

U.S. Election Assistance Commission

Case Studies on the Impact of the Help America Vote Act's Identification Requirements for First-Time Voters



May 2008

Case Studies on the Impact of the Help America Vote Act's Identification Requirements for First-Time Voters

This page intentionally left blank.

Background.....	1
Purpose And Methodology	3
Selection of Case Study Participants.....	3
Availability of Data.....	6
Definitions	6
The Six Selected States	7
Voter Registration.....	8
At the Polls	10
Implementation Costs	11
Benefits and Challenges	12
Recommended Practices.....	13
Voter ID Legislation.....	13
Indiana	15
Voter Registration.....	17
At the Polls	17
Implementation Costs	18
Benefits and Challenges	19
Recommended Practices.....	19
Massachusetts.....	20
Voter Registration.....	21
At the Polls	23
Implementation Costs	23
Benefits and Challenges	23
Recommended Practices.....	24
Montana.....	25
Voter Registration.....	26
At the Polls	27
Implementation Costs	28
Benefits and Challenges	28
Recommended Practices.....	29
New Jersey	30
Voter Registration.....	31
At the Polls	32
Implementation Costs	32
Benefits and Challenges	32
Recommended Practices.....	33
North Carolina.....	34
Voter Registration.....	35
At the Polls	36
Implementation Costs	36
Benefits and Challenges	36
Recommended Practices.....	36

Pennsylvania..... 38
 Voter Registration..... 39
 At the Polls 40
 Implementation Costs 40
 Benefits and Challenges 41
 Recommended Practices..... 41
References..... 42

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) is an independent, bipartisan commission created by the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002 to assist State and local election officials with the administration of Federal elections. The EAC provides assistance by disbursing, administering, and auditing Federal funds for States to implement HAVA requirements; conducting studies and other activities to promote the effective administration of Federal elections; and serving as a source of information regarding election administration.

Section 244(a) of HAVA requires the EAC to study the impact of section 303(b) on voters who register by mail.

How the States Chose to Comply With HAVA's Mandates

Section 303(b) of HAVA introduced a new ID requirement for all individuals who register by mail and have not voted previously in a Federal election in the State in which they are applying to register. According to the Federal law, States must require each of these first-time voters to present one of the following types of ID before casting a ballot:

- A valid photo ID.
- A copy of a current utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck, or other government document that shows the name and address of the voter.

A voter may avoid having to show ID at the polls by submitting a copy of one of the above-mentioned IDs with his or her registration application. Alternatively, the voter may choose to include a driver's license number or at least the last four digits of his or her Social Security number; if that number and the voter's name and date of birth match an existing State identification record, ID will not be required at the polls. Any first-time voter who does not comply with these requirements may cast a provisional or fail-safe

ballot. Military and overseas voters are exempt from this requirement as are any voters, including people with disabilities, who are entitled to vote by absentee ballot according to Federal law.

Congress left it up to the States to decide whether to implement the law as the only ID requirement or to expand on it and require more from voters.

When the law passed, 11 States required all voters to identify themselves before they were allowed to cast a ballot. Voter cards, hunting and fishing licenses, library cards, utility bills, drivers' licenses, and Social Security cards were commonly accepted forms of ID. In some States, voters who did not bring ID with them to the polls were allowed to vote after signing an affidavit attesting to their identity.¹

By 2004, 17 States required all voters to show ID and two more States required all first-time voters to show ID, including those who registered in person. By 2006, 24 States had laws in place that called for every voter to show ID at the polling place. Of those States, two required voters to show photo ID, three requested photo ID, and 19 mandated that every voter provide valid ID that displayed his or her name and address.²

In conjunction with ID requirements, the law also mandated that every State implement a statewide, computerized list of registered voters that, through a link to the State's motor vehicles department, could be used to verify first-time voters' identities. Motor vehicle administrators in turn were required to enter into agreement with the Commissioner of Social Security to obtain the information needed to verify voters' identities.

At least 37 States had already established the lists, but only 10 of them had databases that were accessible by State and local election officials as HAVA required.³ Although most State motor vehicles departments were verifying the Social Security numbers of driver's license applicants before HAVA passed, by 2003, at least 7 still were not doing so.⁴

This page intentionally left blank.

The purpose of this study is to examine the effect that Section 303(b) has had on first-time voters who registered by mail and on election administration in the States. More specifically, Section 244 of HAVA requires the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to study and report on the effect of the law on first-time voters who register to vote by mail and cast their ballots in person, voter registration, the accuracy of voter rolls, and existing State practices.

This report presents the results of six case studies completed during the spring of 2007. The case studies were designed to analyze the effect of HAVA's requirements on first-time voters and the States. Also during the spring of 2007, focus groups were conducted to give researchers perspective of the perceptions of first-time voters about identification requirements.

Data for this report were collected using primary and secondary sources. Electronic questionnaires were submitted to the States via e-mail. Followup phone interviews and in-person visits were conducted with State election officials to obtain more detailed information. Background information was gathered from sources such as the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, the National Conference of State Legislatures, electionline.org, EAC and Federal Election Commission reports, and State Web sites.

It is important to note that larger numbers of voters typically participate in Presidential elections than in midterm elections or "off years." Nonprofit, political, and special interest groups often conduct voter registration drives during Presidential election years, which serves to increase not only the number of registration applications but also the total number and percentage of applications that are submitted by mail. As a result, more accurate comparisons can be made between similar election years (one Presidential election year versus another, one midterm election year versus another). Whenever possible, this report will compare figures for similar years.

Selection of Case Study Participants

The six States that participated in this study were selected based on a number of criteria.

First, all States that do not use "top-down" voter registration databases were eliminated. A top-down system is hosted on a single, central platform maintained by the State and connected to terminals housed at local election offices. This kind of system is considered most closely akin to HAVA's requirements.

States that had similar or more stringent voter ID requirements before HAVA took effect were also precluded from participating in the study, as were any States that had not yet fully implemented the required voter registration database.

The remaining States were organized into five categories based on Census Bureau data.

1. Elderly, Urban, and Affluent Populations

In this category, the States have well-established, stable populations that are highly educated. According to Census Bureau figures, residents of these States are typically more civically engaged. It follows, then, that they also might be more likely to understand and comply with HAVA's voter ID requirements.

2. Young, Rural, and Low-Income Populations

States in this category generally have less stable populations—young residents often migrate out of State or to more urban areas within the State. Residents of these States are less likely to have obtained bachelor's degrees than are residents of most other States. Voter participation rates are lower than the national average. Residents of these States might be less likely to understand and comply with voter ID requirements.

3. White, Rural, and Low Foreign-Born Populations

The residents of these States are typically long-time residents who are also older. They are more likely to vote. It is not uncommon for families to have lived in these States for generations. It could be possible that most first-time voters in these States would understand and comply with Section 303(b) requirements.

4. Non-White, Urban, and High Foreign-Born Populations

High rates of immigration into these States and migration to them from other States make the populations less stable. The States that best fit this category generally have some of the lowest voter registration and participation rates in the country. If participation rates are any indication, it is possible that residents of these States will not understand and comply with ID requirements.

5. Suburban, Middle-Class Populations

A largely suburban, middle-class State was selected to balance the other states chosen.

Final selections were made based on the representation of a variety of ethnic groups in each State's population and varying ID requirements. Three of the selected States implemented more stringent voter ID requirements than were mandated by HAVA, and one of those States requires every voter to show photo ID at the polls. The remaining three States implemented the law as a maximum requirement.

The two States remaining after the initial elimination process require voters to indicate their ethnic background on their voter registration forms. These States were included to help ensure that an ethnically diverse sampling of voters could be identified to participate in the focus groups that make up the second part of the project.

Census Bureau data for each of the States were collected, analyzed, and compared. Overall, they represent a diverse sample of the 50 States.

Note: The higher the rankings described in the following paragraphs, the larger the percentage of the specified group, characteristic, or per capita income. For example, a ranking of 10th indicates a higher percentage than a ranking of 23rd.

Indiana, for example, ranked 17th among the States in the percentage of its population that is White; 23rd in the percentage that is African American; and 22nd in the percentages of residents who are Hawaiian-Pacific Islander and two or more races. It has a comparatively low foreign-born population, ranking 35th in that percentage of its total population. Its population is relatively young—it ranked 34th in the percentage of residents who are 65 and older.

Indiana ranked 29th in the percentage urban, classifying it as a largely suburban State. The State ranked 35th in per capita income. Its educational profile is comparatively low; only 21.9 percent of its population has a bachelor's degree or higher level of education.⁵

Indiana's voter participation numbers are low. It ranked 45th in the percentage of its population that was registered to vote in 2004 and 46th in the percentage that actually voted in 2004. The corresponding percentages for 2000 were very similar, with sharp decreases in the "off year" of 2002.

Massachusetts ranked 23rd in the percentage of its population that is White; 28th in the percentage African American; 7th in the percentage Asian; and 13th in other races and ethnicities. It has a comparatively high foreign-born population, ranking 9th in that percentage of its total population. Its population is relatively elderly, ranking 14th in the percentage of its residents who are 65 and older.

Massachusetts ranked 6th in the percentage urban, and 5th in per capita income. Its educational profile is high, as some 40.4 percent of its population has a bachelor's degree or higher level of education.⁶

The State's voter participation numbers are high: it ranked 8th in the percentage of its population that was registered to vote in 2004 and 10th in the

percentage that actually voted. The corresponding percentages for 2000 were very similar, with sharp decreases in the off year of 2002.

Montana ranked 9th in the percentage of its population that is White, 49th in percentage African American, 5th in the percentage American Indian-Alaskan, and 9th in Hawaiian-Pacific Islander. It has a very low foreign-born population, ranking 49th in that percentage. Its population is relatively elderly, ranking 11th in the percentage of residents aged 65 and older.

Montana exhibits a rural population profile, ranking 45th in the percentage urban; it ranked 40th in per capita income. Its educational profile is comparatively low—some 25.1 percent of its population has a bachelor's degree or higher level of education.⁷

The State's voter participation numbers are high. It ranked 14th in the percentage of its population that was registered to vote in 2004 and 8th in the percentage that actually voted. The corresponding percentages for 2000 were lower, with still greater decreases in the off year of 2002.

New Jersey ranked 40th in the percentage of its population that is White, 17th in the percentage African American, 3rd in the percentage Asian, 9th in the percentage Hispanic-Latino, and 6th in other races and ethnicities. The State has a high foreign-born population, ranking 3rd in that percentage of its total population. Its population distribution by age is unremarkable, ranking 24th in the percentage of residents who are 65 and older.

New Jersey ranked 3rd in the percentage urban and 3rd in per capita income. Its educational profile is high; 35.6 percent of its population has a bachelor's degree or higher level of education.

The State's voter participation numbers are unremarkable. It ranked 26th in the percentage of its population that was registered to vote in 2004 and 22nd in the percentage that actually voted.

The corresponding percentages for 2000 were very similar, with sharp decreases in the off year of 2002.

North Carolina ranked 38th in the percentage of its population that is White, 8th in the percentage African American, and 10th in the percentage American Indian-Alaskan. Its foreign-born population is average, ranking 23rd in that percentage. It ranks 37th in the percentage 65 and older, so the population is comparatively young.

North Carolina ranked 40th in the percentage urban and 35th in per capita income. Some 25.6 percent of its population has a bachelor's degree or higher level of education.⁸

The State's voter participation numbers are on the low side. It ranked 28th in the percentage of its population that was registered to vote in 2004 and 42nd in the percentage that actually voted. The corresponding percentages for 2000 were somewhat lower, with sharp decreases in the midterm election year of 2002.

Pennsylvania ranked 19th in the percentage of its population that is White, 21st in percentage African American, and 33rd in the percentage Hispanic-Latino. Its population is aging; it ranked 3rd in the percentage 65 and older.

The State ranked 21st in the percentage urban and 22nd in per capita income. Some 26.6 percent of its population has a bachelor's degree or higher level of education.⁹

Pennsylvania's voter participation numbers are relatively low. It ranked 34th in the percentage of its population that was registered to vote in 2004 and 27th in the percentage that actually voted. The corresponding percentages for 2000 were lower, with sharp decreases in the off year of 2002.

Availability of Data

Unfortunately, a telephone survey of the 39 States that implemented top-down voter registration databases produced none equipped with systems that can generate detailed reports of first-time voters' registration and voting behaviors. Although many States flag the individual records of first-time, by-mail registrants who must provide ID at the polling place, the State systems are not capable of producing comprehensive, statewide reports of the number of first-time voters who registered by mail or who showed a current and valid ID at the polls, for example. Although that kind of data is helpful for research projects such as this one, many election officials say that it is not vital to the administration of elections.

The States that were selected to participate in this study collect at least as much data as other States and, in many cases, more. In cases in which exact figures are unavailable, State election officials have provided estimates. All estimates are identified in this report as such.

Definitions

For the purposes of this report, we have provided the following working definitions of common election-related terms.

