005, Thursday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 350 words, INDIANAPOLIS

8. Governor should veto photo ID bill, South Bend Tribune (Indiana), March 23, 2005 Wednesday, Michigan Edition, Pg. B4;, 178 words

13. Board agrees better training needed for poll workers; Some votes didn't count this year because of mistakes., South Bend Tribune (Indiana), November 26, 2004 Friday, Marshall Edition, Pg. B1, 841 words, By JAMES WENSITS; Tribune Political Writer


**Iowa:**

Iowa Provisional Ballots

1. Culver announces $17.5 million for election upgrades, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, March 17, 2005, Thursday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 493 words, By MIKE GLOVER, AP Political Writer, DES MOINES, Iowa

15. U.S voting system still has room to improve; Billions spent, but process still lacks consistency, Telegraph Herald (Dubuque, IA), November 5, 2004 Friday, 408 words, TELEGRAPH HERALD EDITORIAL


45. Iowans who forgot to check citizenship box can vote, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, October 20, 2004, Wednesday, BC cycle, Political News, 476 words, By CAROL ANN RIHA, Associated Press Writer, DES MOINES, Iowa

**Kansas:**

Kansas Provisional Ballots

2. Thornburgh urges Congress not to expand federal role in elections, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, February 9, 2005, Wednesday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 412 words, By SAM HANANEL, Associated Press Writer, WASHINGTON


**Kentucky:**
Kentucky Provisional Ballots

1. Provisional ballots by state, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, March 18, 2005, Friday, BC cycle, State and Regional; Washington Dateline, 1306 words, By The Associated Press

2. Two-thirds of provisional ballots counted, but wide variations between states, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, March 18, 2005, Friday, BC cycle, State and Regional; Washington Dateline, 592 words, By DAVID PACE, Associated Press Writer, WASHINGTON


Louisiana:

Louisiana Provisional Ballots


11. Nearly 6,000 cast provisional ballots; About 40% had their votes counted, Times-Picayune (New Orleans), November 13, 2004 Saturday, NATIONAL; Pg. 2, 652 words, By Ed Anderson, Capital bureau

15. Provisional voting good and bad , The Advocate (Baton Rouge, Louisiana), November 7, 2004 Sunday, Metro Edition, NEWS; Pg. 15-B, 718 words, JOHN LAPLANTE

17. Election day chaos, Times-Picayune (New Orleans), November 6, 2004 Saturday, METRO - EDITORIAL; Pg. 6, 339 words


26. Between heaven and ballot box, Times-Picayune (New Orleans), November 3, 2004 Wednesday, METRO; Lolis Eric Elie; Pg. 1, 487 words, Lolis Eric Elie


45. Summary: Lost voters can use provisional ballots, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, October 29, 2004, Friday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 72 words, By The Associated Press

Maine:

Maine Provisional Ballots

Maine does not have provisional ballots being exempt from that section of HAVA because they allow same-day registration.

1. Electors hand in four votes for Kerry; Rather than dwell on their loss, the Democrats emphasize the high quality of Maine's election., Portland Press Herald (Maine), December 14, 2004 Tuesday, Final Edition, FRONT; Pg. A1, 684 words, JOSHUA L. WEINSTEIN Staff Writer, AUGUSTA

5. Only two more voting days left until Nov. 2; Maine makes it so easy to cast a ballot that anyone can do it - and thus, everyone should., Portland Press Herald (Maine), October 31, 2004 Sunday, FINAL Edition, EDITORIAL; Our Views; Pg. C4, 327 words
Maryland:

Maryland Provisional Ballots

3. Commentary: UB Viewpoint - The impact of election reform in Maryland, The Daily Record (Baltimore, MD), March 11, 2005 Friday, COMMENTARY, 1051 words, John T. Willis


Massachusetts:

Massachusetts Provisional Ballots

1. STUDY FINDS VOTING TROUBLE FOR SOME STATE RESIDENTS SAYS NEARLY 9% DENIED BALLOTS, The Boston Globe, June 9, 2005, Thursday, THIRD EDITION, Pg. B6, 858 words, By Rebecca Mahoney, Globe Correspondent


25. Voter fraud made easy, The Berkshire Eagle (Pittsfield, Massachusetts), November 13, 2004 Saturday, LETTERS, 169 words