Statewide Voter Registration Database or System

An interactive, electronic list of all voter registration records in any given State. The term is defined in the EAC's "Voluntary Guidance on Implementation of Statewide Voter Registration Lists" as:

... the one official list of lawfully registered voters within a state for all elections for Federal office and the only lawful source of Federal registration information for poll books or precinct registers on Election Day. The list must be centrally managed at the State level

in a uniform and non-discriminatory manner. The list must be computerized and technically capable of providing immediate electronic access to appropriate State and local election officials; assigning unique identifiers; affording local officials expedited entry of voter registration information; allowing voter registration information to be verified with other State, local and Federal agencies; providing a means for list maintenance; tracking appropriate voting history; and ensuring appropriate system security.¹⁰

State Definitions of a First-Time Voter

HAVA defines a first-time voter as an individual who has not previously voted in an election for Federal office in the State, or who has not previously voted in a Federal election in a jurisdiction located in a State that does not have a statewide voter registration database.¹¹

Indiana and Massachusetts adopted HAVA's definition of a first-time voter.

New Jersey and North Carolina define a first-time voter as an individual who is registering to vote for the first time in a county.

Pennsylvania defines a first-time voter as an individual who is registering to vote for the first time in a precinct.

Montana has no definition for a first-time voter because the State's ID requirements are the same for all voters.

Section 303(b) of the HAVA has had diverse effects on State election administration and first-time voters. Although every State that participated in this study is compliant with the law, each State implemented HAVA in widely varied ways. In turn, election reforms have had different effects on the States and first-time voters who registered by mail.

New State Laws

Five of the States studied expanded on HAVA's minimum ID requirement. Three require more than just first-time, by-mail registrants to provide ID and two more States broadened HAVA's definition of a first-time voter.

Indiana requires every voter to show photo ID before casting a ballot. First-time voters who register by mail are required to show additional ID that includes the address at which they registered to vote, but only if the photo ID they provided does not include that information.

Every voter in Montana must show ID before voting. Acceptable forms of ID include those outlined in HAVA as acceptable for first-time voters: a photo ID, utility bill, bank statement, paycheck, or voter card or other government document, which includes the voter's name and address.

Pennsylvania requires all first-time voters, not just those who registered by mail, to show ID before voting. Pennsylvania, like Montana, will accept any of the forms of ID that are listed as acceptable in HAVA.

The States also passed legislation and promulgated rules to comply with other aspects of Section 303(b), including laws and rules related to the development of a HAVA-compliant statewide voter registration database, revisions to State voter registration forms, election official and poll worker training programs, voter education initiatives, and provisional balloting.

Four of the six States (Massachusetts, Montana, New Jersey, North Carolina) had a voter registration database in place when HAVA passed and one (Pennsylvania) was in the process of developing one. None of the systems had all of the capabilities mandated by HAVA.

Four of the six States (Massachusetts, Montana, New Jersey, North Carolina) offered some kind of provisional or fail-safe voting before HAVA required it, but most were more limited than what the law called for.

Every State made changes to its mail-in voter registration form as required by HAVA. All State forms now require applicants to indicate whether they are U.S. citizens and whether they will be at least 18 years of age on Election Day. States also added statements notifying first-time voters that, if they register to vote by mail, they must submit ID with the form or provide it before they vote.

Training for Election Officials and Poll Workers

Thanks to money allocated by Congress to help pay for HAVA's reforms, the States could afford to pay for new and expanded training programs for election officials. Some States had formal training in place before HAVA passed; others, such as New Jersey, had established training only for county supervisors. Instead of traditional classroom-style sessions, each State introduced innovative new training methods to better communicate the new ID and registration processing requirements to local officials.

Indiana conducted training via streaming video on the Web and set up a "sandbox" system that mirrored the State's actual voter registration database but was housed on a different server. Local officials were able to experiment with the sandbox without corrupting any of the live data. The contractor Indiana hired to develop its voter registration database even brought in motivational speakers to help with training.

Montana provided every county with a special training DVD. Pennsylvania worked with colleges and universities to improve its training curriculum. North Carolina offered certification seminars for election officials through the University of North Carolina's Institute of Government.

Although some States had been training election officials for years, most had not been training poll workers because that task had primarily been the local officials' responsibility. Before the passage of HAVA, it was quite common for poll worker training programs to vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. In 2004, chief election officials in every State called for uniform procedures for training poll workers statewide.

The office of Massachusetts' secretary of the Commonwealth worked with local officials to design presentations to teach poll workers about new ID requirements. New Jersey's attorney general published a manual that included procedures for obtaining ID from first-time voters and distributed it to poll workers across the State.

Voter Education and Outreach

The States that participated in this study approached voter education in equally creative ways. Several States aired voter education videos on public access television and issued election guides for first-time voters. Every State posted information about ID requirements on the Web and many used free media coverage to communicate ID requirements to voters.

Massachusetts sent postcards to first-time registrants who would be required to show ID at their polling place to notify them of the new law. The State also devoted most of the content of its Information for Voters booklet, which was sent to every household in Massachusetts, to explaining the ID requirement.

Indiana and Montana enlisted community organizations to help educate voters. Indiana established partnerships with organizations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the American Association of Retired Persons to reach prospective voters who might have difficulty understanding and complying with ID requirements. Montana provided grants to more than 90 organizations in an effort to help them educate their constituents.

New Jersey recruited high-profile celebrities to appear in public service announcements. Actors Michael Douglas and Jason Alexander and musician Wyclef Jean were among those who helped encourage voters to register and to visit the State's Web site to learn more about requirements for first-time, by-mail registrants.

Voter Registration

Although election officials process voter registration applications differently from State to State, they do have a few commonalities.

All of the States studied adopted uniform procedures for processing voter registration applications and established a link from their statewide voter registration database to the State motor vehicles department for the purpose of verifying the identities of voter registration applicants. Every State notifies registrants when their applications are accepted. County officials in nearly every State studied enter voter registration applications into the system, although in Massachusetts municipal officials are responsible for processing the forms.

Election officials in every State notify applicants whose registration forms are incomplete or whose identities cannot be verified and give them the opportunity to provide additional information, but each State has different procedures for doing so.

Local officials in Indiana are required to contact applicants by phone and by mail. If the applicant does not respond, he or she is not registered and must cast a provisional ballot at the polls. County officials in Montana and New Jersey notify applicants by phone and mail. In Montana, applicants who do not respond are "provisionally registered" and are required to show ID at the polls. New Jersey registers these applicants but requires them to show ID at the polls. In Pennsylvania and North Carolina, applicants receive a letter. If they do not respond, they will be offered a provisional ballot on Election Day.

The Accuracy of Voter Rolls

Before HAVA passed, it was common for different jurisdictions within the same State to use different systems and procedures to process voter registration applications.

Montana reported that, in the absence of a statewide system, some of its counties had to rely on a word processing application to maintain their voter rolls. In Pennsylvania, each of the State's 67 counties had different procedures for processing voter registration applications and it was nearly impossible for them to determine whether applicants were registered to vote in other counties.

But new statewide voter registration databases and ID requirements have helped increase the accuracy of the States' voter rolls. Now, all the local jurisdictions in each State use the same statewide voter registration database to process registration applications and follow the same procedures for entering the applications into the system.

When new registration applications are entered, voter registration databases in all six of the States that participated in this study use the ID number provided by the applicant to automatically check the State motor vehicles department's records for duplicate registrations (one or more pre-existing registration records for the same voter).

All of the States' systems are password protected and permit only users to edit records for their jurisdiction. Several State databases also track user activity. The Massachusetts Voter Registration Information System, for example, requires users to log into a Windows domain controller first and then enter a separate user ID to log into the database. Each user's ID serves as a traceable identifier that enables the system to track the user's activity.

Some of the six States further ensured the accuracy of their voter rolls by providing election officials with technical support and instructional handbooks. In Montana, trainers helped the counties transfer voter registration records to the new system to maintain the integrity of existing records. Indiana distributed a ready-reference guide that system users could attach to their computer screens.

Voter Registration Trends

It is difficult to discern many significant trends from the Census Bureau's State voter registration data for 2004, the year HAVA's ID requirements took

effect, but a few stand out. For example, between 2000 and 2004, the increase in percentage of African Americans registered to vote outpaced the increase in percentage of the total population registered to vote in four of the States surveyed. Only in Massachusetts did African-American voter registration underperform the statewide average, showing a 1.8-percent decrease against a statewide 1.7-percent increase.¹²

Similarly, registration of voters aged 18 to 24 increased considerably more than the State total in three of the six States surveyed, and that figure was unavailable in a fourth (Montana). Only in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania did that subgroup underperform the statewide averages and, in those two cases, only by a slim margin.

Registration of voters 75 and older differed considerably from their statewide changes in four cases. Those figures were considerably higher than the statewide changes in two States (Indiana and North Carolina) and considerably lower in two others (Massachusetts and New Jersey).

Two States saw changes in registration among women that were not entirely consistent with the statewide trend. The percentage of women registered in Indiana decreased by 4.7 percent from 2000 to 2004 as compared with a 1.7-percent overall decrease in registered voters in the State. Registration among women in Montana increased by 3.6 percent, nearly 2 points lower than the statewide increase in the total number of registered voters.¹³

Fewer data were available for 2006, and no figures were available for racial/ethnic, age, and gender subgroups of interest. It appears that four out of the six States studied experienced an increase in the percentage of their voting-age citizen population that was registered to vote. But census population figures for 2006 are only estimated predictions because no formal census data are yet available.

Indiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania all reported increases in the number of new registrants that were added to

the rolls in the days leading up to the 2004 election as compared with 2000. Only one State, Montana, reported adding more new registrants to the rolls in 2006 than in 2002.¹⁴ These registration figures are for the time period beginning after the close of registration for the previous Federal election year and running through the close of registration for the Federal election year named.¹⁵

Three States saw a significant increase in the percentage of voter registration applications that were submitted by mail in 2004 compared with 2000, the previous Presidential election year.

The largest increase in applications submitted by mail was in Massachusetts. Of all voter registration applications, 59 percent were submitted by mail in the State in 2004—a 41-point increase from just 17.7 percent in 2000.¹⁶ This dramatic increase may be attributed in part to the State’s voter education efforts. In 2004, the secretary’s office sent an informational booklet to every household in the State that was largely devoted to explaining how to register to vote by mail and comply with HAVA’s ID requirements. The centerpiece of the booklet was a mail-in registration form.

In Montana, approximately 23 percent of voter registration applications were submitted by mail in 2004 compared with 17 percent in 2000. The percentage of by-mail applications in Pennsylvania increased by 4 points from 2000 to 2004. Pennsylvania also had the second highest percentage of by-mail applications in 2004: 35 percent.¹⁷

Indiana experienced a 17-point drop in the percentage of applications that were submitted in 2004. Of applications in 2000, 35 percent were by mail, but just 17.8 percent were by mail in 2004.¹⁸ The corresponding percentage for 2006 was 6.7 points lower than in 2002.

According to State estimates, most first-time, by-mail registrants included a driver’s license number or the last four digits of their Social Security number with their registration form in 2004 and 2006. Estimates ranged from 80 to 95 percent. States also estimated that anywhere from less than 1 percent

According to State election officials, voters who complete the national form are more likely to include ID than voters who complete a form that the State provides.

to 6 percent of first-time registrants submitted a copy of ID with their registration application.

Because these figures are only estimates, no real comparisons can be drawn from State to State. It is clear, though, that most by-mail registrants who submitted ID with their registration form included a copy of their driver’s license. State estimates ranged from 80 to 98 percent. Two States (New Jersey and North Carolina) did not provide estimates but said most applicants who included ID used a driver’s license.

The States agreed that most of the applicants who included a copy of their ID submitted the National Mail Voter Registration Form, a document created by the Federal Government that may be used to register to vote in any of the 47 States that accept the form. According to State election officials, voters who complete the national form are more likely to include ID than voters who complete a form that the State provides.

That may be because the form’s accompanying instructions advise voters that “Federal law requires you to show proof of identification the first time you vote ... Voters may be exempt from this requirement if they submit a copy of this identification with their mail-in voter registration form.” A reminder on the application itself, in bold red lettering, alerts first-time voters to “refer to the application instructions for information on submitting copies of valid identification documents with this form.”

At the Polls

Most first-time voters who registered by mail provided current and valid ID at the polls in both 2004 and 2006. State election officials’ estimates

of the percentage of first-time voters who complied with ID requirements on Election Day ranged from 95 to 98 percent. North Carolina did not provide an estimate but reported that lack of acceptable ID was a nonissue.

Most first-time voters who were required to show ID at the polls presented a driver's license. Montana and Pennsylvania reported the lowest percentages of voters who showed a license: 85 and 80 percent, respectively.

Montana's lower-than-average percentage is likely due to the fact that 6 percent of the State's residents are Native American, and most Native American voters used a tribal ID card as their ID. Tribal IDs were the second most commonly presented form of ID in Montana.

Pennsylvania officials said that voters who did not show a driver's license at the polls tended to be senior citizens and inner-city residents. These voters presented passports, State residence licenses, and student IDs as their identification.

The number of provisional or fail-safe ballots cast in 2006 was considerably smaller than in 2004 in nearly every State, which is understandable because fewer voters participated in the midterm election than in the Presidential election. But closer examination reveals that provisional ballot figures dropped more than voter participation figures did.