32. Students cry foul over voter sign-up snafu, The Berkshire Eagle (Pittsfield, Massachusetts), November 8, 2004 Monday, HEADLINES, 670 words, D.R. Bahlman, Berkshire Eagle Staff, PITTSFIELD

64. BIG TURNOUT, FEW GLITCHES REPORTED AT STATE POLLS LONG LINES FAIL TO DETER VOTERS IN MANY TOWNS, The Boston Globe, November 3, 2004, Wednesday, THIRD EDITION, Pg. B7, 731 words, By Michael Levenson, Globe Correspondent

77. Common sense vs. fraud, Sentinel & Enterprise (Fitchburg, Massachusetts), November 3, 2004 Wednesday, TODAY'S EDITORIALS, 420 words

79. NEW ID CHECKS TAKE EFFECT AS RECORD TURNOUT IS EXPECTED, The Boston Globe, November 2, 2004, Tuesday, THIRD EDITION, Pg. B4, 522 words, By Elise Castelli Globe Correspondent


93. Law requires IDs from new voters, Lowell Sun (Lowell, MA), October 28, 2004 Thursday, TODAY'S HEADLINES<!--NAV:SPACE_BEFORE-->, 546 words, MICHAEL LAFLEUR, Sun Staff

94. Election Day do's and don'ts, The Berkshire Eagle (Pittsfield, Massachusetts), October 27, 2004
Wednesday, OTHER OPINIONS, 558 words, Bill Shein

99. Republicans planning a heist By Robert Kuttner, The Berkshire Eagle (Pittsfield, Massachusetts), October 23, 2004 Saturday, OTHER OPINIONS, 746 words

**Michigan:**

Michigan Provisional Ballots

2. Lawmakers call for investigations into long lines at voting stations, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, January 12, 2005, Wednesday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 244 words, By MALIA RULON, Associated Press Writer, WASHINGTON


15. Appeals court reverses lower-court ruling on provisional ballots in Michigan, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, October 26, 2004, Tuesday, BC cycle, State and Regional; Political News, 514 words, CINCINNATI


**Minnesota:**

Minnesota Provisional Ballots

Minnesota does not have provisional ballots, being exempt from that portion of HAVA because they allow same-day registration.

3. Voting; Flaws need federal attention, Star Tribune (Minneapolis, MN), November 14, 2004, Sunday, Metro Edition, NEWS; OP EX; Pg. 4AA, 670 words


8. The franchise; A still-imperfect democracy, Star Tribune (Minneapolis, MN), November 3, 2004, Wednesday, Metro Edition, NEWS; Pg. 28A, 629 words

**Mississippi:**
Mississippi Provisional Ballots


Missouri:

Missouri Provisional Ballots

1. Man claims judges allowed illegal voting Poll watcher was told to leave precinct in East St. Louis, St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri), April 7, 2005 Thursday, ILLINOIS FIVE STAR LIFT EDITION, METRO; Pg. B2, 421 words, BY CAROLYN TUFT Of the Post-Dispatch


14. Election Day was a lesson in life and civics, St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri), November 7, 2004 Sunday, FIVE STAR LATE LIFT EDITION, EDITORIAL; Commentary Column; Pg. B03, 385 words, By CHARLES A. NEWMAN


35. Voting in Missouri, St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri), November 2, 2004 Tuesday, FIVE STAR LATE LIFT EDITION, METRO; Pg. B02, 365 words

38. A voter's rights, St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri), November 2, 2004 Tuesday, FIVE STAR LATE LIFT EDITION, EDITORIAL; Pg. B06, 752 words


52. Black voters will draw scrutiny, St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri), October 29, 2004 Friday Five Star Late Lift Edition, METRO; Pg. B01, 959 words, JO MANNIES Post-Dispatch Political Correspondent

70. U.S. judge spells out when they are valid, St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri), October 13, 2004 Wednesday Five Star Late Lift Edition Correction Appended, METRO; Pg. B01, 622 words, JO MANNIES Post-Dispatch Political Correspondent

88. Judge may rule today on provisional balloting, St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri), August 11, 2004 Wednesday Five Star Late Lift Edition, METRO; Pg. B01, 612 words, JO MANNIES Post-Dispatch Political Correspondent

Montana:

Montana Provisional Ballots

No stories in local newspapers.