- The number of provisional ballots cast in New Jersey was 74 percent lower in 2006 than in 2004. The total number of ballots cast in the State dropped by only 37 percent.
- The number of provisional ballots cast in Massachusetts dropped by 60 percent and voter participation dropped by 27 percent.
- Nearly 71 percent fewer provisional ballots were cast in North Carolina. Voter participation in the State dropped by 44 percent.
- In Indiana, provisional ballot totals were 64 percent lower in 2006 than in 2004, compared with a 40-percent decrease in voter participation.

Montana is the only State (for which data were available) in which the number of provisional ballots cast increased, from 623 in 2004 to 2,242 in 2006, despite a 14-percent decrease in the number of ballots cast overall. The State passed its ID-for-all-voters law in 2003, so it is unlikely that the requirement was the cause of an increase in provisional ballots 3 years and one Federal election later.

Montana reported that the percentage of provisional ballots that were able to be counted increased from 60 percent in 2004 to 95 percent in 2006. Just 27, or approximately 1 percent of provisional ballots were not counted due to the voter's failure to provide proper ID.

Four other States also reported higher percentages of provisional ballots counted in 2006. Indiana's percentage of provisional ballots counted jumped from 15 to 44 percent. North Carolina's percentage rose from 65 to 74. Provisional ballots counted in New Jersey increased from 55 percent in 2004 to 69 percent in 2006. Data were not available for Pennsylvania.

Massachusetts is the only State that reported a decrease, from 23 percent of provisional ballots counted in 2004 to 21 percent in 2006. State election officials in Massachusetts estimated that the percentage of provisional ballots cast by first-time voters due to a lack of proper ID dropped a small amount: from 2 percent in 2004 to 1.5 percent in 2006.

Implementation Costs

The exact cost to the States of implementing Section 303(b) is hard to determine, because many of the expenditures paid for equipment, training, and practices that were necessary to comply with more than just this one HAVA mandate.

Only one State, Massachusetts, set aside a designated Section 303(b) budget; but that \$332,000 budget did not include money spent to implement the required statewide voter registration database.

Other States lumped these expenses in with the budget they earmarked to pay for a voter registration database, election official and poll

worker training, voter education, and provisional balloting. States estimated they spent anywhere from less than 1 percent to 25 percent of this money on equipment, training, and initiatives necessary to comply with Section 303(b).

One easily identified cost to the States was time. Nearly every State reported that it takes election officials more time to process voter registration applications than it did before HAVA's ID requirements took effect.

New Jersey was affected the most. State election officials in New Jersey do not handle voter registration applications and were unable to estimate how long the process takes, but several counties reported that it takes them an extra 3 ½ minutes per application.

Benefits and Challenges

Election officials in the six States that participated in this study were asked to highlight what they think were the benefits and challenges of implementing Section 303(b). In States that expanded on HAVA's ID requirement, officials said one of the law's biggest benefits is that ID for first-time voters who register by mail helps to deter fraud.

"Just one case of voter fraud undermines democracy and cancels someone's vote," Indiana HAVA administrator Joe McLain said. "HAVA's ID requirements and our additional ID requirements were a relatively inexpensive way for us to prevent fraud and increase voter confidence."

Similarly, officials in States that chose to implement Section 303(b) as the maximum ID requirement reported that ID for first-time voters was one of the law's biggest challenges.

"We were concerned that the law would keep some eligible voters from participating in our elections," said Maria DelValle-Koch, director of New Jersey's election division. "We have a large immigrant population here. Many of them are new citizens and eligible to vote, but because English is their second language, they can be easily overwhelmed by complicated requirements for voting like voter identification."

"People like the comfort factor that the new ID requirements give them," Tassinari said. "They know that the ID laws help protect against fraud."

In Massachusetts, however, where IDs are required only from first-time voters who register by mail, legal counsel to the secretary of the Commonwealth's Election Division Michelle Tassinari said that the new ID law is both beneficial and a challenge. She said the State's aging poll workers are sometimes uncomfortable addressing complaints about the ID requirements from first-time voters, but the State has had positive feedback from some voters.

"People like the comfort factor that the new ID requirements give them," Tassinari said. "They know that the ID laws help protect against fraud."

Two of the States that extended HAVA's requirements beyond first-time voters reported that educating voters about the new law was challenging. Three States reported that the HAVA-mandated statewide voter registration database was one of the biggest benefits of the law.

According to elections specialist Alan Miller in Montana, the registration database, in conjunction with ID requirements, has made it possible for the State to "consider options that would otherwise not have been feasible if safeguards were not in place." Specifically, Miller is referring to Election Day registration, which Montana currently allows.

Another 19 States are considering legislation that would permit Election Day registration. Of the six selected States under review, only New Jersey has no legislation pending. Although four of the selected States are considering enacting Election Day registration legislation, Montana has draft legislation that would end Election Day registration.

None of the States indicated that the added time it takes to process registrations and verify voters' identities on the statewide system has been

a challenge. But five of the six States studied reported that the time it takes to process one registration has increased by 1 minute or more, which can add up in States that are handling several hundred thousand—and in some cases more than one million—applications each Federal election year.

Recommended Practices

A number of State programs and resources proved to be particularly effective according to the States, and some were more effective than others.

Voter Education

The Indiana secretary of State's office worked with community organizations and other State agencies to reach out to groups of prospective voters, including first-time voters, who were deemed the least likely to understand and comply with the State's ID requirements. State partners such as the Governor's Planning Council for People with Disabilities, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the American Association of Retired Persons helped Indiana communicate ID requirements to these voters directly.

Montana employed a grassroots approach to educating voters. State election office staffers met with prospective voters face to face at powwows (gatherings of the State's Native American population), State and county fairs, trade shows, conventions, and college-sponsored events. They used these opportunities to notify voters of new ID requirements and provisional voting procedures.

The secretary of the Commonwealth's office in Massachusetts sent its Information for Voters booklet to every household in the State. The voting guide focused on explaining requirements for first-time voters who register to vote by mail and included a mail-in voter registration form.

New Jersey's attorney general spoke about HAVA-mandated election reforms, including ID for first-time voters who register by mail, at a special event for young voters that was streamed via the Internet to every high school in the State.

Training and Support for Local Officials

Montana established a "foster" program in which county officials who were members of the State's election reform task force each adopted several counties. "Parent" officials advised the foster counties on how to comply with new ID procedures.

Indiana provided local officials with ready-reference guides that were designed to be attached to the side of a computer screen and included instructions for processing voter registration applications from first-time voters.

Election board officials in North Carolina added a live-help feature to the department's Web site. Local officials who log into the system receive assistance from an information technology professional who can walk them through processes, such as entering a voter registration application, live on the system itself. North Carolina also established a Wellness Check program under which a team of State election officials visit county boards of elections and audit a number of procedures to ensure they are compliant with Federal and State laws.

Massachusetts and Pennsylvania published detailed instructional manuals that, using screen shots and step-by-step directions, explained how to process registration applications from first-time voters.

Media Outreach

Indiana conducted background sessions for media throughout the State to explain the new ID requirements and other election reforms to reporters, producers, and editors. The secretary's office also offered media training to local officials to prepare them to effectively communicate the new requirements to journalists.

Voter ID Legislation

In the future, more States may join the list of those that have expanded on HAVA's Section 303(b) ID requirements for first-time voters who register by mail. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures' Web site, 16 States are considering legislation that would require all voters

to provide photo ID at the polls. Another 12 States are considering legislation that would require every voter to show nonphoto ID. Two of the six studied States are considering legislation that would require ID from all voters. Legislation has been introduced in Indiana that would repeal that State's photo ID law.

Massachusetts is considering a spate of legislation. The most noteworthy bills are SB440, which would require voters to show a photo ID, and SB464, which would accept certain nonphoto IDs. Both bills were read in January of 2007 and have been referred to the Committee on Election Laws.

North Carolina is considering HB185, which provides nonspecifically that voters provide ID before voting, and HB989 and SB779, which require government-issued photo ID. HB185 was introduced on February 15, 2007, and has been referred to the Committee on Rules, Calendar, and Operations. HB989 was introduced in March 2007 and has been referred to the Committee on Election Law and Campaign Finance Reform and, if favorable, will go to the Committee on the Judiciary. SB779, also introduced in March 2007, has been referred to the Select Committee on Government and Election Reform.

Indiana is considering two bills. One, SB182, defines what constitutes acceptable proof of Identification. Nonphoto IDs, such as utility bills and bank statements, would be considered acceptable. The bill was first read in January 2007; it has been referred to the Committee on Local Government and Elections. Another bill, HB1806, changes the definition of "proof of identification" for purposes of voting to reflect the standards set by HAVA. After an initial reading in January, it was referred to the same committee.

Indiana

State election officials estimate that, in 2004 and 2006, 95 percent of first-time, by-mail registrants provided ID that met the State's requirements.

New State Laws

The Indiana legislature passed a bill in 2005 that gave the State some of the strictest ID requirements in the country.¹⁹ The law mandates that every voter present government-issued photo ID before signing in at the polling place. The ID must include the voter's name, photo, and expiration date, and it must have been issued by the Federal Government or the State of Indiana.

Voters who do not already have a valid photo ID may obtain one free of charge from the State's Bureau of Motor Vehicles. Voters who apply for a photo ID at the bureau must provide three types of ID.

The requirements are best explained in Indiana's handbook for precinct election boards, which appears in italics below.

A new issuance of a photo ID Card requires the applicant to present:

- *One (1) Primary Document*
- *One (1) Secondary Document*
- *One (1) Proof of Indiana Residency Document (A Primary or Secondary Document may also meet the Indiana residency requirement as long as the applicant's name and correct address are shown on the document)*

OR

- *Two (2) Primary Documents*
 - *One (1) Proof of Indiana Residency Document*
- Primary Documents (one required)*

- *Official Birth Certificate or Certification of Birth DS-1350*
- *U.S. Certificate of Naturalization/Citizenship*
- *U.S. Passport*
- *U.S. Military I.D. Card or Veteran's Universal ID Card with Photo*

Secondary Documents (one required)

- *Bank Statement*
- *Major Credit/Debit Card*
- *Certified Academic Transcript*
- *Insurance, Medicare, and Medicaid Card*
- *Computer Generated Paycheck Stub*

Proof of Indiana Residency (one required)

Any document from the list of Primary Documents or Secondary Documents may be used as proof of Indiana residence as long as the document contains the applicant's name and residential address. For the purposes of this policy, a Post Office Box is not an acceptable residential address.

- *Utility Bill*
- *Other Current Bill or Benefit Statement (within 60 days of issuance)*
- *Voter Registration Card*
- *Child Support Check from FSSA with name and address of the applicant attached*
- *Change of Address Confirmation Form*
- *Indiana Property Deed or Tax Assessment*
- *Indiana Residency Affidavit*²⁰

In addition to providing a photo ID at the polls, every first-time voter who registered by mail must present ID that includes the voter's name and address, if it is not printed on the voter's photo ID. First-time voters may avoid this requirement by providing ID with their registration application.²¹

Indiana's photo ID law was upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit in April 2007, when the court voted not to rehear the case brought against the State by the Indiana Democratic Party and the State's American Civil Liberties Union chapter.

Indiana also passed laws requiring all of the State's 92 counties to use the statewide voter registration database and to implement provisional ballots.²²

Secretary of State Todd Rokita, elected in 2002, serves as Indiana's chief election official. The secretary has worked with Indiana's election division, a group within the secretary's office led by two codirectors who are appointed by the governor, to implement all election reforms in the State.

Changes to the State's Voter Registration Database and Registration Form

Indiana did not have a statewide voter registration database before HAVA passed. The State hired Quest Information Systems in 2004 to develop a HAVA-compliant system that is accessible by every county voter registration office in the State.

The system, known as First Tuesday, was introduced in 10 pilot counties in May 2005 and used by every county in the State by December 2005. Election officials use the system to generate poll lists that indicate which voters are first-time registrants who are required to present additional ID at the polls. First Tuesday also generates a voter ID card that is sent to every successfully registered voter.

Indiana's voter registration application was updated to include a section that applicants are instructed to fill in with their driver's license number or the last four digits of their Social Security number. The form also informs prospective registrants that, if they are registering to vote in a county for the first time and sending the application by mail, they must provide ID documentation either with the application or at the polls on Election Day. The form includes a list of acceptable ID.

Training for Election Officials and Poll Workers

Indiana contracted with its database developer, Quest, to conduct a series of extensive training sessions with the counties. Quest, in turn, hired motivational speakers and professional trainers to bring county officials up to speed on the new system.

Classes were conducted for all county officials in designated registration training centers throughout the State and on the Web. A sandbox that mirrored the database but was housed on a different server enabled new users to experiment with the registration system without corrupting the live data. A list of standard operating procedures was also issued to each county.

Ongoing training is offered to any new hires, and counties are immediately notified of any changes or updates to the system. All training materials are posted on a designated Web site.

The State issued Election Day handbooks with basic information about polling place procedures to precinct election officials and poll workers in 2004 and 2006. The 2004 guide included instructions for requesting ID from first-time voters who registered by mail and administering provisional ballots. Instructions for implementing the State's photo ID law and additional ID requirements for first-time voters who registered by mail were added to the 2006 guide.