Nebraska:

Nebraska Provisional Ballots

1. Probe finds no bias in Omaha's balloting Nebraska's secretary of state responds to criticism from Democratic leaders., Omaha World-Herald (Nebraska), June 15, 2005, Wednesday, METRO;NEBRASKA;SUNRISE EDITION, Pg. 01B; 502 words, Joseph Morton
6. Bill will smooth voters' path to polls, Omaha World-Herald (Nebraska), May 10, 2005, Tuesday, SUNRISE EDITION, Pg. 01A; 308 words, Martha Stoddard, LINCOLN

8. Provisional ballots available for voters, Lincoln Journal Star (Nebraska), April 29, 2005 Friday, City Edition, B; Pg. 5, 153 words, Lincoln, NE

10. Rural voters stand to benefit, Lincoln Journal Star (Nebraska), March 31, 2005 Thursday, City Edition, B; Pg. 1, 965 words, NANCY HICKS, Lincoln Journal Star

29. Provisional ballots 80% valid in state, Omaha World-Herald (Nebraska), November 11, 2004, Thursday, NEBRASKA; SUNRISE EDITION, Pg. 01B; 513 words, Tom Shaw

36. Voting system still in need of improvement, Lincoln Journal Star (Nebraska), November 6, 2004 Saturday, City Edition, B; Pg. 5, 446 words

43. Provisional ballots mount in Nebraska, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, November 4, 2004, Thursday, BC cycle, State and Regional; Political News, 467 words, By The Associated Press

46. Reasons for provisional ballot use to be probed About 8,000 people in Douglas County cast the ballots in Tuesday's election., Omaha World-Herald (Nebraska), November 4, 2004, Thursday, METRO EDITION, Pg. 06A; 346 words, Tom Shaw

72. Frequently asked questions and answers about voting, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, October 29, 2004, Friday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 370 words

77. Tainted democracy Gratuitous allegations of fraud can promote distrust in system., Omaha World-Herald (Nebraska), October 27, 2004, Wednesday, IOWA; METRO; MIDLANDS; NEBRASKA; SUNRISE EDITION, Pg. 06B; 516 words, 11

**Nevada:**

Nevada Provisional Ballots


30. EDITORIAL: Voter responsibility, Las Vegas Review-Journal (Nevada), November 11, 2004 Thursday, FINAL EDITION, B; Pg. 8B, 360 words

41. Local polls largely problem-free, Las Vegas Review-Journal (Nevada), November 3, 2004 Wednesday, FINAL EDITION, A; Pg. 6A, 802 words, J.M. KALIL and RICHARD LAKE

**New Hampshire:**

New Hampshire is exempted from using provisional ballots.

New Hampshire Provisional Ballots


6. Lawyers gear up for Nov. 2 battles, The Union Leader (Manchester NH), October 31, 2004 Sunday STATE EDITION, NEWS; Pg. A1, 1714 words, By SHAWNE K. WICKHAM Sunday News Staff

**New Jersey:**
New Jersey Provisional Ballots

12. Is there more fraud in voters’ future?; When Hudson clerk says so, N.J. should listen, The Record (Bergen County, NJ), March 14, 2005 Monday, All Editions, NEWS; CAPITAL GAMES; Pg. A03, 972 words, HERB JACKSON, North Jersey Media Group

21. Election foul-ups to rock New Jersey's vote?, The Record (Bergen County, NJ), January 24, 2005 Monday, All Editions, NEWS; CAPITAL GAMES; Pg. A01, 1282 words, HERB JACKSON, North Jersey Media Group

29. Students' ballots could get election tossed; Little Falls loser goes to court, The Record (Bergen County, NJ), December 16, 2004 Thursday, Two Star P Edition, LOCAL; Pg. L03, 607 words, By AMY L. KOVAC, SPECIAL TO THE RECORD, North Jersey Media Group

49. With Lawyers and Judges Watching, Election Day Challenges Are Light, New Jersey Law Journal, November 8, 2004, 1408 words, By Henry Gottlieb

77. Most voting glitches merely annoying; Missing registrations among top problems, The Record (Bergen County, NJ), November 3, 2004 Wednesday Correction Appended, All Editions, NEWS; Pg. A01, 1475 words, By AMY KLEIN, TOM DAVIS and BRIAN KLADKO, STAFF WRITERS, North Jersey Media Group

79. Election Day chaos is a national scandal, The Record (Bergen County, NJ), November 2, 2004 Tuesday, All Editions, OPINION; Pg. L13, 2150 words, E.J. DIONNE, Wire Services

80. Constitutional scholar expects 'chaos' at N.J. polls, The Record (Bergen County, NJ), November 1, 2004 Monday, All Editions, NEWS; Pg. A01, 891 words, By AMY KLEIN, STAFF WRITER, North Jersey Media Group

87. Voter rights guide available; Group gives advice on poll problems, Herald News (Passaic County, NJ), October 15, 2004 Friday, Early Edition, OUR TOWNS; Pg. B05, 455 words, By CHARLES AUSTIN, Special to the Herald News, North Jersey Media Group

94. No Smooth Sailing as New Jersey Implements Election Reform Act, New Jersey Law Journal, October 4, 2004, 969 words, By Charles Toutant

103. ID required of some primary voters; New law affects those registered since 2003, The Record (Bergen County, NJ), June 8, 2004 Tuesday, All Bergen Editions, LOCAL; Pg. L01, 305 words, By SHANNON D. HARRINGTON, STAFF WRITER, North Jersey Media Group

New Mexico:

New Mexico Provisional Ballots

MALDEF Press Release


16. Voter ID doesn't get to real election problems, Albuquerque Tribune (New Mexico), February 19, 2005 Saturday, WEEKEND; Pg. C1, 463 words

20. Governor reveals voter ID package, Albuquerque Tribune (New Mexico), February 15, 2005 Tuesday, EVENING; Pg. A1, 654 words, Shea Andersen

73. We need clarity, but we don't need chaos, Albuquerque Tribune (New Mexico), December 2, 2004 Thursday, EVENING; Pg. C2, 465 words

86. GOVERNOR: ELECTION REFORM STILL NEEDED, The Santa Fe New Mexican (New Mexico), November 24, 2004 Wednesday, MAIN; Pg. A-1, 1032 words, STEVE TERRELL

99. Fiasco or not, vote counting is one piece of work, Albuquerque Tribune (New Mexico), November 13, 2004 Saturday, WEEKEND; Pg. A2, 614 words, Kate Nelson Commentary

129. Clerk Tossing 25% of Ballots, Albuquerque Journal (New Mexico), November 9, 2004 Tuesday, FINAL; Pg. A1, 791 words, Dan McKay and David Miles Journal Staff Writer

136. N.M. Voters Are Red With Embarrassment, Albuquerque Journal (New Mexico), November 8, 2004 Monday Correction Appended, FINAL; Pg. B8, 625 words, Leann Holt Journal Staff Writer

141. Indian Voters Not Protected, Albuquerque Journal (New Mexico), November 7, 2004 Sunday, JOURNAL SANTA FE; Pg. S1, 463 words

158. Provisional Ballots To Be Counted, Albuquerque Journal (New Mexico), November 5, 2004 Friday, RIO RANCHO JOURNAL; Pg. 1, 548 words, Joshua Akers Journal Staff Writer

200. Tuesday's voting troubles were of benign kind, Albuquerque Tribune (New Mexico), November 3, 2004 Wednesday, EVENING; Pg. A4, 933 words, Joline Gutierrez Krueger

243. Tips for Your Trip to the Polls, Albuquerque Journal (New Mexico), November 1, 2004 Monday, FINAL; Pg. A10, 275 words

244. Poll Workers Get Ready for Anything; Voting Tips, Albuquerque Journal (New Mexico), October 31, 2004 Sunday, FINAL; Pg. B1, 1522 words, Dan McKay Journal Staff Writer


261. VOTER-ID RULE TOSSED; LAW STILL NEEDS WORK, The Santa Fe New Mexican (New Mexico), September 29, 2004 Wednesday, EDITORIALS; Pg. A-9, 625 words

268. COMMENTARY: MAKING SURE THE RIGHT VOTES COUNT, The Santa Fe New Mexican (New Mexico), September 26, 2004 Sunday, EDITORIALS; Pg. F-1, 853 words, INEZ RUSSELL

**New York:**

New York Provisional Ballots

7. WHOSE VOTE FRAUD?, The New York Post, February 27, 2005 Sunday, All Editions; Pg. 28, 618 words

8. Tackling Election Reform, The New York Times, February 22, 2005 Tuesday, Late Edition - Final, Section A; Column 1; Editorial Desk; Pg. 16, 514 words