Indiana also created election official and poll worker training videos and streaming video on the Web.

Voter Education and Outreach

Indiana communicated HAVA's ID and provisional balloting requirements to voters in 2004 through video and print materials and direct outreach.

The secretary's office developed agreements with local government and public television stations to air election reform information. The office produced a voter education video and public service announcements that aired on radio and television stations throughout the State and posted information for first-time voters on the Web. The State also sent representatives to community events throughout the State.

After the State passed its photo ID law in 2005, Secretary Rokita assembled a Vote with ID Task Force made up of community leaders from around

the State. He worked with the group to develop a plan for educating voters, including first-time voters who registered by mail, about the new requirements.

In 2006, Indiana implemented a multimedia voter education campaign that used the Internet, outdoor advertising and television and radio public service announcements to reach voters.

The State produced English and Spanish versions of a Photo ID Quick Reference Guide that explained the basics of photo ID and provisional ballots to voters and was distributed by the secretary's office, county election officials, Bureau of Motor Vehicles branches, State agencies and community leaders. The State also released a first-time voters' guide to registering and voting.

Indiana worked with media outlets in the State to achieve coverage of the ID initiative. The secretary's staff wrote a series of editorials, pitched ID-related stories and conducted train-the-media sessions for interested reporters and editors.

Voter Registration

Indiana's local election officials process voter registration applications received from prospective voters in their jurisdictions and enter them into the First Tuesday system. First Tuesday automatically verifies the accuracy of driver's license and partial Social Security numbers (the last four digits of the number) provided on voter registration forms through a link to the State's Bureau of Motor Vehicles Commission.

Voters whose applications are accepted receive a voter ID card. Local election officials are required to contact by phone all voters who submit incomplete registration forms. Counties follow up with written notification if they receive no response to the initial phone contact.

The Accuracy of Voter Rolls

Indiana's counties had an assortment of systems for tracking and processing voter registration applications before HAVA passed. The State's new

First Tuesday system and the training local officials received immediately helped increase the accuracy of the State's voter rolls by ensuring that each county used the same system and followed the same procedures to process applications.

First Tuesday is password-protected and is capable of tracking system activity. In fact, the system saves and time-stamps each key stroke, so each user's entire history can be viewed. User access is limited so that county officials can only edit the information that is relevant to their county. The system also automatically checks for duplicate registrations statewide whenever a new application is entered.

Incomplete registration applications are designated by the system as "pending" until local officials can contact the applicant and obtain the additional information. That way, incomplete registrations do not become part of the permanent record of registered voters, and they are not put away in a file without followup. If election officials are unable to obtain the missing information, applications are rejected and voters must cast a provisional ballot.

Even if the registration application is approved, the voter is considered "pending" until the end of a 7-day period. During that time, if the voter ID card is returned to the county as undeliverable, the registration is cancelled before it is entered permanently into the system.

At the Polls

The percentage of first-time voters who registered by mail and showed proper ID at the polls in Indiana was in line with the percentage reported by other States that participated in this study. State election officials estimate that, in 2004 and 2006, 95 percent of first-time, by-mail registrants provided ID that met the State's requirements.

Also according to State election officials, anywhere from 85 to 90 percent of those voters presented a driver's license in 2004 and 2006. Approximately 5 to 7 percent of voters in those years showed a State ID card and 2 percent provided military or student IDs.

Voter Registration Trends

- Indiana exhibited a slight decrease in voter registration from 2000 to 2004, declining from 68.5 percent registration statewide in 2000 to 66.8 percent in 2004, for a 1.7-percent decrease overall, despite the fact that the State's race for governor in 2004 was closer than the 2000 governor's race, and a closer margin typically increases participation.²³
- Corresponding changes in registration percentages within gender, racial/ethnic and age subgroups were in some cases generally consistent with the statewide trend, whereas others stood apart. The latter include a 1.5 percentage point increase in voter registration among men and a 4.7 point decrease in registration among women.²⁴ African-American voter registration increased 3.6 points, registration within the age 18-to-24 cohort increased 5.7 percentage points and registration of 75-and-older voters increased 1.8 points.²⁵
- More than 470,000 new registrants were added to Indiana's voter rolls from the end of registration in 2003 through the registration period's close of registration in 2004. That number was up from 394,477 during the same period from 1999 through 2000. Approximately 18 percent of those voter registration applications were submitted by mail in 2004, a substantial drop from the 35 and 39 percent that were submitted by mail in 2000 and 2002, respectively.²⁶
- Fewer new registrants were added to the State's voter rolls in 2006—only about 206,000. Registration figures are usually down in off-election years, but it is notable that 2006 numbers were lower than those for the last midterm. In 2002, 257,000 new registrants were added to the rolls.²⁷
- Of all applications, 33 percent were submitted by mail in 2006, an increase from the just 18 percent in 2004. The 2006 percentage was 2 to 6 points lower than in 2000 and 2002, respectively.²⁸
- Most by-mail registrants in Indiana included their driver's license number or the last four digits of their Social Security number with their application. Of all registrants, 85 percent included one of the numbers in 2004 and 90 percent included one of them in 2006.
- Anywhere from 5 to 10 percent of by-mail registrants submitted a copy of ID with their application, according to State estimates. Of those applicants, 90 to 95 percent included a copy of a driver's license or State ID card.

The percentage of total ballots cast that were provisional was lower in 2006 than in 2004 in Indiana: .13 percent in 2006 compared with .21 percent in 2004.

Notably, a much larger percentage of provisional ballots were counted in 2006 than in 2004. Approximately 16 percent of provisional ballots cast in 2004 were counted and 45 percent of provisional ballots cast in 2006 were counted.

State election officials were unable to determine what percentage of provisional ballots in either

year were cast by first-time voters who registered by mail. The State is in the process of building that tracking capability into its statewide voter registration system.

Implementation Costs

State election officials estimate that Indiana spent anywhere from \$11 to \$15 million implementing a statewide voter registration database, educating voters, training election officials and poll workers and setting up provisional balloting. Approximately 5 percent of that money—as much as \$750,000—went toward Section 303(b) requirements.

It takes county officials less than 1 minute more to process voter registrations now than it did before the State implemented a statewide voter registration system and ID requirements. State officials estimate that some counties may even experience a time savings since moving to the more efficient, user-friendly statewide system for processing registration applications.

Benefits and Challenges

The biggest challenge with regard to implementing Section 303(b) and the State's photo ID requirement for all voters, according to State election officials, was educating voters.

"But through a combination of multimedia and direct outreach programs, we were able to reach voters across the State," Indiana HAVA Administrator Joseph McLain said. "We worked hard to make sure everyone understood the new requirements, and we were pleased to see that we did not get a large number of calls about voter ID to our hotline on Election Day."

The number one benefit, according to McLain, is increased voter confidence.

"Just one case of voter fraud undermines democracy and cancels someone's vote," McLain said. "Without ID requirements, there's no way to stop fraud. HAVA's requirements and our additional ID requirements were a relatively inexpensive way for us to prevent fraud and increase voter confidence."

Recommended Practices

The Indiana secretary of State's office recognized that certain groups of voters might have a harder time than others complying with the new ID requirements, either because they do not understand the new laws or do not have the means necessary to obtain photo ID.

These groups were identified as first-time voters, senior citizens, indigent voters, voters with disabilities and re-enfranchised ex-felons.

"Just one case of voter fraud undermines democracy and cancels someone's vote."

*Indiana HAVA Administrator
Joseph McLain*

The State moved quickly to reach out to these at-risk groups. The secretary's office developed strategic partnerships with State agencies and private organizations that are uniquely suited to communicate with these voters. State partners included the American Association of Retired Persons, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Governor's Planning Council for People with Disabilities, student groups, utility companies, and all political parties in the State, among others. Through these organizations, Indiana was able to reach targeted groups of voters directly in a way it could not have on its own.

Indiana recognized the importance of communicating new ID requirements correctly to media outlets around the State, and so the State designed and conducted background and educational sessions for reporters, editors, and producers at regional media outlets. The secretary's office also provided media training to county election officials to prepare them to be interviewed by reporters and to effectively and accurately communicate the new requirements.

The State provided counties with ready-reference guides in an effort to make new verification procedures easy for local officials to follow. The guides, which can be attached to the side of a computer screen and viewed while working on that computer, include instructions for processing voter registration applications from first-time voters who submitted them by mail.

Massachusetts

State election officials estimate that 97 percent of first-timers who were required to show ID at the polls in 2004 provided current, valid, and acceptable ID.

New State Laws

Rather than expanding on HAVA and requiring ID from all voters, Massachusetts chose to implement Section 303(b) as the maximum requirement for voter ID in the State. In 2004, the State legislature passed a voter ID law that is an almost verbatim recitation of the requirements as stated in HAVA.²⁹

The State requires only first-time voters who register to vote by mail to show ID at the polls. Acceptable ID includes a current and valid driver's license, other photo ID or a current utility bill, bank statement, paycheck, government check or other government document that shows the voter's name and address.

Voters may be exempt from this requirement if they include a driver's license number or at least the last four digits of their Social Security number on the application and that number and the voter's identity can be verified. Applicants may also be exempt if they include with their registration a copy of a current and valid ID.

State legislation that established provisional voting was passed to comply with HAVA.³⁰ The State had previously offered "escrow ballots" to voters if local election officials could not find any voter registration record for an individual who wished to vote. "Escrow ballots" were reviewed only if the election victory margin was so small that they could have an effect on the outcome.

The State also passed a law that called on the secretary of the Commonwealth to establish

and manage a statewide voter registration database, as well as a number of rules related to implementing Federal requirements.³¹ Secretary William Galvin was elected in 1994 and is the chief State election official responsible for implementing HAVA's mandates.

Changes to the State's Voter Registration Database and Registration Form

Massachusetts has had a voter registration database since 1995, but overhauled the system after HAVA passed to comply with the law. The improved Voter Registration Information System (VRIS), a real-time database that supports more than 1,000 users in each of the State's 351 cities and towns, was developed by UNISYS in cooperation with on-staff developers in the secretary's office.

The VRIS was modified so that the system could communicate with the State's Registry of Motor Vehicles' network and verify the identity of registration applicants who provided their driver's license number or the last four digits of their Social Security number. The system allows election officials to print a notification letter and mail it to any applicant whose registration is not accepted. It also generates lists of voters who will be required to present ID at the polls. Local officials and poll workers use these lists on Election Day to determine who should be asked for ID.

The State's election division worked with local election officials to redesign the Massachusetts voter registration form before the 2004 Federal election. The updated form instructs voters to provide their driver's license number or the last four digits of their Social Security number. If the voter does not have either of those numbers, the form explains that they will be assigned a unique identifier by the State.

The form also advises voters that if their identity cannot be verified using a driver's license or partial social security number and if they do not include a copy of valid ID, they will be asked to present ID before voting. A list of acceptable ID is provided.

Training for Election Officials and Poll Workers

Secretary Galvin developed a comprehensive plan for training local election officials and poll workers to ensure that the new ID requirements were applied in a uniform manner.

The secretary led seminars on the new ID requirements at meetings of the Association of City and Town Clerks and made himself and his staff members available to help the locals train poll workers. He also worked with the clerks' association to develop an educational certification program that included a briefing on Massachusetts' laws and regulations relating to voter ID.

In cooperation with local election officials, Secretary Galvin sponsored annual election administration workshops that covered such topics as voter ID. Together, State and local officials also produced separate training presentations for election officials, staff and poll workers on ID requirements. They included instruction on the nondiscriminatory application of HAVA's ID requirements, provisional ballots, and poll worker training.

Voter Education and Outreach

The secretary's office established itself as the State's central voter education clearinghouse and launched an aggressive voter outreach plan before the 2004 Federal election.

Before both the primary and general elections, the State sent postcards to first-time registrants who would be required to show ID at the polling place to notify them of the new requirement. The content of the State's *Information for Voters* booklet, which is mailed to every household in the State before each statewide election, was dedicated almost entirely to explaining new ID laws.

The 2004 booklet directed first-time voters to attach ID to their registration form:

Because of a new Federal law, the Help America Vote Act of 2002 passed by Congress, if you registered to vote by mail on or after January 1,

2003, you will be required to show identification when you vote for the first time in a Federal election since registering by mail in 2003, or you can send in a copy of your identification with your voter registration form.

The requirements for first-time voters were outlined both on the secretary's Web site and in public service advertisements placed in newspapers and aired on radio stations throughout the State. Staffers who answered calls to the State's toll-free voter education hotline were trained to answer questions from first-time voters about registration and voting.

Voter Registration

Local election officials in Massachusetts' cities and towns are responsible for processing registration applications submitted by applicants in their jurisdiction and entering them into the centralized, statewide VRIS.

The system automatically checks the driver's license number or last four Social Security number digits provided by the applicant against the State's Registry of Motor Vehicles records. If no match is found, a message will display notifying the election official. The official will then print and mail a notice to the prospective voter that explains that a copy of ID must be submitted on or before Election Day. All first-time voters who register by mail also receive this notice.

Applications from voters who do not include a verifiable ID number or copy of ID and do not provide one when ID is requested in writing are rejected. Every voter whose registration is rejected for any reason is notified in writing and given an opportunity to provide any missing information. Voters whose registrations are accepted receive an acknowledgement notice.