9. When Elections Go Bad, The New York Times, February 13, 2005 Sunday, Late Edition - Final, Section 4; Column 1; Editorial Desk; Pg. 14, 461 words

10. Three months after Election Day, Spano is sworn in again as senator, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, February 9, 2005, Wednesday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 724 words, By JOEL STASHENKO, Associated Press Writer
46. Stalling the Vote, The New York Times, December 5, 2004 Sunday, Late Edition - Final, Section 14WC; Column 1; Westchester Weekly Desk; Pg. 19, 334 words

55. Improving Provisional Ballots, The New York Times, November 21, 2004 Sunday, Late Edition - Final, Section 4; Column 1; Editorial Desk; Pg. 12, 589 words

75. New Standards for Elections, The New York Times, November 7, 2004 Sunday, Late Edition - Final, Section 4; Column 1; Editorial Desk; Pg. 10, 1103 words

78. Fraudulent Voters Bused In, Westchester Republicans Say, The New York Times, November 5, 2004 Friday, Late Edition - Final, Section B; Column 5; Metropolitan Desk; Pg. 7, 567 words, By KIRK SEMPLE and JENNIFER MEDINA

131. What to Do on Election Day, The New York Times, November 1, 2004 Monday, Late Edition - Final, Section A; Column 1; Editorial Desk; Pg. 24, 541 words

141. A presidential election this way comes, The Times Union (Albany, New York), November 1, 2004 Monday, ONE STAR EDITION, MAIN; Pg. A9, 820 words, RENEE LOTH


161. Before You Vote, The New York Times, October 26, 2004 Tuesday, Late Edition - Final, Section G; Column 2; Voter Guide 2004; THE VOTING; Pg. 2, 175 words, By Katharine Q. Seelye

**North Carolina:**

North Carolina Provisional Ballots

Title: CNN.com - N. Carolina election fight drags on - Jun 6, 2005
http://www.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=viewThis&etMailToID=877131764&pt=Y

North Carolina Provisional Ballots

6. DAVIS TO TAKE POST AS INTERIM HEAD OF SCHOOLS, Winston-Salem Journal (Winston Salem, NC), June 1, 2005 Wednesday, METRO EDITION, B; The Region; Pg. 2, 436 words, JOURNAL STAFF AND WIRE REPORT, RALEIGH


93. N.C. contest rules likely to become law, but picking winner could take time, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, February 24, 2005, Thursday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 735 words, By GARY D. ROBERTSON, Associated Press Writer, RALEIGH, N.C.

98. N.C. Senate approve bill to reaffirm counting key provisional ballots, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, February 22, 2005, Tuesday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 421 words, RALEIGH, N.C.


142. N.C. Supreme Court takes on out-of-precinct ballot issue, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, January 18, 2005, Tuesday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 691 words, By GARY D. ROBERTSON,
149. Race enters ballot tiff; Groups assail discounting votes, The News & Observer (Raleigh, North Carolina), January 15, 2005 Saturday, Final Edition, NEWS; Pg. B5, 470 words, Lynn Bonner, Staff Writer


185. CARTERET COUNTY TO VOTE AGAIN FOR AGRICULTURE POST N.C. ELECTIONS BOARD'S COMPROMISE MEANS TROXLER-COBB RACE WILL BE DECIDED ON JAN. 11, Winston-Salem Journal (Winston Salem, NC), December 1, 2004 Wednesday, METRO EDITION, B; Pg. 1, 759 words, By David Ingram JOURNAL RALEIGH BUREAU, RALEIGH

199. North Carolina's ballot blues, The News & Observer (Raleigh, North Carolina), November 26, 2004 Friday, Final Edition, EDITORIAL/OPINION; Point of View; Pg. A21, 579 words, Joyce Mccloy


305. Q&A: WHAT TO EXPECT AT POLLING PLACES, News & Record (Greensboro, NC), November 2, 2004 Tuesday ALL EDITIONS, 311 words, Mark Binker Staff Writer


**North Dakota:**

North Dakota is exempt from using provisional ballots because they do no require voter registration.

**Ohio:**

http://www.ac4vr.com/reports/072005/default.html

http://a9.g.akamai.net/7/9/8082/v001/www démocrats.org/pdfs/ohvreport/fullreport.pdf


24. Provisional-ballot process starts today; Election workers seek to verify which of 155,337 count, Dayton Daily News (Ohio), November 4, 2004 Thursday, SPECIAL; Pg. AA2, 533 words, By Laura A. Bischoff

73. Plan to vote? What you should know, Plain Dealer (Cleveland), November 2, 2004 Tuesday, Final Edition; All Editions, NATIONAL; Pg. A2, 472 words, Grant Segall, Plain Dealer Reporter
80. Provisional ballots: the chads of 2004?, Plain Dealer (Cleveland), November 1, 2004 Monday, FINAL Edition; ALL Editions, NATIONAL; Pg. A1, 733 words, DIANE SUCHETKA, PLAIN DEALER REPORTER

82. VOTERS GUIDE, Columbus Dispatch (Ohio), October 31, 2004 Sunday, Home Final Edition, 395 words

123. ELECTION OFFICIALS HAPPY NOW THAT PROVISIONAL-BALLOT ISSUE IS PUT TO BED; Ohio GOP withdraws thousands of challenges to new registrants, Columbus Dispatch (Ohio), October 25, 2004 Monday, Home Final Edition, 1061 words, Mark Niquette, THE COLUMBUS DISPATCH

**Oklahoma:**

Oklahoma Provisional Ballots

1. Provisional ballots by state, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, March 18, 2005, Friday, BC cycle, State and Regional; Washington Dateline, 1306 words, By The Associated Press

23. It's nearly over, Tulsa World (Oklahoma), November 1, 2004 Monday, Final Home Edition, News, Elections; Focus.; Pg. A17, 1359 words, ROBERT EVATT World Staff Writer

**Oregon:**

Most coverage focused on the Washington governor’s race.

Oregon Provisional Ballots

93. VOTING POSTMORTEM IN WASHINGTON, The Oregonian (Portland, Oregon), January 8, 2005 Saturday, SUNRISE EDITION, EDITORIAL; Pg. B06, 514 words


179. SOME IN COUNTY FAIL TO GET BALLOT, The Oregonian, October 29, 2004 Friday, SUNRISE EDITION, SOUTH ZONER;, Pg. C02, 467 words, BRAD SCHMIDT - The Oregonian

**Pennsylvania:**

Pennsylvania Provisional Ballots

14. Few problems with paper ballots, Pittsburgh Tribune Review, May 18, 2005 Wednesday, 665 words, Andrew Conte


20. Panel unveils repairs to voting problems, Pittsburgh Tribune Review, April 28, 2005 Thursday, 567 words, Glenn May

34. Poor training cited in election problems, Pittsburgh Tribune Review, December 16, 2004 Thursday, 292 words, Brandon Keat

52. More than half of state's provisional ballots rejected, The Evening Sun (Hanover, PA), December 6, 2004 Monday, STATE & REGION NEWS, 357 words

56. Group: County had most vote questions in U.S., Pittsburgh Tribune Review, December 1, 2004 Wednesday, 461 words, Glenn May

58. Provisional ballots are still mystery, Pittsburgh Tribune Review, November 29, 2004 Monday, 380
words, Glenn May


73. FIXING ELECTIONS; LET'S VOTE TO END PROBLEMS AT THE POLLING PLACE, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette (Pennsylvania), November 8, 2004 Monday, SOONER EDITION, Pg.A-16, 415 words


124. Shortfall of special ballots is glitch in county voting, Pittsburgh Tribune Review, November 3, 2004 Wednesday, 1105 words, Andrew Conte


139. Voters, don't forget your licenses today, Pittsburgh Tribune Review, November 2, 2004 Tuesday, 1012 words, David M. Brown and Andy Conte

141. Voters: What you will need to know; Local officials are geared up to make this Election Day smooth., LANCASTER NEW ERA (LANCASTER, PA.), November 1, 2004, Monday, Pg. A-1, 436 words, Tom Murse

151. PROVISIONAL VOTES COULD ADD A NEW TWIST TO TUESDAY'S ELECTION, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette (Pennsylvania), October 29, 2004 Friday, SOONER EDITION, Pg.A-1, 850 words, Jerome L. Sherman, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

157. LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS GUIDE TO THE GENERAL ELECTION, NOVEMBER 2, 2004/POLLS WILL BE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M. ON ELECTION DAY, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette (Pennsylvania), October 26, 2004 Tuesday, SOONER EDITION, Pg.B-3, 558 words