The Accuracy of Voter Rolls

State election officials indicate that the VRIS and the procedures for using and maintaining the system have helped increase the accuracy of the State's voter rolls through identity verification, a rejected

Voter Registration Trends

- More stringent ID requirements for first-time voters have not had a discernable effect on the number of people who register to vote in Massachusetts. Massachusetts exhibited a slight increase in voter registration from 2000 to 2004, rising from 70.3 percent registration statewide in 2000 to 72 percent in 2004, for a 1.7-percent increase overall.³² This increase could be due in part to the fact that Massachusetts Senator John Kerry was a candidate for president in 2004.
- Corresponding changes in registration percentages within different gender, racial/ethnic, and age subgroups were in some cases generally consistent with the statewide trend, whereas others stood apart. African-American voter registration decreased by 1.8 percentage points. Registration of voters aged 65 to 74 and 75 and older dropped by 2 and 6.7 percent, respectively. Similarly, voter registration increased 16.7 percent in the Asian/Pacific Islanders subgroup and 5 percent in voters aged 25 to 44.³³
- Massachusetts reported adding 736,558 new registrants to its voter rolls after the close of the registration period in 2002 through the end of registration in 2004—nearly 140,000 more than in 2000.³⁴

It is possible, though, that because the State was in the process of updating its statewide voter registration database, some of those registrants were actually previously registered voters who were updated in the system and recorded as new.

- A noteworthy increase, however, occurred in the number of voter registration applications that were submitted by mail in 2004. Of voter registration applications, 59 percent were submitted by mail that year, compared with 31 percent in 2002 and just 18 percent in 2000.³⁵
- Most by-mail applicants in Massachusetts included their driver's license number or the last four digits of their Social Security number on their registration application. Of prospective voters who registered by mail in both 2004 and 2006, 95 percent included one of the ID numbers as instructed by the voter registration form.
- Only 3 percent of by-mail registrants submitted a copy of ID with their voter registration application. Of those applicants, 95 percent included a copy of a driver's license. Massachusetts reported that most of the applicants who included a copy of ID completed the National Mail Voter Registration Form.

applicant notification system, password security, limits on user access and broadcast e-mail.

The system makes it easier for election officials to quickly notify rejected applicants so that those applicants have an opportunity to correct any errors on their voter registration application. It can print rejection notifications as appropriate after each individual application is entered, or print them later from a special reports module.

Measures built into the system help prevent untrained users from accessing the database and corrupting voter records. The VRIS features a dual layer of network password security. Users must log into a Windows domain controller first, and then

enter a separate user ID to log into the database. Each user has a unique ID and password and is only permitted to access those sections of the database that fall under his or her purview. The login information also serves as a traceable identifier that enables the system to track user activity.

The State can use the system to communicate new rules, regulations and laws to election officials across the State. A broadcast e-mail function allows the State to notify all system users of any new policies immediately.

The State supplies all system users with a handbook that provides a uniform set of instructions for using VRIS. The handbook also directs users to

carefully review all duplicates found in the system to help keep the database clean and to store voting records correctly.

The handbook states: “All of the potential duplicates that appear on this screen may not be the same person. Be sure to verify all of the information on this screen against the registration being entered. An important field to note is the middle name.” It also notes that “one of the most common mistakes is merging people with different middle initials.”

At the Polls

First-time, by-mail registrants in Massachusetts demonstrated a thorough understanding of new ID requirements on Election Day in 2004 in large numbers and in even larger numbers in 2006.

State election officials estimate that 97 percent of first-timers who were required to show ID at the polls in 2004 provided current, valid, and acceptable ID. Two years later, 98 percent of first-time voters who were required to do so showed ID, giving Massachusetts one of the highest rates of voter ID compliance.

State election officials said the bulk of these voters, 95 percent in both 2004 and 2006, provided a driver’s license. The other 5 percent presented any one of a number of different IDs, all acceptable under State and Federal law, including utility bills, government checks, paychecks, and bank statements. Voters who offered poll workers some form of ID other than a driver’s license tended to be senior citizens and college students.

Higher numbers of provisional ballots were cast in Massachusetts in 2004 than in 2006. This could be due in part to the fact that 2004 was the first election during which the new ID requirements took effect but can certainly be attributed to the fact that more voters participated in the 2004 Presidential election than did in the 2006 midterm elections.

Approximately 10,000 provisional ballots were cast in Massachusetts in 2004, .32 percent of the total number of ballots cast. State election officials

estimate that 2 percent of those provisional ballots were cast by first-time voters who did not have proper ID in 2004. Of those ballots, 23 percent were deemed valid and counted. Just under 4,000 provisional ballots, or .17 percent of the total number of ballots, were cast in 2006 and 21 percent of those ballots were counted. First-time voters without ID cast 1.5 percent of those ballots.

Implementation Costs

The secretary’s office earmarked \$332,347 of the Federal and State HAVA dollars it received to pay for Section 303(b)-related expenses. In addition to that amount, approximately 5 percent of the money the State allocated to pay for improvements to its VRIS, voter education, election official and poll worker training and provisional balloting was used to fund activities and improvements designed to help meet HAVA’s ID requirement.

Altogether, the State spent approximately \$830,000 to implement new registration and ID requirements for first-time voters. That is just slightly more than Montana reported spending, even though the population of Massachusetts is about six and a half times larger.

State election officials estimated that new procedures for entering and processing registration applications from first-time voters who registered by mail lengthened processing time by 1 to 2 minutes per application.

Two hundred and sixty thousand applications were submitted by mail in 2006. At a minimum, then, it took election officials more than 4,000 additional hours to process applications from first-time voters. That translates into 1 year’s work for two full-time employees. It would have taken one full-time employee more than 9 months to process these voter applications in 2004.

Benefits and Challenges

When asked to describe the benefits and challenges of implementing Section 303(b), the secretary’s office reported that the law has not

placed any undue burden on the State and has not been challenging to implement.

“Voters, local election officials and poll workers might feel differently, though,” said Michelle Tassinari, legal counsel to the secretary’s election division. “Some first-time voters might feel it’s somewhat of an inconvenience to bring ID with them to the polls, but we haven’t heard many complaints.”

Some local election officials, however, have told the State that applying the ID law “selectively” has created challenges.

“They have told us that, because poll workers are asking for ID from some voters and not others, first-time voters sometimes ask why they have to show ID and the person standing next to them in line doesn’t,” Tassinari said.

Local election officials have told the secretary’s office that members of the State’s aging pool of poll workers sometimes find it difficult to keep track of which voters are required to show ID and are often uncomfortable addressing complaints from those voters about the requirements.

Tassinari says that although the benefits of Section 303(b) are not always tangible, they are significant.

“We didn’t have a large number of formal voter fraud complaints before HAVA passed, so it’s hard to prove that the law has helped to deter it,” she said. “But people like the comfort factor that the new ID requirements give them. They know that the ID laws help protect against fraud.”

Recommended Practices

Several of Massachusetts’ Section 303(b) administration practices are worth consideration by other States.

In 2003, the secretary’s office published the Central Voter Registry Resource Handbook, a step-by-step guide to using the VRIS and provided every local election office with a copy. The book is updated as needed and includes instructions for everything from logging into the system to generating comprehensive reports. Information in the handbook is organized by task and each set of directions is complete with color screen shots that illustrate the process.

The handbook helped election officials navigate the complex system smoothly. But perhaps more importantly, it helped guarantee that first-time voter registration applications would be processed uniformly and according to State and Federal law by providing election workers with easy-to-follow, detailed instructions for handling them.

The VRIS itself includes levels of functionality, above and beyond what HAVA requires, that help maintain accurate voter rolls. System features such as user traceability and password protection guard against untrained user access and errors. A broadcast e-mail capability allows the secretary’s office to communicate quickly with all system users.

The secretary of the Commonwealth’s office included detailed instructions for registering to vote by mail in its 2004 *Information for Voters* booklet, the centerpiece of which was a mail-in voter registration form. The 10-page booklet, which is produced before every statewide election and typically focuses on explaining ballot questions, was sent to every household in the State. The secretary’s office used the 2004 version to educate voters about new ID requirements and provisional voting.

Massachusetts also ran ads in area newspapers and on radio stations throughout the State that explained the new requirements for voters who register by mail. It is likely that the publicity surrounding the new ID requirements helped encourage prospective voters to register by mail.

Montana

According to estimates by State election officials, 95 percent of first-time voters who registered by mail in Montana provided acceptable ID at the polls on Election Day. The percentage increased to 98 percent in 2006.

New State Laws

Montana broadened HAVA's ID requirement to include every voter in the State. According to State law, every voter must present current photo ID that includes his or her name to an election judge before casting a ballot. If the voter does not have photo ID, he or she must present a current utility bill, bank statement, paycheck, voter card or other government document that includes the voter's name and address.³⁶ Voters who cannot provide ID are offered a provisional ballot.³⁷

According to the office of Montana's secretary of State, the State's chief election official, State government officials thought local officials would be unnecessarily burdened by an ID law that required them to ask only first-time voters for identification. State officials thought an ID-for-everyone provision was a better way to guarantee a uniform and nondiscriminatory voting process.

The State also passed laws and introduced regulations calling for a statewide voter registration database and establishing administrative procedures for processing voter registrations.³⁸ Montana's secretary of State—Bob Brown from 2000 to 2004 and now Brad Johnson—is responsible for implementing all election reform in the State.

Changes to the State's Voter Registration Database and Registration Form

Montana had a computerized voter list when HAVA passed, but the system was incomplete by

HAVA's standards and the software and procedures for entering information differed from county to county. The secretary of State spearheaded the development of a new, enhanced system, which was fully implemented in 2006.

The new system, designed by Saber Consulting with input from county election officials, connects all of the State's 56 counties. It automatically verifies the identities of voter registration applicants by electronically checking the registrant's driver's license number or partial Social Security number against State motor vehicles department records.

The secretary of State's office worked with an election task force that included local election officials to redesign the State's voter registration form. The form now prompts applicants to enter a Montana driver's license number or the last four digits of their Social Security number. Applicants who have neither are advised to submit acceptable ID either in person or by mail.

Training for Election Officials and Poll Workers

The secretary's office conducted workshops for election officials throughout the State that covered all aspects of election reform, including the statewide voter registration database, poll worker training and voter ID requirements. Saber Consulting was hired to provide training support. The company invited election officials from all 56 counties in the State to participate in training sessions designed to introduce them to the new voter registration database.

After the initial training sessions, Saber and members of the State's election task force conducted several training sessions across the State and offered hands-on database training to local officials.

The State's election judges' handbook was updated to include information about new ID requirements and suggested techniques for training poll workers. Representatives from the secretary's office also met with county election judges to review ID

requirements and provisional balloting procedures, and the State provided local election offices with a training DVD.

Voter Education and Outreach

The secretary's office led a statewide, grassroots marketing campaign and worked closely with community organizations and the media to get the word out to voters about the new ID requirements.

Staffers from the State elections office communicated the new ID requirements directly to voters at pow-wows (gatherings of the State's Native American population), State and county fairs, trade shows, conventions and college-sponsored events.

They also notified prospective voters of their right to cast a provisional ballot.

The secretary of State provided voter education grants of \$5,000 each to more than 90 community organizations. Grant recipients produced television commercials, held informative presentations, provided promotional material and brochures, and staffed booths at events around the State to answer questions from the general public.

Election reform educational kits were distributed to every high school, college, university, and technical school in the State as well as to all county courthouses, adult care centers, and tribal governments. The State also hired a professional marketing firm to produce advertisements and public service announcements to inform the public about new voting laws.

Voter Registration

In Montana, county election officials process voter registration applications from prospective voters who live within their jurisdiction. Election officials follow the same procedures when entering all registrations.

State policy dictates that election officials enter the driver's license or partial Social Security number into a special field in the voter registration database.

They must ensure that the number remains private and is accessible only to authorized county election officials and authorized staff at the secretary of State's office. The number, once checked against motor vehicles department records, serves as a unique identifier in addition to another voter registration number that is automatically assigned to the voter.

Applicants who fail to provide ID with their registration application are categorized as "provisionally registered electors." These electors are permitted to cast regular ballots at polling places only if they provide ID. If they do not, they will be allowed to cast provisional ballots.

Election officials immediately contact applicants whose registration is not able to be confirmed, but the voter registration system does not automatically generate rejection letters. Election officials in smaller counties typically contact applicants by phone. Larger counties write and send notification letters.

The voter registration system also generates a voter card that is sent to every applicant whose registration is approved.

The Accuracy of Voter Rolls

According to State election officials, Montana's voter registration database and procedures for confirming the identity of voters have helped increase the accuracy of the State's voter rolls in several ways.

Before the new database was implemented, each county had its own unique system for processing and tracking voter records. Some counties entered voter records into a word processing application. Now, every county uses the State's system and every election official follows the same procedures for processing applications. Saber Consulting trainers were on hand during the switch to the new system to help the counties transfer voter records, thus helping to maintain the integrity of existing records.