175. Changes at the polls; From IDs to provisional ballots, this election should be more reliable than in 2000, INTELLIGENCER JOURNAL (LANCASTER, PA.), October 11, 2004, Monday, Pg. A-8., 568 words

Rhode Island:

Rhode Island Provisional Ballots

18. CAMPAIGN 2004 - R.I. drops rule on voter IDs, The Providence Journal (Rhode Island), November 2, 2004 Tuesday, All Editions, NEWS; Pg. A-09, 564 words, BRUCE LANDIS, Journal Staff Writer

22. Here's what you should know when you go to vote, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, November 1, 2004, Monday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 493 words, PROVIDENCE, R.I.


51. Scary scenarios for upcoming elections, The Providence Journal (Rhode Island), August 27, 2004 Friday, All Editions, EDITORIAL; Pg. B-05, 936 words, M.J. Andersen

South Carolina:

South Carolina Provisional Ballots

COLUMBIA, S.C.

78. What to know on Election Day, The Herald (Rock Hill, S.C.), November 1, 2004 Monday, FINAL EDITION, Pg. 2B, 352 words

83. Provisional ballots give registered voters a voice if denied at polls, The Herald (Rock Hill, S.C.), October 29, 2004 Friday, FINAL EDITION, Pg. 1B, 509 words, By Erica Pippins / The Herald

South Dakota:

South Dakota Provisional Ballots


Tennessee:

Tennessee Provisional Ballots

6. Not all votes yet count, Chattanooga Times Free Press (Tennessee), December 31, 2004 Friday, TIMES EDITORIAL; Pg. B6, 542 words


26. Group warns of Florida-style election fiasco, Chattanooga Times Free Press (Tennessee), October 20, 2004 Wednesday, WIRE - POLITICS; Pg. A4, 481 words

Texas:

Texas Provisional Ballots


48. VOTING WITH CONFIDENCE : Few problems are reported at polling sites across nation, San Antonio Express-News (Texas), November 3, 2004, Wednesday, BULLDOG, Pg. 1A, 846 words, Joseph S. Stroud


57. Provisional ballots could bog down election count, Austin American-Statesman (Texas), October 29, 2004 Friday, NEWS; Pg. A6, 586 words, Julia Malone, WASHINGTON BUREAU

Utah:

Utah Provisional Ballots

1. Utah beats most states in counting provisional ballots, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, March 27, 2005, Sunday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 450 words, SALT LAKE CITY

3. Reformers eye next vote, Deseret Morning News (Salt Lake City), January 3, 2005 Monday, 997 words, Josh Loftin Deseret Morning News
5. Not every Utah voted counted, but more did than in 2000; Percentage improves: This time, only 13 of 1,000 votes were thrown out because of errors, Salt Lake Tribune (Utah), November 25, 2004, Thursday, Utah; Pg. C15, 850 words, Robert Gehrke, The Salt Lake Tribune

9. Every vote counts, Deseret Morning News (Salt Lake City), November 22, 2004 Monday, 372 words, Deseret Morning News editorial

22. Some tips for voters, Salt Lake Tribune (Utah), November 2, 2004, Tuesday, Utah; Pg. A1, 170 words

26. Be aware of changes in vote laws, Deseret Morning News (Salt Lake City), November 1, 2004 Monday, 643 words, Josh Loftin Deseret Morning News

Vermont:

No coverage of provisional voting in local newspapers.

Virginia:

Virginia Provisional Ballots

1. COUNTY MAN'S VOTE WON'T COUNT; HE SAYS HE REGISTERED; CHESTERFIELD REGISTRAR SAYS THERE'S NO PROOF, Richmond Times Dispatch (Virginia), June 16, 2005 Thursday, ONE STAR EDITION, AREA/STATE; Pg. B-6, 557 words, By Julian Walker Times-Dispatch Staff Writer

18. CLOSE VOTE SPOTLIGHTS SYSTEM'S LINGERING FLAWS, Roanoke Times & World News (Roanoke, VA), November 4, 2004 Thursday Metro Edition, 405 words

28. Before heading to polls, have ID to show and know where to go, The Virginian-Pilot (Norfolk, Va.), November 2, 2004 Tuesday, The Virginian-Pilot Edition, Pg. A1, 720 words, JOHN-HENRY DOUCETTE