The State also provides every county with access to a help desk staffed with technical advisors

who can walk election officials through the process of entering new registrations. A help menu within the system itself allows the secretary of State's office to provide uniform instructions and timely updates to all system users.

All system users are given a unique user ID and password. Different levels of access for different users prevent users from editing records outside of their jurisdiction. The system also tracks and reports changes made to voter records and an audit log indicates which users processed which voter applications.

At the Polls

According to estimates by State election officials, 95 percent of first-time voters who registered by mail in Montana provided acceptable ID at the polls on Election Day. The percentage increased to 98 percent in 2006.

Of first-time voters, 85 percent provided a driver's license when asked for ID at the polling place in 2004 and 2006. That number is considerably lower than the percentages reported by the other States that participated in this study. The difference can be explained by taking into account Montana's large Native American population.

Montana has the fifth largest Native American population nationwide: 6 percent of the State's residents are Native American, according to the Census Bureau. State election officials report that most of these voters presented a tribal ID card instead of a driver's license.

The State also has a large population of senior citizens: it ranks 11th nationwide in the percentage of its residents that are 65 and older. Many of those voters do not have driver's licenses and instead used a government check or utility bill as their ID at the polls.

Voter Registration Trends

- Following the passage of Montana's ID for all voters law in 2003, the State exhibited a 5-percent increase in voter registration, rising from 70 percent registration statewide in 2000 to 75.1 percent in 2004. Corresponding changes in registration percentages within different gender, racial/ethnic, and age subgroups were in most cases generally consistent with the statewide trend. The one slight difference was exhibited by the less impressive increase in female voter registration of only 3.6 percentage points.³⁹
- Montana added 59,019 new registrants to its rolls in 2000, but that number dropped dramatically to 30,653 in 2004. The State added 51,194 voters to its rolls in 2006, a significant increase from 2004 and a slight increase compared with the 2002 midterm when 49,008 were added.⁴⁰
- Montana saw a significant increase in the number of applications that were submitted by mail in 2004. Of the applications that were submitted that year, 23 percent (approximately 26,000) were mailed in; that is up 6 points from 17 percent (18,155) in 2000. Of all registration applications, 22 percent were submitted by mail in 2002, but because voter registration was lower in that midterm election year than in the Presidential election year of 2004, that amounted to just 9,996 applications.⁴¹ This increase in by-mail applications can be attributed at least in part to increased awareness of the option to register by mail as a result of the State's voter education efforts.
- In 2006, the percentage of applications submitted by mail fell to 19 percent; however, the total number of by-mail applications was the second highest since 2000 (18,936).
- According to State election officials' estimates, 98 percent of by-mail registrants included a driver's license or partial Social Security number on their registration applications in 2004 and 2006. Of by-mail registrants, 6 percent included a copy of ID with their application in 2004 and 5 percent included ID in 2006. Of by-mail registrants who submitted ID, 98 percent chose to submit a copy of their driver's license in both 2004 and 2006. Most applicants who included ID completed the NVRA rather than the State's registration form.

In 2004, a small percentage of voters cast provisional ballots on Election Day—just .13 percent or 623 voters. More than half of those ballots, 378, were counted. A larger percentage of voters cast provisional ballots in 2006, but the total was still less than 1 percent of the number of voters who participated or 2,242 voters. Of those ballots, 95 percent were deemed valid and counted.

State election officials estimated that less than 2 percent of provisional ballots in both years were cast by first-time voters who did not provide proper ID. A total of 27 provisional ballots cast by first-time voters were not counted in 2006. The same number for 2004 was unavailable.

Implementation Costs

Montana set aside \$3.2 million to pay for improvements to its statewide voter registration database and \$930,000 for voter education, poll worker training, and election official training. The State spent \$176,000 on provisional balloting, money used primarily to pay for additional election judges to help the counties process provisional ballots. The State used a percentage of each of those budgets to pay for measures that would bring it into compliance with Section 303(b). Altogether, Montana estimates it spent just over \$730,000 to implement Section 303(b).

It took local election officials 3 minutes to process a voter registration application before HAVA passed and before the State implemented ID requirements for all voters. Now that State law calls for the verification of all registration applications through some form of ID—whether it is a driver's license or partial Social Security number or a copy of valid ID—it takes election officials 5 minutes to process each application.

In 2004, 114,341 State residents applied to register to vote. An extra 2 minutes per application adds up to an additional 3,800 hours to process those forms. That is about 2 years of work for one full-time employee. It took an extra 3,300 hours to process applications in 2006. That amounts to more than a year and a half of work for one full-time employee.

Benefits and Challenges

The Montana legislature voted in 2007 to allow late registration in the State and, according to State election officials, they felt comfortable doing so because of the extra security measures that had been implemented as part of Section 303(b).

...with our ID-for-all provision, we were able to avoid confusion and claims of discrimination against certain voters...

*Montana State election specialist
Alan Miller*

Late registration allows voters to register or update their registration records after the close of the standard registration period (30 days before Election Day) up to and including Election Day. The State requires applicants to register and vote in person at their county election office during this period to guard against double voting. The ID numbers provided by the applicants are then verified. ID is checked and voters are given a ballot which they mark and return to the election office staff.

“With the ID requirements in place, and the voter registration database being implemented ... we were able to reassure legislators that adequate safeguards would be in place for late registration,” said State election specialist Alan Miller.

According to Miller, the State avoided one of the biggest challenges it might have faced as a result of Section 303(b).

“It would have been a challenge trying to educate first-time voters without confusing the rest of the public,” Miller said. “But with our ID-for-all provision we were able to avoid confusion and claims of discrimination against certain voters that might otherwise have arisen.”

Educating voters about the new ID-for-all law was challenging, but Montana spread the word by using HAVA funds to pay for voter education ads and by talking to voters at community events.

Recommended Practices

Montana's voter education efforts were unique. None of the other States that participated in this study used as extensive a grassroots, community-based approach as the one employed by this State. And the secretary's office saved money by taking its message directly to voters and communicating face to face at everything from State fairs to pow-wows.

Montana also leaned heavily on community-based organizations that, with a little financial help from the State in the form of grants, helped educate their constituents and other community members.

"These groups proved invaluable to our early efforts to spread the word about the new election changes under HAVA," Miller said.

In 2006, the secretary's office carefully planned its media buys to make the most of what can sometimes be very expensive air time. It placed 50 percent of their television and radio public service announcements in prime time slots and, to save money, negotiated "bonus spots" that aired at no cost.

When it came to training election officials on the new statewide voter registration database, Montana set up a program in which county officials who were members of the State's election task force each adopted several counties. The "parent" officials provided additional training on the system where needed and advised the foster counties on how to follow the new ID procedures.

New Jersey

Of first-time voters who were required to show ID, 95 percent did so in 2004 and 2006. State election officials think most of those voters showed a driver's license, but they were unable to provide a more exact figure.

New State Laws

New Jersey requires ID only from first-time voters who register to vote by mail and did not include a verifiable driver's license number or the last four digits of their Social Security number with their voter registration form.⁴² The State did not require ID from any voters before HAVA and, after the law passed, New Jersey incorporated only HAVA's minimum requirement into State law.

According to the Office of the Attorney General, the chief State election official responsible for managing elections and election reform in New Jersey, the State was concerned that broadening the voter ID requirement could depress voter registration and turnout.

The State did, however, broaden HAVA's definition of a first-time voter to include any individual who is registering to vote for the first time in a county.

The State also passed laws requiring all of its local election officials to use the statewide voter registration database, follow uniform procedures for processing voter registrations and offer provisional ballots at all polling places.⁴³

Changes to the State's Voter Registration Database and Registration Form

New Jersey established a computer network in 1996 that linked county election offices and allowed the counties to send their voter registration lists to the State electronically. But the system needed updating to bring it into compliance with HAVA.

The State contracted with Covansys to create a new, Internet-based system, ElectioNet, that connects State, county, and municipal election offices. In New Jersey, 21 county clerks and 566 municipal clerks serve as election officials. The system was also connected to the State's Motor Vehicle Commission and other relevant State agencies.

A space was added to the State's voter registration form for voters to use to provide an ID number. An explanation of ID requirements for first-time voters who register by mail was also added to the form. The form advises prospective first-time voters that, if they do not have a driver's license number or Social Security number, they should include a copy of a current and valid photo ID or a document with their name and address. Otherwise, voters are instructed to bring ID to the polling place.

Training for Election Officials and Poll Workers

Both county and municipal officials administer elections in New Jersey. Training programs were in place for municipal officials before 2002, but county officials did not receive formal election administration training before HAVA passed.

The State's Attorney General—Peter Harvey from 2003 to 2006, now Stuart Rabner—developed educational programs for county officials similar to a certification program that was already being offered to municipal officials. Office staff lectured at statewide and regional county election conferences. The Attorney General also issued memoranda to individual county offices outlining new ID requirements and other key election reforms.

State law that predates HAVA requires poll workers to undergo training at least once every 2 years. County election officials are responsible for conducting the training courses and historically each county's sessions are unique.

In 2004, State election officials developed uniform guidelines for poll worker training. The Attorney

General's office also made a standard manual available to all poll workers statewide.

Voter Education and Outreach

New Jersey created its "Be Powerful, Be Heard" voter outreach and education initiative in 2004 to notify the State's residents of administrative changes related to HAVA, including ID requirements for first-time voters. The campaign also emphasized the importance of registering and voting.

The State launched voter education initiatives in 2004 and 2006 through the Internet, television and radio public service announcements as well as special events throughout the State.

The public service announcements featured such high profile celebrities as actors Michael Douglas and Jason Alexander and musician Wyclef Jean. The announcements underscored the importance of registering and voting and encouraged prospective voters to visit the election division Web site, which included instructions for first-time registrants.

Voter Registration

When election officials enter a voter registration application into New Jersey's newly redesigned voter registration database, the system automatically checks motor vehicles department records for a match. Information in the ID fields, which includes the applicant's driver's license or partial Social Security number, name and address, is submitted and electronically verified.

Confirmation notices are automatically generated by the system and sent to applicants whose registrations are accepted. Applicants whose identity cannot be verified are contacted by mail or by phone and given an opportunity to provide or correct information. If they fail to do so, they will be registered but required to show ID before voting.

The Accuracy of Voter Rolls

The voter registration system that was in place in New Jersey before HAVA connected some—but not all—of the local and State election officials in the State. The system linked the State's election

Voter Registration Trends

- New Jersey exhibited almost no change in voter registration, rising from 63.2 percent registration statewide in 2000 to 63.7 percent in 2004, for a minuscule increase of 0.5 percent overall. Corresponding changes in percentages within the gender, racial/ethnic, and age subgroups of interest were in some cases generally consistent with the statewide trend, whereas others stood apart. The latter include a decrease of 3.4 percent in registration of 75-and-older voters and increases of 8.0 percent in African-American voter registration, 5.7 percent in voters aged 18 to 24, and 6.3 percent in voters aged 65 to 74.⁴⁴
- No real change occurred from 2000 to 2004 in the number of voter registration applications that were submitted by mail. In 2000, 4 percent of applications were submitted by mail and, in 2004, 3.9 percent were sent by mail. The percentage of by-mail registrations peaked in 2002, though. Approximately 7 percent of the applications submitted that year were sent by mail.⁴⁵ New Jersey did not have 2006 registration figures available at the time this report was prepared.
- State election officials estimate that approximately 90 percent of voters who registered by mail included a driver's license or partial Social Security number in 2004 and 2006. During both years, less than 1 percent included a copy of ID with their application. Most of those applicants that included ID submitted a copy of a driver's license.

division with the 21 County Commissioners of Registration. It was not accessible, though, by the 21 county clerks or the 566 municipal clerks who also handle election administration.

The new system links every local election official, the State elections division, the New Jersey Motor

Vehicle Commission and other relevant State agencies. Now, election officials anywhere in the State can access the system at any time which helps keep records current.

The system includes a security infrastructure that provides different levels of access to different users based on job responsibilities. It helps protect data integrity by encrypting it before transferring it between the municipalities, counties, State elections division, and other State agencies. Additional security is built-in to protect voter's personal information.

At the Polls

Of first-time voters who were required to show ID, 95 percent did so in 2004 and 2006. State election officials think most of those voters showed a driver's license, but they were unable to provide a more exact figure.

The percentage of total ballots cast that were provisional decreased from 2004 to 2006. In 2004, 1.7 percent of ballots were provisional and, in 2006, just .71 percent were provisional. The number of ballots that were able to be counted increased substantially from 65 percent in 2004 to 75 percent in 2006. Election officials estimate that anywhere from 1 to 2 percent of provisional ballots were cast by first-time voters who registered by mail.

Implementation Costs

New Jersey budgeted \$20 million for its statewide voter registration database; \$5 million for voter education and election official and poll worker training; and \$1 million for provisional balloting. A portion of this \$26 million was spent to comply with Section 303(b), but State election officials did not know exactly how much.

State election officials were unable to determine how much time it takes the counties to process registration applications using the new statewide database to verify voters' identities. County election officials in Essex, the State's second most populous county, said it takes 4 minutes

New Jersey election officials say the biggest challenge they faced with regard to Section 303(b) has been guarding against disenfranchising voters, particularly recently naturalized citizens for whom English is a second language.

to process a voter registration application using the new statewide voter registration database. Before the statewide system was implemented, it took them approximately 40 seconds to process an application. Burlington County, the State's largest county geographically, also reported that it takes them 4 minutes to process an application now—compared with 40 seconds before HAVA's requirements took effect.

Burlington County processed 45,734 voter registration applications from the close of registration in 2002 through the close of registration in 2004. At 4 minutes per application, it would have taken one full-time employee 1 and a half years to process those voter registration applications. Burlington County received 16,496 applications from the close of registration in 2004 through the close of registration in 2006. That amounts to nearly 7 months of work for a full-time employee.

Benefits and Challenges

New Jersey election officials say the biggest challenge they faced with regard to Section 303(b) has been guarding against disenfranchising voters, particularly recently naturalized citizens.

"We were concerned that the law would keep some eligible voters from participating in our elections," said Maria DelValle-Koch, director of the State's election division. "We have a large immigrant population here. Many of them are new citizens and eligible to vote, but because English is their second language, they can be easily overwhelmed by complicated requirements for voting like voter identification."

DelValle-Koch said the State implemented only the minimum ID requirements mandated by HAVA to avoid depressing registration and turnout by asking first-time voters for photo ID. “A lot of older, recently naturalized citizens don’t have easy access to certain types of ID, like photo ID,” DelValle-Koch said. “They just never had a need for a driver’s license or any other photo identification.”

The law has its benefits. Improvements to the statewide voter registration database allowed local election officials to instantly identify duplicate voter registration records when entering registration applications. When a voter moves to a new jurisdiction and registers to vote there, the voter’s previous jurisdiction can forward that voter’s records to election officials in his or her new hometown.

Recommended Practices

Because the State has such a large percentage of foreign-born residents (it ranks third nationwide in the percentage of its population that is foreign-born), State election officials advocate the printing of voter education materials in multiple languages, including English and Spanish, Cantonese, Mandarin and Gujarati.

New Jersey is not required to produce materials in all of these languages, but election officials think it is important to educate as many voters as possible in their native languages.

The State’s “Be Powerful, Be Heard” voter education campaign included special events designed to educate specific demographic groups.

At a special event for young voters, then-Attorney General Peter Harvey spoke about HAVA-mandated election reforms and emphasized the importance of registering and voting. He was joined by such celebrities as music mogul Russell Simmons, former rap artist Reverend Run, and actor Joe Piscopo. Live video of the event was streamed via the Internet to every high school in the State, and an estimated 55,000 students watched the event from their classrooms.

More than 100 senior citizens participated in the taping of a voter education public service announcement for seniors. The State also held a voter education event at a senior citizens’ health care facility and distributed election information and registration forms.

North Carolina

State election officials estimate that most first-time voters who registered by mail provided current and valid ID, acceptable under State law, at the polls in 2004 and 2006. Of those voters, 90 percent presented a driver's license as their ID.

New State Laws

North Carolina chose to implement HAVA's mandate as the State's maximum requirement for identification—only first-time voters who register by mail are required to show ID before voting.⁴⁶ The State expanded on HAVA's definition of a first-time voter. In North Carolina, an applicant is considered a first-time voter if he or she has not previously registered to vote in the county in which he or she is applying to register.

First-time voters who register by mail are required to present current and valid photo ID or a copy of a document, such as a paycheck or utility bill, that shows the name and address of the voter before voting. Voters may avoid the ID at the polls requirement by providing a copy of ID, driver's license, or partial Social Security number with their registration form.

As with most States, North Carolina also passed laws and rules that called for the implementation of a statewide database and provisional balloting and established administrative procedures.⁴⁷

The North Carolina State Board of Elections manages all election reform efforts under HAVA. The Board's executive director is primarily responsible for election administration in the State.

Changes to the State's Voter Registration Database and Registration Form

North Carolina had a voter registration system that was all-but-statewide before HAVA passed.

The State issued an RFP for the original system, known as SEIMS, in 1997. SEIMS linked all of the State's 100 counties and enabled them to exchange information for voter registration reports, voter list maintenance and election management overall. The central database was used to distribute voter registration applications to the counties that were received at the State's motor vehicles department, disseminate lists of deceased voters and check for duplicate voter records.

SEIMS was not actually used by all of the counties, though. Five counties did not use the State system to process voter registration forms, and data from four counties were not sent in real time to the database. The list of counties not using the database included four of the most populous counties in the State. To comply with HAVA, North Carolina moved all of its counties to SEIMS in 2005.

SEIMS has been updated to meet the requirements of HAVA. The system automatically checks drivers' licenses and partial Social Security numbers against the State's motor vehicles department's electronic records.

North Carolina also changed its voter registration form. The form now prompts voters to include their driver's license number or the last four digits of their Social Security number. If first-time voters do not have either number and they are registering by mail, the form instructs them to send a copy of current and valid photo ID or a copy of a utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck or other government document that includes their name and address. Voters who do not provide this information are advised that they will be required to present it when they vote.

Training for Election Officials and Poll Workers

North Carolina began an election administration certification program for election officials and poll workers in 1995. After HAVA passed, the program's "core" courses were supplemented with information on new ID requirements and methods for processing voter registration forms.

A candidate for certification must complete a requisite number of core courses and electives, attend continuing education through seminars conducted by the State Board and the University

of North Carolina's Institute of Government, and pass a written examination. After completing these requirements, election officials are certified for a 2-year period, but local officials must complete continuing education to maintain certification.

Training videos and online training courses were produced to help train poll workers. The videos were distributed to public access television channels and libraries for viewing by the public.

Voter Education and Outreach

The State Board's voter education efforts centered on their Web site. The site has several tools available now and plans are in place for enhancing the site to include an online voter guide. Citizens' Awareness Month and statewide voter registration drives are also directed and managed by the State Board of Elections.

Voter Registration

SEIMS automatically verifies the applicant's driver's license or partial Social Security number when a voter registration application is entered by a local election official. An electronic message is sent to North Carolina Department Of Motor Vehicles and the SEIMS user is notified of the results. If an ID number is not provided on the form, the system assigns a unique identifying number to the voter.

Once the registration is processed and accepted, a voter card is printed. If the voter is required to show ID before voting, the card includes a notation that reads: "ID required."

SEIMS also automatically generates letters to first-time, by-mail registrants who did not include ID with their application. These letters serve as notification to voters that they must provide ID before they will be allowed to vote. When applications are rejected, notification letters are sent to applicants that include a description of exactly what information is needed to complete the application.

The Accuracy of Voter Rolls

The State immediately increased the accuracy of its voter rolls when it moved all of its 100 counties to SEIMS. Under the State's certification program for election officials, local jurisdictions now follow

Voter Registration Trends

- North Carolina exhibited an increase in voter registration, rising from 66.1 percent statewide in 2000 to 68.7 percent in 2004, for a 2.6-percent increase overall. Corresponding changes in percentages within gender, racial/ethnic and age subgroups of interest were in some cases generally consistent with the statewide trend, whereas others stood apart. The latter include increases of 6.7 percent in African-American voter registration, 7 percent in voters aged 18 to 24, and 6.3 percent in voters aged 75 and older.⁴⁸
- North Carolina added more new registrants to the rolls in 2004 than in the days leading up to the 2000 Presidential election: 924,394 compared with 837,936. No noticeable change occurred in the percentage of registrants who submitted their applications by mail, only a slight decrease from 20.8 in 2000 to 20.1 in 2004.⁴⁹
- In 2006, 10.9 percent of North Carolina's 644,045 applicants submitted their forms by mail, which is a substantial drop from 2004, but a 0.4-point increase compared with the last midterm election in 2002.⁵⁰
- According to State election officials, 90 percent of by-mail registrants included a driver's license or partial Social Security number with their application. Just 5 percent submitted a copy of their ID, and most of those included a copy of a driver's license or Social Security card.

uniform procedures for processing registration applications. The State helps guarantee, through continuing education classes, that election officials keep current on election administration practices.

As with the systems in the other States that took part in this study, North Carolina's voter registration database is password-protected and provides a

unique and traceable ID for every authorized user. The system only allows users to access those areas that directly pertain to their job responsibilities.

At the Polls

State election officials estimate that most first-time voters who registered by mail provided current and valid ID, acceptable under State law, at the polls in 2004 and 2006. Of those voters, 90 percent presented a driver's license as their ID. The other 10 percent showed any one of a number of forms of ID, including a bank statement, utility bill or a photo ID other than a driver's license.

More than 77,000 voters, or more than 2 percent of those who participated, cast provisional ballots in North Carolina in 2004 and 65 percent of those ballots were counted. Slightly more than 22,000 voters, or 1.1 percent, cast provisional ballots in 2006. Approximately 75 percent of those ballots were counted, a 10-percent increase from 2004.

Implementation Costs

The State budgeted \$5 million to update its voter registration system; an additional \$2 million to add an ID number verification capability and to conduct list maintenance mailings; \$1.5 million to pay for election official training programs and support materials; and \$1.65 million to implement provisional ballots.

State election officials estimate that approximately 42 percent of this money, or \$4.3 million, was applied directly to Section 303(b)-related measures.

The new verification procedures for first-time voters' registration applications sent by mail added 1 to 2 minutes per application to the processing time. As noted in other case studies, even such a short amount of time can have a major effect on elections staff.

Benefits and Challenges

To comply with HAVA, North Carolina created an information technology software interface that connected their SEIMS network to the State's motor vehicles department's computer system. State election officials say the development of this interface was one of the benefits of

To comply with HAVA, North Carolina created an information technology software interface that connected their SEIMS network to the State's motor vehicles department's computer system. State election officials say the development of this interface was one of the benefits of implementing Section 303(b) as well as one of the biggest challenges.

implementing Section 303(b) as well as one of the biggest challenges.

Training election officials was another challenge, according to North Carolina Elections Liaison Sharon Everett, but the State elections board spent a considerable amount of time designing new educational programs for local election officials.

"Training was one of our priorities," Everett said. "We added provisional voting and SEIMS classes to a certification program that already existed, but our IT staff also held a series of training sessions to introduce the counties to the new system. And we offer refresher courses to counties several times a year that cover SEIMS and the new identification requirements."

Recommended Practices

North Carolina established a "Wellness Check" program in 2004. Under the program, a team from the State board visits county boards of elections and checks to make sure they are compliant with all aspects of Federal and State election administration law.

State team members follow a formal set of guidelines for conducting the audits and record the counties' answers to their questions. The guidelines include extensive checks of voter registration practices and poll worker training procedures,

among other things. The State recommends improvements to the counties based on audit findings, and a schedule of target completion dates for improvements is agreed upon.

If the counties do not comply with legislative mandates after these efforts, the State Board takes legal action against the county. Under North Carolina law, the State Board of Elections has jurisdiction to force county boards to comply with election law. One hundred North Carolina counties have been scheduled for 2007 “Wellness Check” visits in preparation for 2008.

North Carolina’s State Board of Elections worked with the State’s community college system to establish a specialized training and civics curriculum for election officials. The classes were also made available to members of the general public and the media. By offering these classes to the public, the Board hopes to develop a pool from which they may recruit poll workers in the future.

The State established a SEIMS help desk that is staffed by IT professionals who can answer local election officials’ questions about the system. They also added a “live help” feature to their Web site. Local officials simply contact the SEIMS helpdesk for a live help ticket number, then log into live help and an IT professional walks them through the process in question, for example registering a first-time voter, live on the system itself.

Pennsylvania

State election officials estimate that 96 to 98 percent of first-time voters provided valid ID as required on Election Day. Of those voters, 80 percent presented a driver's license.

New State Laws

The Pennsylvania General Assembly passed a law in early 2002, before HAVA, that called for the establishment of a statewide voter registration database administered by the secretary of the Commonwealth. Under the law, county election officials are responsible for adding, modifying, and deleting records. The secretary's office also implemented a rule that outlined procedures for processing voter registration applications using the new system.⁵¹

The State legislature passed another election reform bill in December of 2002 that amended the State's election code to comply with HAVA. The law established provisional ballot requirements and voter ID requirements for all first-time voters, among other mandates.⁵²

Pennsylvania's voter ID requirements exceed those imposed by Federal law. Although HAVA requires ID only for first-time voters who register by mail, Pennsylvania requires all voters who are voting for the first time in a district to present ID—regardless of their method of registration.

The types of ID that the State will accept from these voters are identical to those identified as acceptable in HAVA. They include photo ID such as a valid driver's license, U.S. passport, or military ID or nonphoto ID that includes the voter's name and address such as a utility bill, bank statement, or paycheck.

Pennsylvania's secretary of the Commonwealth is the State's chief election official and is responsible for managing election reform and administration in the State.

Changes to the State's Voter Registration Database and Registration Form

Although State law called for a statewide registration system in Pennsylvania before HAVA passed, the State had to expand its requirements for the system to comply with Federal law. For example, the secretary's office entered into an agreement with the State's transportation department to provide for the verification of driver's license numbers and the last four digits of registrants' Social Security numbers.

The State updated its voter registration form, which now requires applicants to include their driver's license number or the last four digits of their Social Security number. If the applicant does not have either number, the form's instructions indicate that a unique identifier will be assigned to him or her by the State.