Washington:

Washington Provisional Ballots


14. Logan: King County may never know number of illegal ballots, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, April 26, 2005, Tuesday, BC cycle, State and Regional, 818 words, By REBECCA COOK, Associated Press Writer, OLYMPIA, Wash.


http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/opinion/2002324029_hasen10.html
West Virginia:

West Virginia Provisional Ballots

20. Measure allows voters to ensure provisional ballots were counted, Charleston Gazette (West Virginia), November 6, 2004, Saturday, News; Pg. P6D, 905 words, Avery Johnson

30. Voters' help box, Charleston Gazette (West Virginia), November 2, 2004, Tuesday, News; Pg. P1C, 390 words


Wisconsin:

Wisconsin Provisional Ballots


27. WHAT ARE PROVISIONAL BALLOTS?, Wisconsin State Journal (Madison, Wisconsin), November 3, 2004 Wednesday, FOURTH EDITION, FRONT; Pg. A9, 152 words

29. ELECTION 2004 All you need to know to make your vote count, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel (Wisconsin), November 2, 2004 Tuesday, Final Edition, B News; Pg. 1, 959 words, TOM KERTSCHER, Journal Sentinel, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel

30. Protect voter rights today, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel (Wisconsin), November 2, 2004 Tuesday, Final Edition, A News; Pg. 14, 730 words, STANFORD, Staff, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel

33. PROVISIONAL VOTES NOT SEEN AS PROBLEM, Wisconsin State Journal (Madison, Wisconsin), October 31, 2004 Sunday, ALL EDITION, LOCAL/WISCONSIN; Pg. D2, 366 words, Elizabeth Wachowski Wisconsin State Journal

42. Provisional ballots will allow new voters without identification to vote, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel (Wisconsin), October 5, 2004 Tuesday, Final Edition, B News; Pg. 7, 373 words, MEG JONES, Journal Sentinel, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel

Wyoming:

Wyoming Provisional Ballots


State Elections Websites Consulted

http://www.sos.state.al.us/election/index.cfm
http://ltgov.state.ak.us/elections/
http://www.azsos.gov/
http://www.sosweb.state.ar.us/elections.html
http://www.ss.ca.gov/elections/elections.htm
http://www.sos.state.co.us/pubs/elections/main.htm
http://www.sots.state.ct.us/ElectionsDivision/Electionindex.html
http://www.state.de.us/election/
http://www.dcboee.org/
http://election.dos.state.fl.us/
http://www.sos.state.ga.us/elections/default.htm
http://www.hawaii.gov/elections
http://www.idahovotes.gov/
http://www.elections.state.il.us/
http://www.state.in.us/sos/elections/index.html
http://www.sos.state.ia.us/elections/index.html
http://www.kssos.org/elections/elections.html
http://sos.ky.gov/elections/
http://www.sec.state.la.us/elections/elections-index.htm
http://www.maine.gov/sos/cec/elec/
http://www.elections.state.md.us/
http://www.sec.state.ma.us/ele/eleidx.htm
http://michigan.gov/sos/0,1607,7-127-1633---,00.html
http://www.sos.state.mn.us/election/index.html
http://www.sos.state.ms.us/elections/elections.asp
http://www.sos.state.mt.us/elections/
http://www.state.ne.us/elec/
http://www.sos.state.nh.gov/electionsnew.htm
http://www.state.nj.us/lps/elections/electionshome.html
http://www.sos.state.nm.us/
http://www.sos.state.ny.us/portal/page?_pageid=153,42096,153_53293&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL
http://www.sboe.state.nc.us/
http://www.state.nd.us/sec/electvote/
http://www.sos.state.oh.us/sos/elections/index.html
http://www.oklaosf.state.ok.us/~elections/
http://www.oregonvotes.org/
http://www.dos.state.pa.us/bcel/site/default.asp
http://www.sec.state.ri.us/elections
http://www.sdsos.gov/elections/
http://www.state.in.us/sos/election/index.htm
http://www.sos.state.tx.us/elections/index.shtml
http://www.voterlink.utah.gov/
http://vermont-elections.org/soshome.htm
http://www.sbe.state.va.us/
http://www.seestate.wa.gov/elections/
http://www.wvsos.org/elections/main.htm
http://elections.state.wi.us/
http://soswy.state.wy.us/election/election.htm