The form also provides instructions for registrants who may be required to show ID:

Pennsylvania law requires that registered voters who appear in person to vote for the first time in an election district after December 9, 2003, must present a form of identification. If you are voting for the first time in your county, and you intend to vote by absentee ballot, please include a copy of a form of identification with this voter registration mail application. Otherwise, you will be required by federal law to include a copy of a form of identification with your absentee ballot.

Training for Election Official and Poll Worker

The secretary's office provided extensive training to State and county election officials and poll workers.

State department staff attended a meeting of the Eastern and Western County Election Personnel Associations in early 2004 to advise the group about handling provisional voting, voter identification, and poll worker training. The department also conducted county training sessions in 2004 at five regional meetings across

the State. Of the State's 67 counties, 62 attended the sessions.

Similar training courses were held in 2006 and developed by the State department in cooperation with county election personnel associations, colleges and universities, and representatives of alternative language and disability groups. Department officials continue to offer seminars each year on election procedures, including obtaining ID from first-time voters. They also conduct video conference training sessions.

In 2004 and 2006, State department personnel conducted poll worker training sessions in any county that requested assistance. Training included take-away materials that poll workers could reference while working at the polls on Election Day.

The secretary's office hired additional staff to help conduct poll worker training and work with local officials to ensure each county uses consistent and standard procedures in every polling place.

Voter Education and Outreach

Pennsylvania developed its "Ready. Set. Vote." voter education and outreach program in 2004, with input from county election officials and advocacy groups. The campaign was aimed at increasing voter registration and participation and notifying voters of new ID requirements. The State promoted the campaign, which was centered on the interactive voter education Web site www.votespa.com, through print, radio, television, and Internet advertisements.

The secretary's office also produced voter guides and a tip sheet for first-time voters that included information about ID requirements and a list of acceptable forms of ID. Publications were distributed to voters through county offices and advocacy groups and posted on the secretary's Web site.

The State department also aired voter education videos on the Pennsylvania Cable Network and released public service announcements immediately before both the primary and the general elections in 2004 and 2006.

Voter Registration

Pennsylvania's county election officials use the Statewide Uniform Registry of Electors (SURE) system to process applications from prospective registrants in their jurisdictions. SURE was designed by Accenture to streamline the management of voter rolls by enabling counties to share voter records and to verify applicants' identities through a link to the State motor vehicle department's computer system, among other things.

The system automatically checks applicants' driver's license numbers or the last four digits of applicants' Social Security numbers against the transportation department's records. Once a match is found, a voter card is automatically generated by the system and sent to the registrant. If that card is returned as undeliverable, the application is rejected.

Local election officials in Pennsylvania contact any applicant whose registration form is missing information or whose identity is unable to be verified. Applicants are given 40 days to correct any errors by phone, mail, or in person. Applicants who do not provide any additional information before Election Day, must vote a provisional ballot and provide ID at the polls.

The Accuracy of Voter Rolls

Each of the State's 67 counties had its own procedures for processing voter registration applications before the State implemented SURE, making it almost impossible for the counties to crosscheck their voter records against those of other counties. Now, counties can use SURE to check for duplicate voter records instantly.

SURE is password protected and allows users to access only those areas of the system that directly pertain to their job responsibilities.

If an application is complete, it is considered pending until the end of a 10-day period. If, during that time, the voter card that is sent to the registrant is not returned as undeliverable, the registration is accepted.

Voter Registration Trends

Pennsylvania exhibited an increase in voter registration from 2000 to 2004, rising from 65.3 percent registration statewide in 2000 to 69.3 percent in 2004, for a 4-percent increase overall.⁵³

Corresponding changes in percentages within gender, racial/ethnic and age subgroups of interest were in some cases generally consistent with the statewide trend, whereas others stood apart. The latter include decreases of 2 percent in registration among Asians and 2.3 percent in Hispanic registration. Nevertheless, increases of 8.9 percent in African-American voter registration and 6.4 percent in registration of voters aged 25 to 44 are noteworthy.⁵⁴

State election officials reported adding 1,061,531 voters to the rolls in 2000 and 1,435,974 in 2004. In 2006, more than 855,000 new registrants were added to the rolls. The percentage of voters who registered by mail jumped from 26.3 percent in 2002 to 35.3 percent in 2004, but dropped to 26.9 percent in 2006. The percentage of by-mail registrants in 2000 was 4 percentage points lower than in 2004.⁵⁵

Of first-time voters who registered by mail, 80 percent included a driver's license or partial Social Security number on their application in both 2004 and 2006. Less than 1 percent included a copy of ID during those same years. Registrants who chose to include a copy of ID included a copy of their driver's license 80 percent of the time in 2004 and 2006. Other registrants who included ID sent a copy of a U.S. passport, student ID or State residence license.

At the Polls

State election officials estimate that 96 to 98 percent of first-time voters provided valid ID as required on Election Day. Of those voters, 80 percent presented a driver's license. Most of the remaining voters produced either a U.S. passport, student ID or State residence license.

Voters who did not use a driver's license as their ID on Election Day tended to be senior citizens and inner-city residents, according to State officials who

said that members of both groups very often do not have a driver's license.

Just .3 percent of voters cast provisional ballots in 2006. Of those ballots, 37 percent were counted and 25 percent were partially counted. Of the 12,345 provisional ballots cast, 664 were not counted because the provisional ballot envelope did not include all the information required from the voter (it might have been missing a signature, for example) and 2,539 provisional votes were not counted because the voter was not registered. Provisional ballot figures for 2004 were not available.

Implementation Costs

Pennsylvania budgeted \$13 million to pay for the development of its statewide voter registration database; \$7.6 million for voter education, election official and poll worker training programs; and \$195,000 for provisional balloting.

State election officials were unable to estimate exactly what percentage of that money was applied to costs directly associated with Section 303(b).

The State estimated that it takes local election officials 1 additional minute to process voter registration applications using the newly redesigned SURE system. Election officials in Lycoming County, the geographically largest county in the State, agreed, reporting that it takes them approximately 1 extra minute to process applications now.

The State's most populous county, Philadelphia County, said it takes them twice as long to process an application now. For example, the County received approximately 30,000 paper applications on the last day of registration in 2004 and, using their old system, it took them 6 days to process those applications. It took county officials 7 days to process 13,000 registrations under the new system in 2006.

But Philadelphia County is unique. Because of the political nature of the city and the large number of nonprofit organizations and political groups that work to register voters, the County receives more paper applications than most.

Benefits and Challenges

When asked what the benefits and challenges of implementing Section 303(b) were for the State, State department officials said the measure helps prevent fraud, but that it creates a risk of possibly discouraging people from voting.

Molly O’Leary, the State’s chief of voter registration, highlighted improvements to SURE as a major benefit of the law.

“Our new SURE system provides accurate and up-to-date information about our electors,” O’Leary said. “In fact, every night a snapshot is run by each of the 67 counties that details all of the updates that were made that day.”

O’Leary also indicated that the State’s “Ready. Set. Vote.” Web-based campaign, which was undertaken to educate voters about HAVA-related election reform in the State, helped the State engage voters in a new way.

Recommended Practices

The secretary’s office produced a 25-page manual dedicated entirely to providing local officials with guidelines for processing registration for applications from first-time voters. The manual, entitled “Job Aid: Entering and Processing Applications Requiring Driver’s License and Social Security Number Checks,” included step-by-step instructions and screen shots from SURE.

The office also created guides designed to help poll workers apply the new ID laws uniformly. Poll workers were encouraged to take the booklets to the polls on Election Day and refer to them as needed.

When asked what the benefits and challenges of implementing Section 303(b) were for the State, State department officials said the measure helps prevent fraud, but that it creates a risk of possibly discouraging people from voting.

¹ The Constitution Project and Electionline.org, “Election Reform Briefing: Voter Identification,” Electionline.org, April 2002, <http://www.electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Voter%20Identification.pdf>.

² *ibid.*

³ Electionline.org, “Election Reform Briefing: Statewide Voter Registration Databases,” Electionline.org, March 2002, <http://www.electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Statewide%20Voter%20Registraion%20DB.pdf>.

⁴ American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, “AAMVA Survey Summary: Results on Compliance with HAVA Provisions for Motor Vehicle Agencies,” American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, November 10, 2003, <http://www.aamva.org/aamva/DocumentDisplay.aspx?id={260CEE16-96E5-4B45-A289-4045A5266E27}>.

⁵ U.S. Census Bureau, “Educational Attainment of the Population 25 Years and Over, By State, Including Margin of Error: 2006,” U.S. Census Bureau, 2004, www.census.gov/population/socdemo/education/cps2006/tab13.xls.

⁶ *ibid.*

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ *ibid.*

⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁰ U.S. Election Assistance Commission, “Voluntary Guidance on Implementation of Statewide Voter Registration Lists,” U.S. Election Assistance Commission, July 2005, http://www.eac.gov/docs/Statewide_Registration_Guidelines_072605.html.

¹¹ The Help America Vote Act of 2002. Public Law 107-252. 107th Congress, section 303(b) (2002).

¹² U.S. Census Bureau, “Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin, for States: November 2004,” U.S. Census Bureau, 2004, <http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/voting/cps2004/tab04a.xls>.

¹³ *ibid.*

¹⁴ U.S. Election Assistance Commission, “The Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 on Administration of Elections for Federal Office 2003-2004,” Tables 1 and 2, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, June 30, 2005.

¹⁵ Federal Election Assistance Commission, “The Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 on the Administration of Election for Federal Office 1999-2000,” Tables 1 and 2, Federal Election Commission.

¹⁶ See “The Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993,” 1999-2000 and 2003-2004.

¹⁷ *ibid.*

¹⁸ *ibid.*

¹⁹ Indiana Public Law 109-2005

²⁰ Indiana Secretary of State and Indiana Election Division, “2006 Indiana Election Day Handbook,” Indiana Secretary of State and Indiana Election Division, July 2006, http://www.in.gov/sos/elections/pdfs/EDH_FINAL.pdf.

²¹ Indiana Code 3-7-33-4.5

²² Indiana Codes 3-5-2-40.5, 3-7-13-13, 3-7-26.3, 3-7-44-4.5, 3-7-33-5, 3-7-34, 3-11-8-25.1, 3-11-8-25.2

²³ See “Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin, for States.”

²⁴ U.S. Census Bureau, “Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Age, for States: November 2004,” U.S. Census Bureau, 2004, <http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/voting/cps2004/tab04b.xls>

²⁵ *ibid.*

²⁶ See “The Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993,” 1999-2000, 2001-2002 and 2003-2004.

²⁷ See “The Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993” 2001-2002.

²⁸ *ibid.*

²⁹ Massachusetts General Law Chap. 54, Sec. 76B

³⁰ M.G.L. Chap. 54, Sec. 76C

³¹ M.G.L. Chap. 51, Sec. 47; Code of Massachusetts Regulations 950-57.04, 950-58.03

³² See “Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin, for States” and “Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Age, for States.”

³³ *ibid.*

³⁴ See “The Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993,” 1999-2000 and 2003-2004.

³⁵ See “The Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993,” 1999-2000, 2001-2002 and 2003-2004.

³⁶ Montana Code 13-13-114

³⁷ Montana Code Annotated 13-13-601

³⁸ M.C.A. 13-2-107, 13-2-110, 13-2-207, 13-2-301, 13-13-114, 13-15-107; Administrative Rules of Montana 43.3.2002, 44.3.2013, 44.3.2102, 44.3.2114, 44.4.2013

³⁹ See “Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin, for States” and “Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Age, for States.”

⁴⁰ See “The Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993,” 1999-2000, 2001-2002 and 2003-2004.

⁴¹ *ibid.*

⁴² New Jersey Statutes Annotated 19:31-5

⁴³ N.J.S.A. 19:31-1, 19:31-5, 19:31-6.5, 19:31-31, 19:53C-3; New Jersey Administrative Code 13:17-1.1

⁴⁴ See “Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin, for States” and “Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Age, for States.”

⁴⁵ See “The Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993,” 1999-2000, 2001-2002 and 2003-2004.

⁴⁶ North Carolina General Statute 163-166.12

⁴⁷ N.C.G.S. 163-82.4, 163-82.7, 163-82.11

⁴⁸ See “Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin, for States” and “Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Age, for States.”

⁴⁹ See “The Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993,” 1999-2000, 2001-2002 and 2003-2004.

⁵⁰ *ibid.*

⁵¹ 25 Pa. C.S. Pt. IV; 4 Pa. Code Ch. 183

⁵² 25 P.S. 3050; 25 Pa.C.S. 1328

⁵³ See “Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race and Hispanic

Origin, for States” and “Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Age, for States.”

⁵⁴ *ibid.*

⁵⁵ See “The Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993,” 1999-2000, 2001-2002 and 2003-2004.

U.S. Election Assistance Commission

EAC Commissioners

Chair Rosemary E. Rodriguez
Vice Chair Caroline Hunter
Commissioner Donetta L. Davidson
Commissioner Gracia M. Hillman

EAC Staff

Thomas Wilkey, Executive Director
Juliet Hodgkins, General Counsel



U.S. Election Assistance Commission

1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 (toll free)
HAVAinfo@eac.gov
www.eac.gov